

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Welcome to our online senate meeting. This is a regularly scheduled meeting, and you see the ground rules there on the slide. One thing about the captioning; don't look for the "more" button. Instead, go to chat and you will see a URL that you can click on to take care of that.

Just a quick announcement here. You know we floated this question on the Monday message about in-person teaching, if we had it, just what your thoughts are on risk. So there's lots of dimensions to this very important question, and we've got over 250 comments on it. Of course, they don't fall into any categories, but there's some frequently occurring themes.

For example, one of them is you're insane to start classes. Another one is you know, okay, I can see it, but we have to have good protections in place. Then another, not separate theme is that I want to be able to make the choice myself, without repercussions.

So a bunch of us are going to look over all these comments over the weekend and try to extract some principles that we could then abide by, so to speak, in the event that we have in-person teaching next semester. And we'll have a follow-up town hall next week to be announced, where we'll talk about these 250 postings and also what kind of principles we can have going forward.

Here's a question. When we were setting up these extra meetings, Neema and I felt we've got to be careful about senate overload and that sort of thing, so we've been

having them at every two weeks, but we thought we'd take off May 27th. But I would like to find out from you directly how you would feel about having a discussion-only meeting in two weeks.

Just quickly, using chat, yes, no, abstain; abstain meaning I don't care. And it would not be a voting meeting. It would just be -- no shortage of big things to talk about, so we'd just like to get a reading from you before we make an announcement about that. And we'll let you know in a day or two if we're going to do this. We know it's an extremely busy time of year. It's always busy, so we're very mindful of that and we don't want to overload you.

We have a couple of final discussions here, things that we have been kicking around for two, three senate meetings, and we have to wrap things up. So I'd like to talk about the tenure pause resolution.

Quickly, the situation is somewhere along the tenure review process, an allegation comes in the door that targets the candidate, and the idea behind this policy is that the tenure review is paused at that point and the allegation procedure plays out.

If it plays out and the individual is found responsible, and not dismissed, so some lesser sanction is imposed, then the idea is that what we call the pause panel consisting of the dean of faculty, the provost, the chair and the dean take the allegation report, turn it into a privacy-preserving document that gets put into the dossier, and the process restarts with the department. Of course, the department doesn't start from scratch. They just simply then reconsider things, in light of that summary of the allegation proceedings.

If there's no responsibility, then the case resumes with the ground rule that the proceedings cannot be discussed anywhere along the review process downstream. And there's lots of details. You would have to look at the actual proposed policy, but the candidate can insert at various points in all this statements that would be part of the dossier and read by everyone who is reviewing the case.

We presented this two meetings ago. Then last meeting, there were concerns raised at that point, and we had Vice Provost Avery August and Deputy Provost John Siliciano come and address some of these concerns. So let me then step through those and what the conclusions were on our end.

One question was why don't we just let the candidate call the shots; the candidate decides whether their case is paused. But the fact at issue here is, of course, fairness to the candidate, but also the integrity of the process. And that process is owned by multiple levels; department, college and university. And therefore, the idea is that the candidate certainly could be consulted, could offer opinions, but that decision has to rest beyond or be taken care of beyond the candidate.

Second, there were questions like -- and this is true; these allegation proceedings take a long time to play out. There are other flaws associated with some of these procedures, and we are uncomfortable with that. Those are all valid concerns, but the issue there is to improve those procedures, improve how 6.3 and 1.2 and 6.4 play out. The tenure policy is all about the careful and fair interaction with existing procedures. We can always and should always be in the market for trying to improve them, but that's not this policy. This policy is we have to live with what we've got.

And finally, there were concerns that women and minority faculty would be more likely to have their cases paused. And looking back on prosecutions or allegations in the major policies, there's no evidence that that would be the case.

If anyone wants, we could have a brief discussion about this, but here are the implications of not having a pause policy, of voting this down: First of all, you're going to increase the chance that rumors torque the tenure review, and typically in the direction that's unfavorable to the candidate. It's very difficult. As I mentioned, these allegation procedures take a long time to play out, but at least there's a structure there that aims for fairness and no prejudging of the candidate.

Second, and there are examples of this, if an allegation surfaces after a case leaves the department and those tenured faculty voters are not told about it, they're going to be antagonized. The idea is that all along the review process, the department, the college, the provost sees the same case, and the policy takes care of that.

And finally, you have to worry about inconsistency from case to case. Right now, there's no policy. And let me mention something, again; the numbers. On average, there might be one of these a year, so it's a very small number. But when this happens, they are among the worst of all possible -- to disentangle everything, these are the hardest of all allegation misconduct things to handle.

I think there's one more slide. Suggestions did come in, and we added two small features here. One is there's concern about time limitation. The added feature here is that if it takes a year and nothing has happened in terms of the misconduct procedure, then the case can be unpaused. In practice, that will never happen. I like this insertion,

because it shows there really is a limit there. There's not much we can do about speeding up the allegation procedures, but at least we're acknowledging that that is a problem and there is a finite end to it all.

And the second one is the detail that was overlooked. If, for example, suppose a letter comes in from a student that triggers an investigation and the candidate is found to be not responsible for anything, then that letter's removed from the dossier.

As I hope you know or remember, this policy was jointly developed with the senate's AFPSF committee, the provost's office and university counsel. It also went by the deans, so it really now is all up to the senate. If the senate approves this, it takes effect immediately. It's not as if we don't know what's going to happen downstream. Everything is in place now, except the senate vote. So having said that, is there anyone who would like to speak to this summary of the resolution and the procedure? I see Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thank you, Charlie. I've been thinking about this a lot, and I know everybody has thought hard about it, and I appreciate that; but in thinking about it for this amount of time, I'm convinced that we don't need this new institutional way or bureaucracy to deal with issues that might come up during a tenure process.

As Charlie said, there are very few instances where something does come up, on average one a year, and I think that under these circumstances, the best approach would be a case-by-case basis to arrive at the best outcome, rather than creating this kind of new layer of a formal bureaucratic process.

And I think there's some real dangers, some really concerns about instituting this tenure pause process. I just want to highlight those quickly. One is, as I said, because there's so few cases that have occurred, we don't need this kind of machinery in place. However, creating this new apparatus will, I believe, unfairly disadvantage faculty who are historically targeted for accusations and double standards: Women, people of color, faculty engaged in controversial work in their teaching, their research, their activism.

We've been cited oh, well, there's not a problem because the data shows us that there's not a problem; but with this small number, we don't really know that. But we do know that there's evidence of gender bias, for example, in student evaluations, double standards that exist.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let me just say one thing. Yes, one case a year, but I'm saying looking back on 6.3, 6.4 and 1.2, which is where the majority of these things happened, if you look at that total population, there's no evidence of women or minority faculty being --

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, fine. I understand that too. And my next point really goes to that, which is how will this new apparatus unfairly disadvantage the faculty I'm talking about. It's because it creates a new formal process that really invites allegations of wrongdoing, even if that's not the intent. And I'm sure that's not the intent to invite such allegations, but it creates a forum, a playing field. A forum for allegations of wrongdoing could include dredging up allegations based on conflicts that may have occurred in the past, issues that have already been resolved, personal animosities.

And so with this kind of a situation where we do know that there are double standards for faculty historically targeted in those ways, it creates a new and unnecessary and unfair degree of stress and insecurity to all tenure track faculty, including those, particularly those who I think do, we know have the greatest risk of being targeted.

And so having this kind of new formal panel also weighs in favor of creating a pause. And that damages a candidate, no matter what. And so a couple more points.

Charlie, you talked a long time, so just give me a moment. A couple more points. I think the unfairness here creates a chilling effect on faculty in all their activities. It will occur before the candidate's tenure review, it will continue during the tenure review. In other words, it has the chilling effect on academic freedom, and there are alternatives that we can use.

