

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2021

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogóhó:nq', the Cayuga nation. The Gayogóhó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogóhó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogóhó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters.

So, with gavel, call to order. I think my first order of business is to give the floor to the Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa.

EVE DE ROSA: So, first, thank you everyone who's attending virtually, and the few of us that are here in person. This is our first hybrid -- this is our first hybrid meeting. We're going to keep this format for the entire academic year. And so, just wanted to say welcome. And then also, there's a reception afterwards for new faculty, but also all of the senators. And so, hopefully some of you who are remote will come from home and join us for some wine and hors d'oeuvres.

Okay. Next slide, please. So, these are the new committee members for this academic year. And so, we like to share that, and we'll make these slides available, and post them on our website. And so, this is the first slide, and the second slide please. Okay. So, we have both. I'm going to try to monitor both of those things.

Okay. I have some sad news to share, and I thought the Senate was an appropriate place to acknowledge the contributions of Peter Stein. So, he passed away on September 17th, and I really have learned a lot in the last few days about his importance to the university. His contributions to the Senate, as well as -- he was elected as the Dean of Faculty, and also elected as a Faculty Trustee. But most

critically, the thing that I thought was so interesting, he was part of why we have this Faculty Senate at all. So, before this, it was the Faculty Council of Representatives. So, we owe him a lot, and just wanted to acknowledge him and hopefully we could just take a few minutes to send really loving family -- thoughts to his family.

Okay. Next slide, please. I think it's good for us to remember that we're a democratic body, and I just wanted the new senators -- because this is all things that I had to learn as a new Dean of Faculty, and so, I'm sharing things that I've learned with some of the new senators. So, these are the positions that are elected by our entire faculty. So, you can see that there's almost 1,700 of us. And this office represents all 1,700. So, the elected positions by the entire faculty, the Dean of Faculty, the Associate Dean of Faculty, University Faculty Committee, the University At-Large Senators, and also the Nomination and Elections Committee.

And then, in terms of elected senators, everybody here in the Senate, virtually and physically, we all have three-year terms. And so, in our three-year terms, the senators, the voting members, are voted in by their departments or their college RTEs or designated.

EVE DE ROSA: We have elected by 1,700 -- approximately 1,700 faculty, the Dean of Faculty, Associate Dean of Faculty, University Faculty Committee, University At-Large Senators, and the Nominations and Elections Committee.

Voting members of the Senate come from the colleges and their departments. And the speaker is elected. And then we have designated senators from the Emeriti and also from the university libraries.

It went one back, one slide. So, Peter Stein's "Rules of the Senate" are still actually posted on our website. So, I think new senators should take a look at it. But also on the website is a simplified version that I think is a really handy cheat sheet. And so, I encourage you to bring those or have them open if you're virtual.

But the guiding principle of the Senate is that everybody gets heard. And this is really important. I really want all of our senators to contribute and have their voices heard. This is a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion issue. Right? We want all the voices. So, there's 1,700 faculty members that we're representing. There are three different campuses. So, not all the campuses are degree conferring, but there are different issues. So, we should make sure that they're also being acknowledged. There are 14 colleges and schools and growing. I think we have one more, School of Public Policy, and 84-ish departments.

Next slide, please. So, we are in a hybrid format. I don't want to disadvantage the people who do choose to come in person. I also don't want to push the Robert's Rules where two minutes of communication. And so, the chat will be administrative only at this point. We'll also share it. But please use the website to publicly add to the conversation, so that when you point your faculty members to what was discussed on the floor, they have a resource.

We are also going to prioritize the Zoom attendees first. And so, they will speak first, and then we'll come to the floor. Anybody who wants to speak on the floor, just come up to a mike and queue just like you queue with your electronic hand in Zoom.

Next slide, please. And so, basically, I think that might be it for me. I've already gone over the chat and the website. I do ask new senators, you might not know this part of the culture, but please go back to your faculty, and either through your departmental meeting -- so, the departmental faculty meeting, ask for five minutes. Or share an email just giving a synopsis of what transpired in the Senate meeting. And get their feedback over the two weeks while you consider resolutions.

Next slide, please. Okay. So, on to you, Jonathan, and thank you, everyone.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We now have two announcements. The first, the vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Avery August, will unmute on Zoom.

AVERY AUGUST: Great. Thank you. And thank you, Dean De Rosa, for the invitation and the opportunity to share a brief update on the anti-racism efforts of the institution. And thank you, Senators, for your support.

I really wanted to just quickly remind everyone, particularly for those who were not around in the Senate, what the structure of the Presidential Advisor on Diversity and Equity are. This is a trio of individuals, myself; the Dean of Students, Marla Love; and the associate vice president for Inclusion and Belonging. And we each represent different parts of the university, faculty, staff, and students. And we advise -- next slide -- our charge is to advise the university, particularly the president or our cabinet and the leadership, on goals, activities, and measures around diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging. And we launched now almost two years ago, the Belonging at Cornell initiative where most of our activities are falling, and there are -- there's a lot of activity in your various colleges and units.

Next slide. So, just very briefly, I only have a few minutes with you. I wanted to give you -- we're doing a lot of things across the institution. You see them there grayed out. But the one I will be talking about today are some of the efforts around anti-racism initiatives, largely which emanated from work in the Faculty Senates and the committees.

