

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2019

THE SPEAKER: -- My name is Mark Wysocki. I'm going to be your substitute speaker for today. The first thing I would like to do is to call the meeting to order. And with that, some little bookkeeping, to make sure that we all run fairly smoothly here.

The first thing is to remind people here that if you want to speak, we give the priority to the senators first, or to any of the alternatives that have been designated for the senator, so let them speak first, and if we have time for everybody else.

Also, because of how we record and so forth, we would ask that you wait until you get the microphone and the microphone is working and on before you start talking. And when you do so, could you please clearly state your department and your name, so that we can get it recorded properly. And to make sure that everything keeps on moving, we will kind of limit the speakers to about two minutes for their comments, slash, questions and so forth.

With that in mind, I'd like to bring up Professor Charlie Van Loan, the Dean of Faculty, for the very first part.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Mark.

As Mark mentioned, our parliamentarian from last year is no longer able to do that job, so Mark is going to take over that job, in combination with our current speaker, Sam Nelson, so just to make things run smoothly, the interchangeable parts, so to speak.

A little bit about quorum. Quorum now is 63, because we have 126 senators. You may be curious about the RTE component of our operations, so that's a nice development.

A couple of follow-ups. When stuff happens, I like to make sure we do follow up. For example, you may remember two years ago, we had a resolution on reliable knowledge and, then about a year ago, some colleagues came in, talked about journal cost. The people involved

in that sort of off and on worked on related stuff, and now there's actually an interesting committee that's been formed, an ad hoc committee on scholarly communication. It sort of hangs off of the library, it is made up of lots of interesting journal editors on campus, so they will be pursuing those topics and so on.

Also, it came out -- Professor Tomlan asked President Pollack about eCornell. eCornell was sort of semiautonomous. It's next to the university. Now, if the trustees approve a proposal this week, it will be moved into the university and be an academic program with appropriate oversight. By appropriate oversight, it means that's to be determined. There will be faculty involvement. More later.

In particular, we may in the December meeting have Steve Carvell, who is the new vice provost that oversees this sort of stuff, come and talk to us about that. We have a long discussion at the end of the meeting about grade changes, and I just wanted to bring you up to date, because I did mention something about that in both the May meeting and the September meeting; mainly, that we passed a resolution in the May meeting.

But there's much more work to do, which involves me going to each of the ten college registrars, trying to understand how they do business. I met with them as a group in June. I'm sort of halfway through that lineup right now. The idea is to clarify some things for these exceptional cases that may involve critical offices on campus, such as Cornell Health or the Title IX office or university counsel, and trying to clarify that; the goal being to inspire confidence in the whole process. But much more on that at the end of the meeting. I'm happy to enlarge on this particular stuff.

We have these sense of the senate resolutions. These do not require quorum. Incidentally, we have sign-up sheets around here. We do a quorum count around 4:00, just before we start with voting and so on, to make sure you sign the sheets. The sense of the

senate resolution, we talked last time in September about the smoking ban that the University Assembly is going to float a survey on campus. We had an interesting discussion about it. There were concerns about what the survey would say or what you could conclude from the survey. There were concerns about this sort of class overtone to the whole smoking scene.

Anyway, here's the gist of the resolution. It points out that we clearly care about the health of the environment. We're concerned about the survey, how it's interpreted. The net result is we would like to see the survey results when they're all completed, so that we can talk about all these things with real data in front of us. So the gist of this sense of the senate motion is simply to say that we want to put ourselves in the path there between the end of the survey results and anything that might happen after that, so we can weigh in on this.

So sense of the senate, we just do yays and nays. First of all, is there anyone who wants to add to this or subtract from this?

Do you support that? So how many people feel that's a good idea, that we'll take a look at the survey results when they are released maybe two months from now? Okay. Any opposed?

We'll make sure this message is sent to those who are running the survey and those who may be the recipients of the survey, who will make decisions.

Oh, yeah, sure. Which ones?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I wanted to ask a clarifying question on the eCornell announcement. Number one, I think it is very important, as you said, to have an actual time on the agenda to discuss it. And it sounded like you were saying that that would be possibly in November --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It hasn't been approved by the trustees; so A, then B, then C. A, this week, the trustees, I'm sure, will approve it. Then we have to find out more about the plans

for oversight committees, what kind of faculty oversight will there be. And then we should have Steve Carvell, who's the vice provost on external education and so on, will come and talk to us about that. So my guess is maybe December. November is actually a booked-up senate session.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: And maybe I missed this, but who made the proposal?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It came from -- it's online. It's from the president and the provost to the trustees. And it basically says, in lay terms, once a unit sort of separate from the university, kind of semiautonomous, now becomes a mainstream academic program, we have to pay attention to it.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Right, and so my clarifying question specifically is eCornell is currently a for-profit corporation. So is the proposal I saw to dissolve eCornell as it currently exists? Is that proposal to make it part of the non-profit university -- can I finish? And specifically that it will not be a for-profit corporation?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's my understanding, but this is why we need follow-up with experts. All I know is it now becomes an academic program like Learning Where You Live, that we have to now pay attention to in this oversight.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: And then just one other thing. It seems to me that this may be in the wrong order, that the Faculty Senate should be discussing whether this should be part of the full academic program and, if so, how.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. All I know, it's in the formative stages. If we learn enough about it, then we can exercise the proper oversight of it, so that was the point of Michael Tomlan's question last week. And all I could do is produce the agreement that's being voted on by the trustees this week.

Any other -- yes.

TIM DEVOOGD: Tim DeVogd, Psychology. Just going back to one of the other things that you mentioned, have you gotten far enough with the registrars that you have a sense of either how often this happens or what circumstances are when somebody changes a grade?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's very hard to get data out of the registrar's office; but I reported in May, I went back ten semesters. 50 a semester, in general. But, a large fraction will be things like I forgot to drop and now you're going to change an NRG to a W or things like that. So the majority of those 50 are probably things like that. I don't have data that says how many of the bad things have happened. It's very isolated, but it does happen, and that's why we're talking about this.

