

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you for coming. We have basically two presentations today, two votes, and then open discussion. And Jill will be the moderator. And Jill, you can advance a couple of slides now.

One suggestion is if you click on the screen first and then try it, it usually works.

So only have one announcement, which is that we have elections coming up. They are going to start next Monday, run for about eight days. And the positions in question are faculty trustee, we have three candidates; University Faculty Committee, we have five candidates; Nominations and Elections, and senator-at-large.

So you will get reminders. Real important to have a nice showing during the period when the polls are open. So again, that will start on Monday, you will get an email about that. There's a web page that has all the candidate statements and their web pages, so you can browse through all that easily. And I'll send that to you when I send the -- it will be part of the synopsis of this meeting that you'll get in a day or two.

Remember that this meeting is recorded and, shortly thereafter, we'll post the audio. And shortly thereafter that, there will be the usual transcript. When you speak up, make sure, as usual, you mention your name and your department.

Okay, Jill, I think we're ready for the next slide.

Okay, we'll just live with this, then.

So our first presentation is from the Law School, and it's a proposal that concerns granting tenure to clinical professors. Recall that we have three professorial RTE tracks, clinical, professor of the practice and research professor. And within each of those, there are three ranks. For example, there's assistant clinical professor, associate and full. So to present this, we

have three colleagues from the law school, and we'll start with Beth Lyon, who will introduce the others as the presentation unfolds. So Beth.

BETH LYON: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Beth Lyon, the law school's associate dean for experiential education and clinical program director, and I'm co-presenting with my colleagues, Professor John Blume, who directed the clinical program at the law school for nine years, and Law School Dean Eduardo Penalver. And we really thank all of you for carrying forward in these times and for the opportunity to talk with you today.

We are going to stay on this slide for just a minute, with some background on clinical legal education. Until the late 19th Century, most lawyers in the United States learned their craft through self-directed reading and training in law offices. Beginning in the late (audio difficulties) -- development of the Socratic case study methodology revolutionized -- 1930s, most students of the law were based in university law schools.

As the traditional requirement for a law office-based training faded away, new law schools did not -- teaching the practical skills formerly learned through a well-designed apprenticeship. Instead, they relied almost exclusively on doctrinal analysis to prepare students for practice. And it was not until the turbulent years in the 1960s that law schools began to create new programs designed to inculcate a broader range of competencies and the ideals of professional service by engaging students, under faculty supervision, to provide free representation to indigent people or community organizations.

Next slide. What ensued since the 1960s inside the legal academy has been a slow integration of doctrinal and clinical legal education, a process that really continues to this day. The legal academies' primary regulators the American Bar Association, which accredited law schools, and the state courts that license our alumni to practice. And these institutions have

been pushing the integration process along by increasingly requiring law schools to strengthen both their experiential training and also their pro bono service to the community.

So in 1996, the ABA mandated status protection for clinicians in the form of security of position, reasonably similar to tenure. In 2012, the New York Judiciary required all bar candidates to show they had completed 50 pro bono hours of work, which many of them carried out through their clinical training.

In 2014, an influential national task force urged law schools to make clinical education more central to legal pedagogy. And in 2015, the New York Judiciary required bar candidates to demonstrate substantial experiential law school training. In 2016, the ABA followed on, requiring six credits of experiential coursework for completion of the J.D. degree.

Next slide. 2020 marks a significant anniversary of Cornell Law School's clinical program. And for many decades, our primary clinical offering was the legal aid clinic, serving local communities in areas such as family law, federal benefits -- in the 1990s, we began what has become our largest program, the capital punishment clinic, and related programs.

Next slide. The size of our clinical faculty and the scope of our offerings has grown a great deal, just in the past two decades. And this academic year, we offered twelve in-house clinical courses taught by full-time faculty and ten practicum courses or field clinics taught by adjunct faculty. This expansion has allowed us to blend local and national with international service, litigation with -- civil with criminal law matters, individual cases with impact litigation and policy advocacy, and also to launch a number of inter-professional programs, combining teams of law students with ILR, accounting and medical students.

Next slide. Correspondingly, the percentage of the class the clinical program serves has grown rapidly, and more than 70% of the class of 2020 will have participated in a clinic or

practicum course. We're proud of the breadth of our programs, but also of the depth of our programs.

And many students take more than one clinic or continue on in clinic for multiple semesters, allowing them to build professional expertise and training them as law practice mentors to new students and often as active partners in determining our case priorities. We recently arrived at a major milestone for our program, where we can guarantee a clinical opportunity to every student who wants one.

And now I'm going to hand over, as we move to the next slide, the presentation to Dean Penalver.

EDUARDO PENALVER: Thanks, Beth. Thanks for starting us off. Thank you to the faculty senate for allowing us to make this presentation. I'm going to talk a little bit about why I think this is important for the law school, and it really starts with the reputation of the school that we've enjoyed in recent years among prospective law students for our strong track record in job placement, particularly with the largest law firms in the country.

And so this has created a kind of identity for the school as a little bit of a corporate law school. And that's an identity that has attracted many students to come to Cornell, to be sure, but it's an identity that I'm trying to broaden, for a number of reasons.

For starters, this kind of what I would call an unbalanced identity is not in keeping with the founding vision for Cornell Law School. A.D. White said that he wanted Cornell Law School's graduates to be blessings to the nation on the bench, at the bar and in the various public bodies.

And translating that from 19th Century speak into modern terminology, I think what he meant was that he wanted this law school to send our graduates off into the full range of legal endeavors; in private practice, the judiciary and certainly in public service. And over our long

history, we've done that. We've produced senators and secretaries of state, leaders of public interest, advocacy -- I'm picking up some background noise. I don't know if people could mute.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mute your microphone.

EDUARDO PENALVER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jill could also click mute all, although you'll have to unmute again.

EDUARDO PENALVER: Yeah, I don't think I can do that. But if Jill could do that, yeah, that'd be great. And then I can unmute myself.

JILL SHORT: I got it.

EDUARDO PENALVER: Okay, thank you.

Like I said, in our more recent history, we kind of shared an identity with a number of other top law schools, as more corporate-oriented and less balanced, and so broadening our identity would be in keeping with our founding vision and I think very much in keeping with the university's land grant mission.