Next slide. So, here are the four items that the -- President Pollack charged the Senate to look at last year. And a number of committees met on this, lots of activity over the last year. You all know that those committees and the Senate voted on some recommendations that were sent to the president. They're listed there in those triangles. So, first -- sorry, go back one. Two. One more. Yes. So, first, the creation of a four-credit educational requirement for all Cornell students on racism, bias, and equity. I can tell you that this is now being picked up by the provost and in accordance with the university policies where the faculty and the colleges are responsible for the academic content. The deans are now being engaged with this, and we're developing a process to engage the deans on looking

at how each college can take up this particular recommendation that President Pollack accepted for developing four-credit courses that would fit the criteria for being anti-racist, anti-bias, and equity for all Cornell students. So, that will be moving forward -- or that is moving forward this fall.

The second one is a systemic review of our curriculum in our colleges and schools that will reflect the contributions of all people. And again, here, I know that a number of your units, departments, and colleges, have been doing this, and this is moving forward. I will tell you a bit more about a structure that we've pulled together to provide more resources and help for you to do this.

And the third is the creation of a Center for Racial Justice and Equitable Futures. President Pollack has accepted that. [indiscernible] recommendation and that will be developed as well.

And then finally, faculty programming to complement existing anti-bias programs. I know some of these received varying degrees of votes. But this is also something that we're picking up in a way to try to develop, both within our current structure of programs, but also new programs that address these issues for our faculty.

Next slide. The other thing I wanted to just mention is that we've pulled together a group of the institutional offices that work in this area, the Center for Teaching Innovation, Cornell Interactive Theater Ensemble, the IDP, the Office of Inclusion and Student Engagement in the graduate school, OFDD and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, as well as the Department of Inclusion and Belonging and Human Resources. And we have been meeting very regularly to try to look at what we do here at Cornell, provide support for all of these initiatives, and I will point out that the Center for Teaching Innovation and IDP have developed, for example, a guide for departments to look at their curricula and look at their courses to ensure that they're taking into account the contributions of all its people. So, this is the approach that we'll be taking to support the units to be able to continue and follow up on the work that came out of the Senate.

AVERY AUGUST: I just wanted to just briefly say that there's also a lot going on within the staff realm, including a number of committees that were chaired by Dean Archer in engineering and Vice President Mary Opperman that have proposed a number of different recommendations for staff. I don't have enough time to go through that, but we're also doing quite a bit there on the staff as well.

Next slide. And finally, you know about the Public Safety Advisory Committee that's advising the Cornell Police. President Pollack has also received recommendations from that committee, and I encourage you to look at her letter to the community a few weeks ago on her response to the work of that committee.

So again, a lot of work happening on all of these fronts, and you will continue to hear more on these initiatives as we make progress.

Next slide. So, with that, thank you for your attention. And we're always happy, of course, to take questions. You can email us at pade.cornell.edu. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Is Nancy here in person? So, choose a microphone. Nancy is a Senior Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education. And she will talk on the new department.

NANCY WELLS: Great. Thanks for having me here. So, I'm here to announce that we'll be starting a new department called the Department of Human Centered Design. And it will begin on November 1st of this year. This represents a merging of two departments, which are both about 10-12 faculty members. So, two fairly small departments. And Yasser Gowayed will be the department chair. He's been the department chair for Fiber Science and Apparel Design for several years, and actually is the chair of Design and Environmental Analysis right now for a few months.

NANCY WELLS: They can hardly hear me? Is that better? I will squat a little bit. So, just to clarify that all majors, faculty -- oh, thanks -- programs and staff currently in these two departments will

remain. So, our sort of mantra, nothing is going away. And then over time, we anticipate that new programs and new innovations may likely emerge.

Next slide. So, that's the what. And now, I'll say a little bit about the why. So, the reason for this merger of the two departments is to really capitalize on the synergies and commonalities that exist between these two units. So, those include themes like health and design, technology and design, and sustainability. It's meant as an effort to foster further collaboration between these groups. And also, to support things like equipment needs and space needs. Sort of use our space more efficiently. And to ultimately elevate the prominence of these design departments and the various activities, both here on the campus, and more broadly. And to facilitate collaboration in New York City, on campus, and also industry collaboration. So, the general theme is kind of elevating the prominence and capacity of these already excellent departments.

And the next slide. Just a note on the how, the sort of process that has brought us here. So, a year ago, Dean Rachel Dunifon called on these departments to explore the possibility of a merger. And that effort was led by Keith Green, a senior faculty member in DEA, and Margaret Frey, a senior faculty member in Fiber Science and Apparel Design. The committee met over several months with faculty members in both departments. They considered names and various themes moving forward, and ultimately provided Dean Dunifon with a report of their findings. The departments voted. And then ultimately, based on the report, Dean Dunifon recommended the new department and proposed to launch it on November 1st.

Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're going to move on to the first of -- first two of several resolutions. The first two are going to be handled simultaneously by Dean Alex Colvin from ILR. Is Alex here or in Zoomland?

ALEX COLVIN: I'm in the Zoomland.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, you've got 10 minutes to explain the titles.

ALEX COLVIN: Great. Thanks very much. I'm Alex Colvin, Dean of the ILR School, and we have two resolutions that we're putting forward to the Senate regarding the adoption of the titles of Professor of Practice and Research Professor. These are resolutions that are based on the enabling legislation passed by the Faculty Senate allowing colleges to adopt these two titles. These have been under discussion at ILR for an extended period. We actually have had about a dozen faculty meetings over the years where these issues have been discussed. As many of you know, the other colleges have adopted the Professor of Practice title already, and our counterparts in the other contract or statutory colleges have adopted the Research Professor title.