We can deal with faculty fairly and respectfully. We can, on a case-by-case basis, discuss issues that may come up and discuss those with the faculty member. We can ask for responses, and the dean and department chair and department can decide on what to do. And that might include a pause, but we don't need this kind of sledgehammer approach to dealing with it. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, let's limit comments to two minutes, please. Joanie.

JOANIE: Thank you. Yeah, want to say just, Risa, I cannot disagree with you any more. I see this totally from the other point of view. I feel very grateful for this policy. The issues that this policy are targeting, having to do with injustice, with bias, with

difficult things to talk about, interpersonal issues, professors at Cornell are not experts in these policies, but we all feel passionately about issues of right and wrong.

These are called reactive attitudes. You hear so-and-so did this, so-and-so may have done this; people get an idea before they have thought about it. So we only deal with these, one per year. We don't have experience dealing with these issues.

As one who has witnessed these issues skew the careers of my colleagues because people don't know how to talk about them -- are Me Too issues easy to talk about? No. I feel very emphatic that this is the right policy and that to put it back, oh, that we can deal with this ourselves, that is, again, just sweeping it under the rug and putting it back with the people who have not been dealing with it well. These are serious issues. This is a way of dealing with them seriously so that the tenure process can go on fairly.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, we have time for one more question, if there is one.

JILL: Carl Franck.

CARL FRANCK: Thanks. Carl Franck, Physics. I am switching my position on this in favor of the resolution because I appreciate very much whoever had the idea of putting that one-year time clock on the process. That met my concern, based on experience. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We've talked about this for three meetings. It is time for a vote. What's going to happen is that a note's going to be sent to the chairs, because this is a very, very important issue. We have to make sure there's local discussions about this. And then the one-week window will start next week on Monday.

The other topic we want to wrap up in terms of discussion this time is the Law School's proposal for clinical tenure. We have two guests from the unit to come, and we'll turn it over to them. And Jill, take down the slides.

Aziz.

SANDRA BABCOCK: I think I'm going to be the one starting.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, Sandra. Sorry.

SANDRA BABCOCK: Hi, everyone. Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak to you about what we see as a historic proposal and an opportunity for the Law School to recognize the work of our clinical faculty and to give them greater job security. I am one of the people who is directly affected by this proposal, so I'd like to give you the perspective that's based on my work and the work of my colleagues.

And I'd like to start with just giving you a sense of who we are. Clinical faculty at the Law School are community-engaged scholars who are working with clients and marginalized communities throughout the United States and around the world to address social inequality, to provide central legal services and to train our students to be a new generation of legal professionals.

We are, among other things, defending asylum-seekers who are fleeing persecution because of their sexual orientation, we're advocating on behalf of prisoners in Guantanamo, we are representing persons facing the death penalty in the United States and around the world, including in sub-Saharan Africa.

We are really gratified that our faculty unanimously voted in favor of the proposal that you see before you, because we feel that the faculty, by doing so, has recognized the centrality of our work to the Law School's mission.

One of the things I'd like to address is what I think is a very principled concern that was raised by the Academic Freedom Committee in its report, and that is the suggestion that clinical faculty should simply be considered for tenure under the existing tenure standards. The committee support for this, as I understand it, was unanimous.

While I support unitary tenure -- we've called this sort of unitary tenure -- the idea that all of the tenure considerations should be wrapped into this one track, I support this as a long-term option. But in the immediate term, it is neither feasible, for reasons that Aziz will explain in greater detail, nor desirable.

Clinical faculty face demands on our time that make it difficult for us to engage in the kinds of scholarship that our research colleagues are engaged in. We are writing legal briefs in support of our clients, we're drafting reports for public agencies and we are arguing in courts around the world. Even if the tenure standards in theory were broad enough to encompass the work that we do, our fear is that in practice, they would exclude most of us.

We are trying to attract clinical faculty to the Law School who are engaged in some of the most important legal struggles of our time. We want them to continue that engagement once they come, and we want them to bring our students into those legal battles as well. But if we tell them that we want them to come to the school to continue

with this path-breaking work and also to produce scholarship that is comparable to that of our research faculty, we are setting them up for failure.

Another suggestion that we've heard is that before our proposal is approved, that the university should create enabling legislation that would apply across campus to all schools and colleges. We are, of course, not opposed to the university studying this, but we have been carefully studying and strategizing and working on this proposal for the last three years, and we now have a strong consensus around it.

Voting in favor of this proposal won't preclude that further study at the university level, but we hope that you will allow us to move forward in the meantime and to really seize this moment, which we see as a historic opportunity for the Law School to move forward and to accord us the kind of recognition that we are so gratified to receive. So we hope that you will support us, and thank you very much.

AZIZ RANA: It's great to be here. Can everybody hear me? And maybe, Jill, now you can turn on the slides.

My name is Aziz Rana. I'm tenured at the Law School. I'm on the so-called doctrinal side, and I just want to highlight why clinical tenure is so important to the faculty as a whole. As Sandra said, this is something that really has consensus support at the Law School, and it's due to some pretty basic changes that have been taking place in legal education. So what I'm going to do is give some facts and figures about that context and how it underscores the need both for clinical tenure and also why we focused on the approach of a clinical tenure path rather than a unitary tenure.

Why clinical tenure? Consistent with national trends, what you can see here is really legal education at Cornell has changed very dramatically, from one clinic to two, to thirteen today. Nationally, the clinical section is now by far the largest section of the AALS, the American Association of Law Schools. So there have been big shifts around the country.

Almost three-fifths of our students today take clinics, and part of the reason here is because they're experiential requirements that are placed by state bar associations, the ABA, but it's also because of something else that's really significant, and that's a fact that today access to some of the most prestigious and elite spaces within the profession kind of require clinical training.

For example, especially if you want highly competitive positions in public interest, like you want to be an attorney at the ACLU or you want to do specialized work like become a public criminal defense lawyer, you need a clinical background. That is basically a prerequisite. We have been able to keep pace, to some degree, with our curricular offerings, but where we've really had trouble is on the hiring side, which has been much harder.

A big part of why this has been tough is because clinical hiring these days is incredibly competitive. It's as rigorous as hiring on the tenured doctrinal side. You have the same annual hiring conference that takes place with interviews. It's followed by flybacks with job talks and paper workshops. It's not remotely ad hoc. It's formalized year in, year out. These positions are frankly some of the most prestigious positions in the field.

It's in this competitive context that not having clinical tenure has meant frankly losing recruiting and retention battles with schools that offer some degree of tenure. And these are good schools on the list, but they're not our peers. Many are outside the top 50, some are outside the top 100, like Widener Law School. We should not be losing retention battles at Cornell with Widener Law School. This affects our reputation vis-a-vis our peers.

Separately and just as significantly, it also means that the clinic, which is where much of the public interest work that takes place at law schools occurs, we're just doing less of it than we could be doing. And it's harder to recruit not just faculty, but students, and especially the students that excel, that are top-tier, excellent students committed to the public interest.

But why a clinical, rather than a unitary approach? There are about 205 ABA-approved law schools. But really, when we make our decisions at Cornell, we make our policy choices in the context of our peer schools, and that's the vertical column. These are the so-called T-14 schools, the schools that have been ranked top 10, and the T-25 schools. And you can see where we land. We're 13 overall, but we're 44 in our clinical program, which is a drag on our overall reputation.

This blue dot is the only school in our peer group, the T-14, Georgetown, that has unitary tenure. And if you expand that out from T-14 to 25, the number remains the same. It's still just one. So unitary is a real outlier. The next law school we were able to track down, identify that has a unitary approach is Maryland, at 47.

Essentially, except for Georgetown, all of the schools that have unitary tenure are not peers. Most are well outside the top 50, and a number are actually clustered in D.C. So in Q&A, I can talk a little bit about which schools tend to have moved to unitary and why we have a bunch of schools in the D.C. area with it, American, UDC. This has to do with the particular market for government lawyers.

