

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's get started. I'd like to welcome everybody to the 15th senate meeting of the year. It says it all. I have this one small announcement, and then we'll have a presentation of a resolution, and then three sense of the senate discussion plus votes.

There you see all the usual rules apply: Stay muted, you have two minutes, if you want to say something, post things to chat. The chat will be published afterwards, as will the audio, and we use the raise your hand feature.

Let's go. You remember like two meetings ago, the Vet School came in with a proposal about raising the RTE cap. And part of the discussion, which involved myself, CAPP, which is your Committee On Academic Programs and Policies, and the Vet School itself, led to the design of a framework for all such approvals.

Let me just review for you the notion of a percent limitation. When a college wants to offer any of those three titles that you see there, they have to write a proposal, it comes to CAPP and then the senate, and then it is approved.

One of the things that has to be in that proposal is a statement, such as the one you see in the box there, a statement that says there's a lid on the number of clinical -- for example, a lid on the number of clinical professor appointments as a fraction of the number of tenure track positions in the college. We've done maybe 20 of these things, all these different titles. We have ten colleges and so on. We have done this many, many times.

For the first time now, a college wants to adjust the limitation, and the question is how do we do that. There's no framework. When Vet showed up with their thing two weeks ago, we sort of decided there's a gap and we really do need a framework, because a very logical question is what's the next college going to do. We can't do this by ad hoc means.

Incidentally, this is just a resolution that's been posted. We'll deal with it later. It's unclear what later means, because we are into the summer here, but I just wanted to plant this seed in everyone's head.

The attributes of the proposed process goes something like this: The college has to select some subset of RTE titles that are going to figure in the percent limitation. They have to justify their request at a pretty high level. In particular, they have to show that it really connects and makes sense, given their strategic directions, hopefully written down in, say, a strategic plan.

They also owe us -- that's the senate and CAPP -- some comparison with peer schools. Are they in the centroid of how colleges are handling this particular cluster of RTE titles? They have to show that, among these title-holders, there's no title abuse; that is to say that if you are a senior lecturer, your job description looks like what's in the faculty handbook about senior lecturers.

Likewise, there has to be an argument made that the liberalized limitation will not in any way decrease the number of tenure track faculty. And finally, there's the expectation that we in the senate get to see how the college faculty voted on the

proposal. That's extremely important, because it communicates exactly how the college feels.

Anyway, this is just for your information. When we get back to this, I'm not exactly sure, but I did want to get it out there so that we can begin thinking about it. A few minutes here, if anyone has a question they would like to raise about this. It's on the pending legislation page, and you can post comments on it. Okay, thank you.

Next slide, please. Cindy, are we having major problems? Because I can switch and do screen share off my laptop. Maybe that's the thing to do.

C.A. SHUGARTS: Cindy got dropped completely. She's just gone, Charlie.

CINDY ROBINSON: Charlie, I'm here. I just need a minute.

CINDY ROBINSON: Now everybody has to mute again, because we are getting a lot of feedback.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Carl Franck, on behalf of four cosponsors, is now going to present a resolution in support of -- Cornell staff during the COVID-19 crisis. Carl, you take over.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you. First, I would like to cite the resolution. Proposed resolution in support of continued employment for Cornell staff during the COVID-19 crisis.

Whereas -- pandemic, university staff has demonstrated resilience, ingenuity and dedication; whereas, Cornell administration's recently announced financial plans addressing the COVID-19-related budget shortfalls include the possibilities of layoffs or furloughs of university staff; whereas, loss of employment at Cornell would impose

severe financial hardship on staff and their dependents; whereas, comparable employment elsewhere will not be available for staff, particularly in the conditions of high unemployment during the COVID-19 pandemic; whereas, layoffs or furloughs of staff will have a severely negative impact on the broader community, given Cornell's role as the primary employer in Tomkins County; whereas, significant staff layoffs during the financial downturn of 2008-09 damaged morale throughout the university, negatively affecting the character of the institution; whereas, preservation of employment of Cornell staff is essential to maintain the cooperative spirit that has sustained us thus far and is essential to our recovery.

Be it therefore resolved that this Faculty Senate recognizes the vital role and contributions of the university staff. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the Cornell administration to commit to maintain the employment of all current staff through the COVID-19 crisis.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the Cornell administration to respond to the current crisis with alternatives to layoffs or furloughs, including reassigning staff to positions that will meet the university's critical needs.

Be it further resolved that the faculty and senate encourages the Cornell administration to charge deans, faculty and staff to work together collaboratively to maintain employment of all current staff, including devising adaptable, appropriate and sustainable staff reassignments to carry the university through this crisis and continuing its flourishing when it is over.

Here before you are the names of our cosponsors. As of this afternoon at 2:23, we had 12 faculty senators and 63 faculty overall. I'd just like to quickly say a few words to introduce our resolution. We appreciate the vital work that the administration and reopening committees are doing, and we have our resolution in the hope that it will help us to look after each other as we all pull through together, through a tough time.

I think at the onset, I can declare, after being here 38 years, often the line between staff and faculty is often blurred. Staff has been essential, in my experience, through many things; just most recently, the design of courses that they teach and how we execute them; the attendance at student talks during a time of remote teaching, when that was really essential.

At the same time, over the years, faculty have taken on secretarial duties. The director of my lab, the Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics, had no trouble mopping the floors when a leak developed while he was on duty.

