

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 2021

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There's the land acknowledgment statement, which I hope you have read, and the usual etiquette rules for running the meeting. Quite a few announcements. Let's get started.

You have all seen the results. Every resolution passed. I'm still digesting this, as I'm sure you are, going through all the comments there. You can upload your thoughts on that web page. If you have an interpretation, what does this say, I think, is the key thing. I'd like to hear from you, what your thoughts are about those results.

There are a lot of things that are going to happen in the summer, so this is a mix of heads-up. But also, if you have thoughts about it, you can communicate them to us. Credit hours: One year from now, we have to sort of play ball with all the regulators. The coming year, there's a lot to do. A policy has been drafted by the associate deans. They will be working over the summer. There's going to be a lot of back and forth in the fall about this, and it's pretty high stakes because credit hours feed into the budget model in a very explicit way. Just a heads-up about that. Take a look at that policy. If you have thoughts, please send them to us.

The Vet School has a proposal for a sixth department, and you can read a little bit about the details there. It's sort of a combination of -- you can read the small print there -- human health and animal health in a connected sort of way. This will be the home of the new and emerging and very successful master's in public health.

The way these things work, the proposal is circulated to all the chairs and directors and deans, and that's going on right now. In fact, it wraps up today. People who have comments about that -- and also, we want to hear from senators -- if you have thoughts about this, please

send them to me. They will get fed into the hopper. It's a provost-level decision and, again, we'd like to have those comments in six weeks or so from you.

Just a quick reminder from the library, there was a task force that set up a very short survey. They need faculty and grad student feedback, all about the library's collections and services and how you might think they can be improved.

We need a speaker. We've been coasting on -- since the pandemic started, as you know, and not without some concern, we've been going along without a speaker. We very much need a speaker. This greatly offloads the angst and work associated with running the senate meeting. The DOF should sort of be decoupled from that. If you are interested in this -- it's a very important job, as you can imagine -- or if you know someone who's interested, just have them contact us. We have a list of names we're going through, but we need more.

Let's talk about the fall and beyond, just a few heads-ups, and things have gotten postponed. Here's some things associated with the running of the senate. We clearly have to improve the voting, polling in the meetings. There are various systems out there. It's more complicated than you think, but that clearly is something that has to be worked out. It's unclear about whether senate meetings will continue on Zoom or not; but regardless of that, we want to work on that over the summer.

The website, as you may know, when we were in the middle of the S and F voting, I reminded you that anybody, anywhere can post comments on our website. Up until now, that always has worked well. My philosophy has always been we're looking for ideas; I don't care where they come from. But the last few weeks, there's been sort of a lot of outside posting, so we want to look into how to constrain it just to people with Cornell IDs and so on.

Neema and I are very interested and concerned about the senate committee organization. We cover lots of things. There's some gaps. Also the size of committees, the

staffing of committees, these are important things to work out. Then the notion of term limits is a topic that might be well taken up in the fall. Just a heads-up about things concerning the running of the actual senate.

The Educational Policy Committee, there are a number of things that are ongoing and that have come our way, but we just never had time to bring them up in a systematic way, so the associate deans have been working quite hard about Latin honors across the college, getting some uniformity, competition; mental health issues surfaced. That's something that will show up in the fall agenda, I am sure.

There are also concerns about the ballot system for freshman writing seminar. Basically, there's a main course scheduling and FWS scheduling and, when the pandemic hit, things were approached in a different sort of way. It's an occasion to think about that whole system. There are technical concerns and very fundamental academic concerns. Anyway, heads-up.

Academic integrity is an ongoing thing. Various reforms have been suggested. We didn't have a chance to act on them all. We did some things in the fall that were concerned with online cheating and things like that, but that's a very big issue that will again surface, I'm sure, next year.

We have a bunch of resolutions that once upon a time we thought maybe we could wrap up this year, but they're going to have to be pursued in the fall. One of them is the IDDP approval process for the UFC resolution. We presented it at the March 31st meeting. Subsequent to that, there were several other resolutions relating to this discussion, in particular Resolution 160. Feedback from the presentation, that resolution and subsequent discussions with the provost's office led to a formal resolution, which is up there. We spent a lot of time on this. There's also a web page that has a summary of all those deliberations.

An important reminder, with big stuff like the tenure procedures, free speech and all those sorts of things, no one owns these, per se. To make progress in these kinds of venues, you need cooperation between the senate and the provost's office; just a reminder about that.

Last week, another resolution relating to international programs was submitted. It is up online. You can read about it, post comments about it. There's an extensive background page. That, too, will surface in the fall, no doubt, paired with the other resolution just described for discussion and action.

I had about five different titles for this slide. I guess one of them is we should sort of worry about time. Not sure if going along at this clip is sustainable or necessary. I know we had a lot this year, particularly we had a lot of big things to deal with. All these agendas have been full. When I look back in the earlier part of my job here, I can remember senate meetings, there would be like a half-hour gap. It's the total reverse now. Things are just so jammed up. It's a good sign or whatever, but we should think about that. There's a trend there, and I'm not sure where it's going.

We used to have things called faculty forum. Maybe once or twice a year, there'd be some topic, there'd be a panel, there'd be a forum. We have a whole web page going back to 2000 with all the forums and so on. You could see some of the topics. These were the last five attempts. Should we think of these or start using these as a way of handling special topics?

We had that special meeting in March with a four-person panel, where we talked about international collaboration. That sort of was a faculty forum, but it was folded right into the senate scheme of things, so I'm just sort of mentioning this. Are there certain topics that we might want to off-load, so to speak, into this venue? I tried in 2017. It was real interesting, but ten people showed up. At that point, I figured well, let's just try to make the senate really

interesting and we don't need this device to pull people in to talk about stuff. Anyway, just a thought.

The whole tenure track project, you might remember late February, we had a big things mapped out. The AFPSF Committee spent a lot of time, a whole year on this, developed tons of things to think about, tons of things that could perhaps be improved. The first goal got bumped because of the pandemic, then we tried showing up early this year. We had four resolutions. These were four things that seemed kind of interesting and important, and we were hoping to act on them. They'll all be postponed. In fact, the whole project will be postponed, but we will talk about later on in the meeting, one of the resolutions should remain, which has to do with the visibility of college tenure policy documents.

This is just a reminder here that I have no second thoughts about how we spent our time this year, but you do have to remember that time is limited and things get bumped. Not saying we misspent our time, but this is a really important topic. We have 450 assistant professors. It's a huge and important resource. This is incredibly important. Not saying the system's broken, but this is a real important activity, so I think we should all be mindful that you can't do everything. If you put something on the agenda nowadays, something gets bumped. We just want to be mindful of that.

I think that's the last slide. Let's pause right here, some time here for questions or clarifications on any of that stuff, before we get into Ravi's presentation of the FPC activity. Any questions you would like to direct to me about these various announcements?