Yeah. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering. I also share Risa's concerns about sort of how things have rapidly changed around eCornell. My guess is the faculty senate doesn't have much to say about a stand-alone for-profit corporation that is called eCornell, but it seems like the faculty senate should have a lot to say about a new economic unit that is being integrated into the university. My guess is the cart is the out of the barn, or whatever it is.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The cart before the horse.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: So if this is already going to the board of trustees, it seems like that's moving forward, but I would like maybe the senate to ask the president and the provost what was the rush. What drove this sort of doing things quickly? Why wasn't the senate brought in in a more broadly consultative manner in trying to assess how best to integrate this in as an academic unit?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, these are good points; but I feel, again, we have an opportunity to, I feel, shape the faculty oversight of the courses being offered.

Yeah, okay. Chantelle.

CHANTELLE CLEARY: Hi, folks. How are you? My name is Chantelle Cleary, the university's head online coordinator and director, Institutional Equity here at Cornell. And I am here to talk to you about recent changes to Policy 6.4. And I'm really here to shamelessly beg you and your colleagues to agree to serve as hearing panelists and co-investigators in this process.

As many of you may know, Cornell University Policy 6.4 is the policy that sets forth the university's prohibitions against bias and any other form of unlawful discrimination, including sexual and related misconduct. My office currently oversees any report that a member of the university community, whether that is a member of our student body, our faculty, or our staff has either experienced some form of prohibited discrimination or sexual or related misconduct or has engaged in that conduct.

When my office -- and here's a list of the different types of sexual and related misconduct that University Policy 6.4 prohibits. So 6.4 prohibits sexual assault, sexual exploitation, dating violence, sexual harassment, protected status, meaning any other form of protected class status discrimination, stalking, and then aiding or attempting to commit any form of prohibited conduct or retaliating against anybody for any form of prohibited conduct. If a person who is affiliated with Cornell engages in that conduct or experiences that conduct, they can come to my office and file a formal complaint, if the actor is a member of the Cornell community.

If my office receives a formal complaint, we then utilize the procedures that are related to Policy 6.4 to determine how we're going to investigate and adjudicate that complaint. There are four sets of procedures. This is a change that occurred in June of this year, at the urging of both the Faculty Senate and the University Assembly.

And the student procedures have existed since 2016. They set forth a very clear path for investigation, very clear procedure as to how the alleged conduct will be investigated, and also sets forth how it will be adjudicated. The student procedures required a hearing panel, hearing panel comprised of a combination of faculty and staff, to review the investigation conducted by the investigators in my office and to make a finding as to whether or not there's been a violation of Policy 6.4.

Effective June 1 of 2019, we adopted new employee procedures, and these employee procedures also require that a hearing panel adjudicate allegations after an investigation by the investigators in my office, whether or not there's been a violation of Policy 6.4.

The faculty procedures for the adjudication of prohibited discrimination and the staff procedures for the adjudication of prohibited discrimination are adjudicated by an investigator and the supervisor, so that could be the dean or it could be the supervisor of the employee, if the employee is staff.

The reason I'm here today is this: Under the student procedures, we need at least one member of the faculty to participate as a hearing panelist, in order for us to hold a hearing. Under the employee procedures, and these are the procedures that were very much advocated for by members of the university governance, requires that we have three faculty members participate.

So when my office receives a complaint against a member of the faculty, we must have the participation of three faculty members to investigate and adjudicate that case. One faculty member must serve as a coinvestigator to the investigators in my office, and there must be two faculty members serving on the panel that makes a decision as to whether or not there's been a policy violation.

When we receive a Policy 6.4 complaint against a staff member, and the allegation is not prohibited discrimination, but say it's any form of sexual misconduct or protected status harassment, we have to have at least one member of the faculty serve on the board. And then, when we have a prohibited discrimination complaint against a faculty member, we must have a faculty member serving as a coinvestigator. The big message is, we need a lot of faculty to serve on these roles, in order for us to actually implement the procedures.

Co-investigators will work alongside the Office of Institutional Equity investigator. When you serve or when a person serves as a coinvestigator, it's approximately 30 hours of work, and there's some mandatory training that goes along with that, about six to eight hours at the outset, and then some ongoing training throughout the year. When a person serves in the capacity as a hearing panel member, they will do approximately 30 hours of work -- does that sound right, Chris? On a given case. And then, of course, the mandatory training.

Our current pool that we have of folks volunteering to serve as either co-investigators or hearing panelists are as follows: We have 38 folks in the pool. 30 of them are staff, 8 of them are faculty. If we get even two complaints in this next semester against a faculty member, we will have gone through more than 75% of our pool, and so we'll have to keep calling on those same faculty members to do this work or -- and they don't have to, because they have already done 30 hours of work, they can decline to do that and then we cannot adjudicate the case.

And what that means, practically, is that the folks involved, the person accused of engaging in the misconduct and the person alleging they have experienced it are not going to have the case in front of them adjudicated in a timely and efficient manner.

So I'm here to answer questions about serving in the faculty pool and also to tell you how to apply and to urge you and beg you to ask members of the faculty to serve in this very important capacity. On the office of institutional equity web site, if you go to our home page,

there's a "get involved" tab. You can click on that. And then there's a questionnaire for the Policy 6.4 hearing panelists and coinvestigators. There's a brief questionnaire that we ask you to fill out, if you're willing to serve, and then there's also a frequently asked questions kind of document that will give you more information about what it really means to serve as a member of our faculty 6.4 investigator or hearing panel pool.

Before I ask if you have any questions, I will say this is a really important function. The folks who serve in these roles have -- the feedback we have gotten is that it's difficult work, but it's rewarding work. The students and the faculty and staff that have gone through this process very much appreciate the work that our current panelists do. It's essential to creating a safe and inclusive community here, and much of what we do is focused on educating folks so that, moving forward, they don't engage in conduct that's harmful to the rest of the community.

Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you refer to 30 hours a work, is that over what time frame? Is that a week, a month, a semester?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: For the entire case. So if you are serving as an investigator, a co-investigator, we'll reach out -- we send an email out to the entire pool, and we basically say we're in need of two faculty or three faculty, or whatever it is. If you are available and you don't have a conflict, we may ask you to serve.

If you are serving in the capacity of coinvestigator, you will then work with the investigators throughout the investigatory process, so you'll participate in the intake, which is where we're advising folks that a complaint has been filed against them. You'll participate in investigative interviews. Sometimes there's 3, and sometimes there's 20. It just depends on the nature of the case. And usually, an investigation takes anywhere between two to six months to

complete, depending on the complexity of that investigation. And the faculty coinvestigator will participate throughout that period of time.