Second, and kind of looking forward, balancing our identity positions as for success in attracting the very best law students, and that's what the current slide shows. Student are drawn to law school overwhelmingly in order to serve others and to advocate for social change. And so if we're perceived by prospective students to be a law school that does not stand for those things, then we will not be successful or as successful as we want to be in attracting those students to come to Ithaca.

And then finally, for the reasons best spelled out in her discussion, clinical pedagogy's crucial to a well-rounded legal education. Experiential learning is increasingly important, and schools that can attract the strongest clinicians will provide a better education to their students than schools that cling to the older ways of doing things.

As an aside, that's why I created the associate dean for experiential education, with Beth inaugurating that role. For all these reasons, I've made enhancing our public service program, in which the clinics play a key role, one of the key strategic priorities for the law school over the next five years, and growing that program is one of the top fund-raising priorities for us in the current campaign.

Now, what does this have to do with clinical tenure? Next slide, please. In the world of legal education, there's no question that top clinical programs grant tenure to their clinicians. This slide shows the top ten clinical programs, according to the U.S. News survey. All but two of them confer tenure on clinical faculty -- I've highlighted those, Northwestern and Michigan -- with a roughly even split, as you can see, between a unitary tenure process and a clinical tenure process, like the one we're proposing.

Now, many of the top clinical programs are not schools that we consider to be our peer group. The far right column on this slide shows the overall U.S. News rank, and we tend to consider the top 14 or so schools to be our broad peer group in the law school world. There are a number of top law schools that have managed to create relatively balanced reputations between their clinical and nonclinical programs. If you could advance to the next slide, please.

So these are the top law schools that also have top clinical programs. A number of schools that seem to have been content to just sort of carry on with their strong reputation in corporate -- in the corporate world, but these are the law schools that have really tried to excel in both areas, and this is the group that we seek to join.

And I think what this slide shows is that our peer schools with top clinical programs overwhelmingly favor clinical tenure as their approach to granting tenure to clinicians, so this is the dominant approach. Two schools don't grant tenure at all, four schools grant clinical tenure, and only one has a unitary tenure status for their clinicians. So without clinical tenure, I don't

think we can compete against these schools to attract the very best clinical practitioners to Ithaca.

We already labor under the challenge of attracting clinicians away from urban areas, where most of the clients are and where most of the non-profit collaborators are located. To ask them to come to Ithaca for an inferior status than our primarily urban peer schools are offering, I think, is nearly impossible. And in fact, we have lost battles to some of our lower-ranked, but highly regarded clinical programs at non-peer schools, both for geographic reasons and for reasons of perceived clinical faculty status.

That said, even without clinical tenure, we are certainly making progress in improving our reputation in the clinical world. Our rank of 44 in this year's U.S. News survey represents a jump of nearly 20 spots, as compared to last year. And I think that upward trajectory reflects our commitment and the growth of our clinical program, as reflected in Beth's slides, as well as the excellence of our hiring -- I think Beth herself is a primary example of that -- and extensive efforts by our clinicians in publicizing the superb work they're doing.

Under John Blume's leadership as the outgoing director of our clinic -- and he'll be presenting next -- and now under Beth's leadership, I think we've made great strides in our clinical program. And clinical tenure is the next logical step to allow us to continue to make progress, both by signaling to the world of legal education the importance we place on clinical education at Cornell Law School and by helping us to attract the very best clinicians to Ithaca.

And John will now talk about the process that we've gone through, over a period of several years, to develop this proposal.

JOHN BLUME: Okay, thank you. Again, my name's John Blume. If you head to the next slide, please. So as the dean and Beth indicated, I was the director of the clinical program for nine years. My term ended last December. And in the course of serving in that capacity, I

became convinced that we needed to have a clinical tenure mechanism, a mechanism for persons on the clinical faculty to get tenure, for the reasons which have already been said, and I won't repeat.

But after talking about that with Eduardo and getting the green light from him, what I decided to do was to have a series of meetings with most of the faculty. So over about a 16-month period, I met with almost every member of the faculty, both on the tenure track side and the clinical side, to discuss with them both why I thought we needed this and, Number 2, what it might look like and whether unitary track or a clinical tenure model.

And in the course of those meetings, what became clear was there was consensus that we needed to have a clinical tenure option for at least some members of the clinical faculty. There was really no disagreement about that in the abstract. What people had different opinions on was who it should be done within the existing tenure system or whether we should have a clinical tenure option. But the majority view was, and really no one was opposed to, a clinical tenure option.

And this is really true on both sides. There were people in the clinical faculty who were nervous about, and still are nervous about well, if they were going to be judged by the standard of the current tenured/tenure track, they might not make it. There were people of the tenured/tenure track side who said I want these people to have tenure, but I think the scholarship that they do is not quite in quantity and different than what we do.

So at the end of those meetings, what I did was, along with Beth, who played a guiding role in this, is try to draw up a proposal which captured the consensus of those meetings that I had had with people. And after that, that was given to the dean. The dean sent it to our APPC Committee, and that's a committee at the law school which looks at changes to status and faculty titles within the law school.

They had a series of meetings about it, at which the proposal was modified and refined; but still, again, with consensus clear on the clinical tenure model. After that, it came out of committee. We had several faculty meetings. Beth and I met with the clinical faculty to discuss this and hear any concerns they had.

Mike Dorf, who was the chairperson of APPC, he and I met with the tenured/tenure track faculty. We wanted to meet with them apart from the clinical faculty, so people could sort of say whatever they wanted to about it. And again, in both of those meetings, what emerged was no one was opposed to a clinical tenure option, as is reflected in sort of the current process.

So from there, it went, we had a full meeting of all the faculty and, again, there were 22 yes votes, 0 no votes and 1 abstention. In light of the fact that not everyone was able to be present at that meeting, they were soliciting people who weren't able to attend votes, and so you see that that picks up an additional 9 votes, with no one opposed to this.

So this went through a very long process at the law school. It was discussed and vetted in a number of ways, and we came up with what is really a consensus view of what would work. The law school is a collegial institution, and we felt that it was important to go forward with this initial step with something that everyone agreed upon, and everyone in the law school supports this and agrees upon it.

So that's the basis of the proposal. There might be one more slide, but I'm not sure. Right, this reflects what I basically indicated. So thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, very good. So Jill, can you -- people have raised their hand and posed questions. Jill, can you see the participant list?