JILL: There's a hand raised. Richard Bense.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yes, Charlie. Thanks for that. It was very expeditious. You did present your resolution on IDDP. It would have been nice if you'd allowed the same courtesy to

the sponsors of the other resolution; but as it turns out, I did send out to the senators a description of that resolution and its justification. We need not spend any more time on it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah. It was pretty symmetric. Simply, these resolutions are up there, and it will be a full 21, very important discussion. In general, I love getting things done, and we spent so much time on this issue, it would have been a nice, tidy little package to wrap things up this year, but we ran out of time. The discussion in the UFC about that, people right now are just -- I don't want to use the word beaten down, but we're all stressed out. It's not the time to think hard about this stuff. We'll put it off to the fall and approach it from a fresh point of view. Well, just resume the discussion in the fall, not starting from scratch. We have already done a lot of legwork.

The next segment here, we'll have Ravi Kanbur, who is chair of the Financial Policies Committee.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Risa had her hand up.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Sorry.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks, Charlie. Since we're on that topic, could you provide any updates to us about where things stand with regard to the Hotel School dual degree proposal with Peking University, as well as any updates about the proposed College of Computer and Information Science?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The latter is a done deal. That's been renamed. That was a December activity. There's no follow-up with that. That work was all wrapped up in January or whatever. In terms of where the Hotel thing, I don't know anything about that, other than Wendy told me that she was going to present or did present those ethical questions, the three ethical questions we put together, that those were being posed to the Hotel group. That's all I know at this point, yeah.

Any other hands, Jill?

JILL: No other hands.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you. Okay, Ravi, take it away.

RAVI KANBUR: Thank you very much, Charlie. This is a presentation of the Financial Policies Committee, which I have the honor to chair, and this is a presentation that I'm making on behalf of the FPC. That's the general agreement of the FPC from the dean of faculty's website.

How do we pursue that general agreement? In terms of normal operation, the committee meets once a month. There are two meetings each semester with the provost and vice president budget, and they make presentations on the operating budget, the capital budget, the ten-year budget projections. And these are usually in synch with the cycle of presentations to the trustees, so I guess we're quite low down in the food chain. It goes up the senate and up to the finance committee of the trustees, and so on and so forth. And from these discussions and from other discussions, themes and issues emerge; and we discuss and develop them as they mature, and I will give some examples of those.

This is the normal pattern; but last academic year, as you know, the University was into a full-blown financial crisis caused by COVID. And actually, the salience of the FPC escalated, as it engaged with the Administration's proposals to address the crisis. Our monthly meetings became weekly meetings and, actually, every other one of those weekly meetings was with the provost and -- as you know, the FPC prepared a report in presentation for the senate, and this was in the same session as the presentation of the president and the provost on financial crisis. This report appended last year's annual report, which you can see on the website.

This academic year, we'd been trying to get back to a more normal frequency of meetings and normal operations of the FPC, slowly, although the meetings with the provost and

the VP budget have still focused on the recovery from the crisis. But actually, alongside these, a number of other issues and themes have been taken up and discussed, and we had meetings with the chief investment officer, the vice provost for research, and the assistant director of institutional research and planning. The summaries of these meetings are in the draft 2021 annual report for this academic year, and that's been uploaded to the site.

One particular theme which I want to take up now in the next few slides, which had been set aside last year because of the focus on the pandemic, was that of research costs. As far back as the fall of 2019, we assembled a subcommittee to examine the financial implications of various policies surrounding Cornell research, and research costs, more generally. The subcommittee examined a range of issues, from the overhead rates to college policies and revenue returns, to PIs, et cetera.

I just want to highlight this; one particular issue which is highlighted by the subcommittee in its recommendation, which also has been uploaded to the site, has to do with Cornell's definition of off-campus research. Here's Cornell's definition: For all activities performed at a location which has neither the use nor aid of owned or leased university-operated facilities and with personnel off-campus for two months or longer, the off-campus rate will apply.

The subcommittee, in its report, which you'll see uploaded, argues this stipulation of a required duration for off-campus research is quite unusual, compared to our peers, and maybe a result of an earlier standard. Maybe it made sense some time ago, but really, it hasn't been revisited. Most of our peers, in contrast, seem to define off-campus research in terms of a preponderance of effort, not duration, but preponderance of effort. The subcommittee's specific proposal to the FPC is to change the wording as follows. Essentially has to do with 50%

of budgeted direct cost support activities, whether they are performed off campus or on campus. That's the shift that the subcommittee and the FPC has been discussing.

And in its detailed arguments there, which again, you can read on the report, on the recommendation which has been uploaded, the subcommittee argues that apart from being a vestige and unexamined vestige of the past, this definition has significant negative consequences, Cornell's definition has significant negative consequences.

Firstly, Cornell researchers conducting off-campus research find that their projects, which as you know, are assessed at a 64% indirect cost rate, simply cannot compete alongside peers who access the lower rate of 26%. By the way, when discussing with the finance office, it turns out it will not make that big a difference, our change in definition. There will be some loss of revenue to the university, but it will not make that much difference.

The second point is that this type of definition can and has led some researchers to offshore their research grants to other universities or private think tanks. I'm sure all of you are aware of examples of this. And also, the committee makes the point that the current duration away measure for off-campus research unfairly impacts certain groups of researchers, those with family care responsibilities and so on, and also those with administrative roles, female scholars and faculty in administrative roles.

There's a specific recommendation, which has come out of the deliberations of the subcommittee and of the FPC, the full FPC endorsed report and recommendation. And we have communicated this report and recommendation to the provost, with whom there's going to be continued engagement prior to this summer's F&A discussions, with their F&A discussions with the Department of Health and Human Services. Please, if you have observations or comments, please let us know.

I just put that forward as a specific example of something the FPC has been working on; but of course, there are many other themes that come up in our discussions that we discuss and deliberate. And the meeting summaries that are appended to the annual report for this year, you will see in bullet point form different issues that were taken up by the FPC.

Here are some examples that were taken up this year, but which we will continue discussing, and we will try to highlight some of them, at any rate, next year. There's a question of salaries, and we discussed the diversity and inclusion dimension of salaries.

The question of debt capacity and its allocation cross-units, this is quite an interesting financial issue because what debt does is that it ties together the different parts of the university in a way that might not be obvious to one straight away. Here you have the Ithaca campus and you have the Weil Cornell campus.

One might think these are tubs on their own bottom, their own budget, their own whatever, their own revenue, et cetera, but the point is Cornell debt is unified. What the outside world sees is the total debt of Cornell. And it's that debt capacity and, therefore, the allocation of that debt capacity between different units becomes an important issue. It is a financial issue, but also an important issue for operations of the university.

Another example will be contingency funds for the next crisis. An issue arose when we were talking last year, but if only the university had \$50 million in contingency funds, it wouldn't have had to have done the things that it did on faculty salaries and benefits. When you know you have to build up the \$50 million somehow, and if we started today, putting away \$5 million a year for ten years, let's say, for the next crisis, well, you know, \$5 million would have to come out of the current operating budget and somebody, somewhere would have to pay for this. So those are the sort of issues we need to discuss in terms of the pros and cons of contingency funds.

