

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Welcome, everybody. On the screen you see the usual lineup of rules and etiquette we like to go by in these meetings. I want to call your attention to the fact the meeting is recorded, and we post the audio on the agenda web page, and the chat line soon thereafter.

I have almost hardly any announcements, but it is actually pretty important. As you know, hanging off the senate are tons of committees, tons of behind-the-scenes work, and this is the lineup of people who have signed up to help us out, help us deliver shared governance and to deal with all the issues that come our way. Hats off to that group of people, and we really appreciate that.

There are a couple of slots that are still open, so occasion to contribute in probably significant ways. FACTA is an advisory committee to the provost that looks at all the tenured cases. Hanging off the University Assembly are two important committees, one on codes and judicial, the campus code of conduct and campus infrastructure. And then we need some folks on the review board. I just put those up there. You may get a call from somebody at some point.

Our first order of business today is concerned with one of the RTE titles, the Professor of the Practice. As you know, there are university-level rules about how a college delivers that title. And the College of Business is about three or four years now, an emphasis of three units, each of which have their own POP policy. And here to tell us how JCB is unifying these is Deputy Dean Andrew Karolyi. Andrew.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Charlie. Hello, everybody. Thank you for this wonderful opportunity to come before you. I promise to keep my remarks short, but start by saying looking at the list of volunteers from the senate, all the important things that they do, you should know how much all of us thank you for your service to the senate and all the things that you do for the university.

As Charlie mentioned -- and thank you, Jill. She's running the slides -- the basic background here is we are now in the fifth year following our merger, which took place on July 1, to form a College of Business. We are an amalgamation of three schools with long distinguished legacies, the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, the Johnson Graduate School of Management and the School of Hotel Administration.

As you can imagine, dear friends on this call, some of you may know intimately, we have been working hard in the last four years to harmonize many policies and procedures that run the gamut in each of the three schools towards creating a college. We inherited, as a legacy, three separate Professor of the Practice policies. They were different on different dimensions.

What I'd like to say is that we had initiated, through our newly elected body within the college, the College Faculty Policy Committee. They, two years ago, took it upon themselves to try to figure out some sort of common policy that we could build from this. Charlie asked me, could you relay, given that our senators know well the policy at the university level, can you relay some of the interesting concerns, discussions, debates that took place along the way that were featured as we came to where we are today.

First was clearly the definition of what we meant by a Professor of the Practice. As you will see in the policy that we have shared with you as a pre-read, we worked hard to be close to the language in spirit of the senate resolution of an experienced leader who has held positions in business, professional, entrepreneurial and so on, in other nonacademic organizations; but for our college, given that a number of faculty had been appointed without necessarily those attributes, but had significant high-level or specialized teaching experience, our policy allows for some balance between those two types of individuals or those two types of attributes.

Another example of something that drew a lot of discussion in our College Faculty Policy Committee was about the issue of reclassification or migration. In the business school world at large and the world at large, the appointment of a faculty member to a Professor of the Practice title is something that is considered an important lever to give advantage, from competitiveness standpoint.

While it is clearly understood in the legislation at the senate level, the resolution, as well as in our language, that it is not intended to be seen as a promotion from a lecturer, senior lecturer title or research associate title, for that matter, our business school world definitely sees it that way and exploits it that way, so a lot of discussion revolved around that. You can see where the policy came out in the end.

A thing that was different across the three schools was the restrictions that the respective three schools had put on the cap, the number of faculty that could aspire to this title, relative to the total faculty complement. Some schools had more stringent caps, others less stringent. We decided that we would impose a cap of 25% of the

tenure track faculty as the overall cap for the college; but then, as a compromise, allowed for school-specific limits to be more stringent in their caps, depending on their need or legacy.

Then finally, I should mention about voting rights, it turns out each of the three schools had very different provisioning for voting rights on admission to faculty, promotion, tenure, advancement and relative to other RTE titles. There was a lot of interesting discussion about how that would play out.

I mentioned the first bullet, that we started this about two years ago. I would say there were two major revisions through the spring of 2020. I should commend Charlie for always being there to lend an ear and thoughts, as I reached out to him along the way. Thank you, Charlie.

Eventually, in March of this year, our College Faculty Policy Committee, the nine members, plus me, ex officio, voted to support the policy that you see before you. And then we presented to the chair, Donna Haeger, the chair of that CFPC, then presented to the faculty at-large for a discussion and vote on April 9th. And we had a vote that followed thereafter. They had about a week to vote, and we had 101 voting in favor, 27 opposed, 17 in abstention. And the report of the electorate was 151 tenure track, 65 RTE.

I will stop there, Charlie. Jill, thank you for your help. Any questions that are coming can come my way. I'm more than happy to answer them.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I want to remind the senators that we aren't voting on this today. The resolution and supporting documents are online, and we'll give you a

reference to those in the synopsis, and you can post comments and concerns at that point. Bruce Lewenstein has his hand up.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Thanks, Charlie, and thanks, Andrew. Just a quick question about the 27 votes in opposition. What were the concerns that were expressed?

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Bruce. That's a great question. They ranged in various different forms. I would say the slide that, if you could go back one, Jill, many of the arguments in opposition revolved around issues to do with the caps, issues to do with whether we should have accepted this compromise of balancing the definitions. In fact, I would say the majority of those 27 opponents were very much focused on whether we should allow for this alternative attribute as acceptable for the title. Yeah, but they ranged along those lines. These four bullets would represent the majority of those concerns.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Richard Bensel.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi. Thanks for the presentation. The 214 tenured, tenure track and RTE faculty, 101 voted in favor. That means over half either opposed or abstained or didn't vote at all. Am I reading that right?