Clearly, there's a sense that tenuring clinicians, clinical faculty is important, and it's actually why you see the rise of clinical tenure, so the particular model that we're emphasizing, and these are all the green dots. So eight of the top 25 schools in the country now have the clinical tenure model that we're proposing, four in the top 10. And there are a couple reasons for this.

So why there's been focus on the move toward a clinical rather than a unitary approach. So reason Number 1 is that there's a real worry that the effect of adjusting the unitary tenure standard will have consequences for the school's reputation. So rankings have huge economic effects. There's a fear of too big a leap. And really, law and legal culture more generally involves slowly. Law schools tend to make decisions in tandem.

So that's one significant impediment, but then there's also a second worry, and this is weariness from clinicians, something Sandra brought up, which is even if you have a unitary approach with an adjusted standard, it's going to end up being really weak. And this is basically what's happened at some of the schools that have moved in this direction.

Take Maryland that I mentioned before; that's ranked 47. The effect there is really a dual system, where they have a very small number of clinical faculty that are tenured, but most are still on contract. And that's a poor outcome from the perspective of many clinicians.

All of this is why the collective reform choice basically within our pure law school world has been this clinical tenure model. And even for those who want to move toward a tenure approach, like Sandra mentioned, they see the clinical model as the path forward, given the really profound external constraints on any single school and the fact that law schools move slowly as a general matter.

It's for these reasons that our faculty, again, recommend this and have moved in this direction as a matter of consensus. And I actually think it offers a kind of good principle for when Cornell, when the university should think about granting waivers, especially in the context of ongoing enabling legislation. I think it makes sense, as with the Law School, when, one, the work we're talking about is central to the curriculum; two, there's a disciplinary culture that calls for a separate tenure line; and three, there's really true consensus within the unit and the department.

For us at the Law School, we've come to the conclusion that this proposal is essential already for future well-being, we need it to affirm the value of our colleagues and, frankly, just to keep pace with our peers. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Questions on the chat line? Jill. And please keep your questions brief, like one minute. Or comments, please be brief.

JILL: Professor Michener has had her hand up for a long time.

JAMILA MICHENER: Okay, thank you, Jill. I appreciate that. I'm going to try to be brief. I want to say, just underscore that I support this proposal and I was really swayed by the arguments that Professor Rana and Professor Babcock made, both in terms of the reasons, and I think the reasons are somewhat idiosyncratic and specific to the law school context why unitary tenure won't work, and so I think a unitary tenure approach would be great.

But in a context where that is really not possible and not feasible, to say that unless we can have that, we will have nothing is to essentially say that the Law School can't do what sounds pretty imperative for them to do in order to make forward progress. I'm not a member of the Law School, but were this something involving any department that was imperative in the way it sounds like this is, foregoing it in favor of an option that just is not a real possibility would feel a bit hollow to me.

The last thing I want to say really quickly is I actually took some time before today to look at the proposal that the Law School sent around about this, and I was swayed by two things that are, at least to me, compelling, but arguments around diversity and equity. So one is that it's not possible to get support at the university level for recruiting diverse candidates, given the structure, the present structure of clinical faculty members, and I think that's an important limitation.

And second is this idea that the majority of the clinical faculty members as it stands are women, and so by not creating this system that it sounds like everyone in the Law School, clinical and doctrinal faculty agree with, but by not creating the system where underscoring a different kind of inequity within the structure of the Law School;

so this idea that without a unitary system, outside of a unitary system, there's going to be equity issues.

It's the case that those issues exist now. And this, if anything, brings us closer to addressing them, rather than doing nothing, which feels like the other real option on the table.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Bruce. Questions are being posted on chat. We probably won't be able to get to all of them, but I will make a point of answering them before we start the voting process in a few days. Bruce.

BRUCE: Thanks. So I basically agree with everything that Professor Michener just said. At the last meeting, I was one of the people who raised some questions, not because I have any concerns whatsoever about tenuring the clinical faculty. I think that's clearly something that's needed and appropriate.

The concern I expressed then had to do with the unitary versus parallel process. I think in the long run we, as a unit, need to be thinking much more broadly about what we think tenure means, and that's true across the campus. But as Professor Babcock and Professor Rana have just expressed, and Professor Michener, you confirmed for various reasons, that's a long-term goal. In the meantime, we have the short-term, a much shorter term thing, and I support the proposal.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Anyone else, Jill?

JILL: MMW3.

MARK WYSOCKI: This is Mark Wysocki from Environmental Science. My question deals with is there a proposal in terms of percent limit, in terms of how many faculty would be clinical versus how many would be more traditional?

AZIZ RANA: This has no impact on the current limitations. So my understanding, and somebody else from the Law School that's here can jump in if I'm wrong, is that limit is 25%. So it has no effect on that limit, but it would just mean going forward that, when we hire clinical faculty members, we hire them into the clinical tenure track.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Jill, the chat line.

JILL: Yes, Tracy Stokol.

TRACY STOKOL: Thanks, guys, and I'll try and be quick about this. So I am very empathetic to the Law School. I'm going to address the gender issue really quickly. We have a very similar issue at the Vet School, where we do have faculty doing clinical work and we do recognize that clinical work with tenure under the current system. So that's just to say that it's doable.

The second thing is the gender issue. So we do have more women in our RTE faculty lines versus the tenure lines. And I view that as a problem with our hiring in the tenure track lines, that we should be doing a better job, versus the solution being to create a separate clinical tenure track entirely.

But I do have other reasons, then, which I'm not saying anything about. The issue about creating enabling legislation after the fact is kind of to me shutting the door after the horse has bolted, because you already created something that you're then now creating legislation for. It seems that the legislation should come first.

And if this proposal goes ahead, it's going to create three tiers. It's going to create the tenure track tier or doctrinal tenure, as you call it; it's going to create the clinical tenure tier; and then it's going to create an RTE tier. Instead of two tiers, now there's three tiers, which is going to create even more inequity and even more dissatisfaction with the current status.

And I agree with Bruce that we need to rethink tenure. I think the bottom line is this doesn't affect the Law School. This has ramifications for the entire university and for other colleges. It has ramifications for the other RTE titles and what the tenure process really means. And I think this is a really, really big issue that we shouldn't vote on very quickly and should really have a lot of thought and a lot of discussion as to what this means in the bigger picture.

I understand why you want to move forward and that the clinical -- improving a clinical ranking is laudable. I'm not sure you've shown any data to show clinical tenure is the way to actually move your clinical program forward, particularly when you are saying the scholarship that will be expected is not of the same level or quality that you currently expect from the doctrinal faculty.

And I have been hearing arguments to and from that this isn't tenure-light, that the data you've just presented today or what you have just said really is tenure-light, if you're saying they cannot do the same level of scholarship. They can do different scholarship, but it should still be of rigor and it should still be of high quality to maintain the academic standards of this institution.

And you are giving these people a lifetime appointment. You want to make sure you're giving these people, the right people the right appointment who have done that rigor and who have that rigor documented. That's it. I hope I didn't go overtime.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Other raised hands, Jill?

JILL: Richard BenseL.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's keep it brief, Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: I promise. Tracy raised some of the problems that are there. This does not create unitary tenure. I would favor that. Bruce raised some other questions about tenure in the university. If all of our units were to describe what their double or triple or whatever it is categories are for service in their departments, I do think it's tenure-light. I would favor unitary tenure, but practically, pragmatically, this is the best -- as Aziz and Sandra say, the best we can do now, so I would support this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Who's FEMI on the raised hand?