And so, part of the motivation for ILR was to move in line with the other colleges in terms of the title usage so that we'd be in line with that, and also with our peers at other institutions that have also adopted these titles.

For us, there was particular reasons around each of the specific titles that made this pressing. So, for the Professor of Practice title, this has come up as an issue for us in attempts to recruit distinguished practitioners.

A very specific example that I dealt with was the former head of a major federal agency in our field, the National Labor Relations board, who was interested in a non-tenure track teaching position. And we had difficulty recruiting him because of our inability to offer the Professor of the Practice title that he was seeking, and ultimately, he went to another institution. Probably for that and other reasons. But he did specifically seek that, and that is something that we have encountered.

The other title, the Research Professor title, is of particular interest to us, in addition to the general rationale that other units have adopted this title, and we wanted to be in conformance with that. Because we do have a large number of centers and institutes at ILR that conduct the large majority of our external grant-funded work, much of this activity is conducted by non-tenure track RTE faculty. So, they're very important to our school. Some of the very -- strongest researchers amongst that group are ones for whom this title would be appropriate, and we think this would aid with our retention of those individuals, and also help with recruitment of them.

And so, we want to be responsive to those RTE faculty individuals who I think reasonably have said to us that they would like to be eligible for these titles that are available within other colleges at Cornell that we currently do not have.

On the website which presents the two resolutions, [indiscernible] on those links to the detailed proposals that describe our implementation proposal. They're modeled off the other -- the ones at the other colleges. I highlight the one particular issue that varies across colleges of the proportion of individuals in these two titles relative to the tenure track faculty. We, in our proposals, put a relatively tight limit on them. So, it would be 10% of the size of the tenure track and tenured faculty in the combined -- across these two titles combined. So, our combined number for Professors of Practice and Research Professors could not be more than 10% of the tenure track and tenured faculty. And that was an important consideration for us.

There was, you know, some opposition within the school to use of these titles. Some of it was around concerns about dilution of the professorial title, and too much hiring into RTE titles versus tenure and tenure track titles. And so, that's part of the rationale for a relatively tight limitation on this.

My anticipation as dean, that would not do large amounts of hiring in these areas, I'm very comfortable with that 10% limit, but it would allow strategic use of that for individuals who are

appropriately qualified, both strategically for the Research Professor title to strengthen our [indiscernible] institutes. And then for the Professor of Practice title, to do that strategic recruiting for very distinguished individuals in our field who we'd -- have encountered in our recruitment efforts.

We've conducted a vote on both of these titles, and that's reported in the submission letters that are also on the website. So, for the Professor of the Practice title, we conducted a vote of the tenured and tenure track faculty. 32 were in favor of the adoption of the Professor of the Practice title, 10 voted no, and 1 abstained. So, that's over the two-thirds majority of that group required for approval.

For the non-tenure track faculty, we decided to allow our senior lecturers to vote on the basis they were the closest group of non-tenure track faculty to the title. Of those, four voted yes, one voted no. That's a gain over the two-third majority required.

For the Research Professor title, we had a separate vote of that. The tenured and tenure track faculty, 31 voted yes, 9 no, and 3 abstentions. Again, over the two-thirds majority. For the non-tenured faculty, we allowed our senior research associates to vote on that title on the basis that they are the RTE faculty group closest to the proposed title. We haven't historically used the research scientists or other related titles, so that was the closest group and we thought it appropriate to allow them voice, and they voted three in favor, yes, and zero no.

So, both proposals were approved by our faculty, both the tenured and tenure track faculty, and the relevant non-tenure track faculty groups. And with the required majorities for the vote. So, based on being in conformance with the requirements and the support of the faculty that's voting, we're requesting the Faculty Senate approve these two resolutions for the adoption of the Professor of Practice and Research Professor titles. And I'd be happy to answer any questions about our two proposed resolutions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: In Zoomland, please use the hands up function through the participants tab. If you're in person, please work your way down to one of the microphones to queue up. And I will call on a Zoom person first if I see any hands up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mark Lewis raised his hand. I don't think he's --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I don't think I'm seeing it here.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, Mark Lewis, go ahead. You have two minutes.

MARK LEWIS: I think I need about 20 seconds. But thank you. So, hi, Alex. My question is about the two titles, and if you had any thoughts about restricting that they can only be at 100%? The reason I'm asking is because of one of the big issues that we had was that [indiscernible] 50% Research Professor title and a 50%, let's say, Senior Lecturer or Professor of Practice title, and thereby creating a [indiscernible] line without the tenure, but with the same duties. That's my question. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, feel free to answer it, Dean Colvin.

ALEX COLVIN: Sure. So, this was a -- something that was certainly discussed amongst our faculty, and there's language in the proposals addressing the idea that there should be substantial commitment for us. The concern was a point -- in individuals with insufficient kind of degree of commitment to be appropriate for a professorial title. And so, we have language in there about that.

We also have language specifically about the nature of the duties to distinguish it from the tenured -- dues the tenured faculty indicating, again, the clear -- focus the Professor of Practice on the teaching duties, and the secondary nature of any other kind of activities. And then Research Professor as well clarifying of the duties. So, that should be addressed by those in the proposals.