JILL SHORT: Yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So questions for our colleagues. I will ask a quick one here. Maybe you can clarify what you mean by unitary system. That might not be clear to everybody.

I'd be real interested, Beth, as a clinical professor, how do you look -- suppose you are thinking about coming to Cornell, and why would the clinical track look more attractive than a unitary system?

BETH LYON: One of the features of the contract track system currently at Cornell is that scholarship is not part of the evaluation process now, or the promotion process. So to invite someone onto the faculty onto a new tenure track that would involve sharing your scholarship with the doctrinal faculty that has not been examining clinical scholarship up to this point would be very daunting. It would be quite a leap, and I think it could actually hurt our recruitment efforts, instead of supporting them.

EDUARDO PENALVER: I think to answer the technical part of your question, what is the difference, I think it relates mostly to title, and then the clinical process, so the clinical tenure process. So rather than trying to shoehorn a different style and category of scholarship into the existing process, you create this sort of clinical tenure track that signals, by virtue of the different title and explicitly different tenure considerations, what the process is for moving forward. And I think that's what Beth is referring to in talking about the misgivings that faculty have that we're trying to recruit to a new system that doesn't mark that off.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Jill, you want to call on some people?

JILL SHORT: So Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you, Jill. Ken Birman, Computer Science. I'm curious to know whether you've developed documents for the evaluation of promotion to tenure. In College of Engineering, that was a two- or three-year process some time ago, and most colleges have something analogous that took a while to produce, the reasoning being that if you hire a person who will be evaluated under a certain policy when you hire them, they should know what the criteria for the decision is going to be, so that they can plan the six years appropriately.

JOHN BLUME: I can answer this. As part of the process of going through this, yes, we developed a standard for -- to be used to determine promotion and tenure on the clinical side. We obviously already had one on the tenured/tenure track side, and one was developed and voted on by the faculty in the course of the process that we discussed.

BETH LYON: And I would say that was the topic that occupied most of the discussion. A lot of people were interested in this, and a lot of refinement that happened with that.

JILL SHORT: We have Tracy Stokol.

TRACY STOKOL: Hi. This is Tracy Stokol from Department of Population -- at the Vet School. In your document on the proposal for the clinical tenure, you indicate that you are going to increase the rigor of the assessment to include scholarship, so that process is changing anyway, from what I understand you're saying it currently is. So I'm unclear why that process cannot be changed towards that unitary tenure and why that is going to be more difficult, since you're already going at least partly there with this clinical tenure proposal anyway.

EDUARDO PENALVER: Jill, could you go back to the Slide 11? I think part of the answer is -- I think, certainly -- yeah, that one. In the abstract, one could do it, right. But I think culturally, what you see -- I think what this slide shows, the elite law schools that have moved to clinical tenure have gravitated towards a dual track. And law faculty, law schools are generally kind of culturally conservative places, and that's the sort of incremental step that top law schools have taken. And this, I think, shows great progress in the legal academy over the last 20 years, and we'd like to join that progress.

But I think out of the discussions that John Blume describes having, and I was not involved in those discussions because I was recused from the process, but there was consensus among our faculty that reflects the consensus among elite law schools, that this was the approach that they preferred.

And then you add to that -- and I think reflecting back in some ways, an understanding of that preference, Beth Lyon's assertions about how clinical faculty would perceive a unitary tenure track. So in the abstract, you certainly do it, but I think it creates misgivings on both sides, both for the faculty who are being asked to adopt it, the doctrinal faculty, and the clinical faculty then, who are being asked to come in to a system that would look very different from the system of clinical tenure at other top law schools.

JOHN BLUME: The only thing I would say in addition to that, which I think is important -- you don't need to go back to it. In the slide above this, we looked at the top-ranked law schools with clinical programs, and you saw that there was more of a split between a unitary system and a clinical tenure system.

I think it's also important to note that many of those schools that now have unitary tenure started out with a clinical tenure model, the intermediate step. And people sort of became accustomed and used to it, and then it went to a unitary track. So I think that may happen and can happen eventually. It hasn't happened at some of the other top schools, but this is sort of a first step, and it's a process which other schools have used.

Beth, you have anything else to say?

BETH LYON: Just that it's a process of acculturation. When we were preparing for this presentation, one of the sort of grandfathers of clinical legal education from American University, which has a top program, and he described the process of starting from nothing to a contract track, and then moving to a clinical tenure and beginning to introduce the doctrinal faculty to the types and amounts of scholarship that his clinicians were producing, and then ultimately, everyone arriving at the conclusion that they were ready for the unitary step. But it was very much a process of sort of -- a back and forth and a give and take about what scholarship can be.

EDUARDO PENALVER: And I would just add, the consensus behind this proposal represents really great progress at Cornell. I mean, if this conversation were happening ten years ago at Cornell Law School, it would look very different than it has, and that's really due to the leadership of John and Beth and just the tremendous efforts of our clinical faculty to really educate our doctrinal colleagues about both the importance of this to our students and to their education and the quality of the work they represent for our law school. So it's an incremental step, but it's a big step for Cornell that we're proposing.

JILL SHORT: Richard Bensel has a question.

RICHARD BENSEL: Could we go to Slide 9?

This is for all law school students, I take it. I had a question about are there advanced degrees? Because it looks like almost half of the students perhaps are getting either advanced degrees, or just what that means.

And the second question would be, once this clinical tenure proposal is adopted, do you anticipate a change in the profile of students who attend Cornell? Those are the two questions.

EDUARDO PENALVER : Great, thank you. So my understanding of this slide, this is a survey of undergraduates who are intending to go to law school. And the columns are proportions of the students indicating what they intend to do. So it's not the case that nearly half -- or anywhere near the same number of people intend to go to law school as get other advanced degrees.

I think the number is more like -- it may be single digits who intend to go to law school, but this is saying of the populations that intend to go to law school, what drove them to go to law school or what made them want to go to law school. And then of the populations that are pursuing other advanced degrees, what's motivating that. So a much higher proportion of people who intend to go to law school are driven by public service.

And that makes sense, because you look at government service, many of the people in government service have law degrees. Advocacy for social change is something that attracts people to law. So among the prelaw population, essentially, what is driving their interest in a legal education. And I think that's what this is showing.

