

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think we can begin. Welcome to one of our extra senate meetings. Here we are, October 28th. You see on the slide there the etiquette we all try to follow during these meetings, which is basically if you're speaking, be brief and so on.

Let's go to announcements. Election is coming up, as you all know. It is a high-stress time, and my office often gets questions relating to that. First of all, there's some excellent guides for faculty out there, one put out by The Intergroup Dialogue Project, another one by Center for Teaching Innovation, just on how to talk to students about the election, so those are highly recommended. But I have received questions of the following form: Can I cancel class on November 3rd?

I recall back in 2016, actually it was the day after the election, but this issue sort of came up, so it is a good place to review how we should approach this. First of all, election day will, of course, be stressful, but it's really election week, so you have to keep that sort of frame of mind. It's the usual thing, where students can decide for themselves, based on their own well-being and other factors, as to whether they attend class. So yes, I know it's a special event, but things happen over the years, external events on the national scene create problems for students to focus and so on.

Anyway, as far as advice for faculty, you should hold class. You should read the situation, the body language of your class, you should react with common sense and, with respect to students, it is very important in these things just to be accommodating and flexible and empathetic. But of course, in this venue, we have to be politically neutral.

Let me pause here. In your corner of the university, if there's things about the election that have come up, if there's questions you would like to ask or if you have concerns about the 1, 2 and 3 there. Are there? Any hands up?

Let's wish ourselves good luck.

Next, there is a two-year project involved totally surveying the mental health scene, had external reviewers, had a very extensive on-campus activity with committees and so on. The report is out there, and they want comments by, I guess, the end of next week.

Who are the comments going to? Well, to be assembled, this is called implementation teams. They are going to look into the various aspects of this, how we can improve the quality of mental health care on campus and so on. In that report, it's a 30-pager or 40-pager, tons of recommendations. Those recommendations have to be ordered.

And the section where it touches the senate the most, there are two of them in there that I think, regardless of what the implementation teams come up with or pursue, I think we ought to pay attention to the prelim scheduling scene. And I know the EPC has paid attention to this, so I think we should really get to the bottom of it, if we can do anything about it as well.

Then another recommendation is in there. I don't want to use the word university-wide course evaluation, but somehow a little more systematic approach to assessing well-being and inclusiveness in the course evaluations. Our evaluations are by and large college-specific, and I think that is a topic that warrants a little bit of attention.

These things feed into tenure dossiers, and that is another reason -- which are sort of a university-wide thing, so I think it's something to pay attention to. And I would like to publicly thank three of our professors who served on these committees over the last two years. Things were put on hold in March, and the pandemic created a re-evaluation of everything that's in the report. Nevertheless, before that all happened, I really want to thank Tanzeem, Dawn and Rob

for serving on that committee. So that's a heads-up. If you have time, visit that website and you can read the document and post comments.

Let me pause here, if there are any questions about that. Really an important topic, and we do have to make sure we do our part to participate in things.

Okay, let's go on to the next thing. This is something that sort of got put on hold early summer, and it was driven by, actually, the next agenda item, the Vet College's request in the matter concerning RTE faculty. What I want to do is just present this. We'll vote on it hopefully at the next meeting.

So what is this all about? We have these three special types of professors: Clinical, professor of the practice and research professor. The way it works is if a college wants to be able to offer these positions, they have to write a proposal that's reviewed by the senate.

To cut to the chase, one part of the proposal has to deal with what are called percent limitations; for example, that the number of clinical professors in any department cannot exceed 25% of the number of tenure track faculty in that unit. We've talked about this quite a bit over the last year and a half.

Anyway, so we have had tons of these things come our way. All the colleges have different proposals, and we've dealt with them all; but for the first time, one of the colleges wants to revise their percent limitation clause, so to speak. The existing legislation is very vague. In fact, it doesn't cover this. So what we did, this is CAPP, the Committee On Academic Programs and Policy. I worked with them to get a real clear, detailed framework about what you've got to do if you want to change your percent limitation. Let me sort of step through what it is.

It's common sense, but we really want evidence that the unit has really thought through all these things. First of all, you have to clearly identify the RTEs' titles whose numbers are to be

constrained. As you will see in the Vet presentation, it doesn't necessarily have to be just clinical professors. It could be some combination, so you've got to be really clear on what that is and give us the populations of those title-holders.

Then you have to sort of make a call here; do the limitations apply college-wide? Is the college free to move things around between departments or does the limitation percent apply at each department? So that's a pretty important factor, again, as you'll see for Vet. Vet has five departments, two of which really rely on RTE faculty to a much higher level.

Then you have to say what's wrong with the current setup. If you want to change it, you are obliged to tell us why the current one doesn't work. You're obliged to talk about what the scene is at your peers. You also have to make two things clear to make sure that we don't muddy the waters between RTE and TT. For example, you have to make sure that you aren't using RTE colleagues to have tenure track job descriptions. Every RTE title comes with a job description, and that has to be followed.

Second, this has to do with hiring and so on. You have to explain or give an argument why your RTE hiring patterns and plans do not negatively impact tenure track hiring patterns and plans. Finally, you've got to nail down and tell us exactly who can vote. This is expectation. You have to bring up these things and address them properly if you want to change your limitation constraint.

Then beyond that, explain as much as possible why the request is consistent with your long-term plan. If you see your field headed this way and you need more of this type of faculty, make that connection. And make sure that the whole thing has been adequately discussed in your unit and tell us about that.

Then -- and we have seen how a lack in clarity here has caused problems over the last year, as a matter of fact -- is the voting. Internal votes are expected, and you have to report the

tallies, separate tallies for tenure track and separate tallies for RTE. And the rules -- and this is from early legislation that showed up in the early 2000s -- you have to make sure at least two-thirds of that constituency voted, and you have to make sure that at least half of the constituency are in favor, and this has to be reported. You can't just say well, it was overwhelmingly approved or whatever. You have to show up with these totals.

In summary, this will show up hopefully for a vote next meeting. You can read about the resolution and post comments, if you want. And just to be super clear, this has nothing to do about your thoughts about whether an RTE limitation should be 20% or 30%. It's nothing to do with that. It is about the process of figuring that out. What you have to determine here is whether this process, when a college shows up in our venue with a proposal that is going to be properly vetted and that all the information is on the table so that you, as a senator, can make an intelligent judgment. It is not what you think about relaxing these limitations. You may have strong feelings one way or the other. The key thing is do you think this process sets the proper stage for the senate when something like this shows up.