MARK LEWIS: Am I allowed to ask another -- the same question, Alex, but I don't think you answered my question. It's about percentage appointments. So, I can -- at 100%, be it 50% Professor of

Practice, 50% Research Professor, and thereby at 100%, be creating teaching and research [indiscernible]. Do you understand now?

ALEX COLVIN: Yeah. Sorry, now I understand. Sorry. Sorry. My apologies on that. We didn't contemplate somebody in -- the possibility of somebody being in that. And I think the way that we framed it in the proposals would make that inconsistent with the two proposals, because each of them specifies the nature of the individual duties, and they would be contradictory essentially if we were to try to do an appointment that way.

I mean, it's a good point, and I could ask our personnel committee for implementing details, perhaps, at the college to clarify that. But I would interpret our proposal as being inconsistent with that.

MARK LEWIS: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I'm not seeing any hands up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jonathan, Lars has his hand up.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. So, I need to get my glasses. Lars, go ahead.

LARS: Yeah. I just wanted to point Mark to that [indiscernible] for one, I'm actually one of the senior research associates within ILR. The legislation that was proposed actually talks about the individuals being appointed not having responsibilities that cross those boundaries. So, a Research Professor, the individual, would not have any teaching routine, teaching capabilities. That's not exactly the point that you're referencing, but it gets to it in spirit, which I think was the idea there.

But I agree with Alex that we might want to clarify that as necessary, if the Senate thinks it's important.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. If there are no more comments from Zoomland or in person, I think we can move on to the next resolution on a proposed IDDP, which is International Dual Degree Program, I had to look that up, approval process. So, Neema Kudva, five minutes.

NEEMA KUDVA: [indiscernible] -- move slides?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yep.

NEEMA KUDVA: So, thank you, Jonathan. Should I say Speaker Ochshorn? Okay. So, yeah. So, this is the resolution on a proposed International Dual Degree Program. And I'm just going to give a brief background. Thank you for that slide change. And what I'm going to do is, to just sort of remind us that this first came to the Senate in February, on February 10th, when we were informed by then Dean of Faculty Charlie Van Loan that this -- that the proposal for a joint degree program between the Hotel School and Peking University was going to be coming to us.

On February 24th was when Associate Dean Alex Susskind presented the proposal. And as we know, there was a lot of debate around it. And then a special Senate meeting was convened where we had a faculty -- a panel of faculty who are experts on the areas, on the region, came in and spoke with us about the kinds of challenges that we need to really think through as we consider this resolution.

So, the Senate met on March 10th, on the 17th, and on March 31st. And at each point, there were discussions, there was deliberations, there was presentations, and we took up several questions. There were two resolutions presented to the Senate on March 31st, Resolution 160 and Resolution 161.

Resolution 160 is what the current resolution that I am presenting here on behalf of the University Faculty Committee. That's the resolution that the current resolution really builds on. And so, we -- you have the resolution right there, and it calls for an immediate revision of the vetting and approval process for international dual degree programs, including greater transparency about the

details, the context, active consultation, with the Senate, and compliance with the guidelines on Ethical International Engagement.

And so, these charges were taken up by the Dean of Faculty's office, and we worked in the Dean of Faculty's office to really think through an organizational process that would operationalize these charges. And in -- how was that done? The summary and the background materials are all available on the website, the Dean of Faculty website, that you can look at in greater detail.

I will provide a very brief summary here. We took the feedback from the Senate deliberations on all those meetings that I had mentioned earlier, the four meetings, we took the deliberations that led to Resolution 160 and the vote, we took this -- we went to the provost's office and had several discussions to understand how the process worked. There were discussions also with the UFC and various members and actors involved in the process.

And so, the university policies that really came into play are these three. Article 13 Section 2, and Article 14 Section 2, which really kind of go into the question of how we think through what -- which dual degree programs, which academic programs, are under the purview of which -- you know, of the Senate, the academic leadership, and so on, and how those responsibilities are shared.

We also took up the university's core value statement, and two points in particular in the core value statement. One was on free and open inquiry and expression, and then the other one was on changing lives through public engagement. And what that means for us as Cornell faculty when we're designing new programs.

And the third piece that was taken into account was the university's statement on academic freedom. So, taking these three questions into account, and all those deliberations that I mentioned in terms of supporting work, we work -- we tried -- we attempted to operationalize, like I said, the organizational process for the -- for IDDPs to be vetted.

So, what were the important distinctions made? In this proposed resolution, the first was that we looked very seriously at the very -- the process itself. Right? And laid out -- laid out the process from which you -- from the directly affected unit that initially creates the proposal; the proposing unit, which is the college or school; the UF -- and then, you know, the whole process. Right? From there it goes to the Senate; the UFC; the committee in the Senate is CAPP, the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies; and so on.

I'm going to just walk us through each of those squares, so we understand what's at stake and the work that was done. So, when a directly affected unit puts a program together, they have to do something called the Academic Program Registration Form. In the university, that sits within IRP and the graduate school, depending on whether you're proposing an undergraduate program or a graduate program. IRP is the institution for -- our Institutional Research and Planning board.