And to answer the question about who we would attract, I think it very much would have an impact -- as we move -- as our reputation improves in the world of clinical legal education, as our reputation as a law school becomes less imbalanced, we're able to attract students who have a passion for public service, as opposed to, I would say now disproportionately, we attract students who intend and want to go work at large law firms.

And that's great, and we honor our graduates who work at large law firms, and it's not that we don't want those students, but we want to attract some of these students who want to go into public service. We want them to look at us the way that they look at NYU, which is a kind of school where they will be fully supported and will be able to succeed in their quest. It's a hard road.

One of the ironies of law as a profession is that the hardest jobs to get pay the least, and so students know that coming in and they're very sophisticated. And I have classmates from my undergraduate years who chose NYU over higher-ranked law schools because of its strong reputation in public service, which is driven in part by the strength of its clinics, and so very much think that this would begin to attract different students to Cornell, who otherwise would give a pass to us because they see us as much more like Penn or Chicago, which is really preparation for practice on Wall Street.

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

JILL SHORT: We have three things going on here. So there was a question about how many clinical faculty are there in the law school, and Beth Lyon answered that nine clinical faculty would qualify to seek this status, though likely not all will choose to do so.

Neema had a question, and then there was Risa Lieberwitz and Peter Wolczanski, so it's up to you how many questions you're going to take.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, just two more, then, from the floor, because we have to move on.

JILL SHORT: Neema?

NEEMA KUDVA: Why don't we take the other questions, Jill. I can ask Beth the question later.

JILL SHORT: Okay. Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. This is not really a question. Just a comment. First, thank you to everybody that worked so hard on this. And the other thing I wanted to emphasize is the academic freedom issue, which is in the report, but I think it's so important that tenure and the job security that it provides is based on the ability to exercise academic freedom with that sort of job security.

And I think that's true for all faculty, but I wanted to point out particularly with regard to the kind of work that clinical faculty do, it's essential for them to have academic freedom, given the nature of the questions and the sort of responses one can get from the outside world, in particular. I think that we should always keep that in mind when we're talking about expanding job security in this way. So thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Peter, and then that's it.

Is that it? Okay, so let me mention something --

PETE WOLCZANSKI: Sorry. Just for someone like myself, who is blissfully ignorant about what goes on in the law school, definitions of the clinical professor versus a doctrinal professor and how their tasks are differentiated within the college would have been extremely helpful. I think this presentation is great and, from what I understand from the names clinician and doctrinal and so forth, I can certainly see the logic here, and it looks great, but some definitions would have been quite helpful.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, so let me call attention to a fact. We have a senate committee, the Academic Freedom and the Professional Status of the Faculty Committee, that is charged with looking at all matters concerning tenure. Online you will find their assessment of the proposal. This is, again, Step 1. We'll at some point have a vote in the senate. And then it's advisory, it goes to the provost and the deans for -- and then to the trustees, because we're talking about bylaw changes. I'd like to thank our three presenters very much for doing such an excellent job in communicating this to the senate.

EDUARDO PENALVER : Thank you. Thanks for the time.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Jill, you want to -- okay, so here's a topic that was floated right at the new year. Then, because of the social science issue and then the pandemic, it got bumped. So what I'd like to do is just step through this proposed policy and entertain questions afterwards, okay?

Here's the basic setting. It's sort of a collision of worlds. Suppose, during a tenure review, which extends from the department all the way up to the trustees, suppose at some point an issue of misconduct arises. And we're thinking of major misconduct, and those are the three policies you see there that typically bring this about; an allegation in service in a number of ways. For example, you solicit letters from grad students and something comes in through

one of those, or there's a Title IX issue that comes to your attention, and so on. The issue, then, is what do you do.

At the top is a schematic of typically how these policies work. There's an allegation, then that activates certain procedures. They play out. The candidate is found either responsible or not responsible for the misconduct. Not clearly so binary, but roughly speaking, that's how these policies and the adjudication of them plays out. Below, you see the typical -- these stages we have in the tenure process. There's department, college, university and trustee. The allegation can show up anywhere along that yellow chain.

Here's the basic idea. The idea is to pause the case, when the allegation surfaces. And you would do this for several reasons. One is to preserve the integrity of both processes, that you want to stop the tenure review or pause it until the adjudication plays out. If it plays out and the candidate is not responsible, you simply resume from the pause point, without reference to the allegations.

On the other hand, if the candidate is responsible for some part of the case, then the review restarts with a misconduct summary in the dossier. Let me explain a little bit about what that means and how the pause would be triggered.

One notion here is we'll call it the pause panel. The pause panel consists of four people: The candidate's chair, the candidate's dean, the provost and the dean of faculty. And they have to look at and make a decision about whether or not the case should be delayed or paused. Notice, delayed means that the allegation surfaced before the process begins, and so on. The pause panel, if they decide to pause the case, will then produce -- and if the candidate is found to be responsible for the misconduct, they'll prepare a privacy-respecting misconduct summary that goes into the dossier.

Now again, if this is the case, the thing is recycled, you start from scratch. You start back at the beginning and sort of redo the case from that point. But let's go to the next slide to clarify that.

Oh, I guess this is just a definition. So the red line determines whether we're talking about a delay or a pause, so that's a pretty standard definition. Here is another schematic. So the allegation comes in, and the panel decides, based on that information, whether it's significant enough to warrant a pause.

All along the way here, and in particular at this point, the candidate has the right to respond and to put documents into the dossier that become part of the official record. Again, it's at that point, when one of the procedures is triggered because of an allegation, that the pause panel will then review that allegation and make a decision about the pause. And then, after it plays out, the panel produces or gets the final report, and then writes a privacy-respecting summary that is added to the dossier.

Let's look at the two scenarios again. Suppose it's the found not responsible scenario. The review simply picks up where it left off. No reference to the allegation should show up in the remainder of the review, unless the candidate gives permission. The candidate might want to include a statement about it to perhaps talk about the situation, how it came about, misunderstandings and so on. So the candidate does have the right to insert a document into the dossier that will be seen downstream from the pause point by those who are reviewing the case.

Next. So here's an example of found responsible thing. Unless it was for the sake of example, the pause point was at the college level. So maybe something came up in an ad hoc committee review or something like that. It's paused, and it turns out, let's say, the candidate is responsible for some type of misconduct.

Now, when we say restart, it doesn't mean from ground zero. It goes back to the department. The department is not going to redo the external letters or whatever. It's simply going to revisit the case with this added piece of information. Again, revisit does not mean start from scratch. Again, the rationale for restarting is that evaluators at the department, college and university levels must see the same dossier.