Let me see if there are any questions on this.

In general, a lot of the stuff in the faculty handbook is vague and creates a lot of problems, so we are trying to clean these things up, one by one. This is pretty important.

Let's go on. A nice segue to the next presentation, which is by the Vet College. And they were here back in late May with a proposal. They had some issues that CAPP wanted to clear up. And they did that, and now they're here to tell us about their proposal. I guess we'll start with Dean Lorin Warnick to sort of set the stage here and tell us why the proposal that will be explained in a second is so important to his college. Lorin.

LORIN WARNICK: Thank you. Really good to be with you, and I appreciate the senate looking at this proposal. It's something that's very important for our college. It arose out of our

strategic planning process, was developed by a faculty committee, and then really has strong support within our college.

I'll say Associate Dean Travis will give some more details about how this is set up, but we were trying to achieve two things: One is we wanted to preserve the proportion of tenure track titles in our college. We don't want to see that eroded; but at the same time, we wanted to be able to move a number of faculty from senior lecturer, lecturer, senior extension associate titles to other RTE titles that are more appropriate for our work.

And this is just very critical for the Veterinary College because we have the diagnostic service mission, we have a clinical veterinary medical program, and we have a public health program, all of which take a little different mix of titles to deliver those programs effectively.

I'll just stop at that very brief background. I just thank the committees that have looked at this, provided input, and everybody in our college that has put a lot of work into developing this proposal. And I'm glad we were able to come up with something that, amongst our faculty, we think will work very well for our situation. With that background, I think either Professor Travis or Susie Fubini will take it up and explain the details.

ALEX TRAVIS: Thank you, Dean Warnick, and I am just going to share my slides. Just to recap what the dean just mentioned, the change we're proposing puts a cap on the total of all college voting RTE faculty at 45% of the total number, and that's about where we've been for the past decades. The difference is that within that RTE pool, we will then have discretion to use the most appropriate title for a specific individual.

And this is the opposite of the current system in which a few titles are tightly capped, but then other RTE titles are left completely uncapped. Again, this doesn't in any way change the number or percentage of tenure track positions and, in fact, provides protection that they remain the majority of our faculty.

Very briefly, the college entered a strategic planning effort a few years ago and very quickly identified that issues regarding faculty titles posed very significant problems with our ability to fulfill both our veterinary and public health missions.

And a titles committee was therefore convened, comprising both tenure track and RTE faculty, and they made two recommendations. The first was to adopt the professor of practice titles, which our college previously hadn't employed, and then modifying this system that I just described, while retaining the current proportion of tenure track faculty.

Both of these steps were discussed at multiple department meetings, college faculty meetings several times, and multiple college town halls. Our college voted to adopt the professor of practice titles, and then that was approved by the faculty senate back in the spring, in April.

Then the current proposal that's before you today was voted upon, and here you can see the breakdown with both the tenure track faculty, 74% in favor, 15% not voting; and the RTE faculty, 87% in favor and 9% not voting.

In the spring, again, this was brought forward to CAPP for their review, and they had some questions and concerns about things that they wanted to see in the proposal. And this, then, helped spur the resolution on process that Charlie just described. Based on this now new process and the feedback from CAPP, we prepared a revised proposal, and this was reviewed and passed unanimously by CAPP this month.

The proposal, again, establishes the minimum percentage of tenure track faculty in the college at 55%. And this has not only been stable for the past ten years, but when we look at our hiring plans moving forward, that also does not change for the next few years of plans, hires. It sets a maximum percentage of all voting RTE faculty at the college. And currently, only clinical

and practice track professors are capped at 25%, that combination. There's currently no cap on titles such as lecturer.

And it does, though, allow us to utilize the most appropriate RTE title within that pool to best match the training experience and duties of people. Right now, we have a very inequitable system, where some people, for example, might be called a clinical associate professor, whereas another person might have a lecturer for very, very similar duties. This will promote the scholarly activities and allow greater career growth for our RTE faculty and then enhance the competitiveness of both our veterinary and public health programs in really several different ways, but particularly in terms of recruitment and retention, because our peers are offering, for example, clinical professor titles for things that we just don't have the numbers of, but those are actually the best titles for the duties that we're asking of people.

If you look at peer institutions, you can see that our ratio of 0.9 is very similar to all of our peer institutions. You'll see North Carolina State has an asterisk, and that's because they hire clinicians to work in their hospital, but they do not call them faculty, and so they don't have those people showing up in this math. You'll also notice the Number 3 institution, Colorado State, is not listed here because that one college also runs five or six undergraduate majors, so that's a little different scenario as well, how they're organized.

And lastly, I'm not going to go through this in detail, but our proposal is compliant with this new resolution that Charlie just described in all of these various steps. And we're happy to answer any questions. And Dean Warnick or Associate Dean Fubini, if I missed anything, please feel free to jump in.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Alex. Any questions on the Vet proposal? We hope to vote on this next meeting, which is November 11th. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes, hi. Thanks. I think it's a good idea to talk about limiting the number of non-tenure track lines and increasing -- you're talking about preserving where you are, but I think it would be better to increase the tenure track and tenured lines. Seems to me that being in line with peers who are not trying to increase tenure track and tenured lines is not really a very good goal, so I'd much rather see the goal of all of this to move beyond half tenure track, tenured lines.

And I know everybody always says oh, we don't have the money. It seems to me that what we need to do is prioritize what's important to us and to recognize how important tenure is and that we need to reverse the trends rather than just stay at a point that's really just not protecting our colleagues in the tenure track line the way they should be.

ALEX TRAVIS: If I could answer first maybe from the public health perspective, and then Dean Warnick or Dean Fubini could jump in from the clinical side. I think that's an interesting perspective, but to become an accredited public health program, the Council on Education for Public Health mandates that we have people with extensive practice experience, because what's been found is that public health professionals are coming out taught in a way that doesn't equip them to actually practice on the ground, and so the experience of practitioners is essential in educating the public health workforce.

And so the duties associated with that and their engaged activities versus those that might be the tenure track professor who might have more of a pure research focus, they're really different things. They are complementary. They are actually performing different duties, and those different duties are required for accreditation in preparing the public health workforce.