ANDREW KAROLYI: Well, we never pursued why individuals did not respond to the vote opportunity, Richard. Many of these faculty, of course, are fractional FTEs, a number of them were on leave, sabbatical leaves. Granted sabbatical leaves, we probably had a good chunk of those as well, but I don't have the answers to the breakdown on the complement that you're describing, certainly off the top of my head.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chris Schaffer, then Risa, then we have to move on. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yes. Hi. Just following up on that previous question, what are the rules for business in the College of Engineering? Does this vote, as it was conducted, represent an official perspective of the faculty or not? I think if we're asking the senate to act on that, it's important to understand under which conditions this vote was taken. Like is this an official vote or is this an informal thing that was done with 50% participation at a meeting.

ANDREW KAROLYI: That's a good question. I can't say that it's officially a quorum or not a quorum because I'm not sure that we've actually officially, in our four years' experience, actually defined what is a quorum, but that's a great question, Chris. Be happy to follow up on that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: And Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. I have a question about the breakdown of the vote, to add. The rules about the vote, my understanding is that there -- we have to know was there two-thirds positive vote of the tenure track faculty who voted, tenure track, tenured faculty who voted, as well as a two-thirds positive vote of non-tenure track faculty who voted. Plus, there's another provision, but that was the one I had a question about.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Great question. Unfortunately, we didn't parse out the votes in favor or opposed or in abstention, according to whether they were tenure track or RTE. We didn't do that. We treat all of our faculty as equal members before the electorate.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I understand that. I'm talking about the rules that were originally the clinical faculty.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Oh, back in the day. I can't answer that.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I'm talking about the rules originally for how to vote on clinical faculty, and my understanding that that would have been the same rules with regard to the senate approving it for Professor of the Practice, unless that changed and I don't remember that. Maybe Charlie had --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We did the thing with the Law School last year and, over the last few years, to my knowledge, it's always been simple majority. It's never been close, in the sense of whether or not -- whether 50% or two-thirds mattered, but we can research the voting rules there. If you are eluding to something that's in the enabling legislation, I'll certainly do homework, get it right.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes, it is in the enabling legislation for clinical faculty, and I assumed it was the same for when it was changed to Professor of Practice.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. We'll certainly check on that. Thanks, Andrew.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Charlie. Appreciate it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'll return to this. The next meeting is in three weeks, so for at least that period of time, this will be up there for commentary and we'll respond to questions.

Let's get on to the next stuff. Changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. We hardly ever do this, but last spring, because of its unique nature, brought to light several concerns that, in a way, demand some kind of action. There are three of them. What

I'd like to do is talk through each one in turn, and then pause and see -- solicit questions and so on.

Before we get into that, here's sort of the approval process. Back in the summer, I thought, let's be systematic and just work down that list, but then I said let's do it all at once. These are all the groups that should weigh in on this, and I think there's value in doing it simultaneously, because then we get to see how each other thinks. The process, then, is to get more feedback today. There's a lot of stuff online already. Then we feed all that to the Educational Policy Committee, who will then shape everything into three resolutions that we will then vote on.

The first one here is concerned with the independent witness. This is not a witness of support. This is someone who simply sits in on a meeting and can attest to the professional handling of what goes on. Given that we now do these by Zoom, the proposal here is we don't need an independent witness; just record the audio and video, and that becomes the record of the meeting. If it has to be referred to in an appeal, so be it. That's the basic proposal.

Here are some of the concerns you might want to have. There's some concern that recording captures too much and, boy, if I'm the faculty member, I'd better get it just right; otherwise, we'll have a big legal problem on our hands. Then there's the issue about recording at the appeal. I would assume that would be okay, if one wanted to go over what was said.

There are very interesting questions about figuring out getting at the truth. And Sherry Colb from the Law School pointed me to a really interesting article that she wrote

about that, so that maybe should be something put in the hopper. Then there's the recording itself. We have to be very careful about confidentiality, who has access to it, where is it stored and when would we expunge it.

Let me pause right here. I must say, this one didn't seem to generate any big concerns. It seemed like a way of actually having the workload, at least in terms of the primary hearing, that we would then just resort to Zoom or whatever recording capability may show up in the future. Any questions or concerns you'd like to see above and beyond what you see here? Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I can't remember if it's going to be addressed in the next slides, but I thought there was also, besides the issue of recording, which I think is a good question about what happens to it and privacy questions, but I thought there was also the question of having the person who's -- like the independent witness there, and I think that is a real issue, that it does make a difference if you have another person present. It changes the nature of the interaction.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's be clear. The witness is simply a recorder, takes notes and so on. In my experience, and I have done a lot of these, never once has the witness's notes or whatever figured in anything afterwards. Sometimes I might, after a hearing, chitchat with the witness, to make sure I got everything right, but this is very separate from a witness that the student might bring or the faculty member might bring. That doesn't touch that at all.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I understand that. I'm just saying that I think there's a dynamic quality to having somebody else present. That may actually make a difference

to the student, because it's scary if you are there with the professor. So it's the dynamic quality, not whether the person who's sitting there is an independent observer gets to say anything.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Duly noted. Joanie, and then Chris Schaffer. Joanie.

JOANIE: Thanks. Yes, I was just going to echo -- I was going to say what Risa just said. The issues, sometimes they are clear-cut. There are also instances where subtle manipulation or power issues might be complicating the issue. In that case, I think having just another live person present in the communication is important.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Chris Schaffer.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi. Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. I just wanted to reiterate the point made by Risa and Joanie. In these hearings, the faculty member is asked to play essentially the role of both a prosecutor and a judge, where you both put forward what you think transpired, you hear the defense and you make a judgment about it.

I think another person being there can provide either a real or at least the appearance of a moderating influence, where you take that unique responsibility to be both the prosecutor and the judge seriously and really listen to what the student has to say about the situation. I would at least encourage this committee to think about the additional roles, even if they're not frequent, that another human may play in these hearings, especially when they become less than straightforward.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good points. So we'll make a note of that. Possible option would be that, if a student so chooses, it's an option that can be exercised. Good points for the EPC when they get this.

Let's go to the next one. Some of these issues actually come up here. A primary hearing takes at least half an hour. That's the actual hearing, but the preparation for it and the post-hearing whatever is extremely time-consuming. What if you have a case that has 50 students? Are you going to say to the professor that you have to do every one of those? It may be physically impossible.