That's sort of an axiom in the tenure business. You talk about closing the case. At a certain date, the candidate no longer adds recent papers or whatever. The key principle that we have in the tenure review process is that every stage you are looking at the same set of credentials, the same dossier is the same at each level. That's sort of consistent with how we do things, without any kind of misconduct as part of the scene.

The question here is -- so online, you can see the formal policy. It's like a two-pager. It would go into the faculty handbook section on tenure, but here are the things for the senate and the faculty in general to think about when they reason about the strategy here.

One question here is what makes an allegation serious enough to warrant a pause. It's quite hard to carve that into precise language, but that's a very important thing. How do we reason about -- how does the pause panel make its decision to do a pause.

Then there's the extremely important issue about how well the policy deals with confidentiality. This gets at the idea of the pause panel producing a summary report, and how do you do that in a way that respects the rules we have about confidentiality and privacy.

Then there's the issue about how does the pause affect the tenure -- the voters. How will it affect the candidate's reputation? Does it square with the idea of innocent until proven guilty? These are all the kinds of things that we want the faculty and the senate to think about in advance of deciding whether the recommended policy here is appropriate and good.

I should say the policy was produced through the Academic Freedom and the Professional Status of the -- the AFPSF Committee. Has the worst title. Anyway, their job, as we saw in the law discussion, is to deal with all matters concerning tenure. So that document was worked out in the committee, with consultation with John Siliciano and university counsel and so on.

Just a reminder; no one entity owns the tenure policy. It's a shared enterprise. The provost's office, the faculty, Human Resources all have something to say about the tenure policy. The idea here, then, is for the faculty to decide that this is the right way to go about this very serious problem that happens not much; but when it does happen, these are really tough cases. I talked to Madeline, and I think maybe one or two a year show up, and we really have no policy for handling this.

So the idea here, then, is to have some guidelines to handle perhaps the most difficult kind of issue associated with -- one of the most difficult settings to deal with. We have no policy, and we need one. That's it. And love to take some questions, so that we can, if necessary, go back and make some refinements.

Online, there were several comments posted about two months ago. They were interesting. Some people say there should be no intersection of the policies, that tenure's not about these sorts of things and it should proceed independently; and if the person is found guilty, then just granted tenure, you can still prosecute, so you see that kind of an argument.

You see arguments about fairness to the candidate; that a pause may say, well, it's a stain. If your case is paused, you must have done something bad. But the pause, if you look at it the right way, promotes fairness and deals with rumors in an effective sort of way.

Anyway, I've talked too much. I'd be very interested in hearing from you, your reactions to this policy.

JILL SHORT: Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you, Charlie. And you never talk too much. And that was a very good presentation. I support what you're trying to do here, but I do have one concern. We've heard allegations -- well, in my case, I heard directly that under the consensual relations policy, a great deal of harassment of people is occurring, that we're getting large numbers of sort of fake harassment allegations, which have to be cleared by Mary Opperman's office and are a low percentage of legitimate complaints.

I'm concerned that if that carries over to this policy, then an aggrieved ex-partner can pause someone's tenure, possibly for quite a while. So I'd like to know how the pause committee would sort out legitimate from harassment complaints.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right, so that's one of the key decision points in this process. I don't have a snap answer for that, but that obviously would have to be taken into consideration. I don't know how -- there's no formula that can sort of say well, this is a serious allegation or not, but it's clearly something that you'd have to pay attention to in that venue. Very good point.

JILL SHORT: There's a question: Who decides whether the candidate is guilty or innocent?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: If it was a research misconduct case, there's a whole adjudication process under Policy 1.2. That's where the decision would be made. Under 6.3 and 6.4, there are procedures that are followed, and they are the ones that determine whether or not the allegation had merit or not and what the sanction would be.

JILL SHORT: Richard BenseL.

RICHARD BENSEL: So here's a concern. Under 6.4 and many of these adjudications in the OJA's office, there are often substantial delays, and the delays come from the complaint

coming from outside the university, somebody's graduated or someone who's left the university. They can't be easily found -- or not found, but easily be heard in that process.

The concern is this pause could go on for a long, long time, and that affects the candidate's reputation, that affects their career, and so forth and so on. So it's not a question, it's a comment about how to limit the impact of these kinds of pauses so that the process doesn't inordinately affect the candidate's career.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right. So even if all the players are on campus, I can tell you for a fact, these things play out -- they just take an incredibly long time, so that is a concern. I raised the point about whether you could accelerate the process in these sorts of cases. You might think so, but there'd be no guarantees about that. These things do take time.

As I said, this is a really hard problem. You have to have due process, you have to do things in an appropriate way and, unfortunately, they do take time. I get back to this sort of issue, right now there's no policy. If someone could think of a way to address the length of time that these adjudication processes take, it would be great to incorporate them; but again, I don't see any way of shortcutting that at this point.

JILL SHORT: I have two questions; Risa Lieberwitz and Wendy Wilcox next.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I can defer to Wendy first, if she wants to go.

JILL SHORT: Go ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I have many of the same concerns that other people have raised. And I'm very pulled towards the point that, Charlie, you raised, that at least one person had posted on the uni faculty website as looking at these as separate issues, that you handle the tenure review process and you can also handle allegations separately.

The fact that there's a coincidence of time is what we're trying to deal with, but you can always have allegations come up early in somebody's career on the tenure track, or later. They

can always come up and they will always be dealt with separately at those times. Considering a pause at this point is simply because of the coincidence in time.

I would really at this point favor keeping these as separate processes, because I think that the pause panel will be very heavily weighted towards finding that there should be a pause. If in doubt, it will probably go to a pause. I think that really harms a candidate. I think the prejudicial effect of the pause itself is so harmful that it will be very difficult for a candidate to actually be freed from that. And then the time issue that Richard just talked about.

I think this is fraught with problems to have this pause, and I would really favor, as I said, at this point -- unless something convinces me differently, at this point, I really favor just looking at these as separate issues and they should be dealt with separately.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What if it's research misconduct, and supposedly the candidate had this brilliant paper that ended up being plagiarized, but the case went through? How would you feel about that?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Well, I think that, again, that can come up at any time. And there are certainly examples it has come up at any time in somebody's career. And perhaps it's something that just -- seems to me not be -- of time, not to be a reason to merge the two.