And then there are the issues of endowment returns, and the research cost subcommittee will continue on its work on F&A policy. These are some of the themes that we will take up, and very happy to answer questions on these things in the discussion section.

I'm trying to keep this thing quite brief. I just want to conclude with two operational questions. One has to do with the interaction with the senate of the FPC. The FPC has regular interaction with university administration, the provost and the VP budget and, of course, we report back to the senate through the annual report. However, the FPC's felt perhaps our interaction with the senate could be enhanced.

Charlie talked about how crowded the agenda is, but if there is a desire on the part of the FPC to take up specific issues, we're quite ready to make presentations to the senate from time to time on specific financial themes to engage the faculty. Actually, if the faculty would like the FPC to consider an issue, they could propose that through the dean of faculty or directly to FPC members who are closest to their unit at Cornell, and those names are on the website.

And this is the final slide. This is the second operational issue, and it has to do with committee composition, and Charlie eluded to this in his opening remarks. And really, this is above our pay grade, because appointments to the FPC clearly should not be a matter of the FPC, but a matter for the Nominations Committee. But in our annual reports, the last one and this one, we noted the FPC composition is imbalanced in terms of gender, in terms of underrepresented minorities and in terms of contract college representation. We know the Nominations Committee's trying to change this as turnover happens, but of course, again, as you all know, it's difficult to find replacements.

We would like to say to Cornell faculty to give serious thought serving on the FPC, if you are approached by the Nominations Committee. It interacts with senior administration on a regular basis, it has great esprit de corps and great group dynamics; and I know I have no

credibility saying this as a practitioner of physical science, but the FPC is fun. Thank you very much.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Ravi. Questions for Ravi? Under the heading of activity in the summer, there's going to be work on some of the things Ravi mentioned, so we'll be keeping everybody tightly informed about that. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: First, I wanted to thank you, Ravi, for the report. I think it's great. I totally agree with the idea of enhancing the relationship with the senate and having more interaction. I think that would be wonderful, because there's so many budget implications that come up on different issues. I just have one question for you about -- well, one is whether you feel that you have access from the committee, does the committee have the kind of access to information on the budget that's necessary to do the work, or are there any road blocks on that?

Secondly, I wondered about the committee's work on policies such as structural issues about the way the budget's structured to either encourage or discourage interaction among the colleges; for example, in relation to courses, as we were discussing, with regard to encouraging students to take courses on issues of racism and colonialism and oppression. It seems like the budget policies and the way things are structured actually discourage colleges from encouraging their students to take courses elsewhere. Wondered if you all had any thoughts about that.

RAVI KANBUR: Charlie, would you like me to respond, or --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. I have something to say as well, but you start, Ravi.

RAVI KANBUR: Thanks for that, Risa. I, myself, haven't found huge restrictions on access, but then maybe we haven't asked the right questions. You always find out -- maybe we aren't pushing hard enough. Certainly, we've had great openness from the vice president budget and so on, and they make the presentation, then we can see later on they make the

same presentations to you and to the senate as well. Obviously, there are some confidential things that we can't have access to and so on, but I personally haven't felt that.

In terms of budget structure, I think it's a very important question, but it's a very big structural issue to do with the budget model itself, and how to incentivize what is the sort of fundamental question we face here. We hear ground-level stories all the time about how colleges are trying to, in some sense, hoard students or stop students going -- and every college is doing it. It's not that my college is better than yours and so on, because it is the nature of the incentive system that we have. How do we manage that, I think, that's a very big question. And maybe this can be discussed in the context of a bigger sort of discussion on review of where the budget model now stands after X years or whatever. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just a real quickie, Risa. Back in December, when we started talking about the big-time required course issues, I talked to Paul Streeter about the budget model and this incentive. I can't remember right now, but he gave me a couple of ways it could be adjusted to solve the problem you are eluding to. That would be, I would say, up for grabs, going in and turning some dials so as to realize that ambition, however it plays out. Thomas.

THOMAS: Thank you. In the report, you mentioned the endowment performance, and I don't envy anybody who has to try to balance stability, risk and reward in the crazy environment we've had the last few years, but I would be really interested in your perception of how Cornell's endowment is being handled.

RAVI KANBUR: Well, we had a very interesting meeting with the chief investment officer, and the summary of that meeting is appended to the report, so you will see. The bottom line is that the endowment return is not stellar. I think everybody recognizes that; it is not stellar at all, and I'm talking very loosely here. It's perhaps towards the bottom end of our peers.

One point the chief investment officer made, which I think is worth bearing in mind is that because of the size of the endowment, endowments which are bigger can take up a bigger risk position; and then because of that, they get a higher return, the endowment grows, so on and so forth. For a smallish endowment, one can only tolerate so much risk and, therefore, one can only get so much out of the return. I think that's one point.

But having said that, even subject to that, Cornell's endowment has been performing below par. Part of the problem is -- again, this is something we are learning as we go along -- is that long-term contracts, long-term investment contracts are entered into and, when you realize something's not right, to unwind those, we were shocked, could take as much as half a dozen years. In order to get the returns in the first place, there's a balance. If you get to the long-term contracts and the returns are slightly higher and so on and so forth, but there's no question that Cornell's performance, endowment performance has not been where it should be. And we'll be trying to track this over time.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Looks like there are no more questions. So thank you again, Ravi, for giving us the update and the information.

RAVI KANBUR: Thanks to the members of the Financial Policies Committee. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's get on with fairly brief descriptions of two things that will show up in e-vote, which we'll stage starting tomorrow. I'll send the ballot around with the senate synopsis, so you can perhaps take care of it quickly before the summer sets in. I'm going to talk about this visibility resolution, and then Neema will talk about the external harassment resolution. It's quite simple, and we brought this up a couple of months ago.

In general, the faculty handbook has certain high-level guidelines for the tenure process, but lots of the details are left to the colleges. That's fine, and this is decentralized Cornell and so

on. However, we feel pretty strongly, the AFPSF Committee and myself feel very strongly that we should have all these documents online, out there in full view of the public.

Now, we look at our nine or ten colleges or whatever; CALS and Engineering do this. Just recently, Arts sort of took a half step. Their things are online, but you need a Cornell net ID. That's an improved step, but we're kind of arguing for total transparency. Anyway, next slide for a few of the reasons, just reminders.

First of all, it helps demystify the process. Everybody looks at the same document. It minimizes the chance for missteps. You want the chair's assistant to have as easy access to the document as the chair, so that stuff doesn't happen. Also, if you're writing something and know that it's going to be online for the whole world to see, you're going to pay a lot of attention to clarity. It's kind of a forcing function in there, a healthy forcing function by doing this.

Also, version control is also a problem. Maybe I come in as an assistant professor, you give me a PDF of the procedure, I sort of study that every day for five years, but some new version shows up that I'm unaware of. So it solves the version control problem.

Also, and this is really important in terms of the tenure track review project, it gives the colleges the opportunity to learn from one another. It's a little over two years ago we started doing this, and we went around talking to different deans, and they were kind of surprised that well, the other guy does it this way. It's just a healthy thing all around, and it squares perfectly with the whole notion of transparency. This is, can be argued, our most central process. We should be proud of it and be able to defend it.