So the question here now is when you have a large number of cases -- and one of the parameters in this resolution is three -- if you have more than three students involved in the same case, then the instructor, with the approval of the department chair or equivalent, can have a designee, who can then act in the primary hearing. This would be a way to expedite with fairness a large case.

Then, of course -- these are all parameters to the resolution -- the instructor still makes the decision, but obviously has a dialogue with the designee and also can, afterward, have a face-to-face meeting with the student themselves. There are all those kind of options, but what this does is open the door to handling very large cases.

I should say, when you are looking at a situation and say do I want to pursue this -- and this really goes on. I know young professors who are being advised to look the other way because these things take a huge amount of time. And if we make the load on the faculty so much, we're going to discourage the holding of academic integrity.

That's just below the surface here. We have to have a system that's fair and just, but also respect the huge amount of time that goes into these.

Let's go to the concerns that were voiced here. One is, these things can have a tremendous educational value. I think especially like maybe a freshman who just sort of screws up, you have a talk, and it really registers, and the take-away is really of great educational value. If you have a designee that's kind of subtracted off, it's the face-to-face meeting with the instructor that can really affect the student's thinking in a positive way.

This is sort of a paraphrase of the same thing, that if you create a space between the student and the instructor, and the instructor makes the ruling, it's a recipe for unfairness. The judicial codes counselors, I'd like to thank them for giving really excellent comments on all three of these proposals; brought up something that sort of surfaced in the last discussion, which is the way it is now, the faculty member is both judge and jury, so to speak.

Ideally, you'd like to have a neutral party run the whole show, under normal circumstances. And many universities have a center where these cases are processed. All the faculty member does is sort of hand over the evidence, so to speak. We don't have that. We can work towards that, but there you see the same kind of concern that surfaced in the discussions about the first change.

Let me pause here and ask, do we have a judicial codes counselor here who'd like to state this better than I can?

Irene. Thank you.

IRENE: Hi, everyone. I'm a judicial codes counselor, and what we do is provide free service and advocate for students who are in trouble with academic integrity, Title IX and Campus Code of Conduct. I think you stated it pretty well, Charles, that our concern a lot of the time is, in these things -- and we never think there's any ill will or malicious intent on behalf of anyone here. I think it's just hard to be a neutral fact-finder, but also have a stake in how the outcome of the case comes. It's a difficult balance for professors to navigate.

Our biggest concern is that it would be nice just for all primary hearings, not just primary hearings where a professor can't make it -- like we understand how much of a heavy burden this is on for professors, especially for the large cases, but it would be nice just to have a neutral person there to make the decision, if they're going to delegate it to someone else.

But even if you can extend that to when professors are actually dealing with the case themselves, of having a neutral judge there to make the ultimate decision at the primary hearing. I think procedurally, it might also lift the burden on people who are responsible for secondary hearings, because I think it's far and few for our office. Our clients don't typically want to go to secondary hearings.

I think the ones that really push for the secondary hearings are the ones who feel like -- they come to us, and they're like I went to the primary hearing and it seems like the professor already made up their mind. It seemed like -- we've had clients who told us professors have specifically told them you can't change my mind. I've already decided on this. So it doesn't feel they got a fair process.

I think, if it felt more fair in the primary hearing, at least the objects of it, and also we want to ensure it is more fair, it might also lessen the administrative burden on you all, especially for the secondary hearing, because I know there's a lot, and there's a lot pending from even last semester because of the switch to COVID virtual learning. I think that was our biggest concern. We thought it was a great suggestion to maybe just have a neutral person there from the beginning for the primary hearing, if that makes sense.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Irene. Again, thank you and your colleagues for working on this very important issue all these years. Richard Bensel.

RICHARD BENSEL: Just a simple question. This sounds like they're academic integrity hearings. Is there anything else covered under this proposal?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: This is strictly academic integrity, stuff that happens in your class that shouldn't.

I think the take-away here is similar to the first one, but for the EPC to think about this neutrality thing, are we stuck with this judge plus jury thing. I know for years we've talked about having a place where you just hand over the case, and that's it. I think that's a heavy lift, so to speak. To pull it off is hard, but it's involved here.

Let's go on to the third one, which generated the most concerns. Here's the setting. We had so much S/U last semester. This is where this is coming from. Suppose an S/U student does something. One of the standard sanctions is you lower a student by a half grade or something like that. Of course, if it's S and U, you don't have any wiggle room there. The suggestion here is that the instructor has the authority to

change the grade option to the letter grade, and thereby administer perhaps a more fair, a more reasonable sanction.

Let's look at what the pushback was on this. This is a reasonable idea, but let the student decide. In other words, you would say to the student, do you want a U, if that's your choice, or some reduced letter grade. In the latter case, then the grade change option mechanism would be put in motion.

Then the act of changing from S/U to letter grade can be a penalty because, if you are doing S/U, you aren't going for that A or whatever. You are just sort of skimming along, so just changing to a letter grade might be a form of sanction. On top of that, if you reduce the letter grade, you're penalizing the student twice. Again, that comment concluded with let the student decide.

I checked with the registrar, is it a big deal to do this. This would be after the deadline. There is a grade change option deadline, is it a big deal to do this afterwards. It is a manual operation. However, from my standpoint, the time it would take a registrar to go in by hand and change the grade is probably one-tenth the time that the faculty member had to spend on doing the case. So I appreciate it, but the volume of cases wouldn't be so great that it would be a major headache for the registrars. But it's duly noted that it is a manual change.

Let's get Ken, and then Joanie. Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, I was just curious to know, with this change to a letter grade, you seem to be presuming that they would change it and then give a student a B minus. I would have thought that you maybe want S, U, F. And if the student violated

integrity in a serious way, that there would be an argument that you should change their grade to an F, just say S, U, F are the choices with an S/U student.