I think the prejudicial impact is so great that the merger is not -- it's certainly not the only way to do it, to merge the two issues and have this kind of pause. There are alternatives that will not have that kind of prejudicial impact. And if, in fact, something is serious enough to warrant a kind of a misconduct sanction, that can be done at any moment.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What about rumors that turn the department against the candidate, which ended up being false?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: What about it?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Suppose there are rumors about a misconduct and that the case isn't paused, but the department sort of hears about it, and it really colors people's thinking of the candidate to the point of perhaps creating a negative vote.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: What could be done is that a candidate could be given the option to pause a review. You wouldn't have to have it imposed on a candidate because what you're raising is something that would hurt the candidate. If there's some opportunity for a candidate to pause a review, then that can be built in. I don't think we need this huge mechanism to be put into place in order to give somebody a chance to say well, there's a lot of rumors and I'd rather have a pause now.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. Wendy.

WENDY WILCOX: Thanks. Wendy Wilcox, from the library. Obviously, we don't have quite the same tenure process in the library, but I do have some significant concerns with some of the issues that have been raised. I think they actually very unfairly affect typically minority voices, whether they're graduate students, whether they are women, whether they are people of color.

Often some of these issues that tend to arise during the tenure process are because that is the moment under which confidentiality is guaranteed, and so we have to really understand that when this is happening at the same time, there's probably a reason why they're happening.

And I understand some concerns about harassment or spurious claims, but I think that is a historical argument in favor of keeping status quo and protecting the violators. And I would think that we are confident enough in our processes to pause and ensure that we are getting all the information before we offer possible faculty lifetime appointments to our university, when it's way more difficult and way more problematic to address these issues once someone has gotten tenure.

I did notice that Chris Schaffer posted a comment that says that he could not fairly evaluate someone with an in-the-air process. I understand the concerns about protecting faculty, but I also think that we have to think about all the mechanisms in place and not just the implications on tenure track faculty.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks, Wendy. Paul Ginsparg?

PAUL GINSPARG: Yeah, I just wanted to bring up a case we had in Physics, which are not violating any confidences because it's public and also in The Chronicle for Higher Ed and The Daily Sun, but I think it represents the flip side of something that Charlie said, and it's also come up.

In that case, we were asked to decide on tenure when there was actually an ongoing investigation going on. And it involved not research questions, but sexual harassment issue actually; even worse, questionable whether it was a consensual relationship. The faculty at large was not informed, because the idea of the chair, who consulted with the higher-ups, is that this should not affect the tenure process at all. And the faculty went ahead and voted, and voted in favor of the tenure.

And the faculty looked absolutely awful from the standpoint of the graduate students because, among all of the graduate students who assumed that this was common knowledge among the faculty, it was common knowledge among the graduate students. Most of us were entirely ignorant. So this puts another twist on it, arguing in favor of a pause, just so that the faculty doesn't end up looking embarrassed.

As a footnote to this particular case, it was turned down by the Arts and Sciences dean, who apparently was aware of some of the issues, and it went to litigation and various other things; but again, I would say this also favors a pause.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. How about Chris Schaffer, then Carl, then Peter. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Sorry. I'm here. Sorry, Charlie. To Risa's point, I just can't imagine moving forward in good conscience with a vote on someone where there were substantial unresolved issues that directly or on their conduct and their ability to be a successful faculty member, but I don't know what it is I'm supposed to do as a conscientious faculty member.

I'm supposed to pretend I don't know about it? Is that information supposed to be withheld from me? What if I do hear about it? I'm supposed to ignore it? It just puts those of us that are making one of the biggest decisions we make, to award tenure, in this impossible bind.

And we are doing it because why? We're afraid of making a principle pause in the process of a few months to a fraction of a year, agreed. It could be unfortunately long. But in cases where the faculty member is not responsible for these accusations, you know, many folks are going to still hear about it. It's still going to influence their vote. I would think it's to the benefit of the faculty member for the issue to be resolved before these things move forward.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thanks a lot. I appreciate this. I'm Carl Franck from Physics -- you have to be able to follow instructions and disregard information, but I think that's our job. And also, I would say that if you're in a situation where there's allegations, it's very good to assume that until something is proven, those allegations shouldn't enter into your deliberations.

I do feel at the same time that I think our colleagues from the library said we have to enforce our rules about consensual behavior and nonconsensual behavior. I think that we have to absolutely protect that, but I think that the fact of one experience, it takes a long time to smoke out the facts.

Just a comment, in my own personal experience, I think there's still consequences of things that happen that will go on forever, for long, long periods of time. So I'm very much in

favor of not adopting the pause thing, because I think in any case where it really matters, it's just going to pause forever.

And I think with the question of the perception of our students and things like that, well, there are lots of things that happen that students don't understand and other faculty don't understand. Why does Professor X leave from Cornell to go to another university? We don't know. Why did Lehman leave? We still don't know. You know, that kind of stuff. So I don't think this is a good idea.

I think the idea Risa said, and I think she said it very clearly, that we have to be able to separate these things. And people should just notice that after a while, so-and-so is no longer here and justice got served. So I'm against the proposition.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Peter.

PETER WOLCZANSKI: I think the pause is very important and I think the policy you drafted here, Charlie, is extremely important. We just had a recent case in Chemistry and Chemical Biology of academic malfeasance, questioning some results on the part of a person coming up for tenure.

And it was through a graduate student that this was learned. And it was only through the tenure process, where we asked for comments by the graduate students under the tutelage of the professor, that we learned of the malfeasance. And then the administration tried to force us to go through the tenure decision. The chair was very adamant in not touching the tenure decision until some sort of investigation occurred.

And apparently -- and again, I don't know exactly what happened, but outside parties were involved. It was discovered that there was significant problems in the data that was supposedly brought forth in a few papers by this person, and it saved the department a tremendous amount of time. And without a pause, I'm afraid -- I don't know how you retract a

tenure decision, but that might have been the case, and that would have brought a god-awful mess into the whole thing.

So a lot of these problems in science, they don't show up until you start asking for the letters and asking for students' opinions about somebody, and that's when the students have a chance to actually put on record what the problems that actually exist.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, last comment, Risa, briefly.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I just wanted to mention, actually when Wendy was speaking, I thought she was going to go a different direction in terms of faculty who are in underrepresented groups, because my concern is that often the people who are the most vulnerable to allegations are the faculty from underrepresented groups. There's a real double standard. It's oftentimes applied to faculty women, people of color generally.