This sort of sums up what the resolution looks like, says this is important and let's be transparent. And what the senate will be saying to the colleges is we really believe this is an important move and recommend that you play ball here and make your documents publicly visible. More details on the resolution website. I don't think there's any attempt to hide things.

It takes a little bit of extra work to have things online, and there might be a little bit of an overhead here to transfer documents that way; but long-term, I think it would save a lot of time and be a valuable thing.

Are there any questions about that? This will be one of the two resolutions that will come your way. When we visited all the colleges, I would say some of them had really great documentation. Why do you hide it? I just never could understand at all, but hopefully, this will make a dent in that scene. And also, depending on how Eve wants to pursue, and others, the tenure project, and other things to discuss, this will clear the deck. It will make it much easier to see what's out there, pick up best practices. Of the four resolutions we felt we'd get done this year, this is, in a way, the most important and will set the stage for good things to come, I think, in the next year. Any questions?

Let's go on to the next resolution. Neema will now present the slides and give you an overview of work that's been going on basically since December. I really like this. It's like a quickly formed ad hoc committee, faculty experts working with people across the university to solve a problem, and now we have something concrete in our hands to show for it. Neema, tell us all about it.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Charlie. Yes, Steve Jackson's in a tenure-related meeting, so can't be here today, so I'm just stepping in for him. We've been seeing an uptick, especially in online harassment of faculty and staff, and students as well; but also traditional stuff, cutting letters out of newspapers and writing notes and sending things. It's always been an issue, but there's an uptick because of our online presence. This working group came together late fall, I believe. It includes faculty, and Eliza from the library, as well as people from the police and communications and HR.

What they did was to really look at a whole range of incidents and how we were responding or not responding; and the kind of ways people were being targeted, did we have systematic reporting mechanisms -- we did not -- and how we could strengthen a response and protect and support our faculty and staff better. There was an initial presentation on the kinds of issues that the working group identified, and that happened in the February 24th senate. All that information, including the background information, is available on the DOF website.

Sort of en route to producing the resolution, what the working group has done, it has produced two resource documents. One is for unit directors, chairs, deans on how one can really deal with a situation, once it occurs, and how one can strengthen support mechanisms and how one can put in preventive measures in place. That's the first resource document that's produced. It is available on the website to look at.

And then there's a second one, which really considers the person who's being targeted and what they can do, again, preemptively, and then once something happens. All of these conditions are examined, looked at, and the working group prepared these two documents. The other thing they did was they went back into Cornell's current reporting mechanisms and looked at how it could be retrofitted so that we could continue to look -- would be better kind of systematic reporting out of the kinds of issues that faculty and staff are facing and how we are beginning to address them.

The resolution essentially notes in the background statement and in the whereas part that this is a problem that's getting worse. Charlie and I, we often engage with faculty who suffer harassment, and it really takes a toll, so this was something that we were very concerned about, and the UFC wanted very much to step in as well, and have additional support for our colleagues who suffer harassment. The working group did an amazing job, laid out what pieces need to be improved, what we need to do. And then, in the resolution, they lay out the

recommendations. We have these two research documents that are created, and what they are also suggesting is that a similar resource document and policy guideline be put in place for students.

The group of people who come together in terms of producing such a document for students is a little different from the group of people who come together for faculty and staff, which is why this working group has had to focus on faculty and staff, and we hope that the University will see fit to do the same thing with students, who also are suffering from additional harassment.

Any questions?

Okay, much like we were voting throughout, we send an e-vote around on Qualtrics.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, two little boxes you have to click. This is no magic bullet. All it does is organize how we handle these things, it sends a really important signal that we are really trying to address the problem as best we can. These things take a huge toll. They can really be extremely disturbing, and it gets at everything we do, research and teaching and so on. I'm glad these two documents have been produced. All the content is in the documents online. They're going to be polished up by University Relations and made very nice for distribution. That will happen.

NEEMA KUDVA: If I could just chime in, there's one thing I forgot to add. Part of the documents also points out that the question of harassment and what one can do, again, preemptively and if something happens to you, how you deal with it, it's going to get wrapped into new faculty orientation and into the orientation for chairs and unit heads and all of that. That's the other nice piece to it.

Just want to end by thanking Steve and the rest of the committee, Anthony Burrow and Nathan were on it, as well as Yael and Dave Honan and Joel Malina and Eliza, so thank you to all

of them. They worked very quickly, then came up with a really concrete set of actions by which we hope to support our colleagues better in this increasingly difficult online environment that we face.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: For the remainder of the meeting, we have President Pollack with us today, and she'll make some opening remarks, and then Q&A.

Martha, are you here?

MARTHA POLLACK: I am here. And I have some very nice things I want to say about Charlie, but I'm going to hold them for after the Q&A. Instead, I want to start, really before I start even, by just thanking everyone once again for your hard work and commitment. This has clearly been a very difficult year. I don't need to remind anyone here, it's been almost 15 months we've been dealing with this pandemic.

Last March, we closed the campus, we sent our students home. That was difficult and stressful. And most of us, I think, hoped, certainly I hoped that it wouldn't be too long before things got pretty much back to normal. Yet, here we are, 15 months later, and nothing has changed. We're still here, we're still on Zoom. That said, we're still here and, whether physically or virtually, we're still a campus, we're a campus that's in its second semester of in-person instruction, and we're part of a community that, despite many, many challenges, is continuing to move forward with that core mission of teaching and engagement and research. You have all obviously been the key to that, and I just want to thank you.

A few updates, then I will leave time for question and answer. First of all, I want to start, as I always do, even in the pandemic, by sharing some examples of our incredible ongoing academic excellence. It has continued. In particular, I want to mention very quickly a few really important faculty honors.

First of all, Maureen Hanson, the Liberty Hyde Bailey Professor in the Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, and Bernice Grafstein, the professor of neuroscience at Weill Cornell Medicine, have both been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In fact, Professor Hanson's work has been recognized this year not by one, but by two academies. She was also elected to the National Academy of Sciences, joining fellow new NAS member, Professor Anurag Agrawal, the James A. Perkins Professor of Environmental Studies.

Dean Yoon, Dean Meejin Yoon, the dean of the College of Art, Architecture and Planning, and Professor Roberto Sierra from the Department of Music, have both been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters for lifetime achievement. Up in the Vet School, Colin Parrish, the John M. Olin Professor of Virology, is now the president of the American Society for Virology, the world's premier society for the study of what's obviously an even more important study than ever.

And the last one I want to mention is the American Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, an organization that's near and dear to my own heart -- in fact, I used to be the president of it -- they have awarded their biennial Feigenbaum Prize to Carla Gomes, the Ronald and Antonia Nielsen Professor of Computing and Information Science and director of the Institute for Computational Sustainability.