If it's a hearing panel, there are some prehearing meetings. Those are usually about one or two hours each, where the panel gets together and talks about issues that they might want to explore during the hearing and the witnesses they may call. The hearings themselves then take anywhere -- usually about a day. We say schedule about a day. They could be longer, they could be shorter, and then you have to deliberate and write your decision.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does the definition of faculty include only assistant, associate and professors, not lecturers, senior lecturers and that group of folk?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: I don't know the answer to that, but I can find that out, yeah. I'm not sure. Do you know? It's all faculty, including lecturers, correct? Instructional staff.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The reason I ask is because I'm on a committee right now that is discussing the RTE, the research teaching and extension staff. And in the definition, it says they are not faculty, so there's some confusion there maybe.

CHANTELLE CLEARY: Policy 6.4, I think, speaks to it explicitly. I just don't know it off the top of my head. Sorry.

Any other questions? All the way in the back.

I will say we're almost out of faculty to serve this semester, so we really need people. We're going through a selection process right now.

JONATHAN RUSSELL: Jonathan Russell in LAES, Crop Sciences. I have a question about what is the role of law enforcement in this?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: There is no rule.

JONATHAN RUSSELL: And the question is why.

CHANTELLE CLEARY: Sure. This is going to be a little bit of a long answer. When a person experiences any form of sexual or related misconduct -- I'll focus in on that -- they have the right, under New York state law, federal law, federal guidance, to report their experience both to the police and to the university, to which ever university they are affiliated with.

It's the university's obligation, under the law to, when we are aware that somebody has experienced some form of sexual or related misconduct, reach out to them, let them know that they have rights and options for support, advocacy and reporting. And we let folks know, you have a right to report your experience to the police, you have a right to report your experience to the university. You have your right to do both or to choose one and not the other, or to do neither. It's their right.

The criminal justice process, so where law enforcement would get involved, is very different than the university's process. Criminal justice process is a criminal process. The university's process is an administrative process. There can be concurrent investigations, but they have very different outcomes, very different goals and very different, obviously, procedures. Folks have the right to choose.

In the aftermath of an experience with violence, it is very important we not take the power and control away from the person who's had the experience, but rather that we just let them know what their options are and empower them to make the decisions that are right for them in the aftermath of that experience.

So when a student comes to us or a member of the faculty comes to us and says I was sexually assaulted, but I don't want to deal with the police; rather, I'd like the university to look into this and address it and support me, we accept that, unless there's an imminent threat to campus safety. At that time, we would involve police, but only after informing the person who's had the experience with violence that we are going to do that. Does that answer?

JONATHAN RUSSELL: Yes, to a certain extent. Perhaps this is no comfort to a victim, but how, then, is the university going to remove a bad actor? How does that actually work, then?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: If a person files a formal complaint against a person who's engaged in some form of sexual or related misconduct, the university, my office will do an investigation to determine whether or not there's been a violation of university policy. If there is a finding that a member of the faculty -- and this is where you would all have to serve on the panels and serve as co-investigators -- engaged in some form of sexual or related misconduct, then the panels, the hearing panels would make a recommendation to the dean as to whether or not that person should be removed. Ultimately, it would be up to the dean, if we're talking about a case against faculty. If it's student, the hearing panels determine what the sanction is.

JONATHAN RUSSELL: Then if we do do a removal, how do we actually, in a sense, tag that, so we aren't just moving the problem down the road?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: That's a really great question, and it's a question that universities are struggling with at this very moment. They are calling it "pass the harasser," and we are working with a number of other institutions, including other Ivies to address the problem that you are speaking of right now. So it happens, but we are getting better at that. You're very welcome.

Yes, question right here. I'll just hand my mic over.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How long is the training?

CHANTELLE CLEARY: The training, the first round is six hours. We offer it usually in the off-season, so in January, late January, right before classes start, or right before classes start in August. And then we also have -- we are building a Canvas course, so we can continue to update our panelists and our co-investigators with information. We record our training sessions, so we can put that on there.

We encourage panelists sometimes to go back and watch certain things, if certain training modules are relevant to a case they are sitting on. For example, if there's a sexual assault forensic exam that's going to be discussed in the context of the investigation, we might trigger the panelists to go back and watch the module on how to interpret a sexual assault forensic exam.

Any other questions? Thank you all very much. If you have questions, you can reach out to me directly.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Jill just picked up the clipboards with the sign-up sheet, and we'll do a quorum count and tell you the results after the next presentation, which is Lisa Nishii talking about the Learn Where You Live proposal.

LISA NISHII: I'm here to talk to you about a proposal to improve the process through which courses called Learning Where You Live courses are approved. I'll tell you a little bit about what they are and then the kind of current challenges that we face, and then our proposed solution.

Learning Where You Live courses officially were introduced in 2013. There were some that were offered before that, but they were officially introduced in 2013, with the goal of enhancing intellectual content and programming in the residential halls, without increasing academic stress for students. They are designed to eliminate the formal barriers of the traditional classroom and, as you can imagine, this is particularly important for first-year students, as a lot of them are enrolled in these massive gateway classes.

And in contrast, these Learning Where You Live courses are designed to be small. Some are capped at 10. The max is 20 students per course. They are only one credit, they are taken as SU, so not for a grade. Usually, they meet in the apartment or home of the faculty in

residence in north campus or the house professors on west campus, and usually over dinner. So a very different model from this.

I will tell you more about the goals. The goals are to foster this sense of home and belonging for students, to promote active participation in this small, informal format. Students tend to engage much more actively with their peers, and also with their faculty, and to allow a more sustained form of interaction between the faculty and students over the course of the semester.

Students are also encouraged to explore topics that they might not otherwise study, that may be far field from their majors or disciplines. Another goal is to promote the idea that this intellectual exchange and exploration, they're core values of a Cornell education, to engage in this process with their peers and also with their faculty.

I'll give you a few examples. This one is a course taught by Chris Schaffer on north campus, and it's called Seeing Science in Action. It's a really awesome course designed to help students actually imagine what science looks like in action, so not just in textbooks, but in the labs. And so students are introduced to three faculty members who come and talk about their research, and then they get to spend some time shadowing the faculty and postdocs in each faculty member's lab, so they can actually see it come to life.