And I get very -- I mean, that's a concern, whether we have this pause or not, but I think that this kind of policy is one where the allegations that are raised will also raise that kind of double standard of bringing to the fore and making even more salient allegations against people who were more vulnerable to being held to different standards.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you very much. So lots of good suggestions here. We'll take them into consideration and come back with something.

We're running behind here. Let's see if we can handle these two votes expeditiously. Jill?

We have to do some semblance of Robert's rules here. So there are two resolutions I would like to process here. One of them concerns the professor of the practice authorization for the Vet School. I need someone to offer a motion to consider this.

JILL SHORT: There's a motion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, here it is. Alex Travis from the Vet School is on tap, in case there are any questions. As usual, we post these requests for 60 days. There were no voice concerns. The Vet School would like to be able to use this title to recruit and retain outside faculty and so on, and it joins many other colleges that have this title. Does anyone want to discuss this, or any questions for Alex?

Okay, next slide. Someone call for a vote. Do we have a motion to vote on the resolution? Somebody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Move that we vote on the resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: One of the problems we have in doing votes online is that the audience -- there are non-senators amongst us, and so on. The easy way to do this is simply for you at this point just to go on chat and just say yes or no, and we can then deduce everything from the log.

I'm quite sure we have quorum today. We'll make sure that at least 65, that's quorum.

Next slide, Jill.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Can I just ask, you want us to just post on chat to everyone, yes or no? Or do you want it to just come to one of you, or what?

JILL SHORT: Everyone, please.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just post yes or no. That's all you have to do.

We have to talk about this, and then we'll close the current voting and open up the second round. So this is something we brought up in the March meeting. It happens, but rarely, that a student takes a course from a family member. And there's an obvious conflict of interest. And it was felt that we should have a line or two in the conflict of interest Policy 4.14 that deals with this. Do we have a motion to consider this resolution?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I move that we consider it.

JILL SHORT: There's a motion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Move it on.

Next slide. So here's what we had in March, and there was a little bit of a dustup afterwards. Quite a few hurdles were put in there, that the course had to be an elective or you have to do an S/U or whatever; and people felt it was just too restrictive, stick with a recusal plan and get on with it. So we revised -- so working with others, in particular the individuals who at the March meeting felt we should just live with the last line, we modified the proposal. Jill?

It simply says basically recusal plan, and then it has to be signed by the student, the instructor and the chair, and a little bit about the recusal plan. It simply has to map out a way, the grading process in a way that doesn't involve the instructor, and it has to also be fair to -- with respect to the other students. Anyone want to comment on this or feel it's heavy-handed or whatever?

Seeing none, someone want to call for a vote?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Moved.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, we do the same thing now. Simply yes, no, or abstain.

We have 15 minutes, but I'm happy to stay longer, open discussion about current events; namely, the pandemic and how it's affecting life at the university. Happy to hear about anything.

I'll just name a couple of topics, in case you want to bring them up. How do you feel about messaging from the central administration from your college, from your department? You feel it's working? Have you had feedback -- many of you are teaching, of course, and you've heard things from your colleagues. What's the feedback on the grade option discussion we had

a while ago? What sort of vibes you're picking up from your students, and so on. Virtually anything, open discussion.

Increasing attention is being paid to the fall. Let me sort of begin with this, say a little bit about that. Now that we're sort of in steady state in the online portion of S20, what about F20? So of course, everything is in a state of flux. The decision will be made as late as possible, but it can't be the night before. It can't be in August. So you can imagine all the constraints involved, what Governor Cuomo has to say.

What's the state of testing? Do we have fast, reliable, quick testing? I think in terms of unwinding all the lockdowns, you have to sort of take pity on the universities because, quite honestly, I can't see a university opening up, unless an NBA is authorized for Madison Square Garden. I think it has to be at that level. It's a real tricky thing. And Ithaca has a higher degree of difficulty, because we have a basic population of 30,000. Then in come 20,000 students, so you can appreciate the complexity of that.

Everyone's working on contingency plans, but there's nothing -- I don't think we can expect anything definite until we get at least into June. With that little preamble, I doubt if I can answer questions, but I can pass them along, anything that's on your mind, anything you'd like to talk about.

Jill, what do you say?

JILL SHORT: We have one question on chat: I'm being asked by students if the fall semester will take place on campus.

And we have people waiting: Carl Franck, Ken Birman.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, it's going to be a while before we know the answer to what the fall looks like. One thing that is pretty clear, though, is it's highly likely that the whole international student scene's going to be severely disrupted. You need sort of two months to

get a visa, consulates are closed, so we're talking about like June 20. That is almost assuredly going to be an issue in the fall.

JILL SHORT: Carl Franck.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you. Carl Franck, Physics. I really appreciate the tremendous amount of support we've gotten in preparing for teaching. To talk about the S/U option, I haven't heard any complaints from my students, so I think we made a good decision with that one.

What I would like to bring -- now I'm speaking from the Physics Department, we think the provost -- well, first off, on Monday, we had a Zoom colloquia, which was well-attended, so we know how to conserve funds, but we're really -- about going into next fall and being the kind of organization which we feel our colloquia don't just serve ourselves, but other departments as well. So the provost's rules on finances are draconian, and we hope there'll be some lessening up that will allow us to start a program which serves the whole university, such as the various colloquia.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks. Jill?

JILL SHORT: Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Just briefly, I think that there's a group not well-represented in the senate of young researchers who need physical access to equipment or laboratories, who are very harmed right now because, whereas many of us can teach from home, do our writing from home, this group is completely dead in the water.

And I would like to see the administration start to think about how to let that group back on campus. It doesn't include me, but I do worry about people whose careers could be disproportionately harmed by being trapped at home. And a small group on campus, I would think, could be allowable.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point.

JILL SHORT: Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. Yeah, I'm also reading the chat, and it would be great to hear from some of the people who are writing on the chat group. But this is obviously a really hard time, and I have some real concerns about how the disconnectedness that we're all experiencing is affecting the decision-making.