When we're involved in these integrity cases and they're extreme, it seems to me that the student should see a genuine sanction. If it's a serious enough matter, I think the F sends a message, an unexpungible F. I may sound very tough here, but Computer Science has a lot of these integrity cases. It's sort of easier to cheat in our field, and we've especially run into a lot of this recently. To me, the appeal of saying if you cheat, you may have an unexpungible F on your transcript is substantial. I'm not trying to be unsympathetic, but the reality is that we need the students to be fearful of the consequences of cheating.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks. I'd like to actually get back to the point we just left. This is about the professor being judge and jury. Just a little pushback in that we are also judge and jury when we teach our class. We assess how students perform on the material, so this is bringing in a new dimension, an ethical dimension of not just did the student do the work, has succeeded with the particular task or violated the ethical code, so I think it's a difference from our usual academic freedom assessments in our work, but it's not wholly different.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, good point. Seeing no more hands, but we are also out of time, so what I will do is package all this stuff up -- not reading the chat -- and give it to Professor Delchamps, who's chair of the EPC, and see what they come up with.

Not saying it's super urgent, but would be nice to do this before we get too far into October, if possible. A lot of good suggestions, and I'd like to thank everybody.

Let's do a little intermission here. We have kind of fallen behind in the approval of minutes thing here. This will probably set a Guinness Book of Records in terms of number of meetings you are going to approve all at once. Senators only, on the chat line say I approve. I really don't know what to do if someone wants to quibble about what was said on June 3rd, but let's see if we can wrap these things up right now. If you are a senator, simply go on the chat and say you approve these minutes, just so it's hard-wired into a record and we can move on.

While you're voting on that, and I assume we have a quorum here, so let's go on now to the second half of the meeting, where we want to talk about two extremely important things. One is the antiracism initiative and, then after that, we'll have a pandemic-related session concerning the Behavioral Compact.

Neema and I would like to give you an update on where we are with this. I think it's really important that we do something like this every senate meeting. We have something larger planned for the next meeting, which is in three weeks. Just a side note here, those of you who are familiar with Altschuler's and Kramnick's book, there are two relevant chapters that give you a perspective of what has gone on here at the university in the last 70, 80 years: Chapter 5, Race at Cornell, Chapter 8, Academic Identity Politics. I mention this because we have to educate ourselves on this very complicated issue, and there you have a very nice sort of local history.

Martha's list has more than three items on it. The students' list of demands has more than three items on it, but these are the three that we have talked about in the last two meetings, and the focus is on them. The take-away here, I want to stress, is they're all highly related.

As we'll talk about in a second, we're headed towards forming committees that are going to look into these things, but you cannot disentangle those three boxes. For example, the act of helping deliver the educational requirement for students may satisfy whatever it is the educational requirement for faculty. How we turn to The Center for staffing or advice or resources or whatever obviously touches the other two things. To be clear at the start, these are highly, highly connected, and this is our focus, is on those three initiatives.

I want to say a little bit about how we are getting going in this business. As I mentioned, we're in the process of setting up committees. There's some things I really want to make sure we're clear on at the beginning. Right now, probably for the last month, Neema and I -- just call it doing homework. That means looking into things.

Neema will talk about going into the archives, looking at old task force reports, trying to understand what's been done. I've spent a lot of time recently just looking at the CALS list of diversity courses. We're doing a lot of homework now. And homework doesn't mean we're buying into one thing or the other. It's simply let's get enough stuff on the table so that, when we have our committees, they can work efficiently. We don't want to waste time looking for stuff. That's what we've sort of been doing the last couple of weeks.

I want to bring this up. It's kind of hard to say, but obviously, who's on a committee is extremely important. However, the more transparent that committee is, the less important it becomes. Here's the standard way of doing business. You appoint a gigantic blue ribbon committee, Cornell Chronicle article. Then there's six months of radio silence, then another Chronicle article on the final report.

Now, in that setting, I agree you're in a locked room. Who's in that room is incredibly important. But if the channel to the broader community is free and back and forth, where you get to see what the committee is doing every instant, you get to chime in with what they're working on, then yes, who's in that room is very important, but that person becomes more of a channel or an enabler. A little bit of a point there, because I know this is a topic where everyone feels very strongly, and I just want to encourage a broad view about who's on this or that committee.

Finally, we have to be relaxed about charge and scope. For example, what is antiracism? I, for one, I confess my ignorance. I sort of know what it's about, I know about the book and so on, but what is that? And does that define the scope of what we're trying to do here? I don't know. And I don't think any of us know, but we'll discover it.

I think when we talk about the charge and the scope of what we're doing, yeah, make a rough guess at this point, but be open to modifications as we sort of learn about it. These points are simply about a frame of mind that I'm trying to encourage all of us to have, so that we can be productive and move on these particular issues.

Neema spent a lot of time thinking about The Center and has a couple slides here to bring us to another level of understanding of this. This is step 1 of 100 steps that we'll be having to take. Neema.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Charlie. Like Charlie said, this is a difficult issue that we've been asked to take up, and we're trying to do due diligence, so we've been thinking very much about The Center as a placeholder. There's no form attached to it right now, and the idea really is that the committee that Charlie pulls together, which sort of acts as a channel to the larger community as well, students and faculty, that committee really becomes the place, the space, and the senate becomes the space where we work through what this form is going to be.

We have a lot of examples across Cornell of different kind of centers, and we can draw on what has worked and what we know doesn't work so well, and keeping in mind also what Charlie said about the linkages between the three charges that we're looking at, the educational requirement for students, some kind of educational requirement for faculty, as well as what The Center would do.

We know that we have issues with curriculum. Even though the curriculum sits been colleges and departments, that's something that we're going to be looking at maybe, maybe not. And we know we have issues with what's called compositional diversity, so a diverse faculty, for example.

With just leaving that right now, you see you have a couple of things there to just give you a sense that it could really be anything, but to continue to think of it as a placeholder. Similarly, the language of antiracism is also a placeholder. And I say that

with a huge amount of hesitation because it feels like it's an abdication of responsibility, and that is not at all what one is talking about.