This is another course called Wonder Women, and this is a course taught on north campus, and it is a course designed to help students think about women in leadership. And there are a lot of guest speakers from around campus who talk about their experiences. And also, this is married with various readings and academic work related to women in leadership. There's a lot out there, as you know.

Another one, this is Shorna's class, over there on west campus. On west campus, a lot of these Learning Where You Live courses are used as a structure for students living in the west

campus houses to really get actively involved with the faculty and with a wide range of intellectual content.

So this one is focused on Alice Cook residents, students who reside there, and it introduces them to various opportunities to engage with speakers from Cornell Ithaca and global communities across a wide range of topics. It's really engaging for students. They get to really wrestle with a lot of topics they might not otherwise be thinking about in their courses, and to do so in a really intimate informal, comfortable format.

What do students have to say about Learning Where You Live courses? They tell us: My Learning Where You Live professor -- 97% of students who take these courses say my professor cares about me as a person, increased my excitement about learning, and has served as a mentor to me. Participating in a Learning Where You Live course has helped me to feel more a part of Cornell, so the sense of belonging. Made me feel more comfortable about interacting with other faculty.

This is one of the findings that I love most. You can imagine students feeling comfortable in this 10- or 20-person course over dinner, interacting with faculty, but what they say is that this makes me feel more comfortable going to talk to faculty in that 600-person class. That is really important, I think.

They also say that the course allowed me to explore a topic I would not have otherwise explored. And they say that, due to participation in a course, I have or am likely to choose future classes based on interest and curiosity. I like this idea of taking classes just for fun, to explore new ideas. And I know my Learning Where You Live professor better than any other professors from this year. So I think that really means something. Cornell can feel really big for undergraduates.

99% said that they would recommend the Learning Where You Live course to other students. It's a thing that's working. It's an initiative that we think is really important for our students.

Why am I here in front of you? What's the problem? Right now, Learning Where You Live courses, they are taught primarily by faculty and residence and house professors, so faculty who reside in our residential halls. They are also taught by faculty fellows, who want to teach these classes. They often say that they are interested in teaching a Learning Where You Live course because it's a low-stakes opportunity for them to experiment, engage in innovative pedagogy in different formats, explore new ideas, and often to team teach with people from very different departments.

But courses are reviewed and approved by the faculty member's home department or college, and they are given departmental course codes associated with the faculty member's home department or college, even if the content of what they are offering differs widely from the subject matter of their department. So that Wonder Women class that I told you, Susan Daniel, and I know she's here, on north campus teaches that. The course code is Chemical Engineering because she's a faculty member in Chemical Engineering, which makes it really difficult for students to find these courses.

And it's also a confusing and cumbersome process to have these courses reviewed in the typical department college process, because they're out of the core curriculum. The courses aren't part of the core curriculum, and a lot of times you have a new chair or you have new members on the review committee, and they are like what is this, what's this all about. And it can take a long time and can be rather frustrating, both for the instructors and, I think, for the departments and colleges that are trying to figure out the best way to do this.

So there's some examples here at the bottom, Fascinating Figures is a course. It's got an engineering course title. Bridging Differences has got a music course title. Pursuit of Excellence and Well-being, City and Regional Planning. And so there's a misalignment; very confusing for students. When you have a course that's co-taught and cross-listed, it is even more confusing, because it might be in Chemical Engineering and Plant Sciences or whatever it might be, and students aren't looking in either place for this kind of course.

Our proposed solution is to decrease the administrative impediments for faculty and increase the visibility of the courses to students by creating a more streamlined university-wide process, and this is what it would look like. This proposal, by the way, has gone to both CAPP and EPC, and we have gotten positive feedback, so thank you. I think I saw David Delchamps here.

So University-wide Curriculum Committee will be composed of faculty who teach Learning Where You Live courses. We would have one from north campus, one from west campus, but we would also have faculty who do not teach a Learning Where You Live course, so faculty who are outside of this kind of initiative. They would all be voting members of the faculty, and we would have an associate dean from one of the colleges also represent on this committee.

And we think that creating a shared course code that represents what it actually is would be enormously beneficial for students. So the course code would be LWYL, not Chemical Engineering or anything like that.

Departments and colleges would maintain authority over whether to give their faculty teaching credit for teaching the course. In most cases, actually in all but one case, faculty do not teach these courses for credit. And it would be up to the faculty and the departments whether they want to cross-list this LWYL course with their home department.

And if they did, then it would go through -- in addition to going through the university-wide review process which, by the way, would mirror in every way the process that currently exists in each of the colleges, where a faculty member would submit a proposal with the syllabus and the course learning objectives and assignments and all of that, but if it was going to be cross-listed in a department or college, you would also go under review in that specific unit.

Any questions about what it is we're trying to do or -- yeah. And I have faculty here who have taught and are teaching these courses, if you have any questions for them.

Bruce.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Bruce Lewenstein from Communication. I'm just curious -- it sounds great. I'm curious whether there's any thought about whether this structure might be used for other kinds of university-wide courses beyond the Living Where You Learn type courses, because there have been occasional conversations about that kind of opportunity.

LISA NISHII: At the moment, no, the only thing in front of you is this Learning Where You Live course, and the idea is to just put "UNI" in front of it. I like it because it's short for university, but also kind of a uniting function. And we have spoken with the registrar's office, and they think the administrative burden shouldn't be a problem of handling this centrally.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: I'm thinking more about the intellectual piece of thinking about courses that are much more substantive, richer and deeper.

LISA NISHII: Right now, it's just for this. There could be that possibility and, if so, we would bring it back right here for some other purpose.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Okay, thank you.

LISA NISHII: Any other questions? Oh, and I should also say that we have sent the proposal that is online for you to see to the associate deans of each of the undergraduate colleges and have asked them to ask their EPCs for feedback on the proposal.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, in the English Department. About how many of these courses might a student take?

LISA NISHII: Well, I actually don't know the answer to that, if students take multiple courses. Carol, do you know?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They are not limited, but that's been the norm; not more than two or three.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: And is there any -- just thinking courses count towards graduation and credits; for instance, gym classes, PE courses do not necessarily count towards a student's overall course burden, and I don't know if there would be instances where students would be heaping on many of these courses, and would that be something --

LISA NISHII: I think that's a decision for the college to make is whether or not -- which courses count towards the fulfillment of their elective requirements. It's not something we would be deciding centrally, but it's still an academic credit. And for students who sometimes are at risk of dropping a course and falling under the full load, twelve academic credits, this can be a nice way to kind of -- without adding stress. And in fact, we hear from students that this helps alleviate stress in their other courses because they have -- it helps in that regard, but I don't know the answer to the repeat.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Did you want me to ask my question? I just have a question about the mechanics of this. Is this being put forth as a proposal for the senate to vote on? It wasn't clear to me.