And so, we took the Dean of Faculty office, really worked with people in IRP and the graduate school, to take the concerns that were raised by the Senate and to work them back into this form and registration process. Five questions were raised in the Senate, which were taken to these two bodies, and implemented and incorporated into the process. You will see the five questions laid out on the website very briefly. The form now requires consultation with faculty who have expertise in understanding the region. The form now requires the applicant to show consistency with Cornell's core values, what I spoke about earlier. The form now requires applicants to provide a history of collaboration with the units that they're interested in collaborating with. The form now requires how the collaboration is going to be monitored. And the form requires that the unit faculty be polled by referendum.

Just like Dean Colvin talked to us about the vote that took place in ILR to approve the two sort of titles. Similarly, if an IDDP is to come before us, there has to be a vote, and it had to be tallied. Both how many people voted, how many didn't vote, how many abstained.

So, this entire registration form goes to IRP, goes to the grad -- all the grad school or, you know, both. And then along with the Dean's Letter which lays out the entire summary, the pros, the cons, the discussion, the dossier goes to the Dean of Faculty. The Dean of Faculty then sends it to CAPP, which is our committee that looks at all policies and programs.

The committee works -- we have a new chair for the committee now, Mark Milstein () from JCB, and the committee is appointed by the Dean of Faculty's office. And they have terms, and you can see all of that up -- like every one of the 12 committees of the Senate, the CAPP is appointed by the Dean of Faculty's office through the Nominations and Elections Committee, which is one of the elected committees of the Senate.

So, CAPP then makes a recommendation on whether the -- whether we should approve or not approve. CAPP can also ask for the proposal to come to the floor of the Senate. That's an option that CAPP always has. Every committee of the Senate has that option of bringing an issue to the floor of the Senate.

Once we have -- you know, once we've talked through that -- those issues, we -- then the proposal go -- and we have voted on it, the proposal goes to the International Council.

Wendy Wolford, the Vice Provost for International Affairs, is here with us today. There was a recommendation in the original resolution that the chair of CAPP sit on the International Council. And this was -- there was some debate around this issue. And so, this had become a little bit of a sticking point. But over the summer, this was worked out, and the vice -- the Provost's Office now has agreed and, you know, wants to move forward with having the chair of CAPP really move into and sit on the

International Council. So, you see the whole process right there. From the International Council, it goes to the provost, and from the provost to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

So, this was what we were suggesting. And over the summer we've reached the point where, you know, every one of our -- every piece of the proposal was accepted. So, I think I'd like -- was Wendy in there? Yeah, Wendy's right there, right? So, maybe if Wendy Wolford, the vice provost, can talk to us a little bit about that piece of it, that would be great. And then we can come back for a discussion. Thank you.

WENDY WOLFORD: [indiscernible] thanks a lot, Neema. Hi, everyone. So, I'll just say that from the provost's office, from the vice provost's office, the discussion that we had in the Faculty Senate, and then the conversations after that were all really helpful, and they did point to the need for more oversight of this process. So, as Neema said, we did accept and implement the changes to the process so that the process now includes the International Council, as you can see. The chair of CAPP is an ex officio member of the International Council. And that was only a very minor sticking out. It was just on the sort of logistics of that.

And the proposing unit, or the directly affected unit, the DAU, in this case they're usually the department, right, or the graduate field, that unit now needs to answer these questions from the ethical guidelines that do go into the depth of the background, and the way in which the degree will meet the ethical guidelines, but also how those would be monitored, and what the process would be for addressing any gaps or an exit strategy for the program.

So, you can see here, I've just -- basically, I've put in our process for the whole approval. Right? Starting, of course, with the department faculty, and usually a fair bit, of course, of back and forth between department faculty, college faculty, and leadership. The graduate committee or the vice

provost for undergraduate education. And then CAPP. CAPP decides whether to take that to the full Faculty Senate, the International Council, and the provost.

There's an additional step, of course, which is just the official registration of the degree, and that usually also involves a fair bit of back and forth. And then the Board of Trustees.

So again, thank you for the input.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We now have some time for discussion. We'll start with Zoom people, and if anyone wants to speak from the room, please walk up to the mike and queue up. And I look for your hands up on the participant.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jonathan, David Lee has his hand up.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: David Lee, I see.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: David, you're -- unmute yourself and go ahead.

DAVID LEE: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. I would like to -- I'm a member of the UFC. I would like to move that we withdraw this resolution in light of everything we've just heard from both Neema and Wendy.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. There's a motion to withdraw, which is an appropriate motion. If someone from the floor wants to speak, there's no debate on a motion to withdraw. It's -- if there's a point of order or a point of information, please come to the microphone so everyone can hear you. Those would be -- that would be appropriate.

RICHARD BENDEL: I second the motion.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Well, yeah. I was going to get to that. I want to outline the approach for this kind of a motion. Again, there's no debate. The path of least resistance for withdrawing a motion

is to ask for unanimous consent. What that means is, when I ask it, if there's any objection from any Senator, then we have to go to a vote. But it's worth asking the question.

So, right now I'm going to ask for unanimous consent on the motion to withdraw this resolution. And if you are in person and object, raise your hand. If you're in Zoomland and object, please raise your hand electronically.

And if I don't see any within -- I mean, I don't want to rush this through, because I know these parliamentary procedures can be confusing, but if I don't see any objections, then the motion passes without a vote. I'm not seeing any objections. We'll just say that the motion is approved and move on to the next agenda item.

This is our last resolution, resolution four, and it will be presented by Richard Bense, who I believe is here somewhere. Please come up. And you can turn that around to face the audience if you --

RICHARD BENSE: Yeah. [indiscernible]. So, that's the camera?