When I think about the experiences I had at Cornell, and I'm talking as a researcher who's absolutely lucky to be here at Cornell, and I so appreciate the opportunities I have had; and most recently, I have had the opportunities to do research at CHESS. At CHESS, it's like a pandemic every experiment. Time is precious, technical staff and faculty work together, and we get it done. And at the end, your co-authors, staff are co-authors on paper. And surely, that is a product of our academic work. And here we are, sharing in the results because they earned it.

Ezra Cornell put us into a tiny town together, maybe it was by accident or maybe as a genius. Faculty and staff benefit from things done collectively, like build a science

center. When we go to our curriculum nights at school, we sit in the same tiny desks and see how our kids are learning.

I appeal to the senators to solicit feedback and cosponsors from their departments and to go, after this discussion that we'll have today, look at the good points being raised on the website. And please push your meetings. You may wonder, where do we get the ideas for this, how do we presume to talk for the faculty. Well, Charlie gave us a homework assignment a week ago. It was go back to our faculty and our staff and talk to them about what's going on.

Well, I'm pretty darn lucky to be working with Sara Eddleman, our Associate Director of Administration, and we sat down and talked about it. So if you ask where's the spark from this -- for this resolution, it's coming from Sara. It's what the staff are undergoing and what they are thinking.

So I just want to add a brief note. Earlier today, Sara reported the membership of the Employee Assembly, today in its meeting, indicate a strong support and appreciation for our proposed Faculty Senate resolution and is working on a similar resolution. And thank you for all the effort that our administration and the special committees have been putting into preserving our university. I can't thank you enough personally, and I know I speak for all our cosponsors. Please let us have the discussion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks, Carl. So please raise your hand, if you'd like to make a comment. It's often good to make suggestions on how the resolution can be improved or modified or whatever. That's all a part of the point of having the discussion. Are there any questions for Carl or any of the cosponsors about this? I think

we'll probably have a meeting next week, where this will be voted on; so right now, it's simply discussion of what's been proposed. Any comments?

Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I would be curious to know how, in the three scenarios that the provost and president told us about, this choice would impact other aspects of university functioning.

For example, we fund our diversity initiatives out of endowment and, if we reduce less in some scenario in one respect, for example, by not furloughing staff, in a situation where they were counting on doing that, does that turn out to have some impact on either diversity initiatives within the faculty, such as hiring incentives of various kinds, startup packages or financial aid for this group of students who, in some cases, have less resources than others?

In order to support anything that would have a financial impact, I would like to understand the trade-offs, because we know that there have to be trade-offs in this situation, that we're up against such a financial challenge as a university, that anything will have a trade-off effect.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Ken. Carl or any of the other cosponsors like to reply?

CARL FRANCK: I can only speak for myself, and that is I've advocated on the faculty website, and the point is we are all in this together. Really, the point I'm trying to make is sacrifice should be shared. And what sticks in our craw was the idea that furloughs and layoffs were mentioned in the initial directives. Funds can be freed up,

and I've advocated that tenured faculty should be the first to receive significant hits, and I just speak for myself.

Ken, I appreciate very much what you are saying about diversity. I mean, that's what's going to make us a stronger place, and so I also claimed no special knowledge as finance, but there's so many things we're discussing today, the questions of the endowment. These are very important issues. I would really recommend, though, and I forgot to say this, that wonderful editorial in The New York Times that I posted on the website.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Hello. Thank you. Just one quick point. Tenure is designed to protect academic freedom that, under duress of oppression due to what we say being contrary to the wishes of a government or of a power, but if tenure provides job security in a crisis like this, I feel like we're abusing tenure and that it's consistent with why we have the security of tenure to advocate for sharing this sacrifice.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Joanie. Buz Barsto?

BUZ BARSTO: Charlie, I just wanted to second what Joanie said about -- I wanted to bring something up that you reminded me of when I first joined the senate. With the privilege of tenure comes a responsibility to lead, and I think it comes with a responsibility to sort of look after their staff of Cornell. This is one problem. It may cause a set of subsequent problems, but I feel confident that we can solve them. I don't think we should give up at the first hurdle.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, Buz, thank you. Risa, another cosponsor, please.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes, thanks. I want to echo some of the things, but also point out in regard to Ken's question that I think it's really unnecessary and not realistic to think of this resolution about maintaining staff employment as being pit against the need for -- the other needs we have for student needs and faculty diversity, et cetera; that all of these are priorities that we have. And as other people have pointed out, we have lots of choices about how to address it.

And our resolution is putting forward a very reasonable choice to say let's take shared governance seriously and think about how working together with our staff, who have done extraordinary work, as everybody's pointed out, including the president, how do we work together, deans, faculty and staff, to maintain their employment, recognizing the devastating impact that furloughs and/or layoffs will have on the staff; so that all of this is for the good of the institution, as well as for the particular needs and deserved respect that the staff have.

And we have many choices of how to address these issues about endowments, about other savings, about issues of taking out loans, debt. There are many other things to do, and I think it's a mistake to say well, this will take away from X, Y or Z.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. We have time for one more question from S.C. Pryor.