What we are trying to sort of get at is that, along with thinking about antiracism, we need to think about questions of what it means to think about systemic racism, what it means to think about research into why this happens and why we've had it stay for this long. We need to think about how we teach, we need to think about how we decolonize, not just our minds, but our disciplines, and think about the kind of climate we create at this university.

We're trying hard to hold these two very charged terms -- we're trying to keep them in play, if that makes sense, without any loss of responsibility for what we have to do or any loss of a sense of the importance, the historical importance of the ways in which race has completely stripped entire communities of voice and of dignity.

A couple of things that we are doing. Like Charlie said, we've been trying to do our homework. We thought it was really important to look at Cornell's institutional history of dealing with questions of racism, of colonization, so we've pulled together a whole bunch of these reports.

And I just want to read a couple of things. Here's a sentence from one of the earliest reports. It says: The time for committee discussion is past. The time for action is now. And this was written in 1968, and it could be true of today.

What is striking, after having sort of looked at all these reports, is how the same three sets of initiatives keep coming up every time. With every one of those committee reports, there is a call for change in the curriculum. With every one of those committee

reports, there is a call for building a more diverse faculty. Not every one, but every third one or so of those committee reports, there is a call for creating new program centers. The word "forum" sometimes comes up.

So what was striking to us in reviewing these reports was why things did not happen, why a task force's recommendations did not actually get implemented or, if they got implemented, why they got implemented in parts and not as a whole.

A large part of it has to do with policies that don't have accountability built into them, so a really important piece, it seemed to us in reviewing this, was to understand how we do that, how we think about the accountability piece and build that in, and the question of why a program disappears if suddenly the resource condition changes. We cannot have a long-term transformation of the institution if it is so tied to a temporary part of resources. So thinking about that resource question is also going to be quite central.

We think it is really important to build on our current strengths, and we have considerable strengths. This is just a very partial list. We've been writing to various programs across the university to say any part of the university that wants to be involved in this conversation, that sees itself as a partner in this conversation needs to come to the table. The invitation is open to everybody.

But there are great strengths in terms of scholarship in particular units. Where we've not done an equally good job is for units that don't appear, they don't sort of self-identify with thinking about how they wish to change tend to remain outside, so the

professional schools, the STEM disciplines sometimes tend to feel that this is not a concern.

That's something I think that's going to be a renewed conversation about how, especially when we talk about decolonization, how one really begins to think about our disciplines and how they're rooted in particular modes of knowledge production and thinking. We want to build on our current strengths and we want everyone to be at the table.

The piece about accountability has one dimension of sort of keeping ourselves accountable, of course, is in how we maintain metrics or how we create metrics that feel just, that feel appropriate, that are appropriate, and how -- we are all in agreement in it and that we build on it.

Cornell has started since the early 2000s to maintain information about data; even before that, but very systematically since the early 2000s, they've been maintaining data on four dimensions of diversity and inclusion. One of them is compositional diversity, and there are various offices that sort of follow these numbers. At one level, looking at compositional diversity, we seem to be doing okay, and at another level we do not.

There's a lot of issues around how we parse the data and how we understand it, but we wanted to bring this up because we think that when the accountability -- when we take it sort of quite seriously, we need to look at how we collect information, how we compare information and how we begin to understand if we're doing a good job or not.

We just wanted to show you the extent of sort of data that's being collected and where it sits right now in the university. Primarily, it sits in IRP, the Office of Research and Planning, but the graduate school collects data and the HR function of the university collects data on questions of climate in particular with both staff and faculty.

I'm going to switch it back to Charlie to talk about the educational programs.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Neema. These are just very, very preliminary thoughts about the other two parts of the initiative that we're looking at. Here are some things regarding educational requirement for students. First of all, I think it's good to have a deadline. Of course, you may not make it, but the target here is we'll assemble a committee very soon, and that by more or less beginning of December, something shows up in the senate.

Again, the scope and the content of this requirement is all up for grabs. Here's the hard fact of life, which is to say students and faculty are already booked solid, the former with course requirements, the latter with broad commitments to research, teaching and service. The challenge is how do you get into that, how do you embed this requirement into everyday life, so to speak. The time requirement, the booked solid issue has to be dealt with.

There are obvious nearby programs that are of great interest. One is the Intergroup Dialogue Project that shows up in the orientation, freshman writing seminar, Engage Cornell. And there's a huge amount of activity, and we're becoming more and more aware of it in the colleges and the units. All this has to be assimilated, and we have to assess how it might relate to some university-wide requirement.

One thing you get to real quickly is whether you're talking about a single course, which seems logistically very hard to deliver. And if you don't have that, then you get into the menu business. And you also get into the menu business where each college does their own thing, but hopefully there's some overarching criteria. Whenever you have a menu, then you have to have rules about how do you get on the menu. So again, the take-away here is the complexity of this.

Finally, Martha just mentioned students in her July memo, and I think the focus kind of has been at the undergraduate level. We have to deal with the six colleges, there are graduation requirements and so on. However, the content of that requirement, whatever we determine it to be, will have relevance to graduate and professional students, but the delivery system will have to be totally different. Instead of six colleges, you now have 90 or 100 different degree programs. So very much on the radar is the graduate student scene, but it's a very different way of realizing the university-wide requirement.

Just briefly about the faculty's end of this, you all know that in the Office of Faculty Development and Diversity, there's a huge array of programs and resources. I mean, it's really, really impressive. And the question is how can we take advantage of that.

The key thing here is the word required faculty training, which prompts a considerable blowback from faculty. You don't just want a program that preaches to the choir, so to speak. That's a major challenge. And there's also a reality, with some research to support it, that if you drag people into a program or a session or a course or

a workshop, then whatever bias that was there tends to get solidified, so we have to think hard about those dynamics.

I should say the staff are further along on this than we are, so to speak. They have, with eCornell, four or five different courses that are going to be part of the required training thing for staff. I'm not saying it's all relevant to us, but just saying we should pay attention and learn from them as appropriate.