OLUFEMI TAIWO: I do not read this as tenure-light in any manner, shape or form. We are talking about people who perform duties that are not the same as the duties of those in the doctrinal line. So you can write all the law review articles and all of that that make waves, but you may be a very bad clinician. That's the reason why some become doctrinal professors fully, why some go into practice. And we are now finding a situation where we need to address people who combine both because they do need to shape the students for the future.

The United Kingdom has a different approach, whereby you leave the college and then you go to the course to get your preparation, and then work, you know,

affiliated to other lawyers, solicitors. In this country, we do it differently, and I think that when people are saying that there should be unitary tenure, what they are saying essentially is clinicians should also just write those law review articles, in addition to their clinical responsibilities. I think we need to take it very carefully at that point. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, Risa, but one minute.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Just following on the prior comment, yeah, I think it's -- I think that Tracy's characterization that this is not going to be high-quality scholarship seems to be completely outside of what we've understood from the Law School, that we're talking about tenure -- job security of tenure for people based on the high-quality work they do as clinicians, and that will not be the same as the sort of law journal articles that the so-called doctrinal faculty are producing.

But this is not any reduction in quality. I strongly support this proposal for clinical tenure, and I just want to point out for people who may not have had a chance to see it, that the Cornell chapter of the AAUP, the American Association of University Professors, the Cornell chapter voted unanimously in support of the Law School proposal for clinical tenure that is posted with the other materials on the senate website, in addition to what was already there.

On May 11, we adopted this statement strongly supporting it, for many of the reasons that you've already heard about. We think this is a very positive move to showing respect and protection of academic freedom for our faculty colleagues and, of

course, that includes the clinicians and all the strong needs that they have for academic freedom. So we strongly support this proposal.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. We're kind of out of time. Can we go to the next slide, please? Before we do this, if anyone wants to float a motion to delay the vote or whatever, now's the time to speak up. And if you do that, we'll have to take a vote on that. So anyone who objects to this timeline and wants to have the senate weigh in right now about it?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Excuse me, Charlie. Could you repeat what you just asked us to weigh in on?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, anyone who is unhappy with this timeline can float a motion that we delay the vote, delay doing this. So this is a very deep topic. On the one hand, you can talk about it forever. On the other hand, the Law School has spent more than two years on this, and I think we've had three meetings where this has been discussed. I personally think we are ready to vote, but I want to make sure that if anyone wants to follow the procedure and ask the senate to delay the vote, now's the time to speak up.

Okay, well, hearing none, then, we'll go on to the next topic. Again, thank you, Sandra and Aziz, for coming to the senate and explaining the proposal.

This is going to be voting by chat, and I think we can do this fairly quickly. The first vote is to approve the last four meeting minutes. If you are in favor of that, just say yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Over the last 10 or 15 years, there've been quite a few department name changes, and I've never really seen any that show up in the senate, but it's supposed to. We're part of the approval process. The department of Natural Resources has applied for this name change. It's gone through everything now, except us. Consent item here. If you're in favor of that, say yes or just vote yes on chat.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the reason for the name change?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Patrick, are you in the audience here? You want to explain why we are --

PAT SULLIVAN: This is Pat Sullivan, Chair of the Department of Natural Resources. And broadly speaking, we feel that the name change better reflects what we do. So we've traditionally done fish, wildlife, forestry type of things, but we continue to do and have frankly always done environmental sorts of things. And this includes conservation, genetics, invasive species, conservation social sciences, et cetera. And it's all explained in the memo that's in your handout here for today.

We also are one of the lead departments in terms of the new environment sustainability major in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and we feel that the name change also reflects a better mapping to that. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We all set, Jill? I forget. Did we vote on this yet?

JILL: Yes, we voted on chat.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, and now the third thing, which is a sense of the senate resolution, picking up on discussions at the tail end of the last meeting, where there was nervousness about course evaluations, given the extraordinary circumstances of this semester. Course evaluations, I think most people agree, are flawed to begin with, but we've got to have them, so to speak, but there was nervousness about these evaluations showing up in promotion cases, and perhaps unfairly. The whereases just sort of sum up all the things we know from the last five or six weeks about the difficulties teaching this semester, and here is the be it resolved.

Basically, if you're a candidate for a promotion or tenure or contract renewal, you have the option of having them removed from the dossier, but you have to replace it with just a brief personal summary of the teaching experience. In other words, it's not just erase this. It's rather I don't feel it's appropriate, and here's a brief summary of why I feel that way.

I think this creates the option we felt the senate was interested in having, but then there is an element that is not simply expunged from the record, the whole thing. I think the candidate can certainly articulate the difficulties that were encountered, and that's valuable.

Anyone want to comment on this sense of the senate? If it's controversial, then we would take this off and work on it and show up next meeting, but does anyone have a concern about this or doesn't capture the mood of the senate, as you recall?

Let's vote. Same old way.

Sorry, Paul? Yeah?

PAUL: One question. Does the candidate decide this after having seen the evaluation?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, yeah. You collect the evaluations. We don't stop that. It's just that how they're used. That's what the sense of the senate is, on the use of S20 course evaluations.

Thank you very much. You can keep voting. We now move to the next item. The Vet School has a proposal that concerns RTE faculty and their ratio to tenure track faculty in their operation, and I believe Dean Warnick will kick this discussion off. Lorin, are you in the meeting?

LORIN WARNICK: Yes, I am. Thanks. Just give me a thumbs up if you can hear me okay, Charlie. Okay, great. I really appreciate the opportunity to talk about our college's proposal, which is truly critical for maintaining excellence in Cornell's veterinary and public health programs. And this proposal, as you're aware, is to change the way caps for clinical titles and professor of practice would be applied in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

And there's three key points that I'd like to make quickly. The first is this proposal maintains at least the percentage of tenure track positions that we have now, and it would make sure that the tenure track titles continue to be the majority of the faculty in veterinary medicine.

Secondly, right now, there's no cap on several of the RTE faculty titles, and this proposal would bring all these under a single cap of 45% of the total faculty numbers. And then third, the proposal gives us the flexibility to use the best titles for our existing

and future RTE faculty. For example, the clinical professor and professor of practice titles, they're really important for us for performing missions in our teaching hospital, in the diagnostic laboratory and the new master of public health program.

This is a feature very common in veterinary medicine. You'll see some information on our peers, where it's typical for our peer institutions and those we compete with for hiring to have a large number of clinical professors to help deliver the program.

I also wanted to give you just a little bit of background on the origin of the proposal. This came out of our college's strategic planning process that we completed a couple of years ago. And during that, we recognized that the way we were using titles was causing some problems in meeting our goals for the college and limiting our ability to mount some new programs.

As a result of that, we set up a titles committee and had representatives of the tenure track faculty, RTE faculty, who carefully considered our use of titles in the college, and they came up with the proposals that we considered in the college, and then this one that you're reviewing now.

The first two recommendations of the committee -- the first one was to adopt the use of the professor of practice title, which you recently approved. We appreciate that. The second one was to change the cap so that we could increase our use of clinical professor and professor of practice and, over time, decrease our use of lecturer, senior lecturer and senior extension associate titles, which for many of our faculty that hold

those currently are a poor fit for what they do, and then also have been a challenge for us in terms of recruitment.

The current proposal really comes from a great deal of work by many of our faculty and, I think as you saw in the vote in the college, it had overwhelming support of faculty across all the titles in the college.

With that brief introduction, Professor Alex Travis is going to give some more detail on the proposal, and we hope that we can address any questions that the faculty senate has. So thank you very much. I appreciate it.

ALEX TRAVIS: Thank you, Lorin. So as the dean mentioned, our proposal really protects tenure, but for the first time establishing that the majority of the faculty in the college, at least 55%, will be tenure track. And this does affirm our college's strong commitment to the role of tenure track faculty.

Current legislation limits both the combination of the clinical professors and the professors of practice to 25% of the numbers of the tenure track faculty. So because of this cap, our college has been unable to convert all of our RTE faculty who are doing the jobs that are best aligned with those titles, but who currently serve under uncapped titles, things like lecturers, senior extension associates, senior research associates. So we're unable to appropriately title the people we have.