SUSIE FUBINI: The only thing I might add from the clinical side -- and my clinical appointment is a large animal surgeon, so I am on the clinic floor a lot -- and we pride ourselves

on running a top-notch veterinary hospital that services tertiary care to animals all over the northeast. In order to provide that level of care, we need clinicians with specialized expertise. And frankly, we're competing with private practice, where they make -- it's a much more lucrative endeavor in private practice.

Many of us are seeing patients 50% of our time. It's extremely time-consuming. We went through a long training process of residency and board certification to get to where we are now, and we all have published extensively, but perhaps not to the level you would expect of a tenure track person.

Our dean is highly motivated to recruit tenure track faculty, highly motivated. We are trying the best we can. Frankly, it's just difficult in some of the clinical disciplines. And we have put in our proposal that we will keep tenure track faculty in every unit of the college; but in some instances, as Alex mentioned, we'll have a tenure track person that will be complementary to an RTE position, so that one person has more clinical responsibilities that complements their section mate that has less clinical responsibilities, but more a research appointment; and then often, there's collaborative efforts in that area. But we are lucky to get a pool of several candidates for some of these critical clinical positions in the specialty areas.

LORIN WARNICK: I would just add to that quickly, Charlie, we absolutely do value and promote the role of the tenure track faculty positions. And that's a core principle that, at the same time, as Alex and SUSIE described, we have certain needs where that's just not working out. It's not the direction that's going in both medical education and veterinary medical education, and so we need to be in a position to compete effectively to fill these positions at our college.

And to do that, we would like to use more of the clinical professorships and professor of practice, where it's appropriate. So I think we share the commitment -- certainly I do -- to preserve and grow the number of tenure track faculty in the college.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Before I call on Ken, a couple of university-wide stats: The number of tenure track faculty and the number of RTE faculty is relatively static for the last 20 years. We looked that up when we did all this stuff on RTE a while ago. What you read about, especially in metropolitan areas, the increased use of adjuncts; but again, that has not shown up here on our campus, but these are very important things to track and be aware of. Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science. I wanted to thank Risa for her comments. I agree with the intent that we wouldn't want to see an erosion of tenure track faculty, but I would be concerned if this type of RTE position wasn't permitted and if we insisted they had to be tenure track, that you could actually create an erosion of the research standard for tenure and you could put a school like the Vet School in an impossible position where they would be forced to use tenure track faculty members for positions where research isn't a major component, reduce their research standard. And I think that would erode Cornell's stature as a preeminent research institution.

To me, the more important thing is to maintain the numbers of tenure track faculty, but also a very strong research tenure standard. And I would view the proposal as being very much in line with that protocol.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Any other questions? Risa again.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. I've been reading the chat, and I think there's some really important issues that people are raising there. And I would really be happy if people would also speak about them, because I think there's something different about saying something out loud and hearing it, as opposed to just reading it in the chat.

One of the questions was about the clinical professor we talked about recently with regard to the Law School. And I think that one of the principles that we just dance around and we don't really address is the static, concrete way in which we talk about what is the tenure track line.

I mean, the reality that we hear about from our colleagues in different places and I think in our own departments is to say there are people doing perhaps what could be called clinical work, professor of the practice work, where there's a lot of really good research being done and, if we just have one vision of what tenurable research is; that is, the strong job security that tenure carries that protects academic freedom, if we only have one view of what that research is and we don't allow for a different view of what is tenurable, it doesn't change tenure standards, it doesn't dilute tenure standards.

It's as we understand the nature of research being different and as higher quality in different ways of doing clinical research, and as opposed to sort of other kinds of research that we do. I wish that we would have a more broad vision in that way -- increase job security.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Bruno.

BRUNO XAVIER: I just want to complement what the colleague said, because Risa is mentioning the need to expand on what defines tenurable position. I am an RTE faculty in Food Science. My name is Bruno Xavier, by the way. We do experience that situation in which we do come with an experience in the industry, and I feel it is extremely important, it is essential for extension programs, but we have a limited participation on how the college, how the unit and how the department is managed because we have to fund our positions.

So the colleagues in the college will have such limitations, and it's important to make sure that they have the same vote, because if that participation, that experience in the field is

necessary to train the students, so certainly, the college should be ready to listen to them the same way that they were ready to listen to tenured faculty.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Ken, you have another question. Yeah.

KEN BIRMAN: I won't repeat what I said earlier. I simply want to respond to Risa by pointing out that, for example, in the revision of the tenure standards for Engineering, Computer Science, in CIS, New York Tech, there has been an adaptation of the standard to provide for an evaluation of external engagement, which is a significant part of New York Tech activity for faculty members.

It's not exactly a reduction in their research. It's a different dimension, and we have an evaluation procedure. I do think that tenure standards can adapt. I don't believe it's reasonable to talk about tenure for people who don't perform research in a kind of external educational sense; papers, other types of scholarly work, communicated work that has external impact. And I'm afraid that if we try to impose that kind of a universal standard in order to pull everything into tenured, it would just erode our tenure standard.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Richard BenseL.

RICHARD BENSEL: I agree with what Risa said. I just point out that job descriptions and task assignments, they are malleable, so we can encourage units to redesign RTE, as many as possible RTE positions, so that they do encompass research and do encompass contributing to the knowledge mission of the university.

There was a comment some time ago that RTE faculty don't want to be tenure track. I don't think that's a relevant argument. The argument is the creation of an academy in which we don't have the ghettoization of second class in faculty. And the drawing of lines that somehow there's an essentialist distinction between RTE and tenure track assignments, I'm skeptical of that. And I think that kind of argument undermines the collegiality of the institution.

ALEX TRAVIS: If I could respond. In following what Ken said, I think we are at risk of conflating two related questions. And the first is these duties of practice and clinical professors, we would still want to use those titles, but the current system severely constrains our ability to use those titles that are most appropriate for people. Whether their activities are also tenurable in those domains of practice and clinics, that's a separate question.

And I think first we need to deal with can we give people titles that appropriately match their duties and that our accrediting agents also are very happy to see us use and want to see us use to reflect those experiences and duties they bring to the table.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. David Lee, then we'll have to move on.

DAVID LEE: Yes, maybe the discussion could be assisted by just a brief, by Dean Warnick or one of you from the Vet School, maybe just for a minute or two, talk about the competitive position of Cornell vis-a-vis other institutions and other vet schools. You have the slide Cal Davis, Ohio State, so forth. What are we considered to be strong in, what are we weak on?