Neema mentioned accountability, and that really is an important thing. What I want to do is engage two of our committees that oversee processes where accountability shows up or can show up and maybe should show up in a heightened profile way. One is the AFPSF committee that looks at the tenure review process, all the way from hiring, starting with hiring and so on, and to think a little bit more maybe about the role of student letters or whatever, how can we strengthen our tenure process so that we inspire ethical behavior amongst the faculty.

I mentioned tenure, but any promotion, RTE, associate, same arguments apply. We want to look at that, so I'll engage that committee. To kick it up a notch, instead of individuals, now you're talking about departments. Every department is reviewed about every ten years. I know it's a long time.

However, I want to look carefully with Avery August, who oversees this process, to see if we can improve that review process in a way that inspires ethical behavior, accountability, how do you handle these difficult situations that come to light and so on. There are a couple avenues that I want to explore with colleagues, and those are senate-related committees.

Let me just pause here. We have some time for questions. I know this is sort of a breezy overview. I wanted to make sure that you understand how we're approaching this. And the next time we meet, we intend to have -- I'll put it in quotes -- oh, there is another slide, yeah.

Next time we meet, the ad hoc committee for the course requirements should be set up and going, I'll be able to report on some preliminary chitchats with these two committees, and then we're working with various groups, that slide Neema had there of all the different centers and programs, from that group, trying to figure out how we can spend some time in the next meeting just to educate ourselves about this whole scene. That's in three weeks.

That's sort of what we're working on. We want to make sure that you see exactly what we're doing at all times. There is a website brewing, and it will be up there and we'll be able to post comments and gracefully share with you what we're doing.

Now, if you have any questions or advice to us, you can either raise your hand now or put it in chat or, of course, contact us in the usual way.

Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. Thanks for all the work on this. Just wanted to emphasize something that Neema talked about that I think is so important here, and that is the issue of resources. We have really excellent programs, as you pointed out with the partial list on campus, that are dealing with various aspects of inequality, institutional inequality, systemic inequalities around race and gender and class and all the intersections, and they are always fighting for resources.

I think that what's very important -- this is not a critique at all of what we just heard, it's simply emphasizing that the point is to make institutional changes, as Neema said, that are everlasting, rather than this sort of response to protests that turn out to be very discouraging when they feel like they're more lip service and public relations, as opposed to genuinely institutional change and resources.

Individual issues are very important, and I don't like the term "training." I like the term "education." I don't do training. We do education, so it seems to me that educating each other, educating ourselves, educating our students, all of those -- and students educating us and each other, that's about education, so that's extremely important.

But what I really want to emphasize here is that institutional commitment of resources to the programs that already exist. Whether we need another center or not, I don't know. But I do know we need better advocacy for the programs that are not getting the sort of resources that they should have because of the important work that they're doing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. That's a good point, under the heading of how we package all this great talent we have on campus. That gets right to the heart of it. How can we multiply their level of commitment and activity through what we're calling The Center, in quotes.

Mark Lewis, then David Delchamps. Mark?

MARK LEWIS: Thank you for recognizing me, Charlie. Two quick things. The first thing is I'm not sure if Avery has done this, but it might be a good idea to have him come

present on a regular basis on activities that the Office of Faculty Diversity and Development are doing. Particularly interested in things they have done in response to those reports that were generated a couple years ago. That's the first thing.

Second thing is I want to mention that the slide before the one that's on the screen now, you mentioned accountability actually occurring at the tenure time and at the time for promotion. That generally only covers about twelve years, and we need something that is accountability throughout the career. That's all. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. The spacing is important. You can't show up in freshman orientation, do a three-hour thing and say that's it. There has to be a sustained thing. Of course, the annual SIP letters and all that stuff, they are opportunities to refine the dialogue and so on.

Let's do David Delchamps, then we actually have to move on. I want to make sure we have enough time to hear the students. So David Delchamps, did you have your hand up?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Just quickly, I just want to make sure that we maintain the focus on the race part of this and we don't let it get into human difference, gender stuff and whatever. I mean, those are all important, but I think that this is really -- we really need to keep the focus on the race part of this honestly, to tell you the truth. I think that's what the Do Better Cornell folks want to hear from us, and I think we should do that. That's my opinion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Kenneth, you can be really, really quick.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I was just wondering if we might consider restarting the freshman book project with doing it around this stuff.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's obviously on the table, a big common denominator thing you can do, and maybe the start of both semesters. Okay, very good. Thanks a lot. Let's now get on to the last part of the meeting.

You all are familiar by now with The Behavioral Compact. A lot of the concern is about enforcement and whatever, and what's the university doing when they see bad behavior and so on, but I think we all know that more effective is to inspire good behavior. I wanted to hear from students in the trenches.

You can easily read about the various programs that they are part of, but I'd like to have them talk from a personal point of view. I said what are you seeing, what do you think about The Behavioral Compact. Are you optimistic? Why are you doing this, all that kind of stuff. I want to begin with Brian Maley, who's an MPH student, and he's part of a group of students from that program who are doing surveys on campus to find out how students -- well, how anyone on the street thinks about this stuff.

So Brian, how about it?

BRIAN MALEY: Thank you for that introduction, Charlie. Since late July, we in the MPH program, 19 students, myself included, supervised by MPH faculty, have been systematically going to various locations on campus and conducting these semi-structured interviews using Qualtrics surveys to get a sense for the percentage of people on campus who are adhering to prevention behaviors such as social distancing and mask-wearing. We're also trying to understand what factors motivate or limit those

behaviors, and gather input and ideas to inform or improve processes and practices on campus and off-campus, if mentioned.

Throughout the course of these semi-structured interviews, we've talked to now just about 600 people now, with about 90% of the respondents wearing masks and about 90% also choosing to physically distance from one another. And one of the interesting observations or some of the results that we've gotten are fairly overwhelmingly positive results.