We also, then, are unable to address our expanding clinical and practice missions by hiring new faculty under those most useful titles, the clinical professor and professor of practice. What this new proposal does is aggregate all of the RTE faculty titles under a single cap of 45% of the total faculty numbers.

As the dean mentioned, this is really essential to give us the flexibility within that 45% to utilize the titles that are most appropriate for people's training, their skills, their experience and their responsibilities. And this is very important for maintaining the excellence of our college's programs and developing excellence in new programs.

In many cases, faculty on the RTE side who are under those uncapped titles have the exact same credentials and duties as the clinical track or professor of practice track faculty, but they cannot have those same titles solely because of the cap. These faculty are serving as section chiefs, they run diagnostic service sections, and they hold many other prominent positions, so the cap has effectively created severe inequity in terms of promotion, in terms of recognition in stature and that are not at all consistent with the training, ability or responsibilities of our faculty.

Now, for the faculty who must work under those titles, we've performed surveys as part of the Strategic Planning and Titles Committee of job satisfaction and the barriers that the titles produce. Only half of all of our RTE faculty that responded said that they felt that the title accurately reflected their job duties.

Most importantly, they said that the titles interfered with the performance of their scholarly activities, they cannot as easily serve as PIs on proposals. When they submit proposals, they're disadvantaged by reviewers who don't understand our use of titles and the expertise and positions that they hold. As we'll show in a few moments, our peer institutions usually don't have to work under these caps and utilize other more appropriate titles, such as clinical professor.

This translates, then, into our faculty are not being sought after for collaborations or invited to give as prestigious lectures, because people are misunderstanding our titles. And all these things, obviously, combine to hurt morale, add to that inequity problem and reduce our college's standing.

Of course, this creates very significant problems in terms of recruiting and retaining the world-class faculty upon which we depend. And I'll say this is both for the veterinary clinical hospital and diagnostic lab, as well as for the new master of public health program. We are running a search currently, and several outstanding candidates have told me that they would not consider coming here without a, for example, professor of practice title and would not come under, say, a lecturer or senior lecturer title.

Here we see a comparison using the most recent AAVMC data with our peer institutions. Again, we want to reinforce that our college really recognizes the critical role of tenure track faculty in combining discovery with teaching and service. Over the past decades, we've evolved to this point where we have a ratio of about 45% RTE, 55% being tenure track.

Just before the shelter-in-place order, we also mapped out all of our anticipated future hires at the college for the next five years, and that ratio stayed exactly the same. Here you can see our peer institutions, which are all top five in U.S. News rankings, and none of them have the same kind of hard cap that Cornell has. Many of them have percentages that are the same.

North Carolina State, which seems to have the lowest ratio of RTE to tenure track, actually gets around this by hiring all clinical and teaching faculty under non-faculty titles, so that's why their ratio looks so low. But you will see all of our peer institutions, actually. Cornell, therefore, has really the lowest ratio here.

In compiling these numbers and literally going through the faculty lists of each one of these schools, one by one, one thing really leapt out. Almost none of the RTE faculty at these institutions, for example, have lecturer titles, which are the most commonly used at our college. The vast majority are the clinical professor track. And this is, again, why our use of titles disadvantages our faculty and hurts our recruitment so heavily.

Basically, none of our peers know how to evaluate our faculty, because those lecturer titles are used for very junior people who have predominantly teaching duties and we're using them as an assistant, associate or even full professor, clinical professor.

At this point, I think we are able to take some questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Richard?

RICHARD BENSEL: The question relates to the previous discussion. So we have clinical and practice at the Vet School, we have clinical at the Law School, we have two sets of discussions. One would be tenured, this one would be titles. I appreciate this slide on the ratios and other peer institutions.

The question I have is really isn't this something that is an institution general-university; we should be engaging in constructive discussions, comparison between programs. So the question is compared to the clinical case in law, because I actually

think 45% is very large, with RTE faculty, regardless what the peer institutions are, but compared with the Law School, what are the criteria you are suggesting? How does it compare with theirs? That's it.

ALEX TRAVIS: I'm happy to jump in on that, but Dean Warnick or Associate Dean Fubini, feel free to follow up. I really don't want to make a comparison with percentages with law. We run a teaching hospital, which is a very different thing entirely. We run one of the world's largest veterinary diagnostic labs.

And many of our peer institutions, those numbers you see, for example, University of Pennsylvania, they do not run a state diagnostic lab. So they don't nearly have the numbers, the demands for RTE faculty positions that we do, and yet our ratio is lower. I think this is one of the reasons our college has a firm commitment to the role of tenure track faculty, and this is why our numbers are as they are.

On the public health program, I will say that the Council on Education for Public Health, which is the accrediting body for public health, mandates that we have a significant number of faculty with practice experience teaching our students. That was something that they evaluated both on their site visit and in written documents, for which we got a lot of favorable mentions on the written evaluation.

However, all those people that we hired, none of them are under the practice track titles; first, because those were just recently approved, but also now, we cannot move them into those titles because we don't have room with the cap as it exists. This is a university-wide program, and we cannot use these titles effectively for it because of this cap.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Questions on the chat line, Jill?

JILL: Mark Wysocki.

MARK WYSOCKI: Yes. Six years ago, the College of Agricultural Science struggled with this, and we came up with a resolution which limited the use of this down to 20%, to this kind of a title as to across the college. That is fairly low, compared to what you are proposing here, 45. But I suspect that it's because of the nature of the beast or the field that you're in that you tend to have more faculty that are more in the practice field, and that's why your percent is fairly large. Is that correct?

LORIN WARNICK: Can I respond to that? That sums it up well. As Alex said, we have the diagnostic lab, which serves the State of New York, sees over 200,000 sessions every year, very major enterprise. The teaching hospital sees over 20,000 patient visits a year. In order to staff those clinical enterprises which serve critical teaching needs, critical research needs and public service needs, we really need this large number of clinical faculty.

We, of course, value the tenure track positions, but it really becomes impossible to staff those enterprises if we were to rely entirely on tenure track faculty positions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have time for one more question. This is, again, the first reading, and we'll talk about this at our next meeting, whenever that is. Risa, keep it brief, and this will be the last question.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. My understanding of reading the proposal and hearing this today is that at least a significant amount of the reason for the proposal has to do with the new master of public health program and the number of clinical faculty who

are being hired by the Veterinary College for that and your concern about not having enough positions for clinical professors outside of that public health program.

And then also, as you said today, there are scholarly activities that clinical professors will want to engage in, as well as other RTE faculty, being PIs, et cetera, so they're doing scholarship. Given the importance that you pointed out, high strategic priority, as you said, for the College of Medicine and for the university for this master of public health program, if it's such a high strategic priority, seems to me that you can attract and retain a lot of people if you hire them into tenure track positions and that, right now, the College of Medicine has a very strong argument for saying we need more tenure track lines.

That seems to me to be consistent with what we've been talking about with regard to protecting academic freedom, respecting our faculty, giving them job security. That's a better approach, as opposed to well, let's have as our goal, which as I hear it, the goal of having 45%, almost half of your faculty in veterinary medicine being non-tenure track. I'd like to hear why you don't try to get more tenure track lines for this high strategic priority.

LORIN WARNICK: Let me comment on part of that, then I think Alex can talk about the master of public health specifically. So the first thing is the 45%, that would not be a new thing. That's where we've been at for a long time. In fact, we don't have any limit on the number of lecturers or senior lecturers, senior extension associates that can be hired as a percentage of the tenure track faculty. This would actually introduce a

new control that would preserve and maintain the percentage of tenure track faculty at at least the point it is now.