Cornell is not and should not be a mercenary corporation, and yet, that is what this university is becoming. We see this transformation in several ways. Last spring, as was alluded to but not discussed in depth, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for the School of Hotel Administration cited the sizable profits for Cornell as a major reason for the creation of a dual degree program between the Hotel School and Peking University. Noting the absence of academic and intellectual freedom within China and within Peking University, along with the horrific violations of human rights in [indiscernible], the Faculty Senate rejected that proposal.

In the process of gathering information on this and other programs that Cornell has created, we discovered that the Hotel School was also a party to a commercial agreement, that's university's words, commercial agreement with the Marriott Corporation in which the Hotel School provides instruction and

grants a Cornell certificate to students trained in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia at the Ritz Carlton Hotel. Saudi Arabia, of course, is like China, another very repressive society and state.

As part of that commercial agreement, the Hotel School also put out, as we distributed last spring, a publication boosting investment in Saudi real estate. The office of the vice provost for International Affairs states that it is not able to provide information on how many such commercial agreements there are, or where they are located. The office did say that there are many types of commercial activities at the university, and our office is responsible for tracking, reporting only a small sliver of them.

In short, there could be an immense archipelago of commercial agreements involving corporations and Cornell instruction, of which we are not aware. And that is not all.

On March 17, 2021, again, something alluded to in the prior discussions, the vice provost for International Affairs made a detailed presentation of Central Administration policy with respect to international collaborations. This presentation was part of the Central Administration's attempt to head off Faculty Senate rejection of the Hotel School-Peking University proposal. What she did not tell us was that the university had already created several dual degree programs that had never come before the Faculty Senate. Two of these involved the Hotel School. One of them is in Singapore, Nanyang Technological University. Another is a partnership in dual -- and this is a quote, "in dual MBA and Master of Management in Hospitality with the China Europe International Business School."

This seems to be more than a problem in transparency. Whatever the motive behind these failures to recognize Faculty Senate rights and responsibilities over education policy, we need to strengthen the process through which such programs come before our body.

That means, in the first instance, strengthening the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, that would be CAPPs, so that it becomes a necessary step in the consideration of dual degree

programs. CAPPs is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, and is well equipped to review such programs before they are considered by the Faculty Senate, so that -- one of our differences between our proposal and the one that was just withdrawn, is to put CAPPs just before the Faculty Senate.

And it also means, in the second instance, that the Faculty Senate should be the next step in the process where all the materials that are available are given to us, delivered to us, for debate and discussion. That means moving, in this diagram, International Council, which is really an administration committee, that's the reason there was a debate over putting the chair of CAPPs in it or not, moving the International Council to before the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies.

So, the process of deliberation and discussion would then come to the Faculty Senate with everything in hand.

Part of the motivation for our proposal is that the process -- and this was admitted in the first presentation -- is that the process as it stands now clearly does not work. Another part of the motivation for our proposal is that the quality of Cornell education policy is the fundamental responsibility of the faculty. We believe that the creation of programs with foreign institutions in repressive societies that do not respect academic freedom, intellectual integrity, and human rights is fundamentally inconsistent with our Cornell education.

Unlike the Central Administration, we neither have a staff -- I'm speaking now for the [indiscernible] who sponsored this resolution. I should say also that the AAUP chapter, Cornell AAUP chapter, has endorsed it. Unlike the Central Administration, we neither have a staff to support our participation in President Pollack's shared governance, nor do we have the ability to manipulate the Senate agenda, as will be demonstrated in the provost comments that will soon follow this.

All we can do, all we can do, is take a stand for what we believe to be correct, to fulfill our responsibilities as faculty for the safety, education of our students. In this case, that stand means

reclaiming the -- a reclaiming of long-standing Senate authority over the conditions and institutions through which we are asked to teach our students.

Cornell is not and should not be a mercenary corporation. If you have questions -- usually presenters, in the past, have had the right and ability to recognize people for questions and so forth. We've changed that in a way that disables presenters. But if you do have questions or comments and you want to direct them to me, just mention my name. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And there will be a comment discussion period after we do have a response from the provost and deputy provost from Zoomland. I'm not sure who's speaking first, but just unmute yourself and begin, John or Mike.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: John?

JOHN: I'm sorry, Mike. Good afternoon, everybody. I've been asked to just give a brief perspective. There's a lot of conversation about Article 13 that's been invoked in the context of this resolution. The provost wants to speak more broadly to it, but I wanted to give a brief overview of Article 13, because it is a complicated thing, and it's often, I think, cited without full understanding.

So, Article 13 is from the Trustee Bylaws. The bylaws define how the trustees have delegated various oversight authority to individuals and groups. That includes the president, the provost, the deans, the department chairs, and the faculty of the university, and the faculty of the schools and colleges. This is sometimes misunderstood in Senate conversations as defining the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the university administration.

But actually, what Article 13 is, is it's primarily a critical coordinating mechanism that defines the respective spheres of responsibility between two groups of faculty. That's the university faculty as a

whole, which is discussed in Article 13, and the faculty at the individual colleges and schools, which is discussed in Article 14.

Article 13, let me just read the pertinent part of this to this resolution. It says, "the functions of the university faculty shall be to consider questions of general educational policy or questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school, or separate academic unit, or are of general in nature." So, the actual language of this matters.