S.C. PRYOR: Hello. It seems I'm going to be speaking against the majority opinion here, but I think we should be a little bit careful offering staff retirements or severance and engaging in processes that lead to a reduction in force. It really isn't unique to Cornell, and it's not unique to this situation. If we think about any institution,

it should organically evolve, and this may mean that employing information technologies really helps the system to be more efficient.

And that may mean that we need to think about the way that we have staff supporting us evolves. And that has to inevitably include numbers. We're not the only university who has in the past engaged in workforce reductions, and I suspect we won't be the only ones in the future. It's not a case of them against us. It's that the nature of our jobs evolving, and that necessarily means the nature of the support we need will also evolve. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you very much. So again, a reminder that the resolution is on the pending page. We'll send you a link, as part of the synopsis, and please comment on it during the upcoming week. Let's move on to the next thing. The next slide, please, Cindy.

We have three sense of the senate resolutions coming up. Let me say a word about these. These don't require quorum. We started this last year, based on this kind of a situation: We have a speaker come in, there'd be a big exchange, and that would be the end of it. We wanted to have followup and to crystallize how the senate thinks.

These resolutions are basically designed to extract how senators think about important topics. We'll start with the first one, which is on transparency, and Professor David Lee from Dyson will handle the discussion. David.

DAVID LEE: Thank you, Charlie. David Lee, Dyson School and UFC. On behalf of the UFC, I'd like to present this resolution regarding transparency. There are two parts.

I'll read them through briefly and then make just very few comments on motivations and then open it up.

The two parts, be it resolved the administration makes available the unredacted final reports of the reopening committees as soon as they're communicated to the president to ensure that faculty whose futures are critically affected by the reports' recommendations are adequately informed of the deliberations and inform the administration's decision-making process.

Second, be it further resolved the administration work more closely with the Financial Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate during the pandemic and its aftermath to ensure that the faculty is adequately informed prior to decisions being made about the economic realities facing the university and about the trade-offs associated with forthcoming decisions.

Of course, we've had discussion the last two or three faculty meetings about this. I think the motivations here are really in two groups. And the first group is basic principles that apply pretty much across the board, and the second group relates to what's going on specifically now with the Coronavirus pandemic.

In terms of basic principles, shared governance requires participation by definition, and informed participation requires transparency and maximum information. I think it's really that simple. Both transparency and availability of information are key to establishing a sense of common purpose and trust among participants in shared governance. I think it's a fundamental principle that applies across the board and,

perhaps more than ever, in the current situation, where we are all in this situation of being asked to make equitable sacrifices, it's doubly important.

Speaking, then, to the current situation. We all, or many of us, those of us that taught this spring are certainly well aware of the unprecedented effort to reallocate our time away from research, away from extension and outreach, administrative work and everything else we're doing to teach, reteach, revise our instructional materials, intensify our teaching efforts and so on and so forth. It's been an enormous effort, it's been an unprecedented effort. We are going to be asked to do it again this fall, and maybe next spring. We'll see how it goes.

I think the cloud of uncertainty is one of the things we're facing here. These are responsibilities that we take seriously. We feel responsibilities to our students in any case, of course; but realistically, we are going to be drawing our efforts away, our time away from other things to teach, to revise our courses and to basically intensify what we've been doing.

Secondly, the university is asking faculty -- and this was the subject of discussion last week, asking the faculty to make considerable personal financial sacrifices to address expected budgetary deficits. I'm not going to go over the whole discussion from previously; but obviously, whether it's 10% cut in one's retirement benefits, if you're in the endowed colleges or whether it's a 1% to 5% or whatever it may be salary reduction in the statutory colleges, these are considerable sacrifices we are being asked to undertake for the good of the cause, basically.

Finally, the quality and adequacy of information from the administration have profound effects on faculty morale. And again, I think one doesn't need to elaborate on this, but the more information we have, the better the quality of information we have, I don't want to speak for anyone else, but I think we probably all feel better about making these sacrifices if we have the sense that we are in this together, that there is this sense of trust and this sense of equitable and shared sacrifice, to use the language from last week.

That is background. Coming back to the resolution, the first resolution -- I'm not going to read it again, but speaks to when the sharing of the reports of the reopening committees. There was some uncertainty as recently as last week's meeting about the sharing of these reports and how widespread that would be and so on.

This first resolution speaks to the immediate sharing of those reports in their entirety with the faculty. We are, after all, those that are on the front lines. We're going to be critically affected by whatever emerges from those reports.

Secondly, we're suggesting that the administration work more closely with the Financial Policies Committee to share with us the information, adequate information, sufficient information about the financial circumstances facing the university moving forward.

We certainly had a good discussion last week about this. There's still some lingering issues that -- there was a discussion about the credit rating of the university and how that would be affected by borrowing, for example. And there are other issues that come up. I think we have a lot of expertise in the university among the faculty. We

are well able to deal with many of these questions. There are very few of these issues that remain confidential, and so we're simply reaffirming, asking for a reaffirmation of the importance of financial transparency and good communications. I will leave it at that and open it up for any questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, David, thank you. As David mentioned, reaffirmation of some pretty basic stuff, sort of tailored to what's going on right now with the pandemic-related matters on campus. David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I just wanted to say I think this is a great resolution, a great sense of the senate resolution. When I saw it coming up, I thought this is a wonderful idea. I could not understand why we had to wait a week and a half to see the research reopening report. That was the first thing.