And then the second thing, in terms of why wouldn't we just give more tenure track lines, it's not so much a limit of lines. It's a limit of funding and how you deploy that funding to reach the mission. And I think Alex could comment on why the professor of practice, for example, plays such a critical role for the public health program.

ALEX TRAVIS: Absolutely. Again, it's a mandate by the Council on Education for Public Health that we have faculty who have experience working with communities that are involved in assessing a community's health needs, designing interventions to promote the health of populations and doing monitoring and evaluation, so that kind of engaged activity constitutes public health practice. It's a mix of research, service and training all in one.

Unfortunately, a lot of those people with those backgrounds, those would not meet the traditional academic metrics for tenure. They're not writing papers. They're influencing policy, they're influencing government programs, they're actually having real-world outcomes that are a result of practice.

And that is why the Council on Education for Public Health in 2016 instituted the largest changes in public health education in probably 50 years, switching from a course-based structure to a competency-based curriculum. This is where that mandate for practitioners comes in. It does make sense; if you want to learn medicine, veterinary medicine or human medicine, you would want clinicians to be part of who's training that

next generation of physicians or veterinarians. The same way with public health; you want people with practiced experience to be training your professional public health practitioners.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you very much. This is the first reading. I have a few things to say about what the next steps are. This proposal was reviewed by CAPP, as required, and they had some concerns. And you can see their report on the website. The idea here now is CVM will revise their proposal accordingly and resubmit things to CAPP, and the CAPP final report and revised proposal will be communicated here.

There are sort of two concerns. One is, again, the environmental impact. If Vet does this, then what about other units? Do we need some kind of guidelines about that? So that's a very important question that needs to be addressed.

And then the second one is sort of fundamental, and it comes up here, which is the tenure track to RTE ratio, and to discuss more about the impact of this on the tenure system university-wide, and we get into some deep stuff. So that's all in the cards and will be showing up in the senate in the near future. There's no target date for voting. Just simply between now and June, we'll carry this to the next step; then at that time take stock of where we are. Thank you very much.

We're over time, but what I am going to propose here -- I don't know exactly how to do it -- is that we go for an extra 15 minutes beyond the 5:00 period. What we want to do now is hear from our three faculty members who are on these reopening committees. I've asked them each to give us a little update, and also things they're struggling with and so on.

So why don't we begin with Courtney, because Courtney has some slides, and then Shorna and Chris. Again, there's no more voting. Obviously, people are busy. Take off when you have to take off, but we'll go until 5:15, because I did promise them 30 minutes and it's very important stuff that we want to hear. Courtney.

COURTNEY ROBY: Thank you very much, Charlie. I'm Courtney Roby, the senator from Classics and the faculty representative on the so-called CPOT Committee.

Here's some fast facts about the committee, for those of you that haven't studied its composition. Today, just in the few minutes that we have, I want to focus on the work that's been done so far. So these are the subcommittees of CPOT.

I am involved mostly with the substantive curriculum and models of delivery, which are sort of all things curriculum and course design-related, which of course are inextricable from the tech support issues, which are everything from making certain that students who can't join us on campus have the computing resources they need, to shoring up our campus WiFi, which everyone here has probably already noticed has some holes in it.

And I'm also on the Student Experience and Co-curriculars Subcommittee, which is focused on shrinking the sort of presence gap that students have felt over the last half a semester of emergency online teaching, so ways that we can make them feel more engaged, not only in this co-curricular sense around their coursework, but also how we can integrate those co-curricular resources with teaching that will happen in the fall, should we be all or partially online.

There are also subcommittees on international issues and budget and finance. They tend to involve more people who are peripheralized than the committee, but I'm happy to field any questions on what I've heard so far about those issues.

Most of the substantive work that I have witnessed being done has actually been with the great group of faculty that Charlie calls our brain trust. We gave ourselves the name FCOT, because everyone was getting confused with too many committees. These are faculty representatives from across the university, many of whom are here with us today, as well as our grad student representative, R.L. Johnson of Plant Biology.

And in addition to those groups, we've also got focus groups drawing on additional faculty, working on the particularly tricky issues of how you might put a lab or a studio or performance class online and still have it be a meaningful, educational experience. But I would say within this group, the challenges we are most focused on, a couple of interrelated labor issues, for which both Neema on CPOT and Alisa on FCOT have been invaluable in helping us to refine.

One set of issues, of course, revolves around us securing teaching positions, whether those are faculty, staff, graduate instructors. And then there's the sort of flip side of this. Putting courses online, especially if we're not meant to do it in the kind of emergency standard that we did for the fall, requires a lot of work. Putting both resources and rules in place so that faculty are not overwhelmed with workloads, for example; improving our accessibility, so working to meet ADA standards, which we did not for the fall.

What I would love to get as feedback from you, from your faculty, is as much information, even the really nitty-gritty stuff, maybe especially the nitty-gritty stuff on what you need, what you want, what you're worried about just as far as tech, hardware, software, staffing issues, course design issues, and then what information channels are most efficient at communicating these kinds of resources to faculty.

So there's an open comment stage on the University Faculty website, so please feel free to contribute there. You can also write directly to me with more detailed stuff.

Finally, I see our work, both as faculty on FCOT and then as a part of CPOT as well, as being kind of double-sided. So there's an admin phasing set of recommendations that CPOT will make, and central administration will do whatever they do with those recommendations. But whatever happens with that, I think we're also working to produce a faculty-facing set of resources.

And so these are concrete resources, rather than the kind of one-size-fits-all guidelines that out of necessity one tends to get from groups like CTI. So concrete resources for faculty on available software, hardware, assessment suggestions, example assessment, course design issues, accessibilities tools and ways of securing, again, that higher level of student engagement. That's my five minutes, I think.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. I thought, since there's so many interrelated themes here, we'd have Shorna and Chris talk, and then open it up for questions, targeted appropriately. Shorna is on the committee that basically is going to look at how, if we do have students on campus, how do we manage that. Shorna.

Is Shorna in the room?

SHORNA ALLRED: I was muted. Should be much better at this Zoom thing by now.

Hi, everyone. My name is Shorna Allred. I'm the faculty representative on the Committee of Teaching Reactivation Options, and just wanted to share with you a little bit about where the committee is. This particular committee is charged with identifying recommendations for and criteria used to reactivate the campus for in-person teaching or perhaps a hybrid model of in-person teaching.

And the issues that we're looking at, there's a subcommittee on teaching and social distancing and also on public health considerations and looking at classrooms and teaching spaces, co-curricular and extracurricular activities, which interfaces with Courtney's committee as well; housing and dining because, of course, over half of our undergraduate students live and eat on campus, and many more also dine on campus, so those are really important spaces to think about any kind of reactivation.

Also campus facilities and thinking about how our communal spaces on campus, community centers, RPCC, places like this, how campus facilities would be altered in the fall, if we were to have any kind of residential semester. And there's also a group that's looking at tracing technologies, so really understanding the different technologies and how they could help with things like contact tracing, utilizing WiFi systems that individuals are connected to. I just wanted to mention those different dimensions of our committee's work.

Another aspect of what we've been examining is really this question of risk and thinking about the principles of decision-making, so what principles are we applying to

whatever recommendations are being put forth, things like issues of equity, things like burden to faculty, the issue of risk and understanding what level of risk we're comfortable with, impacts on mental health because, under any of these scenarios, there's going to be potential mental health impacts.

The student learning experience as well is a critical aspect of the kind of decision-making process, so it would be really helpful to get feedback at the very granular level, as well as on these decision principles and how much risk are we willing to assume, how much are we comfortable with and how vulnerable populations are impacted, which is also a really key decision principle for any alternative to be weighed against.