What I think I heard is that we're weak on the clinical side, if anything, so that would suggest that, in fact, that's what you should be focusing on is beefing that up. Maybe that's not right. Could you just briefly speak to that? Because I think that would help inform this overall discussion.

LORIN WARNICK: Yeah, thank you. I have a very biased view, and I think we're very strong across the board, actually, relative to our peers in basic research, clinical programs, the new public health program and so on; but the area that we're working really hard at is to be more competitive in recruiting for the clinical disciplines.

As one of our faculty wrote in the chat, this is not something unique to our college. It's happening across the whole profession. This change we're proposing will help us in that because we'll be able to use more of the appropriate titles for people where it fits their

responsibilities in the college. So I think that's a key point, is I think this will make us more competitive in recruiting in the clinical and diagnostic disciplines.

The second thing is the public health program, which is off to a great start, recently got accredited, but it's a growing program, and so we hope to recruit faculty over time for that program as well. We also believe that this will help us to be competitive to get public health practitioners who have had stellar careers in various areas of public health to join the university as a professor of practice and really help meet that experiential teaching and engaged learning need.

So I don't know if that exactly answers your question, David, but those are a couple of areas where we think it will help us competitively in the next five to ten years.

DAVID LEE: That's helpful. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, we'll move on. Again, you can post comments on the resolution, and we'll take it to the next step at the next meeting.

In my absent-minded thing, I forgot a whole agenda item, and Jill's going to pull it up. It's very brief. We talked about this now for two successive meetings. This is about a resolution, a real, formal resolution from the senate, and it is about the dorm naming thing.

As you know, the president and the trustees did a great thing about two or three weeks ago, when they said that two of the five North Campus residences would be named after two of our greatest alums, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Toni Morrison. A naming committee is set up now to solicit nominations, so to speak, for the other three dormitories.

We're going to put one in. The UFC is sponsoring this, and we hope the senate would approve. So Barbara McClintock was a student here maybe 90 years ago. She did all three of her degrees here, truly one of the great geneticists of the 20th Century, had a very profound and inspiring impact on the life sciences here and beyond.

Here's the resolution, simply that we hope that the senate will pass this resolution, which will then recommend that Dr. McClintock be advanced as a nomination to this committee. And just think about it. We have these three fantastic women who span the humanities, the arts, the sciences and so on. To have three namings on North Campus, where thousands of students each year will be reminded of their tremendous legacy, we think is a big positive.

So this will show up again at the next meeting I'm trying to get endorsers. So on Monday, I think I emailed all the life science chairs, you want to cosign to support this, and I think we're doing the same thing now -- I know we are -- for all the life science DDSs. So I think this is going to be a really powerful nomination, but I just want to do it right and in the most powerful way. That's why doing a full resolution, not just a sense of the senate thing, a full resolution with all of us behind it, I don't see how we can be stopped.

Anyone want to comment on this? Okay, good.

Probably like you, I'm just forgetting stuff now. Oversights. Let's go on to the next item. This is now a vote. We've discussed this at a couple of meetings. The proposal was discussed, presented by David Delchamps. This is about making three changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. As we described in the last meeting, these are driven by things that happened in the spring semester, and let me quickly summarize for you the three changes.

But first, we've got to get a little bit formal, so this is Robert's Rules. We know we have quorum. We need someone to make a motion that we are now going to discuss this resolution. So would someone just raise their hand or something? Thank you. We need a second, so can I see another hand?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seconded.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, great. Let's get to the next slide. The first change has to do with the grade option; in particular, that if you are taking a course S/U and are found guilty of an

infraction, the instructor doesn't have a lot of wiggle room. Typically, it's some kind of grade sanction would come into play, but now you have just S and U.

So the idea here now is to, in consultation with the student, instead of getting a U, for example, you could go to a letter grade and have the sanction play out in that venue. We seem to be on board with that, but there was discussion last time simply that we don't want to get into a game-playing thing here. So just a little green line there; it doesn't change anything. It just simply says you got to lay it all out for the student. So no change in the policy. We are just saying a reminder, if you are in this scene as the faculty member, you just spell it out clearly and so on. That is the first change.

Second change has to do with the independent witness. We pretty much decided not to do away with the independent witness via Zoom, but instead just relaxed who that person can be. Instead of insisting on it being a faculty member, a staff member can serve in that capacity.

Last change, this has to do with large cases. You can easily get a case that involves 30, 40, 50 students, if it involves where you can upload an exam in realtime to one of these sites that another student can look at it. You can get to very big cases, and it's not realistic to expect the instructor to handle 50 primary hearings. There's a systematic, careful way of delegating this.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the issue is that someone who is unmuted has a background noise that's confusing Zoom, so they've got to mute everybody, and then Charlie will be able to be heard again.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: For large cases, the proposal has a very careful way of delegating this. The instructor still makes the decision. The primary hearing has to be recorded, to make sure the information flow is accurate and correct to the instructor. It's just a way of having -- it's an awful scene out there of large cases, and we have to take some steps to address it.

Those are the three things. Let's pause here. I see a hand up. Before we go to the vote, Frederick.

FREDERICK: Sorry. My apologies. That was raised back at the second, and I never took it off.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Any questions? We discussed all these things, and it is a package. We have some hands up here. So Risa, then Harold.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I have a question, and hope somebody can answer it for me. The engagement with the student on this slide that we're looking at now, the instructor's ability to engage with the student from whose primary hearing the instructor was absent, and then it says if such engagement takes place, it will be treated as part of the primary hearing. Does that mean that the instructor can engage with the student without a witness present, or would a witness need to be present?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: This actually happens now. You can have a primary hearing on Wednesday and decide you need to continue it on Thursday, so it would be the same sort of thing. In other words, the first one would be held by the designee and, if the student wanted to have a face-to-face with the instructor, that's within the realm of the possible. The whole thing is considered the primary hearing.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So the answer is yes, you would have to have a witness present?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, yeah. Harold.

HAROLD HODES: Yes, I think there are good ideas here, but I think there are better ideas too. I don't think it's a good idea to put staff in the position of having to serve as witnesses in these hearings, so I'd say for a divided vote on each of the changes separately. In general, I think it's best to give the faculty maximum flexibility, but not as far as allowing staff to be witnesses.