Why the calendar ideas somehow leaked to the students and the general public through back channels; you know, while all the while, the central administration is saying we're all in this together, we're keeping the ship afloat, and all that stuff. It does create a really bad feeling when these things are being held close to the vest.

I'm curious if there's anyone here from one of the committees who could maybe speak to the rationale for keeping them close to the vest, waiting before releasing unredacted versions to us, the main sort of beneficiaries and/or -- what's the opposite of that -- of whatever's going to happen here. So that's my comment and my question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, Neema, maybe you can speak for the online committee, and I'll say a little bit about the in-person committee.

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay. Do you want to go first?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The urgency of getting these out in front of us is known by the provost, and I know that they're working on it as fast as they can. The committee report that I was involved on is very long, like 70-plus pages. I think there's some making sure everything is sort of editorially consistent and so on, going on now, but I think it's going to be very, very soon.

The reason it's urgent is because we work back from a week from Friday, when the trustees make their decision or when the recommendation is presented there. The timeline is very short, so we've made the urgency as high as we can. I was hoping earlier in the process that there would be a commitment to immediately releasing things, so that's all I can sort of say at this point. I think it's already forthcoming. I will get very anxious if another day or two passes and we don't have them. Neema.

NEEMA KUDVA: The online committee sort of worked hard to make a shorter, more digestible report, and what we've been told -- I can't speak to the redaction piece, but the concerns are really around privacy, if there are any sort of privacy-related issues -- and it would mostly be part of the HIPAA kind of regulations that we have to, I guess, abide by -- apart from that, that we would be able to see the entire report.

Now, when exactly, I think Mike is fully aware that there's real hunger amongst the faculty to see this and has promised that it's going to be very soon. I really don't have more word than that.

David asked why things are being kept so close to the vest. I think a lot of sort of central committees at the university tend to have confidentiality agreements. As you're working, you keep things confidential. I don't fully understand why. I wouldn't be

standing here as Associate Dean of Faculty if I didn't think transparency was important, you know. Sorry, David, I don't have a better answer than that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, any other comments? Thank you, David, for your comment. Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thanks for this resolution. I think it's very important, and I think it fits in, particularly the last resolved part here is essential for us to be able to actually have meaningful shared governance. It's obvious to everybody, and particularly for people who work in the university, based on evidence, that you've got to have information so that you can genuinely participate.

And I think Neema was pointing to this. This is a broader issue of kind of a default towards confidentiality rather than openness. I think that this is a very important resolution, and we should see it not only for the moment, but for the way in which it fits into an assertion of broader transparency so that whenever issues come up, whether it's in a crisis or not, that the default becomes openness rather than confidentiality.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Risa. Any other hands up? Well, seeing none, here's what's going to happen. I will show you the next slide, and that means you can vote. You vote by chat and simply say yes, no or abstain.

You can start uploading your support or lack of support for this particular resolution. That can continue, while we move on to the next sense of the senate resolution, which is concerned with how we use the endowment.

The presentation will be led by Professor Cynthia Bowman from Law. She's also a member of the UFC. Next slide. And Cynthia.

CYNTHIA BOWMAN: This is the resolution, and it's slightly changed from the one that was posted, based on comments that people gave after the posting. Be it resolved that the University should draw upon its endowment or borrow against the endowment in all variants of its plan to address the projected deficit, in order to better equalize the economic burden on all parties, past, present and future.

The motivation behind this resolution is a feeling on the part of many faculty that they are being asked to make extraordinary contributions and, at the same time, to shoulder a very large burden of the measures designed to address projected deficits. We are, for example, repeatedly exhorted by the provost to get on it right away, to start working up online classes in new format and learn how to do things differently.

Faculty who are on nine-month contracts, which is many of us, are working over the summer without compensation to prepare for the possibility of online teaching next year, and to do it even better than the emergency remote teaching they engaged in last spring. Yet, under the plan proposed by the administration, they are being required to give up either a portion of their salary or a year of contributions to their retirement accounts in the endowed colleges to meet the projected deficits for the next academic year. It's not clear to us how the equities between these two approaches are, in fact, being calculated.

It is clear that the faculty support a progressive approach to allocating the burden of these deficits, but faculty morale is negatively affected by the fact that the

university plans to reserve any draw upon university endowment until the worst-case scenario occurs and the university basically can't open, except online.

This allocation of loss is -- it also gives a public perception that the burden should fall on faculty and staff first, before the institution's own rather substantial resources are tapped. A plan to meet the deficit, we think, by drawing upon all sources, including the endowment, or alternatively, borrowing upon the endowment from the get-go under all versions of the university's scenarios and their plan appears to many to be a more equitable approach.

Discussion? That's the resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Cynthia. And now let's have a discussion on basically your thoughts on using the endowment. Of course, we always use the endowment, so the issue is about increasing the payout from the endowment over what it is now. Joanie, you have your hand up. Thank you.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Hi. Thank you. The Financial Policies Committee, when they spoke to us last week, did they give us a recommendation? I thought that we were being urged to understand that the endowment is not a big chunk of change, that it's tied up and that it's a resource to sustain, that it is something that produces money more so than it is money -- equalize the economic burden on all parties, past, present and future.

I mean, the past, they've already paid enough on their debt, so I'm worried about them. The future, I don't know what else they're going to be paying for, so I see this as we're sort of scrambling to find money. And I don't think people are really trying

to hide it from us. I think that this is an enormous financial and health crisis that the whole world is going through.