And I just want to note a few key things. First is the use of the word consider. "Consider questions of educational policy." Consider means simply consider. It doesn't mean approve, administer, veto, manage, and so forth. As Charlie Van Loan would say repeatedly, the Senate's role is advisory. It's not regulatory. The Senate is a key prime source of faculty wisdom, advice, input, but it's not set up as an operational authority meant to manage the academic enterprise.

The second key bit of language is the -- is "questions of educational policy." And this is really very important language, but it's often skipped over in reference to the third chunk of text, which says "which concern more than one college, school, or academic unit." If you focus just on this last clause, then almost anything the university does can be viewed as within the delegated scope of responsibility of the Senate. Indeed, you know, one joke that a former dean said is that what -- if under that view, anything that happens in any office [indiscernible] at any time is within that definition.

So, this language of one school -- one college, school, or academic unit only makes sense in the context of what questions of educational policy are. What does that term mean? Well, [indiscernible] policy means exactly what it says. It's a policy, which a set of rules or practices, that governs our educational efforts.

The Senate itself defines it as such. You can see this in the language of the Educational Policy Committee, which states the Educational Policy Committee that's -- exactly trustee language, is

concerned with general educational policies that relate to instruction, involve more than one college, school, or separate academic unit. Issues include grades and grading policy, preliminary and final examination policy, university-wide academic requirements, the academic calendar, class schedule, and hours of instruction. So, those are examples of what educational policy is. And those are matters for the Faculty Senate in terms of its spear of responsibility.

Article 14 reinforces this by talking about the spears of responsibility of the colleges and schools. And so, it tracks exactly the same language. It says, "subject to the authority of the university faculty in all matters affecting general educational policy." That's a reference to Article 13. "It shall be the duty of each school and college." And then it lists the responsibilities of the schools and colleges, as opposed to the university faculty. It talks about faculty in their role in terms of the schools and colleges, and that's a long list of things including the responsibility to prescribe and define courses of study and a [indiscernible] to exercise jurisdiction over the academic interests of students in all other educational matters in a particular school [indiscernible].

So, Article 13 and Article 14 are read in conjunction, is really dividing authority over educational policy. And this makes complete sense because you do need a coordinating mechanism, that's Article 13, because you don't want schools and colleges adopting policies that impact each other in a problematic way. So, example, if Arts and Sciences had an ABC scale, and Engineering had a 0-100 grading scale, that would be problematic. So, it's primarily a very important coordinating mechanism, but it's also important to remember that Article 14 is trying to maintain the fundamental independence of school and college faculty to determine how to educate their students. So, all of this is a jurisdictional perspective. It's kind of technical.

This doesn't mean that the Senate can't do much more. The rest of Article 13 does encourage the Senate to consider matters of general importance. These are matters up here. This is what Charlie

Van Loan always encouraged the Senate to do, to think about the big, big issues facing higher education and provide advice and insight. But this is a technical sort of explanation of how those two articles work together.

I'll turn it back to you, Provost.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Thanks. Thanks, John. I'll be brief. And thanks everybody for giving us the opportunity to respond to this resolution. John's outlined the way that -- the ways that Article 13 and Article 14 describe faculty responsibilities with respect to, on the one hand, general educational policy, versus on the other, the responsibility for specific degree programs and other non-degree educational offerings.

I just comment that the Senate resolution covers educational outreach programs that have been a hallmark of Cornell, and are one of our -- I consider one of our key differentiators. It covers agreements with external organizations that include our extension programs, our engaged learning programs, our executive education programs, our online certificate programs, our joint master's programs, our online master's programs, our combined research and educational agreements, and continuing professional education.

We also have -- Cornell also has many agreements with educational institutions abroad that include bilateral recognition of credits, student exchanges, dual programs, and mixed research and educational agreements. And the resolution is really breathtaking in its scope because it covers all of these things. In aggregate, these comprise hundreds of individual agreements and contracts for programs that do enormous good, and are fundamental to Cornell's local and global impact.

All of our colleges and schools mount programs of this kind, and they do this through a process that involves faculty governance within each of the schools and colleges. So, the division of responsibilities between the Faculty Senate and the college faculty, between on the one hand, Articles

13, and on the other, Article 14, is important in maintaining the ability of our faculty to innovate, and also to exercise their academic freedom.

So, finally, I just point out that I think it's very important that resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate are consistent with the university bylaws, as well as our long-standing customs and culture.

Thanks very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We now have some time for discussion. I'll start with the Zoom. If you raise your hands on Zoom. If you're in the audience, come up to the microphone and queue up. And I'm looking as hard as I can and so far, I don't see any. So, I'll wait for a few seconds to see if anybody wants to raise their hands. Okay. Not seeing anyone on Zoom.

Introduce yourself and go right ahead.

KATHRYN CAGGIANO: Hi, thank you. My name's Kathryn Caggiano. I am an RTE senator representing College of Engineering. I just had a -- perhaps a question, clarifying question, regarding this proposal. And that is picking up on -- sorry, can you hear me okay?

Picking up on something that I think the provost mentioned. This policy and process is intended to apply to all dual degree programs. Much of the language in this, and much of the process, seems to really be focused on those dual degree programs that are within international institutions, international corporations. And, well, I realize that that is where many of the newer programs are coming from, and that's where the thrust is.