I mean, we always have a difficult time having shared governance be a really robust process, and I appreciate what Charlie and Neema are doing in terms of keeping people involved as much as possible and your being involved, but I am really concerned with the sort of top-down approach that comes with crises, understanding that things are complicated and it's hard to do that.

And I would just love it if there's some way we could look now to between now and the fall and beyond, to see what could we put in place that actually addresses the way in which shared governance can be made as robust as possible.

And one of the issues that I raised at an earlier discussion we had last week, the open faculty discussion, was a concern I had that online classes will be promoted in a way from the administration that really pressures faculty to do it more, without really having a shared governance process involved in it. And I'm already seeing some of that in messages from deans, where it's viewed online work that we're doing as an opportunity to use it more in the future. This is central to what we do as faculty. This is educational policy. That's just one of the examples.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think the pandemic has forced a rethink of everything, and I think we often take for granted the value of the residential experience, in-person teaching. Now we're revisiting that, which is sort of healthy, and I think we have -- I was at some presentation

where someone said don't waste a crisis. A crisis does push you into thinking about things you took for granted and how we do things.

I should say, though, that major decisions are going to be made in the summer, so there's actually a practical issue here, which is when summer comes, do we have senate meetings, stated in that kind of form. How do we do things in the summer, when people often are with their own research? Anyway, more questions, Jill.

JILL SHORT: I apologize. I believe I lowered someone's hand before they had a chance to speak. I don't know who that was. Buz Barsto is next. And just to make everyone aware, there's a considerable amount of chat and comments on chat.

BUZ BARSTO: Ken and Risa, I really want to thank you for your comments regarding junior researchers. As an assistant professor, I'm really appreciative of sort of the possibility of extending the tenure clock. I'm not so worried about myself, but I am worried about a generation of post-docs and grad students.

If you think about it, the post-doc is probably the most vulnerable time of anybody's career. It's the shortest time span and it's the most dependent upon the short-term grants. And I feel that this has the potential to derail an awful lot of people, and I feel like we've somehow got to get some support to these people, to ensure that when they should -- right now they should be collecting data, they should be -- for papers. We somehow need to extend their timeline. This isn't a problem that's unique to Cornell. It's shared across the country, probably across the world, but I really hope we can figure out some way to deal with it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Buz.

JILL SHORT: There's no one else raised hands.

NEEMA KUDVA: I actually just want to speak to a whole set of comments that various speakers have raised, Tracy, Risa, many others, about this whole business of going online. We

went online very, very quickly. Somebody called it triage education, and we did so without necessarily -- we tried very hard, we got a lot of support, happy about that, but it raises a lot of questions.

It raises questions about what does a long-term strategy mean. Can all courses do this and how often are we going to keep doing this, if the pandemic comes back a second time? I mean, there are many, many questions around it and, I think, concerns. What does it mean to have signed on, to be a faculty member at Cornell? We didn't sign on to be online educators, or did we, and so on and so forth.

So one of the ideas Charlie and I had was to leave a larger sort of block for discussion of exactly this, both its longer-term implications and sort of the -- the ways in which we have done it now and how we feel supported or not as faculty in this -- in the process we are undergoing right now.

So if it's okay with you, in subsequent sort of faculty senate meetings, we leave a period of time to discuss this. We do think it's important. And I think not just we, but I think many of you feel it's really important and gets to the core of our mission. Your concerns around online education just keeps collecting those. We'll set something up on the website to collect that information, and then have a longer, more in-depth conversation around that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Neema.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does Buz Barsto want to speak again?

BUZ BARSTO: Thanks, Jill, if it's okay if I can speak again.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Sure.

BUZ BARSTO: This is Buz Barsto from Biological and Environmental Engineering. Charlie, I just wanted to follow up on your point about like not wasting a crisis. I've actually really enjoyed online teaching actually, and I think we should say a big thank you to sort of everybody

in CIT for -- if you think about, they provided us with these amazing tools for doing online teaching, have really been tested over the past couple of weeks and I think have really proven themselves.

In earlier faculty senates, we've raised this question with President Pollack, like what are we going to do about the sort of exploding cost of higher ed, and we haven't really gotten a satisfactory answer. That's not to fault her. I don't think anybody has come up with one yet, but maybe this gives us an opportunity to think about how do we solve that problem. And I think, like you said, I don't think we should waste a crisis, and I hope just by bringing this up inspires us in the next coming months to really think about this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point, Buz.

JILL SHORT: Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, I simply wanted to say that I think the communication quality has been quite high and that these opportunities have been excellent. As we move forward and, eventually, when we start to talk about returning to the campus, even if it does involve a senate meeting in the summer, many of us are going to have concerns about our own safety.

We're not young people, and so a lot of us are solidly in the demographic that has to be concerned. And I think that engaging this way and airing concerns is a very healthy, positive part of the faculty governance, and I'd like to see that continue.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, it can be done in a very low-overhead, non-intrusive hey, drop in if you have time kind of thing. So I think we could pull that off. As I said, major, major decisions are going to be made June, July, and so on. And we'll be paying attention all along the way and should articulate our thoughts as they develop. Anything else, Jill?

JILL SHORT: Risa has her hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Sorry, Jill. This is the governance issue again. Oftentimes, the term of not wasting a crisis is used as a critique of people at the top of an organization, imposing things on people on the bottom. And so kind of turning it around that way, this is the moment we're all home. We're not traveling this summer.

This is the moment where a real structure of governance, not just a conversation, but a real structure of governance to place us into where we belong on educational policy, having discussions, having votes on resolutions, really dealing with this as a governance process, which is integrated with the decisions, as Charlie said, that will be made.

And you said it in a passive voice, decisions will be made. Who's going to make them? The administration will be making decisions. We need to be acting proactively on issues that we know are being handled. This is a real -- I'm advocating for us to take control and actively use governance when we're all here, we're not scattering for the summer.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Anything -- we're at the 5:00 point here. I'm going to go get a drink as soon as I push the end meeting button here. Anyone want to sum it all up, anyone want to wax eloquent here for 30 seconds?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I beat you to the drink, Charlie. I beat you to the drink by an entire glass.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So I guess that's the end of the meeting. Thank you very much. It was productive. And we'll send you a synopsis, we'll be in touch about the next meeting, and we can be flexible about when that is. And we can also think a little bit about having discussions on specific issues that relate to the pandemic and its effect on the university and so on. Thank you very much. The meeting's over.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks, Jill and Charlie.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.