Yes, that's why we're working on the summer. That's why we might be losing income, not because Cornell is taking advantage of us, but because there's this huge crisis going on. I feel it's almost a little out of synch with what the whole world is dealing with. That's it.

CYNTHIA BOWMAN: The endowment is just like any corporate assets or funds or like your own brokerage account or your retirement accounts; that is, it can be drawn upon in cases of need. And the reference to the past, I think you sort of misinterpreted. The reference to the past is that the endowment was set up in order to meet challenges that Cornell might face in the future, and we draw upon it for those, and Cornell is now facing an enormous challenge that it's never faced before, so I wanted to say that by way of explanation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: I strongly agree with Joanie. And with respect to what Cynthia just said, I'll remind us that a week ago, we heard many parts of the endowment were locked down; for example, endowed professorships. That's not money you can borrow against. The endowment is used, as I mentioned earlier, to permit us to attract faculty from diverse backgrounds and students who might not otherwise be able to come to an excellent school like Cornell because they can't afford it. It's the basis of us being able to offer financial aid in a need-blind way.

I worry, if we borrow against the endowment, we're borrowing against a small part of it, we're going to harm our financial rating, as Michael told us. And if he's right, that makes the future a very expensive future. We're essentially consuming our own insurance fund, if you want to think of it that way.

To me, this is a very narrow and somewhat self-serving proposal in the sense that -- I agree with the transparency. I voted for the transparency, but given that we lack full transparency into the financial situation, it seems to say aha, we should borrow against the endowment or just spend it; that would solve all of these problems is a somewhat unbalanced proposal. It shows a lack of trust in the administration officials who do have that degree of visibility.

Transparency was right. We need to understand better why they're making these choices, but to just sort of say we find that what we ought to do is pay ourselves full-time and get the money from the endowment, I feel that is a mistake.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: S.C. Pryor.

S.C. PRYOR: I just wanted to raise an additional point and then fully endorse Cynthia's position. So the additional point is while the University are urging us to be spending our summer working on online teaching preparation, I should mention that many of us are actually employed on federal grounds. So what the university is actually encouraging us to do is spend our weekends and evenings preparing for online teaching.

Secondly, in support of Cynthia's point here, the goal of the university is not to preserve the endowment. Surely, the goal of the university is to engage in research and teaching, and I think maintaining faculty, excellent faculty, because we will for sure lose

some, if we cut people's salary; but also maintaining faculty morale and goodwill is essential to ensuring we are engaging in world-class research and teaching. I think this idea that we have to preserve the endowment; what for? If this isn't the rainy day, I don't know what a rainy day looks like. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Richard Bensel.

Please take your hand down after you have spoken.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Department of Government. I support this resolution. I see it in connection with the first one. The more pressure we can apply and send out and request and so forth for transparency, the better.

Personally, I really like to see what's going on with Cornell Tech and how much of our money would be going to New York City rather than the Cornell campus and what that balance looks like and what the future obligations of the institution down there are affecting us. I see this in connection with the first one, and I think it should pass.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Harold Hodes.

HAROLD HODES: I'm Harold Hodes, Philosophy. I would like to propose two friendly amendments. First of all, that "should draw" be replaced by "should be willing to draw," and that the word "borrow" should be replaced by "and borrow."

I think that the first replacement would address the worry that was raised a couple of speakers back about the fact that we are -- that as originally formulated here, we're making this "should" statement from a position of a certain level of ignorance about, for example, what would be involved in drawing on the endowment or what

would be involved in borrowing against the endowment; but also, by replacing "or" by "and," I think we're making a firmer statement.

Obviously, the powers that be, if we recommend "and," and they only go for one of the two conjuncts, it would be a partial victory for us, but I think it gives us a little more leeway and it gives the administration a little more leeway.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, so when we're online, it's a little hard to handle motions and amendments. Why don't we go this way. If people feel these changes that Harold is suggesting make a substantial difference to the message here, then please speak to that, and then they can circle back to see if we should try to do something online.

Again, it's very hard to actually make a formal change. Remember, it's a message. It's advisory; we all know that. And if you think the ingredients in the resolution here are insufficient, then you should say so. But let's keep going and see if people feel that the resolution is missing a point or could be strengthened. Again, I wonder what strengthen means in this kind of advisory, very last-minute setting we find ourselves in. Risa, then Durba.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I am willing to vote on this resolution, as worded. I think that what Harold proposed is better, because I think the intent of this, as I understand it, is that the University should be willing to put all these options on the table about debt, about the endowment, from the first scenario on. And I think that the wording that Harold suggested captures that the best. And I think a number of people have stated something like that in the chat function here.

The other thing I point out is with regard to the endowment, that what we heard from the provost last time was if there was somewhere around 20%, might be a little less than that, but around 20% of the endowment is unrestricted, and then also with the readings that we had for last time, there's a lot of material that shows the ability to increase the payout from the endowment, as needed, and that we have all kinds of choices of the endowment and borrowing -- also borrowing money at low interest rates is something that a lot of organizations are doing, so I think this is a very, very good resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Durba?