I'm also a little concerned about faculty who don't want to allow a student to change from S/U to grade, for whatever reason. I guess I don't see a compelling reason to insist that always be permitted. But my main point is I think we should have a divided vote on the changes separately.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, does someone want to second that motion? Is there someone out there who feels we should split the votes on these proposals? Richard?

JILL: We have a second on chat.

RICHARD BENSEL: Robert's Rules specifies that if the parts of the resolution are distinct and someone wants to divide the question, that's actually a right rather than something that we vote on. But I would second it anyway.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Can we do this; let's have three separate votes. We can do them very quickly, and then -- is everyone okay with that?

What I'm proposing here is that we're going to vote now on three different things. Paul Ginsparg.

PAUL GINSPARG: I wanted to ask a question regarding a message I forwarded to David. We had a response from one of our instructors in Physics who's gone through a number of these, and he didn't like the wording on laying it out for the student in advance what all of the -- I see David has his hand to respond to me, but let me just say the issue is that just laying it out to the student wasn't sufficient; that there was the potential of causing a lot more wasted time for all involved, when the students were actually doing a lot of internal thought about whether they would prefer to have, believe it or not, a D or a U, because a U would not count against their grade point average, and that would perhaps be ignorable.

And then, for the students who ended up being forced to take the letter grade, then they petitioned to get it back to S/U on the basis of having gotten a D, and it was just causing

more difficulty all around. And he recommended adding something in there where it was up to the instructor to specify that final stage of it, and I thought that was an interesting observation.

I haven't thought this through -- and this was based on, incidentally, having a large number of these. Apparently, the issues were quite prominent in the spring, and potentially again in the fall, and so I was wondering what the response to that was.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: David?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: EPC talked about that whole thing. Before I respond to Paul, let me just say, Harold, the faculty member is not forced to offer the student the opportunity to change the grade option. Faculty member may. That's what it says.

Now, back to Paul's question, the EPC unanimously felt, along with most of the commenters on the website, including the JCC's office, that having the faculty member be able to unilaterally change grading option from S/U to grade just so they could impose what they thought was a fair grading penalty, was too much to give the faculty member, that it was like punishing the student twice. That's thing Number 1.

Thing Number 2 is that spelling it out, it means, just for everyone's information, here are examples of spelling it out: If you don't switch a grade, you get a U. If you do switch to a grade, you'll get docked one and a half letter grades from whatever you end up by scores. That's an example of spelling it out. You don't have to tell the student what they're going to get if they switch. You just have to tell them how their grade is going to be computed.

I think that the folks who raised this issue, the chicken, game of chicken thing at the last senate meeting, the folks on EPC agreed with that argument; that is, it was better to have the full information on the table if the faculty member opted to give the student a chance to change to a letter grade.

And finally, the Physics faculty member who suggested in the email, Paul, that you sent me, to add text to the code saying this should not be grounds for being able to switch back to an S, EPC talked about that and thought this has to go in the guidelines rather than the code, that there's a whole set of guidelines for academic integrity that aren't code, and it's extensive advice for faculty members and students. And an elusion to that will occur there, that it will say students, of course, if they change their grade option to grade and then they get a B, they can't change back because that's interpretable as an S. That's the disposition of the email from Paul to us.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you. This is perhaps a side issue, but related, since we're discussing about what penalty, how to respond to these infractions, what penalty; and that academic integrity, there are cases that happen in isolation, and adjudicating each one, but then there are also, say, repeat offenders.

I've been here ten years, and I don't really understand the University's methods for tracking the offenses, the infractions, and also ways of getting faculty to buy into the process of holding students accountable. Last meeting we had, I think it was mentioned that faculty just don't want to deal with the work sometimes of holding the hearing, et cetera; but I also think it can be a matter, say, of the culture of different departments or individuals who just feel it's not a big issue or something.

And if it is a big issue, though, this can only be assessed by looking at how many times a student might do this. Listening to this, I wonder about whether it's a U or a B or an F or whatever, but putting -- this is a joke, but putting "cheater" in red ink on their transcript or something like this, but another way of indicating the person violated academic integrity, rather than just a faculty member's personal assessment of the issue. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Joanie. That's an excellent side note. Let me put some things into perspective. This is just the first round of a bunch of changes to the code we want to make this year. We'll get these done, and then we'll go on. We have quite a list. It's actually somewhere on the website, but this is just Step 1. We might have two or three rounds like this over the year, and Joanie's comment fits squarely with that.

Mary? You had your hand up.

Let's go on. Peter?

PETE WOLCZANSKI: I'm just curious whether the faculty ever considered a no-credit option instead of an F or a D.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's, again, an interesting topic that we can bring up, that kind of an expansion, if it helps us in the whole AI business.

PETE WOLCZANSKI: Because it may solve some of these problems if we went to something like this, because we often see students struggling, and they're young enough in their careers where if the course is necessary, it would be a better option to retake it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. Mary?

MARY MACAUSLAND: Yes, thank you. Sorry, Charlie. I muted myself. Mary MacAusland from the Hotel School. I just wanted to comment on Joanie's point. I am on the Academic Integrity Hearing Board for the Hotel School, and one of the things we encourage our faculty to do is to put a note into the file, even if there is no penalty, just saying that the student was found guilty. That way, if there is a second offense, it can be weighed heavily on another occurrence. I don't know what other schools are doing, but I feel that that's encouraging some of our faculty to get involved in the process.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. K.E., and then Abby, then we really have to move on with this vote.

Okay, Abby.

ABBY COHN: There's very explicit process in the code to address exactly that point. And even if there is no grade penalty after a primary hearing, it is actually per the code an obligation for there to be a report put on file. Each college has an administrator who holds those records, so that they're not used in any other case.

And any time there have been two violations, it automatically goes to a board hearing, and then there is -- necessarily, a penalty assessed. So it's completely acceptable for an instructor to -- if the student is found not guilty, there's no record. If the student is found guilty, it is still completely at the discretion of the instructor not to impose a grade penalty, but it is their obligation, as per the code, to report it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. K.E., then we really want to get to the votes. We are running a little behind. K.E., did you want to say something about these three proposals? Okay, we have to get eCornell to give a course on how to push the unmute button.