We also, of course, have amazing students, and I'll mention just three prestigious fellowships that went to Arts and Sciences students. Cosimo Fabrizio, class of '22, is the winner of the Harry Truman fellowship for students committed to public service. And Nikita Borisov and Jon Meinhardt, also class of '22, were awarded the Barry Goldwater scholarship. This is a national award for students pursuing careers in the natural sciences, mathematics or engineering.

I want to share updates on several very significant university items. All of them have been previously announced by email, but you never know who's missed what, so I'll take just a few minutes and make sure that the faculty senate hears these directly from me.

First of all, I am delighted that we were able to announce our new vice president and general counsel, Donica Thomas Varner, who is currently vice president, general counsel and secretary at Oberlin College, will be coming here. She will be replacing Madelyn Wessel, who I think you all know is retiring at the end of the year. Donica has many years of leadership in higher education, she has a breadth of expertise in areas from immigration to international engagement and litigation. She's going to be a tremendous asset, and I really look forward to having her join us. I also want to take a moment to thank Madelyn for her many contributions to Cornell over the past four years.

I'm also pleased that Andrew Karolyi, acting dean of the SC Johnson College of Business, since the departure of Dean Kevin Hallock last month, has been chosen to succeed Dean Hallock. He will complete Dean Hallock's term, which runs through June 2024. We are moving forward with our other dean searches, first of all, for the new School of Public Policy, and secondly, for the Law School. We have excellent pools of candidates in both searches, and we expect to have the new deans in place later this year.

I want to thank the faculty senate for the work that you've done on the initiatives on racial justice and equitable futures, really having in-depth, rich conversations, considering and exploring the ways we should be teaching and conducting research in these critically important areas. I deeply appreciate the thoughtful intention you have given, and I look forward to taking the next steps on this with the provost.

Looking ahead to the fall, right now, given all the available data, we are envisioning a fall semester that's going to look a lot more like our pre-pandemic normal. Classes will be taught in

person on a significantly re-densified campus. Now, that depends on having a campus that overwhelmingly consists of vaccinated individuals. We have announced already that we're going to have mandatory vaccination for students beginning this fall. There is a process in place, of course, for medical and religious exemptions, but the expectation is that the majority of our community will be vaccinated.

And in fact, as of today -- I wrote this down -- nearly 85% of our faculty, 78% of our staff and 61% of our students have been vaccinated, so things are looking really good. I guess we don't use the term "herd immunity" anymore, but they are looking good for a community that is overwhelmingly vaccinated.

We do know that with the return to on-campus instruction, there will be challenges for a number of our international students who are abroad. With current processing times, U.S. embassies in a lot of countries really are going to have difficulties providing a visa in time for the fall semester. There's a number of embassies, including in the U.K., that are only taking emergency appointments. And of course, the situation for our students in India is particularly difficult, in light of the catastrophic turn that the pandemic has taken there.

There is some positive news, importantly for us, the Beijing council, it is now open. It's prioritizing student visas, and there's a wait time of only one day. National interest exemptions are available for students in the areas where there's an ongoing travel ban, so all of our students should be able to travel directly to the U.S. in the fall, instead of having to spend 14 days en route in a third country.

Another positive development is that current State Department guidance gives all consulates the flexibility to waive interviews for visa renewals that have expired within the past 48 months. That only helps returning students, but it is a signal that the State Department is attending to this.

We will continue to advocate strongly on behalf of all of our international students. We hope to see continued improvements in the months before the fall semester. In the meantime, particularly for graduate students, our departments are all working individually with the students who are facing difficulties getting back to Ithaca, with the goal of being as flexible as possible, and I would ask all of you to please try and have that in mind and be flexible with international students.

The answer is yes, I believe the expedited visa process is applied to new faculty, although don't hold me to that. I'm not certain. Someone will have to check on that.

Finally, regarding commencement. After back and forth and changes in the government's guidelines, and then changes in the governor's guidelines again, I was really happy to share the good news that we're going to be to have in-person ceremonies for our students, with a maximum of two guests each, next month. And the plan, which is in line with the New York State guidance, is that we hold a Ph.D. ceremony on Friday evening in Schoellkopf; then we have four commencement ceremonies on Saturday, in Schoellkopf, with students divided up by their college or school. Faculty are welcome at all these events, and I'd really encourage you to attend, if you can. If you hear me give comments four times -- but please try to come to at least one.

I am going to stop there, because I do want to have some time to say my nice words about Charlie, but first we'll go to questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Thank you, Martha. Ken Birman had his hand up. Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: I simply would like to say thank you to you -- and Provost Kotlikoff, I see, is on as well -- and I hope people will join me and unmute for a moment and just give a hand of applause. I think, after all, the two of them have led us unerringly to one of the very, very best situations of any university in the world, really, in this difficult time, so thank you so much.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you, Ken. Appreciate it. Thank you very much.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Questions for Martha?

MARTHA POLLACK: They're waiting to hear my nice comments about you, Charlie.

NEEMA KUDVA: There are a couple of questions in the chat. Paul Ginsparg. Paul, if you want to speak.

MARTHA POLLACK: I see the question now. I'm going to defer to Mike Kotlikoff, but I believe the answer is yes, the plan is to return to fully occupied classrooms, without social distancing and masking, assuming we get the kind of vaccination rates we're looking at.

Am I right about that, Mike?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: You're right, Martha. Everybody knows, I think, New York State yesterday or the day before announced that for inside events of 250 or less, they could be handled by the CDC guidelines with vaccinated individuals being maskless and densified, and those who are unvaccinated having masks on. We'll talk at the town hall tomorrow about implementing this starting June 1 and how we'll do that. Couple nuances, but largely, the answer to the question is yes.

We expect the same thing even more so in the fall, when of course, there's the student mandate for vaccination, so we expect virtually all of our students, with some minimal exemptions, to be vaccinated, creating a very safe environment to be maskless within the classroom.

MARTHA POLLACK: To the question from Rhonda about the staff and Herculean efforts, we've been talking about that. I really do want to recognize our staff. Here's the trick, and actually, it's on my list for one of my first things to talk to Eve about, once she's the dean of faculty. Usually, when we pull off some sort of an event or some sort of a celebration, who

mans it? It's the staff. The question is can we get faculty and -- I would volunteer -- volunteers to do something, that we play the role to thank them.

We're just now at the point where we're thinking through how that might be, but I know that Mary is very interested in doing that. And I hope -- we all worked incredibly hard, but at some deep level, I really feel like we owe it to the staff to pitch in and thank them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It might be just as simple as a T-shirt.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah, it could be; I don't know. So if people have thoughts or ideas on this, please email them to me, because we're just starting to -- someone was emailing me about something else later, and I said you're right, we've got to get planning this stuff. It's really only been like the last three weeks or so that I think any of us have felt confident enough about the state of things to really begin planning post-pandemic in a serious way. If you have thoughts, please send them.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa has her hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Hi. Thank you, Martha. I wanted to ask a question about how you see the role of the Administration in relation to the governance matters that we've been dealing with and addressing regarding the antiracism initiatives. And of course, we have the Center that's been voted on quite overwhelmingly by the faculty supporting that, but also we have the other issues regarding the student education requirement question, as well as the faculty education issue.