Also just wanted to thank the sounding board brain trust group for CTRO as well, which has been really helpful in initial conversation, kind of thinking through what some of the options are as well. And there's also Joe Anderson as the president of the Student Assembly, and Becca Harrison, a doctoral student here at Cornell and STS, and they really provided really critical student input on the committees and have been really valuable in organizing the town halls that we have had with graduate students that have really produced some very helpful feedback on making sure we're covering and considering graduate student concerns in this process as well. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Shorna. So Shorna and Courtney's Committees have a June 15 deadline, and that's because the decision about what to do in the fall probably has to come, at most, one or two weeks after that. However, Chris's committee, and Chris is up next, their report is due this Friday, so let's hear from Chris what's up.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you, Charlie. Thanks for the opportunity to address the senate on this. Committee anticipates submitting a report on time Friday, which will detail strategies for reopening the research and many other operations on campus.

As I've said in many formats, this is going to be a proposal-based reactivation, where faculty and senate directors and PIs of labs are going to be writing proposals to re-engage in scholarly work that requires on-campus resources with descriptions about the strategies they're going to take to schedule people, so we don't have individuals where they shouldn't be; strategies to maintain social distancing; strategies to ensure high-quality disinfection of high-touch surfaces and other things to minimize the risk of spread of the virus.

Those proposals are going to be evaluated at department and college levels. And there's going to have to be coordination, for example, among faculty or groups using facilities that are on the same floor or on the same wing of a building, as well as coordination across a building, all with the goal of trying to allow a phased reactivation of the use of on-campus resources for scholarship, while at the same time abiding by the needed social distancing guidelines to prevent reemergence of the virus.

I would say one of the really -- here I'm speaking for myself, what I anticipate to be a thorny issue going forward is how we monitor for and then how we try to police against abuses. There's really two kinds of abuses that I think we're really concerned about.

One is faculty putting undue pressure on individuals to return to campus when they don't feel it's safe for them to do so, either because of their own health or the

health status of someone that they cohabit with. The other concern we have is people flouting and going beyond -- feeling constrained by the restrictions that are going to be in place and going beyond them and violating social distance rules.

And so I think it's going to be tricky to think about what things are we going to put in place to encourage people not to engage in those kinds of behaviors, how are we going to watch for it. Of course, there will be anonymous and non-anonymous pathways for people to report cases of abuse, but even when we become aware of them, what would be the strategy to try to mitigate and to reduce them.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks. I think we have a couple of raised hands. So if it's easy, preface your question with online or in-person[teaching] or research, and the appropriate faculty member will respond. Jill, raised hands.

JILL: Wendy Wilcox.

WENDY WILCOX: Yes. This is in regards to in-person. I just want to pose the question that I understand that we are definitely going to need to be able to do contact tracing if we have students on campus, but I also want to get some assurances that any of the compromises we make in this short-term emergency scenario in terms of individual privacies do not become the standard for which we operate as a campus. I think that's a very, very dangerous precedent to get into.

The library is looking to bring forth a resolution about privacy and how we ensure individual privacies in the tracking of people on campus, and I just want that committee to be very clear, that whatever you're proposing is a short-term proposal.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Courtney, would you like to say anything on that?

COURTNEY ROBY: Yeah. Thank you for that. That is something that's definitely come up, particularly in that subcommittee on contact tracing, because technology -- you have to consent to utilize these technologies, which would aid in things like contact tracing, and I think the privacy issue is really important.

And I think that should also be one of those kind of principles that we think about that's really something that we consider for all of the alternatives; what are the impacts to privacy, how do we protect public health while also thinking about the privacy of individuals and their consent, and how long will these policies be in place, that it's not an indefinite kind of policy. So I'll bring both of those things forward. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, Jill. Chat line or raised hand?

JILL: Yes, there's a raised hand for SP2279.

SARA PRYOR: Hello. My name is Sara Pryor. Before this meeting, Dean Boor had a Zoom meeting where she was discussing preparations from the CALS perspective. She was very clear the individual faculty member would be responsible for funding sanitization of their own labs, funding supply of appropriate PPE, and that people would be expected to clean as they went in and clean as they went out of their labs. That's quite a significant burden to put on individual faculty members. Is that really the sentiment of these faculty committees?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yeah, I can take that, and I'd say that if what you related is what Dean Boor said in that meeting, then that is capturing the direction things are heading here.

I think we will need people who are using on-campus facilities for their scholarship to imagine that they're going to come to campus, put on personal protective equipment, and they're going to disinfect and clean their way into the facility they're using -- obviously, not the outer door to the building, but getting to, say, a lab suite or a studio area, going to disinfect high-touch surfaces on the way in, do the work, clean and disinfect that work space and clean and disinfect high-touch surfaces on the way back out.

In terms of the supplies that are required, it's really 70% ethanol and paper towels are adequate for the disinfection. Face masks are going to be needed inside all buildings at all times and, beyond that, the kind of personal protective equipment that you would need for your particular kind of your research, typically gloves and those kind of things.

While I don't anticipate it being a heavy burden in terms of costs, it will require additional time for each person that's coming to use on-campus resources to be thorough, thoughtful and careful about the way they disinfect their way into and back out of research spaces.

SARA PRYOR: Because, just following up, if I might just briefly, that's quite an extraordinary state of affairs to think that the university no longer considers that it is appropriate for them to provide a safe working environment.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: To be clear, I think this is not an abdication of the university's responsibility to provide a safe working environment. And there will be increased, for example, cleaning of surfaces and spaces by custodial staff. I think it's more a

recognition of the fact that all of us who are going to be using on-campus resources are going to have to adjust our behaviors and take on a little bit greater burden of work, in order to ensure that we're able to keep the campus open and keep using these resources for our scholarship going forward.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I see Ken's hand is up.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah. My question is this, sort of for all the committees: We have a lot of technician staff, custodians, who were just mentioned, who work really at minimum wage and may feel that they have no choice, that if we reopen certain types of equipment, for example, it has to be managed by the technicians who manage it. So they may be under an obligation to work.

Is Cornell going to be able to guarantee that they don't bear any undue costs? Because this is a community where there could really be quite a harsh blow to face potentially losing your job versus, I don't know, purchasing an iPhone or other types of costs that might be fairly heavy from their point of view.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Sometimes these are rhetorical questions. Does anyone have any insights here?

SHORNA ALLRED: I think I can speak from the perspective of my position as house dean here, living on campus and seeing how dining and building care, which is where we have a lot of our staff that are working as dishwashers, taking care of buildings and working in those particular positions, that they have been provided with PPE and that dining has rigorous and robust procedures in place for how to keep

employees safe under these conditions. And so I know that at least for those employees, that those materials have been provided by Cornell.

Neema, you may know more, from your perspective.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah, just to chime in. Thanks for the question, Ken. Chris, I can't remember who exactly, but someone spoke about sort of these principles by which the committees are working, and I think equity is one of the central principles. And so equity operates in multiple directions, depending on the committee, but also based on our communities' characteristics.

So equity at one level is about making sure all students, all kind of various student questions are being considered. At another level, it is about us, faculty and instructors, our graduate students. And so equity on those dimensions related to our community of faculty, and then we are looking staff questions is quite important.

And these questions of employment, of trying to keep as many people employed as possible, to think about the larger community, Ithaca that we live in, Tompkins County, surrounding counties, Cortland County comes up quite a bit. So I think all the issues are under consideration. Now, how exactly policy guidelines are going to shake out are harder to know.

KEN BIRMAN: Neema, can I ask a related question? How do you view the issue of obligation to return to work? We've heard comments already that no professor will be required to teach in the fall, but of course, that same issue arises for staff and grad students. So are we going to have pockets of people who are required, who would face

losing their job, where they go to work on such-and-such a day, whether it's to operate an electron microscope or whatever the purpose, and who don't have a choice?