K.E. VON WITTELSBACH: Sorry. Just wanted to suggest that Brown University has audit for delicate situations, so that's one possibility.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. So what we're going to do is just split up, we are going to vote three times. Jill, can you back up, so we can show -- so right now, we will vote on this. When I say it's over, then we will go on to Number 2. So one minute here, just to vote on Change Number 1. Yes, no or abstain.

Let's go on to the second one. Jill, put a marker in the chat so that we don't muddy these up.

And ready, go.

Okay, Jill, put a marker in the chat. Once that's done, we'll go to Number 3. Okay, Number 3.

Okay, thanks. We'll relay the results to you when I send you the synopsis tomorrow.

Let's move on to the next -- can you find the thing on the breaks, Jill?

Okay, let's do this one, then we'll go to the breaks. This is about what used to be called the Campus Code of Conduct, now called the Student Code of Conduct. Basically, faculty had been subtracted out from it. Here's the background: The code is the responsibility of another assembly, the University Assembly.

Maybe two or three years ago, President Pollack asked for a major revision, for various reasons. And for other reasons, there are a lot of missed deadlines and deadlines were missed, so at the end of last -- in the spring semester, the task was handed over to the University Counsel's Office, who worked with rough drafts that were out there. The document is now available for public commenting. It's a long one. It's a 40-pager. And I doubt many of you will have time to read through it, but it has some very important parts that we should be advised about.

I've asked two members of the Judicial Codes Counselor Office, both law students, Eirene Kim and Marisa O'Gara, I asked them would you pick the three most controversial or concerning aspects of the revision and just tell us about them, just so that we know about it. And if anyone is so inspired, can go and make comments on the site, which are due sort of before Thanksgiving.

So Eirene, are you here and are you ready to take it away?

EIRENE KIM: Yes, I'm here. Unfortunately, Marisa's tied up in class, so I'll try to get through this as quickly as possible for you all. First of all, thank you for having us. It means a lot for our clients that you guys are having us here to just present to you our three biggest concerns.

One of the first concerns is just about the students' and the advisor's ability to speak and to question witnesses. As you can see here, for the students' ability to speak, you can see previously in the current code that the accused's rights include the ability to question witnesses. And then in the proposed amended code, that's going to be taken away and given primarily to the hearing panel and the chair.

I'll get into the effects in a little bit. In the next slide, this kind of shows the current code and the proposed code and the language about the advisor's ability to speak and to question witnesses. In the previous slide, I mentioned the current code talks about how the right to question witnesses was a student's right. It was the accused's right. Now the current code is taking that away. Then in addition to that, they're stripping the students of the right to have their advisor speak on their behalf as well.

On the next slide, you can see just some summaries of the effects that would have. One of the effects is it not only takes away from the respondents, but also the complainants. The two parties with the most knowledge of the case and the most at stake, they both lose the ability to question witnesses directly.

Not only that, but the hearing process will be slowed down. I think some of you might serve on some of these hearing panels, and you know that these hearings can go on for hours. I think the last one I was part of went from 5 p.m. to midnight, and then a little bit past midnight, which usually doesn't happen, but we were just trying to get it done in one day. To stop the hearing panel, the chair, every time we need to respond to questions or ask more questions, that would severely slow down the process and isn't the most efficient way to go about it.

And then third, of course, for students who especially their first language isn't English or those who really suffer from crippling anxiety, they're left to defend themselves against representatives of the university, where this is their full-time job. They have the resources of

the university behind their back, while students are left -- being full-time students, left to defend themselves here.

I just want to kind of clarify a point that just like anecdotally, our office, we represent so many different clients, and so rarely does it get to the point in the hearing process where we get to the hearing that these students are just doing it maliciously or just trying to get out of trouble, you know.

The hearing process takes a long time to prep for. It takes prepping, elicit evidence, you have to prep the student for questions, you have to think about opening statements, what are you going to say to the panel, what do you want to do. You have to respond to the other side's evidence and everything. And sometimes those turn-arounds can be within 24 hours, when students have classes and many other obligations that they can't let fall through the cracks while dealing with this.

I just want to emphasize that a lot of the time when it gets to the hearing, people aren't trying to bamboozle -- it's most of the time because our clients feel like at some point along the way, they were fundamentally misrepresented or misunderstood. And so I just kind of felt like that should be thrown in there, even if it's anecdotal.

That is something where most of our clients, they just feel like the process, the informal process before the hearing just let them down in some way, and that's why they are going to a hearing. To say that all these changes are made in the effort to make it more educational for respondents, I mean, I can tell you they're learning a lot from the process, and they're really, really reflecting throughout the informal part of the process. And especially by the time it gets to the hearing, I feel like it is unfair to start saying that making changes that strips students of rights in the name of educating them, when there is evidence that they're getting plenty of education in the meantime and plenty of opportunity to reflect.

There's so far and few between things that are within the students' control, and I feel like the more we take away from the student to control this process and to feel like they had a voice in it, the more unrest there will be in the larger community.

Thanks, Jill, for bearing with me here. The next slide, this mostly pertains to the independence of our office, and that is in the end the biggest concern for us. Right now, under the current code, the judicial codes counselor -- so our office that represents the respondents are an independent office. That independence is what gives our office so much credibility and so much trust for our clients. Our clients come to us because they know there's no connection between us and the people that are going to be pursuing charges against them.

But under the new code, of course, we would be under the Student Conduct and Community Office, and that is the office that will be primarily investigating them. Our biggest concern is that, once we lose independence, then students are going to lose their trust in us.

And then, if students lose their trust in us, then it's almost as if the right to have a free advisor is taken away from them because, if they don't trust us, they are not going to come to us. They are going to go to outside resources. And then it kind of becomes who can afford an outside advisor at that point, which is not in the spirit of the code.

I think it's fantastic that Cornell is one of the few institutions that really recognizes the need to provide support and representation to students. So that is our biggest concern here; that this would be putting us under the office that is primarily in charge of investigating the student, will just lead to the downfall of our office and our office's utility.

And then the last main point that we really wanted to bring up was the evidentiary standard. Under the current code, the burden of proof -- so the burden of proof lies on the complainant. Right now, that burden of proof is clear and convincing evidence. In the proposed

amended code, that burden of proof has the potential to lower to preponderance of the evidence, and the next slide goes into the effects.