As Charlie said earlier in the meeting, the faculty senate really should figure out what's the meaning of the results of those votes. I guess my question is not so much what you think the meaning of those votes are, it's really about -- that's our job, but I'm wondering what you see the Administration's position is in regard to those student education and faculty education issues.

MARTHA POLLACK: Look, it's a great question. The research center is, I think, easy. There's overwhelming support for it, and I think fairly quickly we can begin to move forward. The others, honestly, the results came in yesterday. I mean, I literally have not had time to sit down, think through them carefully, look at them with Mike. We will do that. Obviously, since it involves education of students, we'll have to bring in the deans. We're just not ready to think about how we move forward, especially given how divided the votes were on the different proposals.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I guess I was asking more kind of a broader, philosophical question about what is the Administration role, because of course, educational, curricular kinds of issues, as well as faculty statuses are primarily the responsibility of the faculty through its governance processes.

MARTHA POLLACK: Look, the curriculum, for sure, is the purview of the faculty. That's why we handed this over to the faculty senate to provide some guidance. Now we need to think about it in terms of how it rolls out to the different schools and colleges, how it fits with the purview of faculty across the campus, and I just haven't had time to sort through those issues with the provost yet.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chris Schaffer.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hello, Martha. I just wanted to second the earlier comment about how grateful I am to be at Cornell this past year, given the way this pandemic has been handled here. My alma mater is the University of Florida, which is the largest concentrated outbreak in the country.

I've mentioned this to Provost Kotlikoff in the past, and I hope something has happened, but I really would encourage the leadership team that helped make this happen, you, provost Kotlikoff, Frazier and other folks, to write this up, write up a scientific paper about how you run

a research-intensive residential university during a pandemic, and share the science and the policy and the challenges of this achievement with the broader university community. This is not going to be the only time universities face this kind of challenge, and the success story here should be disseminated.

MARTHA POLLACK: Thank you, Chris. This is going to sound like I'm just saying it to say it back, but I do have to acknowledge, when I talk to peers at other places, that our faculty and our students have been remarkable. Let me start with the students. I mean, last summer, I just heard over and over and over, oh, they'll never behave, they're never going to do this, you're going to shut down in four weeks, maybe it will be five weeks. And we saw it happen, even at other universities that put in place very impressive testing programs like UIUC. Our students were really quite amazing.

And our faculty, I mean, you guys went into the classroom, you did what you needed to do, you put your research careers on hold. So we can write this up, but I actually think a lot of the success goes to this very special culture that Cornell has and Cornell fosters, and it's going to be hard to explain that. I appreciate it. I also love that you are outside with the shades.

Hi, Bruce.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: How are you?

Unlike Chris, I'm indoors, with my study behind me. Like everybody else, I appreciate what we've done. I know that there's been some disquiet among graduate students about whether there's been appropriate recognition of the role they played, given that they are also instructors in many cases, because this has long-term implications to thinking about efforts to unionize. It raises concerns for me about thinking about what the role of graduate students is, students versus employees, all of those kinds of issues. And I'm wondering sort of your

thoughts about, one, how we can recognize what they've done; two, sort of thinking about it systemically about where they fit into our system.

MARTHA POLLACK: Yeah, those are both really, really important questions. On the former, how we recognize them, per se, again, if you have thoughts, please email them to me. The new GPSA president has already reached out to Mike and I, has a very interesting agenda. We are going to meet with him, and I think we're going to try and get a sense from him about how we can acknowledge them and what would be most meaningful for them.

The broader issue of Ph.D. students, particularly in a time in which there continues to be a shrinking job market, academic job market, is a really critical one. This was one of the major topics of the last AAU presidents' meeting just a few weeks ago, and I do think we're going to have to think differently about -- actually, that's not fair, because we've already started to think differently here at Cornell quite a bit, but continue to think differently about how we prepare -- what Ph.D. education is really all about and what we're preparing our students for. We're going to have to, I think, all of us, be much more open to the idea that not all of our students are going to be being prepared for academic careers.

Easy for me to say. I come from a field, which Charlie and Ken and others can attest to, where it's always been the case that roughly 80% of our graduates, Ph.D. graduates don't become professors. They go to work for -- used to be Microsoft, then Google, then Facebook, but I think all of us are going to have to think about that.

I think there are a number of creative ideas that came out at the last AAU meeting about cross-disciplinary cohorts. If you're at the point where you've really reduced the number of Ph.D. students you can bring in, are there creative ways to get groups of students, as we already do, to some extent, with our graduate field, so they have the -- I'm not sure who exactly

the right group to take that on here at Cornell is. It might well be the faculty senate, but I think it's a very important issue for us to be thinking about.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: I will admit that one of the things delayed by the pandemic was my discussions about the long-term future of the university. And this is one of those things, because this last comment you made about reducing the number, and one of the concerns, then, that raises for us, we do, to a certain extent, rely on graduate students for teaching staff, so reducing the number to match changes in at least the academic part of the job opportunities has a follow-on effect to think about.

MARTHA POLLACK: I mean, this is very short-term and just a very first step, but to go back to your first point about how we acknowledge them, there is a message teed up from Kathryn Boor, Ryan Lombardi, and I think the deans of the Graduate Professional School next week specifically thanking the graduate students. It's just a gesture, but, you know, gestures are worth something.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any more questions for Martha or Mike? Well, very good. Thank you all for coming. We are all in the Guinness Book of World Records now --

MARTHA POLLACK: Stop. We are not leaving yet. We are going to take a little bit of time now to honor Charlie -- actually, the first thing I want to do is I want to welcome our new dean of faculty, Eve De Rosa. She'll begin her three-year term on July 1. I think everybody knows her, associate professor of human development and comparative cognitive neuroscience in the College of Human Ecology. What I'm going to tell you about Eve is that I got an email last week from the president of her undergraduate college, the college where -- did I say her 30-year term?

NEEMA KUDVA: No. We do not wish that on her.

MARTHA POLLACK: I get an email from the president of her undergraduate college, who had noticed that, as an alumnus, she had been elected dean of faculty, and she described Eve as a treasure. Congratulations to Eve, and I am really looking forward to working with her.

But I also really, really sincerely want to take a moment to thank Charlie van Loan for everything he's done. We're going to be introducing a resolution to honor him at the board of trustees meeting later this month. I won't read the resolution.

I just want to say, first of all, I met Charlie -- Charlie was one of the very first people I met because he was on the search committee when I was interviewing for the presidency. He was the faculty dean-elect at that time. And then, when he came, his office was right down the hall from mine at Day Hall. It has been a true pleasure to work with Charlie in the four years since I've been here.

I was thinking earlier this morning, what do I want to say, what's the one thing I want to say about Charlie, and it's this: Charlie has never shied away from difficult tasks, whether it was helping us develop that much-needed consensual relations policy my first year here, to re-examining and revising the academic calendar, which is a very sensitive issue, to along with Neema, leading all the really sometimes difficult discussions on the racial justice and equitable futures initiatives.