NEEMA KUDVA: It's being talked about, Ken. I think there's going to be issues of how -- I mean, I can say I'm vulnerable and cannot go in to work, what does that mean? How do I demonstrate that? Do I just have the ability to opt in and opt out? I mean, I'm both an employee of Cornell and a faculty member.

So I think these are very difficult questions, and the university and all of us have to wrestle with how exactly we're going to establish guidelines in order to allow each of us to be able to assert our desire and our -- act on what is important for us in terms of our personal risk and health, as well as that of the institution's.

I'm just talking around you. I'm not answering anything directly, in part because I think where we are, at least where CPOT, on which Courtney and I serve, where we are is we're talking through things. Nobody's actually come down with any decision yet, but I can assure you that every one of these issues is being discussed. But I don't have anything better than that to report, actually.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I can say a little bit about that. On the reopening committee, Mary Opperman is on that committee, and this has been one of the key issues that she's brought up in committee meetings and that she's continuing to wrestle with. So the head of Human Resources is engaged on precisely this issue; how do you make a judgment about someone who says they're too scared, for example, to return to campus, in the absence of a documented medical issue. It's exactly in that thorny issue

and, like Neema, I'm talking around it here because I don't have an answer, but I'll tell you that it's being brought up.

Shannon in the chat also brought up impact in terms of job security and occupational health on cleaning staff and maintenance workers. So Rick Burgess is also on this reopening committee. He's head of facilities on campus, and protocols to try to protect the health of custodial staff and other building workers are being developed.

Job security is a big challenge, and I think we'll have to look to our leadership, Martha and Mike, for decisions as to whether or not the financial impact of this is going to lead to layoffs or not. I don't believe any decision has been made.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Paul Ginsparg.

PAUL GINSPARG: Just a quick question for the online teaching. I'm curious, if I do have to teach online, I'm not looking forward to it, but looking even less forward to risking my life. I would almost certainly need to buy some large iPad to use as a Blackboard. Actually borrowed one from my son to use in my teaching in the spring, but I would need one of my own in the fall. I can shell out the money.

I'm just curious, even this is an additional expense, and Charlie may designate this a rhetorical question, given the financial situation the university is in, but I'm just wondering if -- or widespread use of these things -- there are any plans to have some repository of these just available, as we have always had some number of computers in classrooms, or we don't have to bring our own projectors; they are on the ceiling. And certain items like that can be shared. And I'm wondering if any thought has been given

to that so that everybody doesn't have to purchase the same thing to use once or twice a week.

COURTNEY ROBY: Not a rhetorical question at all. It's a question that's already come up repeatedly. And I agree. Tablets, probably also doc cams, technology like this that replaces or would replace whiteboards, were we not allowed to use whiteboards because we're not in classroom spaces, super-important.

And again, these issues of equity, it's obviously not at all fair to ask grad TAs to purchase these things for themselves. So yeah, that's definitely something that we're working on, together with the tech subcommittee. Like everybody else, I have no answer for you with what's going to happen, but something we're definitely aware of.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, then David Delchamps.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, I just put something in the chat. It's actually responsive to the issue that we were just talking about and that Chris was addressing on job security for all of us, all faculty, graduate assistants and staff. This is a basic principle that I think we need to commit ourselves to, rather than something that can be compromised.

Again, referring to the AAUP chapter, we also adopted a statement -- I've put the link in the chat box there, a statement committed to the continued employment of all these groups, faculty, TAs, graduate assistants and staff. And the reality that we -- many choices, including the flexibility that the provost referred to, because of being more liquid, et cetera.

And these are priorities. And we belong -- not only faculty, for sure governance, but all shared governance bodies, we all belong in that discussion. I don't think we should just look to those in charge in the administration to make those decisions. We are all part of this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Carl, then David.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you very much. I appreciate very much these points we are making. Just quickly say, who is our best resource to discover if things are being conducted in a financially proper way, from the point of view of equity? Who is our best resource for that?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I can actually answer that, because I sit in on the FPC Committee, Financial Policy Committee. That's one of the senate standing committees, and we're dealing with that very issue. In other words, somehow getting the discussion of the options out there in front of the faculty, things of such as how much do you pull out of the endowment and whatever. How do you reason about that? There are a bunch of questions. So that's coming down the pike, yeah.

CARL FRANCK: And then quickly, to ask a second question. It just dawned on me, for people who work in labs with hazards, it's an old no-brainer: We have to learn standards, EH&S inspects us, looks at our protocols and so forth. Who at Cornell is looking -- is going to certify that those protocols are -- in other words, I realize this is a moving target and might have to change, but there has to be a single -- is EH&S in charge of us in this sense, they are going to certify that these are proper protocols that we'll be following?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: No. Carl, I believe my goal will at least be to try to push the decision-making down to the department and senate director level, with higher-level approvals by the college, with guidance coming from Environmental Health & Safety and other campus partners on the requirements in terms of social distancing and scheduling and disinfection, but then allowing department chairs and senate directors who know the details of the kind of work that's occurring in their department, building managers who understand the details of the layouts in their facilities, for them to be the ones that are approving specific protocols by specific sets of strategies by faculty and by groups of faculty on, say, same floors or same wings.

I think EH&S would be just completely overwhelmed by the need to evaluate all of these, so there will be guidance as to what needs to be achieved, and local and then college-level evaluation and commenting on an approval of protocols that achieve that guidance.

CARL FRANCK: I respectfully have to disagree, because I feel that under our present circumstances, our department chairs look after many complicated research situations that have been there for years, buildings got designed and so forth, but we need standards. And I realize the standards can change, so I would just submit that I can't expect my department chair to be up on the latest medical reports.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: The idea is the requirements in terms of maintaining distance and achieving disinfection, that would adequately address the needs to reduce spread of the virus, those requirements will be handed down. Department chairs are not going to be making judgments about what is and isn't safe in terms of the virus. They'll be

making judgments about does this strategy meet the social distancing requirements or not, and that feels like a very spoke discussion that needs to be made at a more local level.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Related to what Paul Ginsparg brought up -- David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering -- for some of us in my department, we were told by the associate dean to, when we had our discussion about online teaching readiness for the fall, we should for now assume that classrooms would be available, whether there's students around or not.

And I just wanted whoever's doing those committees about whether we're going to be in person or online to know there are a lot of faculty members for whom teaching in a room with a big blackboard and a videographer -- in this case it would be a TA, as I used this semester -- is important. The doc cam thing doesn't work, the standing in one place thing doesn't work, and I just wanted to say that, put in a plug for there's some of us who really need the rooms with the boards, and that's it. And not even whiteboards; blackboards, just so you know.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. DNY88 has your hand up.

MARIA GANDOLFO: Maria Gandolfo from Plant Biology. And I don't know why my name is not there. I'm a senator for Plant Biology.

One concern that I have is about teaching. If we return to campus and teach, a lot of classes have a lot of labs using microscopes and other type of instruments. And those would have to be cleaned every single time students are using. So who will be

responsible for that? Would be the professor teaching the lab? It will have somebody helping to do that, that would increase the time that the professor or TA will have to spend there. I think we should think about that when we are deciding about what classes we will be able to offer during the semester.

And the other concern I have was for teaching, if we have to teach online, a majority of the faculty is nine-month appointment, so we would have to spend our summers maybe putting together the classes. And some of us have responsibilities with agencies that pay for our summer study, so how are we dealing with that? It would be really important for the administration to give some guidance on those aspects. Thank you so much, and thank you for the work of all the members of the committees.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We're getting kind of late here. Is there anything on the chat line, Jill? You're muted.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah. I think this is the appropriate time to end, so thank you very much. Sorry for running over, but this is so important, I think it was worth it. And we'll comb the chat line, trying to answer as many questions that we didn't get to from the earlier part of the meeting and so on. So thanks a lot, everybody. And you'll be hearing from us soon, one way or the other.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks, everyone. Very helpful points. Thanks for your time.