The first effect, it makes it easier for students to be found responsible with a lower burden of proof, because it requires less evidentiary proof. The second effect, it really disadvantages students, especially those coming from low-income backgrounds who can't afford an attorney. We have many students who feel uncomfortable, not just when there's like suspension or expulsion on the table, who try to seek legal advice. And we don't want this, again, to be something where those who can afford an attorney are going to be the ones who benefit the most. When we lower the standard of proof, that is a very realistic direction that this could go.

And finally, one of the effects -- or not really an effect, but just something that we wanted to point out, there's no statutory reason, nor any other reason in our opinion, backed by evidence, given by the University to justify the standard of proof.

I think at one point it was represented by the University that because of the new Title IX regulations, we might have to take Campus Code of Conduct and lower the standard of proof to preponderance instead of clear and convincing to meet Title IX, but that's just not the case.

It's now clear that we do not have to have one standard burden of proof. And in fact, it is more appropriate to have two different standards of proof, because it makes sense to have lower burden of proof for Title IX because, for Title IX, the type of evidence that characterizes many of these charges, like sexual assault, tends to be he said/she said. So if we had a higher burden of proof of clear and convincing in Title IX, then it would be incredibly difficult for complainants to come forward and to get any sort of justice.

But that kind of need that requires preponderance in Title IX is not at all present in the Campus Code of Conduct proceedings. There is no evidence to show that the University is

having any trouble finding people responsible. In fact, I would say for our clients, we have more clients being found responsible than not responsible.

And also, the kind of evidence that comes forward in these cases, there's police reports, there's many witnesses. So the whole he said/she said evidence that characterizes Title IX cases is just not present here, and there's no need to have a lower burden of proof for Campus Code of Conduct proceedings.

And you know, it really, with preponderance, what could happen is the investigatory body, all they need is really 51% assurance that they're right. And that's just really a coin flip at some point. And what we want for our clients is something more than a coin flip -- sorry. My dog is going a little crazy -- but something more than a coin flip to hold them responsible for certain charges.

Just to wrap up, because I know we're kind of short on time, you guys have more things to move on to. On the last slide, there's some other changes that we wanted to touch on; but of course, if you go to the comments page, which I will post a link here, you can see a comment left by our head judicial codes counselor, Marisa O'Gara, that addresses these other changes.

Just to wrap up, in the end, our office's biggest concerns, that regardless of intention, certain proposals are being drafted and made with the justification that this isn't a legal system, that this is supposed to be an educational process. And that sounds great in the abstract; but in the end, we shouldn't be stripping students of different safeguards and different checks and balances that ensure students are given a fair chance to defend themselves and to, in the end, get to the truth of the matter on things that are going to have direct impacts on them.

Thank you so much for having us here. I know you have so much to go through and you are in a very busy time, so it means a lot to be given this opportunity.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks an awful lot, Eirene. I want to say again that we'll have this up in a way that people can comment on it, and we'll make sure all these comments get forwarded to the University Counsel Office, where they will be folded into their general revisions. There will be more back and forth between University Counsel and the UA, but I wanted to thank Eirene for coming, and also to thank the JCCers for that work. It's voluntary, and this shows how much they care, and I think it's a great service.

I made another absent-minded thing. I forgot to send Jill -- here we go. Can't believe all the things I forgot this morning.

Let's talk about breaks in the upcoming semester. There's kind of a deadline. I was speaking with the registrar and the DPUE, who oversee this thing. They want to be formal about the academic calendar next week. They would like to make an announcement next week, saying this is what the spring looks like. Of course, everything can be wiped out with pandemic-related events; but in any case, here's the palette, so to speak.

We are starting on February 9th. The classes end on May 14th, and then we go into the study exam period. We can't play with this. As we begin to talk about this, starting February 14th is not an option, going into June is not an option. We have to now look at the green tiles and punch them out with breaks. So that's what this is about, so give feedback to those in charge about how we think about breaks.

First of all, here's some possibilities, and some are kind of remote and not options, but here it is. We have the notion of a five-day break, like spring break. We have the notion of a two-day break, like fall break and February break. We have the recent example of a one-day break in the current semester. And then you also have another option, which should be out there, no break. You saw quite a bit of that in the fall, the current semester. There have been

schools that just marched right through and so on. Anyway, there's some possibilities. So the question now is how should we use any or all of these in the upcoming semester.

Just an obvious kind of reminder, why do we have breaks. For stress and other reasons. And on top of that now, we have to add Zoom fatigue and the whole stress of the pandemic as well, but that's kind of obvious. If you have no breaks, the mere thought of having to go 14 weeks straight is enough to induce stress in itself. So these are obvious, but we should think about them, of course.

As you know, travel is a great threat to the infection rate that we see on campus, very strict, really the strongest possible bully pulpit and traveling, going out of Ithaca and coming back. You have to now worry about what a break implies for travel. This should be in your head. No one's saying that a Tuesday-Wednesday break has to become this thing, but I'm just sort of saying people like to get out of town and, when you have a couple of days off, it gets more tempting. And if you park those days off next to a weekend, it gets even more tempting. But it's up for all of you to think in your head how powerful that temptation is to travel with any kind of a break pattern.

Let's start out with no breaks. How would that calendar compare to a normal spring calendar? So you count the number of weekdays, and it's actually the same. We have 13 Mondays, 14 Tuesdays, and so on. Actually, the same. Whole weeks is important, especially for departments, Physics, Chemistry, whatever, where their courses require a five-day lab scene. To pull off the laboratory part of their course, they need all five days. So when you punch out a Wednesday or something, then suddenly, that makes their job a little harder.

In a normal semester, spring semester, there are 12 whole weeks. If we start like this, there are 13. These are very important metrics. If you are the instructor, the more we depart from these, the more you're going to have to fiddle with your syllabus. Not saying it's bad, not

saying that it's not welcome, but you got to fiddle with your syllabus, and there's a cost there. That's also in the soup.

If you park a single one-day break in the middle, then of course, you reduce by one the number of whole weeks, you have one less Wednesday. So if you are a Monday-Wednesday instructor, you can see you're at a little bit of a disadvantage here. Anyway, this is the game that's played. You start punching out breaks, these statistics then change and affect things. What I want to communicate to the registrar, say, by the end of this week is how we sort of think about this.

Here are the things that have to be considered: There's the mental health aspect, there's the virus spread aspect. How much does this break tease students to leave town and go on trips and so on. And then there's the cost to the faculty member and TAs associated with changing or departing from a normal semester schedule.