LISA NISHII: Yes, November meeting.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Discussed now, voted in November.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: And the resolution is coming --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: From Lisa and her colleagues.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: It is not coming from our standing committees?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It went through the standing committees. It was approved by EPC and CAPP.

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Hi. Christine Leuenberger, Department of Science and Technology Studies. It's obviously a fantastic idea, and also very valuable for students. My question is, can there be a -- for a standardized mechanism for actually getting teaching credit? Because obviously, most faculty are overworked. And to incentivize the faculty to do so, what can we do?

LISA NISHII: To incentivize the faculty to teach these courses?

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Exactly.

LISA NISHII: The faculty who teach these are rewarded in other ways, to some extent, in that the faculty who are in residence, this is part of their programmatic responsibilities. If they choose to teach one of these classes, it counts towards that. So they have the free room and board and everything that comes with the package, and the idea is this is part of that.

And for faculty fellows who teach, there's a small -- an honorarium. I think that is a separate issue from what you are bringing up. And it's a really good question about giving faculty credit for teaching, but this is a decision that resides at the level of the department, the level of the college. I think it would be great if faculty could get credit, but there are also so many other teaching responsibilities, and so it's really not a decision that can be made, I think, outside a particular unit or college.

CHRISTINE LEUENBERGER: Yeah, thank you.

LISA NISHII: Okay, thank you. Is that it? I don't see any other questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. We have quorum. Quorum is 63. We got 65. But show of hands: How many people that are senators did not sign the sheets? Okay, so it's 65 plus maybe five, okay, good. We have one item that Mark will handle.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: So we have to approve the minutes from September, and hopefully they have been distributed to you, the minutes. At this point, I would ask, are there any corrections to the minutes? No, okay. Then could I ask, then, if there's no further corrections, then I would ask, can we have a vote to approve the minutes from September? And we could just say with nay or yays. All those in favor?

Anybody opposed? Anybody want to abstain? Good. The minutes are passed.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So we have quorum, and we have two resolutions to discuss and vote on. So this is on student accommodations, and we were working on this all last year. A year ago, we had a panel discussion on that here, and there was lots of follow-up, fine-tuning over the summer and a few online comments and whatever, so that's the history that we have here.

I'm sorry, the slides are mixed up. We're talking about the device -- this slide is wrong -- the resolution on device-enabled cheating on exams. Here's the history of it. We talked about it last month. Some very good comments came in, and we made some modifications to the resolution. They're shown up here in red, basically adding a little more flexibility. For example, if a student requires a device because they're disabled, that's obviously okay, so we added a line like that. Then just some grammatical stuff here.

For example, you can ask a student to put their watch on the floor during an exam. Think about how you give exams. Nothing can change, if you don't want it to. All this does is call attention to a problem and give you a cover, if you want to, for example, say put your smart phones on the floor or I'm going to supply you with a writing instrument. And that's all this

resolution does. It doesn't force you to do anything. It just calls attention to this problem and gives you cover, in case you want to do something during your exams.

There's some side effects of this that we should talk about. For example, it was brought up why don't we have an honor code. We are being nicked and dined to death with these new things, we can't keep up. It's an arms race, I can't whatever. Why don't we have an honor code.

So I did a little homework on that. There are honor codes at Brown, Princeton and Stanford. You can take a look at them. There are counter-arguments to that. There's an article there as well you can look at. I appreciate that we currently have a Turnitin feature, Turnitin license and whatever, and that's been around for about ten years, and it's integrated into how you deal with your class, for example.

Anyway, that's the setting. Any discussion, additional comments you'd like to make on this, before we vote?

Okay, we'll do a show of hands on this. I'll count this section. Mark, you count the middle. How many are in favor of this resolution? Senators and alternates can vote. Just hold your hand up.

You can put your hands down. Okay, opposed? Abstain? 67, 66 vote in favor, okay. So that's taken care of, thank you.

There will be a section in the faculty handbook about this, and I sent out these start of semester announcements. That will be in there, like the laptop policy and stuff like that, so that you can deal with that effectively in your class.

Now let's talk about the student accommodation resolution. Again, the history here is a longer one. We worked on this all last year. The kickoff was a panel discussion we had. If you recall, we had a couple of chaplains, we had someone from athletics, someone from disability

services and so on. Then we worked on this, talked to lots of people over the year, more fine-tuning over the summer. And again, I mentioned this in September, that we'd be dealing with this this month.

The problem was that it was very uneven in the faculty handbook. The religious observance stuff was pretty precise, because that's the New York State law; but if you looked at athletics or students on a job interview, or there was nothing really on disabilities and so on.

So what we did is there's a web page now that has everything in there. It has tips for faculty on how to efficiently deal with this very important feature of teaching. And you have sections on all these different things; medical accommodations, varsity athletics, Title IX accommodations, and so on.

There's prose on each one of these, because I get lots of questions from faculty, what do I do here? Here's a situation. What do I do? The one goal here -- it's not going to solve all problems, but there's a place where you can go and get some guidance. That's what that's about. We are talking about a section in the faculty handbook that will have all this stuff.

This isn't a high five, we solved a problem thing at all. There's very big concerns out there. For example, the number of accommodations is going up. I polled faculty in about 20 large courses last semester, saying hey, you taught this course for a couple of years. What are you seeing? There's lots of concern here.

Some of the big departments are a real machine. In other words, they have staff who will handle the extra-time exams and whatever, but there's faculty in smaller departments where it's all on them, so this is a very big concern. Other units have testing centers, more organized ways of handling things. So we should look into that, and I'll see what I can do, but that's a harder problem.

Testing centers sound great, where you just maybe send over your exam in PDF form, someone takes care of it and it comes back to you, but we may not -- I don't think we could have anything university-wide, so there may be some things we can do within colleges. We'll poke around a little bit there, just to see if there's something we can do to address this trend, which is out there. In this whole setting, everything is driven by integrity and trust, and that's what will make this successful.

Any questions, comments on accommodations, as you see them? Then we'll vote.