DURBA GHOSH: I think I'd like to echo what Risa said and also what you say, Charlie. This is a sense of the senate resolution, so it's advisory, it's not binding in any way. My read of the comments in the meeting last week was that there were some very serious concerns about the ways that the salary cut and the retirement savings were effectively subsidizing us not spending from the endowment in this first year.

If we're only talking about the first year -- we haven't talked much beyond -- the wording for this could be better or improved, but I think as it stands, it's a pretty good resolution. Again, it's entirely advisory, and I think it does give a sense of where the faculty is in terms of asking that the borrowing or drawing from the endowment be on the table as a part of the adjustments being made in the coming year. I would plan to vote for it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any other comments? Anyone from the Financial Policies Committee here who would like to articulate their view or how they read the whole situation? Anyone from the FPC like to speak up?

Victoria.

VICTORIA BEARD: Hi. I didn't know if it was appropriate to speak up, because I feel like I had an opportunity to speak when we put forth our report, but I do think that all of the --

(Audio difficulties) -- presented, there were -- and I was on the part of the committee that felt that all resources should be on the table in the first and second scenarios, as well as the third. It just logically doesn't make sense to me that these other resources are somehow acceptable later on.

I guess I come down on the side of the earlier motions and feel we should have transparency. I feel if we have massive staff layoffs, we're going to hurt the town irreparably and end up in an island in Upstate New York here economically, and so I feel it's very important to have shared pain in the first scenario.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you, Victoria. Any other comments? Doug, also on the FPC. Doug.

DOUG ANTCZAK: Hello, everyone. I had a different view on the endowment. I really think it's a very complicated financial situation, and the endowment has so many different accounts which are restricted for different purposes, that it's very hard to just take a lump sum out of the endowment, out of each of those individual accounts. Also, most of the endowment is already used for scholarships and faculty salaries. If you're

drawing down against that, you're going to put us into a more difficult position in the future. That's all.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Doug. Any other comments? David Lee.

DAVID LEE: I just wanted to speak on behalf of Harold's amendment. While I'm sympathetic with the notion here, I'm a little nervous about the inflexibility that the current wording implies. I think that flexibility in a time of financial crisis is good from the standpoint of those that have to make the ultimate decisions, and so I like Harold's very modest amendments that I think impart some greater flexibility in the wording here.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Any other comments here? Okay, Harold, you want to come back on and review again -- so change the "or" to "and." And what was the other modification? Let's see if we could keep this in our head rather than go through the rigmarole of making a motion and so on. So Harold, what was the other component of your modification?

HAROLD HODES: To replace "should draw" by "should be willing to draw."

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah. So let me read through this and -- first of all, the voting on the first SOS is over. Now we will do this one. So it's what you see on the screen, only "should be willing to draw" and the "or" is "and."

Be it resolved the university should be willing to draw upon its endowment and borrow against the endowment. I hope that's clear, and we'll now go to the next slide. And please vote on chat, as you did before. And I would sort of say, if you feel you have insufficient information, then that would be abstain, so whatever.

NEEMA KUDVA: We are voting on the amended version.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right, yeah. Those two word changes. Does anyone feel that we need to vote on both the original and the amended, or do people think the amendment adds a little bit and we're okay with that?

Okay, please continue to vote. We move on to the third and last sense of the senate resolution, so next slide, please. Durba Ghosh, Professor of History, will lead this discussion. Durba.

DURBA GHOSH: Great. Thank you, Charlie. The whereases aren't on the slide, but I'll just read them out.

Well, you can read the be it resolved, but the whereases: Whereas, on May 29, 2020, President Martha Pollack issued a statement to the Cornell community expressing her sorrow about the deaths of George Floyd and, before him, Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and others whose deaths were less publicized.

Whereas, the recent statements, including the action items listed in her statement on June 3rd, are consistent with Cornell's core values of being a welcoming, caring and equitable community that is built on mutual respect and empowerment.

Therefore -- and then you see the three resolved, which I'll let you take a look at. If we can look at the next slide, I'll just talk through a bit of the motivation. The language of this resolution is patterned on a resolution the Faculty Senate passed unanimously in October 2017, after a rash of racist incidents. I think some of you were probably on the senate there, but you'll recall that we had some vandalism, some anti-

Semitic symbols put up around campus, and so the final clause of the resolution is brought from that October 2017 resolution.

I saw in the chat that folks felt that it didn't say quite enough. One of the reasons that I bring this resolution, and I realize -- I would say I'm very ambivalent about these statements and resolutions because I think words do matter, but I also think words are probably not enough at this moment. But having said that, I do think it's important that the Faculty Senate speak with some voice and some unity to reaffirm its commitment to Cornell's core values, which we adopted last year.

Many statements have been made by the president, the provost, several vice presidents and several deans about various events that have occurred, both on campus and nationally, and I think it's really important that the faculty express our commitments to racial justice. I don't think we're going out on a limb by making that kind of a commitment.

I also think it's important that the Faculty Senate issue a collective statement that reaffirms our belief in the freedom to assemble and peacefully protest. Again, I don't think we're going out on a limb here.

One of the things I will say that I know a number of faculty have had extended conversations with our students and our graduate students and the impact of these recent events and, in particular, thinking about the different kinds of protests that have been ongoing, there's some very active student groups raising funds.

I think those individual discussions between faculty members and students are very important; but I think, given the climate, it's even more important that the Faculty

Senate issue a collective statement that reaffirms our belief in the freedom to assemble and peacefully protest.