It should be emphasized here, and it's not for me or anybody to sort of say which is how these rank, but there's stress associated with Number 2 and Number 3 there. Virus spread induces stress. Changing around your syllabus induces stress, so it's all over the place. How you, in your head, weigh these three things is up to you.

Here's sort of the options, sort of covers everything: One is no break, one is to do what we did in the fall, which is have a single, one-day break parked on a Wednesday, or you want to do something in addition. Do you want to have the two-day break, like a Monday-Tuesday or something like that? Do you feel strongly about that?

Let's pause right here, talk, and then I'm going to have you vote. Very informal, but just want a reading. From where you sit, you have, no doubt, seen students up close. You may have some thoughts about the singleton Wednesday break we had on October 14. Maybe you have

some thoughts about that, so I would just like to pause here and see if anyone would like to sort of comment on this scene.

Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Just a quick question, Charlie. How long does the break have to be before in-person classes have to switch to online? I'm teaching in person, so this is a relevant question for me. Like one-day break, we have to switch? Or two, or what? How does it work?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Say it again?

RICHARD BENSEL: If you have -- like Thanksgiving, if you have a break of a certain length, then you're presuming people go home. And if they're going home, they're not coming back, so how long does the break have to be before in-person classes have to switch to online?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There seem to be two parts to your question. If there's a break, we can say the dorms close before Thanksgiving, you have to go home. You can't legislate Collegetown, right? If we have like a two-day break, a Monday-Tuesday break in there, you can tell students don't travel, but it's all bully pulpit, and you can do quarantine if you come back and all that kind of stuff.

But the point here is you think that's a risk worth taking. You think having a Monday-Tuesday break, which would be a welcome respite and so on, you think that's worth it, given what it might imply for travel. This has nothing to do with in-person or online. Just a break from class.

Joanie, then Debbie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Hi. Thanks. Zoom fatigue and just the strangeness of this time that I find with a one-day break, it was nice; but also, all days and all time is -- I'm teaching online, by the way. All days and all time, they're all rather the same, you know. So rather like,

say, running. If you are pausing in the middle of a run, then sometimes it's harder to get started again.

I wonder if there's a way to have -- I might be in favor of a one-day break or no breaks, but ways of -- and I teach small classes, but ways of perhaps building into a kind of Zoom break into my teaching, in which students would have like a project for a few days and we would still be working, but not on Zoom. Just talking, thinking out loud.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's an excellent thinking out loud. I think, regardless of all this, we should float sort of best practice, interesting ideas like that. If you can, in your course, lighten up a bit during some week or whatever, that would be a great thing to do.

It has been formally discussed, for example, to have a one-week thing where no assignments that are graded are due. That's sort of an in between here. So you would have a five-day -- not a break, but a five-day break from graded due dates.

Debbie.

DEBBIE CHERNEY: First, why start on a Tuesday instead of a Monday? Because then we don't lose that week, and we could have a break in the middle of a couple of days. My students are burned out. Even though they had that one day, most of them stayed and worked because they couldn't go home, so they stayed and they had assignments and tests to study for. Like you said, the Zoom break and everything.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's an interesting point. If you had that initial Monday, then you would have another full week, and then you could punch out two weeks with breaks and still keep the big science departments happy that they could get in enough of their usual lab work. That's an interesting point.

Please put your suggestions in the chat. These will all be forwarded to the authorities, so to speak.

Rhonda.

RHONDA GILMORE: Thanks, Charlie. My sense is that students visualize or characterize spring semester a lot differently than fall semester because of spring break, and so having two one-day Wednesday breaks, several people have supported that on the chat, and I think that would be really effective because I don't think you can discount the cumulative effect of being in classes this semester and next semester. It's just a greater burden by the time you're moving through the spring semester. And I think two one-day breaks would be a great option.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Of course, you could do mix and match. You could have the one-day breaks and designate those weeks as try to lighten up, if you can. Again, everybody's instruction scene is different and you have to respect that, but we can certainly give guidance.

Any other comments before we do a very informal vote here?

Paul.

PAUL GINSPARG: Yeah, I just had a quick comment. My course is Tuesday-Thursday, so of course, the break had no meaning whatsoever. I understand the constraints there. You don't want to put it on a Tuesday or Thursday because it's too close to the weekend, but it is worth pointing out that if you have two Wednesday breaks, it cuts more into the lecture time over Monday-Wednesday-Friday courses than Tuesday-Thursday, causing an asymmetry.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, good point there. If all your classes -- I'm a student -- are Tuesday-Thursday, and of course those are kind of favored times, then you're untouched by the break thing. That's a good point there. One might want to then contemplate, if we have a Tuesday singleton, is that dangerous to put in the soup there. If we had a single Wednesday and a single Tuesday, then it would be kind of balanced out.

I see Deborah has her hand up.

DEBORAH: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that we are talking about a situation where the students, those that are moving back to Ithaca, are coming back on February 9th and staying here until that date in May, and that we're not talking about starting online and then moving to a hybrid semester, because I know that was something that had been discussed previously.

And just to point out that what we had in the fall, we had the one-day break, but then we have the week for Thanksgiving that the students are actually getting significant break time. We don't know what impact that's going to be on the learning and what it's going to be like to resume teaching after Thanksgiving, after we have essentially two weeks off from class meetings.

I imagine, as someone who teaches seminars, that things are going to be a little awkward; but nevertheless, they are going to have that mental health break. And now we're talking about 14 weeks completely unbroken or with a single day or possibly two days off, which is a different animal. And I think we just need to recognize that.

I'm also afraid of the implications of having something like this spring break or a break that would be connected to a weekend. That obviously is not consistent with the public health advice, but I did want to point out that distinction.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point.

Before you start voting, just remember, if you want to have two single days -- I think we leave it to the authorities, the health group, how dangerous it is to park one of these things on a Tuesday or a Thursday. That's not for us to decide. Just sort of register the volume here of break that you think would well-serve both students and faculty. So 0, 1 or 2-plus are the three categories. You just do that, and then you can go.

Are the votes still coming in?

JILL: I think they're slowing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The meeting's over, but as usual, Neema and I hang around out in the hall, so to speak, for the arbitrary chitchat. Jill will turn the recording off. You can keep voting for a while.

Thanks an awful lot. We'll tell you about all the results tomorrow, when I send around the synopsis. And good luck in the next two weeks. We'll see you on November 11th.