WALKER WHITE: Walker White, Computer Science. So I teach an 800-person class, and I see a lot of these. I've probably gotten 20 formal requests for accommodation this semester alone. Most of these are fine. Even STS and religious observances, all these things can be planned ahead of time. The thing that's become a real problem is the medical emergencies, because you have no idea how long that's going to last.

I currently have a student that I'm dealing with who has missed over three weeks of class, all assignments, all labs, all everything, because they actually got a formal letter for request for accommodation. This student is expecting that they're going to be able to catch up in this class and, at this point, I have no idea how that's going to happen. I really do see that category is different than all the other categories that have been posted.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The other thing I've heard is, for example, you are giving an exam tonight. A student comes into your office and says, for emotional reasons, I can't take your exam. So I've contacted Cornell Health over the summer for some guidance on that, and they sent me back a memo, whatever. That's online as well. Again, there's no clear snap solution to any of these things, and you've brought up a tough part of this whole scene here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The one question I would ask is the following: I'm getting quite a few requests in the last two years for these club activities, ski club, extreme Frisbees,

and what they do is they take an entire week off, unlike athletic varsity teams, which go on weekends. So they are simply saying we're going.

And they do usually have a faculty advisor that writes you an email saying can you please excuse them, but that's an entire week gone. And unfortunately for the ski club, they always have it right after spring break, so that's like two weeks gone. So does that fall under athletics, or is there a different organization, or is that the variety of other situations?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think you referred to club sports, so like skiing is a club sport. Some of the club sports are more organized than others. That's a very organized one because they once upon a time were a varsity sport, until Title IX forced them -- they were removed from that. So that's in the category of your discretion. The prose in there, there's a line, and the advice is what's the educational value of it? If it's a family situation and my sister's graduating, it is your call.

You can ask for more certification, like a faculty advisor, to get more information. That's all within your right. It's your discretion. Whenever a faculty member asks me about this, I'll sort of talk through what I would do, but I always end by saying it's your call. And if anyone gives you grief, contact me again, because that's not right.

JOHN SIPPLE: John Sipple, from Development Sociology, here for Lindy Williams today. I just want to fully support this, accentuating the concept that we're trying to be fair to students across these different groups. I think part of the reason this has come up is there's been unequal treatment by the nature of what group they were in before, what affiliation the student had before, and I think this fairness issue should carry the day.

I don't have a good answer for you, Walker, on that one. It's tough. The other people, the other groups on more informal activities that will ask, that's hard, but these are pretty formal categories you have listed, and just express my support for that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There was a follow-up comment I received in the last month about fairness, and there's fairness to the individual, but also to the classmates that you have to take into consideration. And it's a judgment call, and you are the only one who sees the big picture, and it's your call.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. This is in regard to what Mark brought up about the clubs that have a week that they go away, et cetera. Just want to give two examples. One of them is the ski thing. I taught a 148-student course last spring, and I had a cross-country skier and a downhill skier in the class. They both went away for a week, and that happened to be our prelim week. They had someone lined up to administer the test at the competition. And they did that, and it worked out great.

Another case in Engineering, there's this project team called the Formula SAE Project Team. Every year during spring term finals, they go away for the whole finals week. What happens? Well, someone goes along with them and administers the finals.

The moral of the story is that teams such as those ought to know that they have to set something up and, in my experience, they have known that and they have set it up. I don't know whether they had it set up for you. They did for me, for whatever reason. And so what I would do, the bottom line is I think someone, I don't know who, should encourage teams that have special situations such as those to get something set up, so that we don't have to have a dilemma on our hands.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Varsity athletics is highly organized; but the club sport, it's not. What we should do is sort of mimic the kind of scene that you have with varsity athletics. They pay attention, they map out the whole semester and there's planning. So we have to somehow figure out how to reach the club sports and the faculty advisors. I'll figure that out.

PETE WOLCZANSKI: Pete Wolczanski, Chemistry and Chemical Biology. I think the sort of elephant in the room here are the students that are disproportionately asking for accommodations, and their economic status is different from others. We in the Chemistry Department get these problems all the time in our large courses, and we have -- I don't teach these specific courses, but the people that taught the courses tried to deal with the administration that knows full well economically advantaged students are taking tremendous advantage of these situations, and that's really the problem.

The rest of this stuff, we can accommodate students who have problems and needs, I think, fine. And club sports and all this kind of stuff, that's not the real problem. The real problem is, for example, African-Americans, very few of them ask for accommodations in these exams; but somehow, we get a staggering number of people from Westchester County. That's the real issue.

And the president stonewalled this issue when she talked last month, because she claims at least we didn't make the front of the "New York Times." But behind the scenes, we are having the same sorts of issues constantly in these big courses with accommodations.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'll look into that. I remember it came up about a year ago, in terms of getting extra time. So you can do the Westchester County thing, but I believe there's some effort for students to get accommodations based on services here. I'll look into that, though, but the point you bring up is excellent.

PETE WOLCZANSKI: I think there's the possibility of having people here check them out because, right now, we're taking pretty much any sort of doctor's -- from wherever the hell they're from. So these are significant issues, and we've been stonewalled by the administration when we tried to address these issues with them in the past.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. Maybe one more, then we should vote, because we are getting to the time for the last part.

Seems to be frozen. While they work on that, let's do a vote. So the vote now -- and the links, I hope you checked it out -- to have this single unified treatment of accommodations in the faculty handbook, acknowledging that there are flaws. We haven't solved the problem. We are just making it more structured and easier for faculty to navigate these difficult decisions.

Let's do a quick vote here, and we'll count them up. All those in favor of this resolution?

All those opposed? And are there any abstentions? I count three abstentions, okay, thank you.

Richard. The last segment is resolution on grade change policy. Richard Bensele.

RICHARD BENSEL: This is on the grading resolution. We have three slides, but they're really abbreviated, so there's hard copy available of the resolution. Anybody not have a hard copy? Okay, good.

We have 25 minutes to go through that copy. We will not vote on the resolution today. We'll do that in November. Basically, what we would like to do is go through the handout and, if you have questions -- I'm not going to do a lecture on this -- you have questions on any of the elements or provisions, then that could be the basis -- those questions would be the basis of our discussions today.