He's always been an honest broker, he's always worked to align the goals and aspirations of the faculty, the goals and aspirations of the Administration, so that we can all see Cornell be what we want it to be. And he's always done this with a smile on his face and a joke to tell at just the right moment. They're not always good jokes, but they're always jokes. So Charlie, I just want to say that we really, really are going to miss you. I wish you all the best in the years to come. And I think Mike wants to say a few words too.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you very much, Martha. I appreciate it.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, let me just add on to the embarrassment, Charlie. For the 21 years I've been at Cornell, there hasn't been a more effective or fearless dean of the faculty. I looked back at our emails and thought of some of the things that you've taken on as part of the dean of the faculty. You started out with the thing that is untouchable at the university, the calendar, and you spent months on getting every possible point of view on the calendar, every possible permutation, all of which were voted on and discussed, et cetera, and came up, led the group, led the university to a resolution.

On things like grade change policies, student-athlete accommodations, research misconduct policy, social sciences discussions, academic freedom, the tenure guidelines, our campus code; most recently, our efforts and discussions around racial justice, you've just been absolutely tireless, and I really want to celebrate your term as chair.

The characteristics that I think about for you are tireless. As Martha says, you never say no to a task, you're fearless about tackling issues, but you're open to all points of view, and you make it, I think, a priority to listen to everybody, no matter what the degree of sense of the comments; utterly, completely democratic, everything transparent, everything on the web. And you've pushed all of us to do the same and to emulate your transparency. It's been a terrific pleasure working with you, Charlie, and you have well-earned your rest, so thank you very much?

MARTHA POLLACK: And let me add, he's a damn good computer scientist.

NEEMA KUDVA: Martha and Mike, thank you so much for that. The faculty -- I have been receiving lots of emails. And so Charlie, I will step in now, and you get a break. We have more things to go to, so Jill, could I have the slides up, please?

Along with the board of trustees' resolution, which is very long, and it starts on this particular slide, and it goes to the next slide, and it goes to the next slide, and honest Charlie

walks us -- we put it up on the website. You can see everything about Charlie's career and all the good things that people have had to say to him.

Along with that, the UFC -- and I see some members of the UFC here, David Lee, Alan Mathios, Durba Ghosh, Anthony Hay, Mariana Wolfner, Courtney Roby -- I hope I haven't forgotten anybody -- Mike Thonney, who we miss greatly, they put together this resolution, three resolutions. You see the numbering, which is very much like what Charlie numbers his resolutions, to confuse the hell out of the rest of us. I don't know about transparency, Mike. There's something deeply Energizer Bunny in the naming of resolutions.

The first resolution, Charlie van Loan speaks in a dialect of incomprehensible abbreviations and has mastered how to optimally visualize and represent changes in a calendar. Came up again and again about the calendar. We resolve that Charlie van Loan develop the RC-F, a retirement calendar with entries for whiskey drinking on the second and third Wednesday of every month, from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. in the afternoon, because Charlie's going to be celebrating the fact that he doesn't have to be at another faculty senate meeting.

The next resolution -- and the voting should happen at the end of the three resolutions. We will vote on chat, we will do all kinds of things against Robert's Rules of Order, in honor of Charlie. He believes in radical transparency, as Mike pointed out, shared governance, civility, justice and equity, but he doesn't believe so much in rules, regulations and orders. Charlie's always in a hurry, as we know. And he also wakes up at 2 a.m. every night, dreaming of -- I think he wakes up dreaming of how he's going to burn Robert's Rules of Order, but we are going to be civil here and talk about completing a full revision of Robert's Rules.

We resolve that Charlie develop Bob's Suggestions, and this is David Lee's great contribution to our resolution here. So Charlie, we're waiting for Bob's Suggestions to run all faculty senate meetings into the future.

The next resolution comes from the heart. Charlie held weekly meet and greets over soup at the Statler, and many of you came in and met him. And his two associate deans, Chris Schaffer and myself, were forced to go along. He would give us free little soup tickets to make sure we joined him.

And he created hallways for chat in the absence of buildings, for those of you who stay on after the senate meeting, to talk with Charlie. Charlie is convinced, as he told me many times, that chitchat on a contentious issue, especially the stuff that riles faculty up, is what moves the needle forward, so we resolve and we wish Charlie all the best in finding new hallways and fresh challenges and many opportunities for chitchat and conversation, as he rides into the next phase of his life.

And we're not done, because as you know -- all of you, vote now, start, and then Jill will -- if you are in favor of these three resolutions, please put your votes down now. You may abstain. And you may also refuse to vote; that is completely allowed.

As you are voting, we set up a kudo board for Charlie. If you don't know how to get to it, write to Jill. She will send you -- or C.A., who sort of set this up -- and the kudo board is full of little notes for Charlie, and images, and it's quite wonderful. Please do add your -- you already have about 50 or 55 faculty who have written in. Please do add your comments. We'll close the kudo board maybe on Friday. Lots of stuff for Charlie, lots of stuff you can read about Charlie and feel embarrassed.

There's also been all sorts of swag arriving at the dean of faculty office, so we want to thank the Law School, the Political Programs, who are so thrilled at having -- I don't know, whatever we did -- Charlie, I don't know what happened, but anyway, you have Law School swag.

And then what's next? We also collected contributions to Charlie. For the love of your life, Marian and you, to be able to go to the Otesaga in Cooperstown. There's a gift certificate there.

And then the next one, if you work with Charlie van Loan, you only hear about Fabio and Fiona, so you get a message a week, with the witty and not so witty, as Martha pointed out. We have a little basket for Fabio and Fiona. Fabio is apparently the laziest cat in the universe, but Fiona is the one with the Rubik's Cube.

And Charlie's favorite film of all time is Lagaan. I know it well. So what we did -- and this is my little surprise for you, Charlie -- I spoke to Aamir Khan, who's the actor in Lagaan, and he sent us this lovely little recording for you. Charlie, this is for you, from Aamir, in India. It's very quiet, because it's a home recording, so folks, just -- if it ever plays.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you share screen, make sure you share the audio.

NEEMA KUDVA: For those of you that don't follow Bollywood movies, this is like having Brad Pitt come online and talk to Charlie. I was so proud of myself for having done this, and then we can't play the damn video. Charlie, that's for you.

MARTHA POLLACK: Jill, unshare and try again, from the start.

NEEMA KUDVA: While we are waiting for -- we have to wait for that, Charlie. Everything is linked to that.

Hey, Chris, you're the other pesky associate dean. Do you have something to say to Charlie, while I'm figuring out the video?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I do. I know we are all used to the calm, competent leadership of Dean Van Loan, sort of to the point where I feel we take it for granted. I mean, we just heard the president and provost of the university praising this sort of broad outreach, transparency, drive to come to a finish --

(Video playing.)

AAMIR KHAN: Hi, Charlie. Really happy to know that you have seen the film and you liked it so much, and thought it would be a nice surprise to get you a message from me. I'm not sure how you will react, but still, I'm really happy to know you liked Lagaan, you saw Lagaan.