There were varied suggestions made on the chat, which I can certainly speak to. I have my own views of action items we could or couldn't take, but as one of the folks who drafted this resolution, my main goal really is to express our commitments in a very clear and unified way. If it's too soft for some, there's a reason. If it's too harsh for others, there's a reason for that. I hope we can meet in the middle.

I don't know who posted the comment on the chat that says do you think -- does anyone think we disagree with this, yet now this resolution is here. It will be stupid if it's voted down. Here's the newspaper headline: Cornell Faculty Senate votes down ending racial injustice.

I'll end by saying I hope we don't vote it down, but I'm certainly happy to listen to whatever comments folks have.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you, Durba. So let's go to the next slide, so we can see the actual resolve statements. Let's start with Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Yes, thank you. This is just -- the things that are happening are just so awful, and people are sort of struggling how to show support, what to do, but I want to remind people of some of the things, say, that Marla Love at our meeting on June 3rd, you know, Senior Associate Dean of Students, she said students are experiencing frustration, sadness, hurt, rage, wanting to mobilize.

And she said that students are tired of statements. One of the things we're clearly hearing is that students want action. They want more than statements. They

want the institution to say this is what we will do to actually become antiracist, to actually become equitable in our actions. They want to know that the institution wants to be brave; that if the institution fully believes these words, then it will provide actions and ways for them to happen.

When I read this resolution, unfortunately, I don't support it. It seems just not enough. It's a statement. It's very abstract. In Martha Pollack's statement, it was personal, a personal statement. If we're going to do something brave, how about -- I mean, that's about complicity with what's going on. What are we doing -- how do we recognize our participation in the systemic injustice? I think if we acknowledge that Cornell stands on land stolen from the Haudenosaunee, that right now, just to urge people to do the right thing just strikes me as unfortunately not the right move right now.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Joanie. David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I plan to vote for this. And Joanie, my response -- part of my response to you and to what I saw on the online comments that Durba referred to about this not being enough or just being a statement and they need action, this is the beginning. It's not the end to me. That's the way I look at it. This is Step 1 or Step 0.5, something like that.

I think going on record is constructive. I think that's good, and that's why I support this. I understand that some might have substantive reasons for opposing it. I saw a comment on the website about well, this Black Lives Matter is a radical thing and I'm not going to vote for anything that endorses it. Fine, you could have that opinion,

but I don't have that opinion. But anyway, I think opposing this because it's not enough or because a statement doesn't do it, this does not close the book for us. It opens it. That's my comment.

DURBA GHOSH: I would hope this is a sense of senate resolution -- I would hope we come back in the fall with a more substantive resolution, in part because I really don't want this issue to fade away over the summer. I feel like we bounced from crisis to crisis on these resolutions, and I'd like us to do something more substantive. I'm in agreement with you, Joanie, about more action rather than less.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Joanie, did you want to reply to David or --

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: You are aware that the director of The Poetry Foundation has stepped down, has been forced to step down because The Poetry Foundation came out with a statement saying Poetry Foundation stands against racism, blah, blah, blah.

And there was an outrage, like how dare you say this when -- people are dying. How dare you say this, that we want people to treat each other with respect. Give me a break. So that's -- was the response, outrage, fucking outrage. Pardon me. So I've heard that and I -- that's how I hear part of this conversation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you, Joanie. Charlie Walcott, and then Barbara.

CHARLIE WALCOTT: I think this is a very good first step, but I couldn't agree more with David. But I think we need to do a lot more. It's not altogether clear to me exactly what and how, but I think it's important that we make a statement that supports

this and supports Martha's comments and that of the other university administrators. I think it's a beginning, it's not the end. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Barbara Regenspan.

BARBARA REGENSPAN: I agree it's only a beginning, but I want to point out the fact that it does something more specific that I think some students want, which is it makes it clear that the faculty reaffirms a belief in peaceful protest, which means that no student can be punished for peaceful protest.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. Other comments? Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, just to kind of weigh in, I'm going to vote for the resolution. I understand what Durba's saying in terms of writing a resolution that will gather, I guess, the most support possible. I particularly appreciate the support for collective action and protest, which is so essential.

It's unfortunate -- I think a lot of people agree that it's unfortunate this is where we are at, the first step. We're not saying anything here about systemic racism, which is what a lot of the discussion is really about, in terms of making social change.

It's not about individualized feelings. Of course, everybody has individual positions, but what we're talking about is dismantling structural inequalities, and those should start at home to address inequality structurally in the university. I do want to join with the resolution and support it. I think we very quickly need to add to this with very real action that applies to ourselves as an institution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Risa. Wendy Wilcox.

WENDY WILCOX: Hi. I sympathize with where Joanie is coming from. I think action has been long, long overdue. Unfortunately, I have worked -- fortunately, I have worked at the university long enough to know that it is very, very difficult to pinpoint specific actions to target. And by delaying because you think that you can't release a statement without specific action, you actually undermine the message.

And I get your point of you want to come out with something more, but we can't act as quickly on that as we should be able to do. It requires thought, it requires having more conversation than we perhaps have had on the campus. I think this is a multi-pronged process and we need to give ourselves time to really know that the actions that we're stating that we are going to do are achievable resonate with the students. I need to vote yes on this, with the caveat that of course we have more work to do.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Wendy. Hakim Weatherspoon.