I should say the resolution has 14 cosponsors in the faculty senate, some of who can't be here today; but those of you who are cosponsors, if you might stand. A lot of my cosponsors are not here, but some of them are. Thank you.

And we also have 21 endorsements from the Department of Government, which is about two-thirds of our department. Bryce Corrigan is going to also -- let's start with the

resolution. You have it up there. Any questions, comments, anything we should discuss before moving on to the next section?

Okay, the next section in the handout is really just the background. And those of you who were senators in the spring, you have seen this before. It's basically Charlie's summary synopsis of the debate we had. I bring your attention to one section. This is the best that we can speak -- referring to the resolution in spring, this is the best we can do at this time.

It emerged from the discussion that we need more data to understand the scope of the problem and that we need to totally understand the grade changing protocols that are in place in each of the colleges. Only then can the Senate effectively participate in the design of a transparent, low-overhead, bullet-proof system consistent across the colleges.

And that's what the resolution is primarily intended to do, both to get that data and to provoke a discussion in which we would design that bullet-proof system and participate in it. The background, of course, is that the grade change protocols to which Charlie was referring in that passage, they were instituted in secret, they were never brought to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty senate has jurisdiction over education policy. There is no question that grades and the assignment of grades by faculty lie at the heart of education policy and, therefore, of our jurisdiction, our rights, our privileges as a faculty. Because it was instituted in secret, it was never brought before the Faculty Senate. The information that Charlie has worked to provide us in no way constitutes bringing it before the Faculty Senate. We need to do that ourselves, and that is the purpose of the resolution.

The next section in the handout is the section on grading from the faculty handbook. And I'm not going to read that, but it affirms the faculty rights, privileges, responsibility for determining grades.

Then comes the text of the resolution we passed. The justifications are on Page 3. And I just said some of this. The new grading policy was originally created in secret. I mean, it's time this stuff stopped. It's time that administrators stop transgressing on our rights, responsibilities, privileges as a faculty, doing it in secret.

Somehow, some way, in this case through Charlie, it comes to our attention, and that's it? It just happens to us? It's time that we -- and I think this is actually one of the primary responsibilities as a faculty. If we do not do this, we're giving up everything. We'll have no identity as instructors, we have no characteristics or honor as a professional guild. We're just passive employees. So that sums up the justifications.

The last thing -- not last thing. Part B, which is Page 4, I asked Charlie, has there been any official response to the resolution we passed last spring, and you have his response there; the engagement with college registrars and so forth. I also understand from Charlie that he's had conversations with the Provost and with University Counsel and so forth, but not quite conversations that delivered the resolution to them as our statement.

I would say that in looking at this, the way it was described to us in the spring, the University Counsel, Health Services, Title IX are all involved, in one way or another, in the initiation of grade changes, which then go, as I understand it -- and boy, there's a lot I do not understand.

So when you have questions, there's a lot I do not know and I won't pretend to know it, but the best guess is that Title IX, Health Services, and the University Counsel initiate those changes, they go through the provost's office, they end up at the registrar. Maybe they go through the college dean or not, but there's a whole process there that we have never, ever seen or had described to us. Charlie earlier today said there are 50 cases in the last ten months. Is that --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: On average, about 50 retroactive Ws.

RICHARD BENDEL: Yeah. So 50, that seems like a lot to me. And we know nothing about them. They were done -- of course, until we passed our resolution, they were done without even the knowledge of the instructor. You could have had your grades changed, grades you determined, they were your own judgment, your own running of a course. They may have been changed and you did not know it. You would not have been told.

Oh, and then the last thing. You might remember from the session in September, I asked Martha about the grade change policy, and she knew -- she said she knew nothing about it. And I believe her. I mean, she didn't know anything about it. That was her response.

Once I wrote her, I apologized for blind-siding her in that question. I didn't know that she did not know, and I think it's something we need to think about, where our resolutions go and who is addressed to them and who knows what we do. But in this case, she did not know and she basically replied, if we don't like it, then we do it here. And that's the reason why I and we, and the cosponsors and the Government Department are bringing it to your attention today.

Questions, comments?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. I agree 100% with this resolution. I don't share necessarily the feeling that this was sort of done in a devious way behind our back; they'll never get it through the faculty, so we'd better sneak it in there. I don't necessarily agree with that. That was implicit in what you said, it wasn't explicit.

But honestly, after our meeting last spring, I thought about this some more, and I thought wait a minute now, I didn't hear a single concrete description of an instance of a retro W, like this person did this to this student and, therefore, Title IX office told this person to do

this. And then it was discussed and then this grade was changed. Or some other reason, you know, health services.

I would like to hear some of those stories with details, with no names, of course, obviously. And there have got to be such stories out there with no identifying information for the participants. I would like to hear a few of those stories from each of these ways of getting retro Ws.

I also thought -- I assumed the whole time that a retro W meant an F got changed to a W or incomplete, but I thought well, what if a C minus got changed to a W? I thought maybe that happened. Some student was really upset because their med school application would be terrible with a C minus on it, so they went to health services and they got their C minus changed to a retro W. I don't know that that's never happened. I don't know that has happened.

Bottom line, honestly, I think we really need to put on the brakes here, until we get some hard data, and not just stats. Charlie was saying earlier it's hard to get numbers from the colleges. Well, I want to hear more detail about specific cases.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you. I should bring your -- Charlie had two questions that he -- yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think you're absolutely right. I don't want everybody in this room to think that registrars are running amuck here, doing their own thing. I served on a petition committee for seven years with CALS. I saw these types of petitions come through and, specifically, examples of where Ws were requested. It is not something that is done arbitrarily. There is a lot of work that is done, a lot of research. A lot is also asked of the faculty member.

Now, there may be some cases that slip through, so I'm really wondering of those 50, are all 50 that, or are you talking 2 out of those 50? So I agree with you that we could actually put together some very good examples for you historically of how registrars have actually acted

in looking at the request from the student, request from either the medical, from Cornell Health, whatever the case may be, in making that judgment.

Now, I think what is important here, though, is in some cases what slips through the cracks is the faculty member was not always in the loop. And I do know that for CALS, you have to send that and get a signature of the petition from the faculty member; but that may be a problem when we're dealing with the college problems like that, that that may be what's slipping through the cracks.

But I will agree with you, and I just want everybody here to think, to understand that my experience has been these registrars are working their tails off and they are trying to do the best they can for both the students and the integrity of this university. So even though these words of "secret" being thrown around and things like this, please don't think that they're just doing it arbitrarily. They are really working hard for both sides to make sure.