And I got a note from Neema that you're highly regarded in your faculty, students have really benefited from you, and you are about to retire, so I'd like to congratulate you for this wonderful journey that you have led so far, as a teacher, as someone who has inspired and had so many students and colleagues. It must be a wonderful feeling that you have right now.

I often believed, you know, that teaching is such an important job. If you have a bad doctor, you'll have a few patients, a few hundred patients who have not been treated well enough. If you have a bad civil engineer, you might have some structures which are not stable enough, might cause some amount of damage; but a bad teacher kills generations, one after the other. And a good teacher builds generations, so I really value good teachers.

And from what Neema tells me, you are someone who everyone loves and is deeply connected to. So this must be very important moment for you in your life, and I'm glad -- get to know more about you, but congratulations for the life you have led, and all the very best for your life ahead from here. May you continue to contribute to people's lives, and a very warm wish to your family. I don't know who is in your family, but your wife and kids, I guess, whoever else is close to you, not just in your family. My best wishes to all of them, and hello to all of your colleagues who are probably wishing you a farewell right now -- refused to join me. She's shooting this video. She's standing right in front of me. Let me include her.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Charlie.

AAMIR KHAN: So Charlie, have a good time, have a great day, have a great life ahead, and it's so wonderful to know that everyone around you values you so much. Must be a wonderful feeling. Lots of love. Bye-bye.

NEEMA KUDVA: That was our little surprise from India that we were talking about. Six bottles of your favorite whiskey, one for each year for being dean of faculty and two for the pandemic year. With that, Charlie, you are going to be riding away into the sunset.

If anybody else -- I mean, Chris, do you want to finish? I interrupted you rudely. With that, Charlie, thank you so much for everything. I'll stop, and Chris will take over. And anybody else who wants to speak up and say something, we can do that. We have three more minutes before we transition to our hallway chat.

Chris Schaffer.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I'm going to need more than three minutes.

NEEMA KUDVA: Ten minutes, 15, 20.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: So like I was saying, we just heard from Martha and Mike about how Charlie's broad outreach, his transparency, his drive to come to a finish characterizes his approach to solving hard problems, as well as what I've come to call a Charlie van Loan style committee. I hope we keep with that kind of tradition in the dean of faculty's office, but that's not what I'm here to talk about. I'm here to talk about and take a few minutes to remind everyone that it's not been such smooth sailing all the way along.

There's a lot of jobs in the dean of faculty's office that, well, it didn't go so well. One of them is there's a dean of faculty job that's about coordinating social events for faculty, with a focus on new hires, and it makes a lot of sense. And we get help. It's not just us. There's some event coordinator folks from Human Resources.

For the first of these events, back when I was Charlie's associate dean of faculty, we got together, we got a room, we got a time, we coordinated HR, we got the caterers together, we sent out an invitation to the last few years and new faculty hires. Does everybody remember this? It was in 2018.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, I remember.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Charlie, you remember? Anybody else remember? I'm not surprised you don't remember. It's because you weren't there, because nobody was there.

Showed up at our event, and it's me and it's Charlie, and it's these two junior faculty, tables stacked with food, this huge room. It was so much beer and wine. Anyway, Charlie and I and these two wonderful junior faculty, we had a great night getting to know the catering wait staff. I got really drunk. I think Charlie had to help me -- walk me out of the room, but if there's anything we've learned about Charlie, it's that he's not easily discouraged and he doesn't lose hope.

The next semester, we decided that what we needed was an interesting activity to go along with all the food and the booze. We got the director of the Johnson Museum to agree to give a back-stage tour of collections, and we got that beautiful room at the top of the Johnson, overlooking the lake right at sunset, all of that kind of stuff, for the event. Again, we sent out a note to all the recent hires. This time, we got RSVPs, we're working our way up in our event kind of coordination strategies.

But we were concerned about low attendance anyway, so this time, as a back-stop, Charlie and I decided we would send personal notes out to all of our friends on the faculty. We'd even encourage them to maybe bring a junior colleague along or something like that. Yeah, we did all of that and, after we invited all our friends and we show up, and there are fewer people at this event than the first one. Now we have me and Charlie and one junior faculty

member, who goes on a private tour of the -- with the museum director. And for this, we couldn't even bring our drinks, so we went home sober.

But Charlie is not easily discouraged, and he does not lose hope. The next year, at the library, centered on Cornell's hip-hop collection, and this one, actually about 100 folks turned out, and it was a lot of fun.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chris asked me if we could put those first events on his resume. I said yeah.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I've got another story, though. I have one more, if that's okay.

NEEMA KUDVA: I just want to announce, Charlie, this is the only and only time the faculty senate has voted XX-0 for the three resolutions honoring Charlie van Loan. Pretty amazing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Lagaan is a great movie. It's three hours long. We had the three-hour senate meeting, and I can tell you it was playing on my other laptop while I was listening. It's a great movie. It's moving and inspiring. I thought about it all during that meeting.

Anyway, is it my turn to -- I don't have anything planned. I just want to thank everybody. This job, to me, it's the same thing as teaching and research; a problem comes your way, you research it with others, you try to figure out how to teach it to others and so on, so it's really been a nice feature here in my career.

I've enjoyed every minute, and I really mean that. Sometimes you're working on stuff and you start cursing, but then after you get done with things, you learned a few things and it was all worth it, and so on. I have enjoyed these Zoom meetings a lot with the senate, and they moved right along, a lot of information flow. In the end, I'm just -- these last few weeks, I'm really proud of us all because of the way we dealt with the hard stuff, and we learned a lot. It's

not clear what we learned, but it's out there, and we put this thing further than anyone before, so I'm really proud of us doing that.

Having said that, I'm not so much for spontaneous kind of things like this, but I appreciate it. I want to thank Neema and Chris. How lucky am I to have two associate deans like that. A gap in my background, I'm not as close to the student scene, and how great is it to have a faculty residence and a house dean as a partner in this. It really was a great experience to work with both of them.

And then in our office here, Jill and Karen Lucas, the institutional knowledge those folks have is so critical, and I know Eve will step into a really well-oiled machine. And Cindy Robinson runs the emeritus office. I'm emeritus, so I actually care about emeriti. Emeriti are a great group, really. You know, I go to these deans' meetings and I truly love all the colleges, but there are more emeriti than any of those colleges. Those are like my people; you know what I mean? So I'm proud of that. Emeriti are a great group.

Here's my wife, Marian -- the dean of faculty job. Separated me from the job, because she actually hates the job. Anyways, to get along with people who have opposing views -- anyway, very good. Have a great rest of the afternoon.

Was that true about all the 16s?

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. You have six bottles. I think we should unmute and yell out our appreciation. And thank you so much, Charlie. Thank you, Martha. Thank you, Mike, for coming here to celebrate with us. And thank you, everybody, for all your help. Jill, C.A., special thanks, Cindy.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Are we going to have the hallway chat thing?

NEEMA KUDVA: Oh, you want to? Okay, people, stay for a hallway chat. Last hallway chat.