When approaching people who aren't wearing masks, asking them the question why -- can you explain why you aren't wearing a mask, a lot of the responses that we get are that they're with people that they know and trust, they forgot or that they're outside and the risk feels low. But the overwhelming responses that we get from people who are wearing the mask is that they want to protect others and they feel a strong sense of community and that they want to prevent COVID transmission on campus.

Some of the facilitators to people wearing masks were just generally being around others and a desire to follow the rules. Barriers to mask-wearing that we found overwhelmingly was discomfort, either physical or kind of social discomfort, general awkwardness, but a lot of people said it's the heat. You know, wearing the mask is physically uncomfortable, and that's why they're not.

And for the about 90% of respondents who had been complying with social distancing guidelines, they stated that signage and knowledge of rules were the biggest reasons for them following those guidelines. And for those that were not distancing, it

was because they were with roommates or with colleagues or people that they spend a lot of time with and tend to trust. Other barriers for that include, obviously, crowded spaces and so on.

But in my more observational experience going around campus and conducting these surveys, or these interviews rather, is that people really want to comply with these and are very interested in, one, talking to me and the other interviewers about their thoughts and feelings about this, but they really have a strong sense of community and a desire to comply with these guidelines for one another and so that they can continue with their Cornell experience as best as they possibly can.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Brian. Would anyone like to pose a question to Brian before we go on to the other students? Anyone want to -- there's an abstract to some data up on the website, if you want to take a look at some of the percents associated with the various questions.

BRIAN MALEY: I see the question how were student respondents selected. We were selecting every tenth person in a space, so going out, standing by a doorway outside or kind of walking through an indoor space in a building and just picking every tenth person. Obviously, when we were starting this back in July, there were fewer people on campus, so we were trying to get as many people as we could, but we were trying to make it as random as possible. Yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks, Brian. I'll talk to three undergraduates. There are two programs out there. One's called peer ambassadors, and these are students who are out in the field, so to speak. You see them under tents, they're on

campus. Behind the scenes, they interact with clubs and their own circle of context and so on, and they number in the hundreds, I believe.

The peer consultants serve as a sounding board, they interact with Cornell Health and the public health fellows that are there, reviewing policies and whatever. So a lot of policies you see coming out of Cornell Health and other places do have a student input component to them. Remember, what I want here, what do you see, what are you thinking about, why are you doing this. So let's start with Kaylee, who is majoring in global public health science. Kaylee, I wanted you to tell us what you think of this whole business.

KAYLEE ZHONG: Hi. Thank you, Dean Van Loan, for that introduction. I'm a coordinator for the COVID peer ambassador program that you guys see on campus, and we're mainly here for like a positive structure for students to utilize. We have tents set up all over campus in different locations, such as West Campus, Baker Flagpole, Collegetown, Ag Quad, 626 Thurston and McGraw Towers, so like all over campus, and we give out free supplies for students that just want to grab a mask or some hand sanitizer and stuff like that, to promote the safest measures on campus.

We spread words of social distancing through multiple social media campaigns, like we have planned, such as the importance of wearing a mask, certain things like tips for studying with friends or trying to hang out with friends and other things like mental health, tips for happiness and stuff, because that's also a big issue on campus right now.

We're mainly just here for spreading positive messages. We're different from the thing that's called behavioral compact monitors, which is mainly faculty and staff

who are roving around campus to ensure that everyone's wearing their masks and practicing social distancing, so that's a separate entity from us. We're transitioning to something called roving ambassadors, where we're going to have students walking around campus with bags, and they're going to be handing out supplies to people they see that might have forgotten their mask or something like that.

People have been responding to this very well. People are very optimistic. We see that the majority of people walking around campus are wearing masks and doing the social distancing stuff that Cornell has been requiring, because I feel like everyone wants to be safe and have a successful semester on campus. I don't think anyone is outly trying to disregard these rules, because we are all in it together as a community, like Brian previously said. Yeah, that's basically it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Kaylee. And the program is -- Brian Walker, and then maybe we'll get some questions. So Brian, from your point of view, what are you seeing? Are you more optimistic today than you were two weeks ago, or vice versa? Just tell us what you're thinking.

BRIAN WALKER: Okay, thank you for the introduction, Dean Van Loan. I'm one of the peer ambassadors on campus this semester that Kaylee described. As to why I think a lot of people are peer ambassadors this semester, just to answer what you said before, Dean Van Loan, Kaylee said it very well, that virtually all the students here care very deeply about their time and their Cornell experience, and I think people are really willing to adopt a culture of shared responsibility for that.

And I've seen a lot of that around campus, both as a peer ambassador and just as a student and a peer of the thousands of other students that came back to campus. You said about optimism, for now, I am very optimistic. I think the students care very deeply and are willing to uphold each other to a very high standard of behavior. I think the best examples of this are people really spending a lot of time outside, eating outside, distancing, mask-wearing. And when people don't have masks, no one's afraid to go and try to get one or reach out and stuff like that, so I'd say I'm very optimistic.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any questions for Kaylee and Brian? We are only at the one-week point in the semester. I know for faculty, it's very hard to focus on your regular job, like research and so on. How hard do you find it doing schoolwork? How much of a space in your head does all this stuff occupy, and does it make it hard for you to do the academics?

BRIAN WALKER: I think most Cornell students, since we're all here, are very serious about their studies and they're very willing to prioritize their studies, but it's definitely a thought in the back of our heads, I think, to speak for the student body, I guess, especially with the significant reduction in in-person classes. Personally, I have two lectures a week in person, so spending a lot of time in my room, just online lectures, a lot of Zoom. I definitely think about that, but for the most part, I'd say we can focus on our studies.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Kaylee?

KAYLEE ZHONG: Yeah. Sort of adding on to what Brian said, it is a thought in the back of our head because, obviously, this semester is something we've never really

experienced before and things are so different. Like he said, he's only taking two in-person classes. I don't have any in-person as of now, so I am spending a significant amount of time in my dorm, which I could say, for me and others, it could take a potential massive toll on your mental health if you're just in your room by yourself all day instead of prior semesters, when you can be out and about all the time.