So some people have fallen through the cracks. That's what we need to resolve here. And I agree, the faculty has to be in this loop at all times. And I think where the problem lies is when you have classes that a student in one college in another college, I think that's where a lot of the cracks occur, and we really have to tighten that up. I will agree that we could put -- I know I could put together some good examples for you.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you for both comments. You have to understand, the registrars are the end of this process. They don't initiate the request, they don't review it and -- these requests, as I understand it -- and again, we don't know the facts of the matter; these begin somewhere else. We can make very good examples, and I believe that some of them are correct, where we say yeah, that should be done. That grade should be changed. But I can dream up a whole lot of examples where it shouldn't be done.

For example, and I don't want to pretend this is fact but I do want other cases on the table. Imagine the University Counsel gets a request from a big donor that one of their children should have a grade, a C minus changed to a W. We'd never see it. The instructor would never see it. This would just happen. I can think up all kinds of examples like that, more borderline cases perhaps, where we would really like to know that the integrity of the grades we assigned actually have some integrity to them, that we do pay attention.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Joanie Mackowski, English Department. Yes, I think some more information would be good about how this process happens. I do know that it happens, say, differently in each college. In Arts and Sciences, there's the Academic Records Committee, of which I'm a member, and we are a committee of faculty. We review petitions that come through first student's advisory, then there will be documentation from whatever, Title IX or Cornell Health.

So there's a group of faculty, three faculty members, and then the dean. So it's a group, we are discussing it. The imaginative story that you just offered us is a -- it is imaginative, it's creative writing, but that's the sort of thing that happens when we don't have the information of what's going on.

And then there's certain information that we can't have; say, information, if there is a Title IX proceeding or delicate health information, so there are reasons that it might seem secret. There are cases with students facing really difficult situations.

And I want to say also that, while you're framing this as about the university changing course grades – your resolution begins, 'Whereas the university has been changing course grades,' as I see it, a retroactive W, I really don't feel that's changing a grade. That is determining that this college experience is not relevant in the student's academic trajectory. It's removing something from the equation, from the diploma. It's not that people are going in there and

saying that the C is a B, you know. It's removing it. It is putting it off the table, expunging a grade.

I think that part of the difficulty is that calling this grade changing, when really expunging something from the record is the issue. And I don't think that we should be tattooing our students' foreheads with the letter F if they fail our course. There are difficult issues going on that we don't understand—health related, assault related, difficult personal issues. We should trust that our faculty colleagues are evaluating these issues fairly and appropriately. We should let them deal with it.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you. Removing a grade does affect the grade point average. It is a grade. So if you have an F and you turn it into a W, I mean, it's the same as a grade, but we need to know these things. The designing of a policy, something that makes as certain as we can be, that there's consistency between the integrity of our grading responsibilities as faculty and the process for making legitimate corrections in the record, that's what we need to design and that's what we're after.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. Richard, I have to say, I could not be more opposed to this resolution. I agree very firmly that faculty need to be informed of and be involved in setting policy around how these retroactive expungements or turning into Ws, how those grade changes are made. I couldn't agree more; but this resolution is, in my view, going to cause problems for three primary reasons.

The first are the chance for what I think are unintended consequences. Most of the great changes, back when I was associate dean of faculty with Charlie, we did see some anecdotal cases about why some of these things were changed. And most of the ones that I saw were made for very legitimate reasons.

If this policy came to pass, then this semester we will have a student who was sexually assaulted, unable to continue work in classes, as a result, and not able to have that grade removed from their record. That experience of having that frustration is going to exacerbate the trauma from that sexual assault. That will happen if this comes to pass.

The second reason that I'm so strongly opposed to this resolution is I think it's going to derail a cooperative process in an example of good faculty oversight in trying to modulate and change and guide the direction of university policy.

This came to us not from Charlie. It came from a faculty member who noted that, and that initiated an oversight procedure that has been housed in the faculty senate, has led to the passing of one resolution that has changed policy, and had now led to a cooperative process that Charlie described earlier between Charlie and the registrars to try to form again a thoughtful policy that is clearly going to involve the faculty senate at every stage going forward.

The final reason that I'm opposed to it is it's just bad politics. So what is going to happen, if this resolution passes here, is President Pollack is going to say thank you for passing this resolution, I do not approve it. So now we've created -- and she would probably need to do that to avoid those unintended consequences that I'm worried about. And so now we've created a direct conflict with the administration over an issue which we currently have cooperation around.

While I couldn't agree more that faculty should know what grade students are getting and we should be deeply involved in the process of setting a policy around these retroactive expungements and changes to withdraws, I think that process is already in place. And what you've proposed here is going to derail it, cause unintended consequences, and is fundamentally bad politics. Sorry for the long comment.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Chris. Replies to each of them. There are unintended consequences in everything; but what you're talking about is a delay, not a permanent unresponse to or legitimate response to a difficult situation. Not only that, there are other ways in which the student you described could appeal a grade, and there are processes that do not involve this one.

The second is yes, things perhaps are going on covertly informally somewhere. This resolution arms those purposes. This says, basically, the present situation is intolerable. In order to arm those who pursue correctly, effectively perhaps -- not yet effectively, as we have seen it -- a response to these questions and concerns, we need to arm them. And that's the second response.

The third response was oh, yes, that Martha might ignore it, yeah. I think she ignores a lot of things. This whole problem with grading, think of how many times we have heard in here that this is a university with shared governance. Good luck with that.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: At this point, I'm sorry to say, but we're going to have to call time, for waiting for adjournment. Okay, so if we can then call to an end here.

Yes, we have one more area. We wanted two minutes for -- fine. Go right ahead, say something.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Hi. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Just wanted to remind people that after the senate meeting, we will have an AAUP -- Cornell AAUP meeting. And if people want to discuss anything at this senate meeting that occurred, we can do that; but we also want to talk more broadly about the role of the AAUP on campus, so please stay, if you are interested in doing that. It would be like five to six. That's it.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: Thank you very much.

RICHARD BENSEL: And thank you for your attention to the resolution.

SPEAKER WYSOCKI: You said what's next now, the last thing? That's it? Okay. So thank you all. I'm going to call for an adjournment and let you all go out and enjoy the wonderful weather.