HAKIM WEATHERSPOON: Thanks, Charlie. I just want to say that I intend to vote yes on this as well. I think that, like other people said, this is a step, and that it would be good to follow it up in the fall with some concrete actions. I think there are a number of actions that we can take at the university. This is a large aggregate organization, but we still can set some markers.

I think College of Engineering, what not, has quite the experience with the Diversity Program in Engineering and the associate dean for diversity that they have there, and they then have response with their units, so there's an interaction there that I think we can adopt university-wide. In any case, I think this is an okay first step.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Anyone else like to say anything? I just want to remind people, a week ago, on June 12th, I believe, we moved the senate off that day, and there were quite a few initiatives on campus that sort of addressed the action, concern that we have seen here, discussed. I guess Mark Wysocki has his hand up.

MARK WYSOCKI: I just want to ask Joanie, are you trying to make, in your comments in the chat, some kind of addition to this resolution?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you, Mark. I guess I am, indirectly. Thank you. But I also understand that my reservations and concerns do not seem to be generally shared, at least -- those speaking seem fine with what's there, but thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think what Joanie is saying, if one votes against this, it can be for a very good reason. If you are a believer of what Joanie is sort of saying, it's a perfectly rational argument there, that's an absolutely fine thing to do. Again, you can always post thoughts on the website anonymously and perhaps to explain how you voted and why and whatever. That would be valuable.

But having said that and seeing no more hands, let's now do our third and last vote. By the way, the last vote is closed. We have to go through the chat log and make sure we have three distinct votes here. So this is the last slide.

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie, in the chat, there's been a whole bunch of conversation about whether Joanie wants to propose a modification and whether we -- just like we did with the previous one, where we took Harold's suggested modifications, is there something that Joanie wants to propose?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Well, I propose, I guess -- for one thing, the resolution doesn't actually say anything about reaffirming our belief in the freedom to assemble and peacefully --

DURBA GHOSH: We could replace the last one.

NEEMA KUDVA: Cindy, can we have the resolution slide up, please?

DURBA GHOSH: The June 3rd statement lists action items, President Pollack listed several action items. Again, it's a big structural institutional problem, and I think we could debate how effective we think those action items were.

There was also suggestion on the chat about mandating diversity and inclusion workshops. And I talked to Chris Schaffer about that yesterday, and there's research showing that -- I totally hear what you're saying, Joanie. I've been following some of these statements that had to be retracted, so I certainly don't want that to happen to this.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Okay. May I clarify, let me just also clarify, it really is the last bit, the last be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate charges all members of the Cornell community to consider how best to heal the harms committed by racial injustice.

DURBA GHOSH: So, Joanie, how would it work if we replaced that final clause, the be it further resolved, with be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate reaffirms our commitment to the freedom to assemble and peacefully protest.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Great. Because that is we -- we are acting. If we are reaffirming our commitment, rather than telling other people to do something, urges the community, that's a big difference.

DURBA GHOSH: Yeah, but I was moved by what Barbara said earlier, which was for us to reaffirm the right of students to assemble and protest is a very important right.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Absolutely.

DURBA GHOSH: So I'll read the be it resolved again, and I could rewrite it on my PowerPoint slide, if I can share it, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa has her hand up. And let's see, if you sort of slowly read the revised last be it further resolved, I think that should work. Let's try Risa first, and then we'll go for that.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Maybe I'm confused about what we're talking about, but I think that the point about the be it further resolved part in the third one is to strengthen that. My suggestion has been to strengthen it with adding how to best dismantle systemic racism, comma, and then the rest.

I think it's very hard to make these changes on the fly right now, but -- and I certainly am in favor of rights of association and protest, which I thought was -- I read into the second one, but I don't want to get rid of a resolution that actually says we need -- because I think the third one says we need to do something. I think it can be stronger, but I wouldn't want to just get rid of it.

DURBA GHOSH: Sorry, I think I just Zoom-bombed you, but this would be the new resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's see. We have some more hands up here. John Whitman.

DURBA GHOSH: So I've changed that final clause so that we reaffirm our belief in the freedom to assemble and peacefully protest.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: First, John Whitman.

JOHN WHITMAN: Thanks very much, Charlie. I feel, given the number of different voices that have spoken up right now, and also the fact that it's very, very important that we get this right, that although it's important also to act quickly, it would be well worthwhile to take another week to consult with everyone, particularly the people that have spoken up now, and think about the wording again. It really would not be a good idea, I think, to vote for it in a hurry.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a good point. Yeah, I'm quite sure we'll have a meeting next week. And Durba, how does that sound to you?

DURBA GHOSH: Yeah, that sounds fine.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Instead of voting on this today, what we'll do is we'll revisit the chat and all the things that have been posted, everything that's been online, and then come up with a revision that looks like of that last be it further resolved, and then we'll just do that one next week.

In a way, sense of the senates are a reaction to something from the previous week. And in a way, we've had our discussion on this, it's been an interesting discussion, and it kind of squares with how the SOSs work, that we have a presentation,

a collective presentation, so to speak. Now we'll cogitate on it and show up next week with something that captures the sense of the senate, so to speak.

Very good. There will certainly be things to discuss about them. I'm going to hang around for a little bit, if anyone wants to chat or whatever, but the senate is adjourned. Thank you.