Relating this to academics, I do say it is a thought out there that should be taken into consideration when talking about academics, because it might be easier to focus, given it's the only thing that we have to do, like you are in your room by yourself, but there are many other factors that we should weigh into that equation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. I think it's really important to hear directly from students these sorts of thoughts, really. Thank you.

Samantha Noland is a peer consultant, and they advise individuals in Cornell Health about policy and so on. Samantha, are you there? And let's hear what you're thinking about nowadays.

SAMANTHA NOLAND: Hello, everyone. Thanks for having us. Yeah, so I got involved with the program from the early stages, when I first heard about the ambassadors and consultants, which originally were all under one title, then kind of split off. I wanted to get involved because I know this is such a privilege to be able to come back to campus.

And I have all in-person classes because it was a huge motivating factor for me to return. And I know they may transition to online at some point, but it's been really

successful so far in the classroom. And I've seen really great -- people wearing their masks, people keeping physical distancing and the professors are doing an amazing job.

I'd say, as a peer consultant, the program actually is just gearing up. First, the ambassador program was rolled out to kind of get people on the ground, handing things out. And then the peer consultants are going to have our first meeting with everyone this week.

We worked closely with Laura Santacrose in Cornell Health, a small group of students from the start, kind of building what the messaging was going to be and exactly how do you inspire people in all different cross-sections of campus life, whether it be athletics or Greek life or clubs or anything, really, or arts organizations, how do you inspire people to do these measures.

I think what I've been seeing, even before the official program has begun its meetings, is that students, as others had said, really are finding this to be a privilege to be back on campus, when so many universities and colleges couldn't open their doors. I feel the same way.

And I think that also students, when they do have an in-person class or some in-person classes, feel this extra responsibility because we're going to be interfacing with professors and other members of the community. But really, most people I'd say I talk to really care a lot.

And the whole idea behind the consultants is to really influence others, because it would be like the cool thing to do if most people are doing it. That will just become the campus culture. And how can we shift campus culture into this safe way of doing

things, when it's counter to our intuition and counter to how we normally do things on campus. That's mostly the goal behind it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. One thing, there's sort of daytime behavior. When I'm stuck here in my basement for days on end, I get really jaded, but then I go for a walk on campus during the day, and it is really inspiring to see students going to class and the high compliance with the rules and so on, but what about nighttime?

I know Brian mentioned there was no -- we're worried about the nighttime. You hear the parties, all that kind of stuff. What about that whole scene? Is there an opportunity for peer ambassadors, and do you consider these sorts of things in the peer consultant group?

SAMANTHA NOLAND: Yeah, that's a really good point. So in that compact, in order to sign the compact and return to campus, you had to watch a series of videos, and I did help in creating some of the ideas behind one of the videos, which was about a party situation and community spread, and how someone goes to a party, they may think they're fine, and then little do they know, they have the virus and then everybody around them, sort of showing how it can spread throughout the community to different people with immunocompromised health situations. And I think that's just sort of a messaging campaign.

But as far as the actual in real life situation, I have talked to people about well, what are you doing socially? Because people do have to have some social life. It's not really healthy to be alone all the time. So gathering in really small groups outside, I see

a lot of people eating outside on the slope, eating outside on North Campus and Rawlings Green, playing a game of catch, things like that.

But as far as the parties that we heard about, there are this small group of people that some people had parties, and that unfortunately has created some community spread, and now there's this fear of going to code yellow and everything, and then maybe getting worse.

So I think the problem with the situation is even a couple people having a party could create a big outbreak, so I think that's why there's that added element of fear that, even if everyone is complying, if one or two people say let's have a party and there's this one party, it could end up throwing the whole thing off. So I think that's why trying to influence as many people as possible is important.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Any other comments, either from the students or faculty? I see some questions on the chat about the dashboard, and I know that's been kind of a hot topic the last couple of days. Here's sort of what I know about it. Question was why was there the lull in reporting over the weekend and so on.

They wanted to reformat the sentences that were displayed, so that one could judge better how close we are to Governor Cuomo's threshold. So I know there was some redesign of it, but there are concerns about the dashboard, and if anyone would like to bring that up -- the students, do you monitor the dashboard daily? When you get up in the morning, is that the first thing you look at or --

NEEMA KUDVA: While we're waiting for people to respond to whether they monitor the dashboard daily, I thought I'd just respond to a couple of issues raised

about students new to Cornell and transfer students, I think to Susan Clark, who asked about it. I'm a dean on West Campus, and I know there are others on this call who are faculty in residence or deans, and we've always had programs directed towards transfer students, for example. A house like Becker will have at least 40 to 60, sometimes 70 transfer students coming in out of 380 or so.

We always have programs, and that's something that we've continued. It's quite remarkable, actually, to see students sort of participating through things like Yammer and Discord and stuff like that. You might also know the dean of students has launched an entire series of online programming for people new to Cornell, for first-years, as well as other students. There's virtual escape rooms that are hugely attended.

There's a lot of stuff that's going on, so you can find all that on the website. I can't remember the name of it. Samantha, Kaylee, I don't know if any of the two Brians know of that site off the top of your head, but it's happening. It's not easy, but it's happening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Campus Groups, yeah. Jenny just put it in.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. And I know there's been a group of staff, and Jenny's on this call, who have done amazing amounts of work, along with faculty, to sort of put things together, and students like Samantha and Kaylee and Brian on the call.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Maybe time to wrap up, but I'd like to really thank the four students. What you are doing is really, extremely important, and it's very important for us to hear first-hand about your experience. And we're really thankful that you were able to come today, and we want to wish you the very best for the rest of

the semester in all that you are doing to help keep the place going. So thank you very much.

I guess we'll end the meeting. Now, we do the usual hallway stuff, that is to say we turn off the recording, and we can hang around and chitchat, if you'd like. I will and Neema will.