This does seem to be a structure that is not necessarily well suited to dual degree programs that are wholly domestic, unless we wanted to certainly make sure that we evaluate our own selves in terms of the repression of dissent, violation human rights, and chivalry generally, as far as the U.S. is concerned as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I have the Zoom hands up from David Lee, and then we'll go back to the room. So, unmute yourself, David Lee.

DAVID LEE: Yes. Thank you. I find myself in agreement with some of the sentiments that Richard articulated. But I also find myself in agreement with the provost about the administrative complexity of what I think, if we read this motion literally, is involved.

Article 13, section 2b of the bylaws, just quoting, "all arrangements in which course credits and by -- are by agreement, accepted by Cornell." So, as I read that literally, it would include the -- all the programs of the Office of Global Learning, and the colleges, the Study Abroad programs, of which there are 82. I think a year ago there were about twice that, but I know that the vice-provost has been whittling that down. But still, 82.

There are nearly -- consulting the university website, there are nearly 600 incoming transfer students each year at Cornell. That would also be -- they would also be included if -- I think if we read this literally.

The motion also references sections C and D, which basically include all arrangements, and this is basically, I think, the argument the provost was making, all arrangements in which Cornell provides course instruction including certificates with basically everyone, or all entities or bodies. So, academic bodies, corporations, government, non-profits, et cetera.

And again, just checking the website, eCornell has 145 certificate programs. So, without getting into the issue of, you know, the corporate issues or noncorporate issues or whatever, I just don't see that this is -- the motion is administratively manageable. It just seems like an administrative nightmare if we take this literally. And I don't know where we stop.

Again, going back to last year, we all know what motivated this whole discussion, and I think there was very widespread sentiment on the part of the faculty in favor of Resolution 160. But I think this, as I read it, goes way, way too far in -- and is so all encompassing, it's just not -- it's just not workable. So, I really take exception to this just from the -- just from a purely administrative standpoint. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. We're going to make a little exception and let Professor Bensel respond for two minutes in person, and then go back to Zoom for Ken Birman (). Two minutes, please.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yeah. Is this on? The jurisdiction issue is an important one. Up to now, of course, we have had too little, too few joint degree programs. Have their programs come before the Faculty Senate? That has been the desire, the purpose, the design of the provost and the vice provost for International Affairs. We did design this so it was broader, and there will be a lot of programs, some of them coming out of the woodwork from years ago, that should have come before the Faculty Senate.

I think the jurisdictional issue is a red herring. The real issue is the transparency, legitimacy, honest, and integrity the Central Administration in honoring and respecting the rights and the responsibilities of the Faculty Senate for education policy.

The domestic versus international, yeah, we were -- last spring we were dealing with international policy. How this would apply to domestic policies? Eh, I don't know. I mean, that would be something that CAPPs would work out. One of the reasons for putting -- oh, wait. The diagram's gone. But putting CAPPs centrally, just before the Faculty Senate, is that these kinds of issues would be raised by CAPPs and decided, deliberated in the Faculty Senate. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Professor Birman, unmute yourself.

KEN BIRMAN: I believe I am unmuted. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah. Good. So, Richard, I want to thank you for an eloquent presentation. You always are eloquent, and this a great deal to agree with you in what you've said. But like David, I'm concerned that you're proposing an unwieldy structure that, as a practical matter, would greatly limit Cornell's ability to engage internationally with other countries and with students from those countries.

And my view is that as a research institution, a prominent international institution, that we depend upon those external engagements, which often do include joint programs that are taught partly at Cornell, and partly abroad, and do award Cornell credit towards part of what might be a dual degree.

And I think it's unworkable to imagine a process in which the Senate is involved in the detailed negotiations that we heard about from the provost and the vice provost. The degree of minutia that arises in arriving at these agreements is huge, and it's not simply a question of pushing it off to them.

And I think that we, in some sense, delegate the responsibilities and the role of negotiating and ultimately bringing these forward to them, and it's inappropriate, in my view, to take the view that the Faculty Senate is -- has the ultimate judgment here.

I think we must have a say, and that it's very important that our faculty and our students be safe and supported by the university and protected when they lecture abroad or engage in joint research, or work with students teaching abroad, not be at risk of some kind of reprisals for what they teach in the course [indiscernible]. But we've heard repeatedly that the university legal structure will back our faculty and protect us if we don't break laws outright.

So, I feel that your motion overreaches, and I'm going to vote against it, but again, I want to say that you speak well, and is a great deal to agree with in your remarks. Maybe less, in my view, in the actual details of the motion.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have a in-person speaker. Introduce yourself please.

ELIZABETH LAMB: So, Elizabeth Lamb for RTE for College of Ag and Life Sciences. This is another question of clarification. In the previous proposal, there was a set of five questions that were added in terms of what information would be gathered in the process of going through this proposal. And I'm not clear whether those five questions are still detailed in this new proposal. And I think that's truly important to gather the information that we need to make the decisions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Richard, do you want to quick response?

RICHARD BENSEL: No, I think Neema did an excellent job in articulating the kinds of questions, the kinds of information, and so forth that we would incorporate in the process that we're proposing. So, I would just take those five questions and most of that and just incorporate it in addendum to what we're proposing. I don't see any problem with that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Abby Cohn, unmute yourself, if you're not still muted, and speak for two minutes.

ABBY COHN: Thank you. So, I have a -- guess a comment and then a procedural question. I want to actually agree with David and Ken, but I want to go actually a bit further in the sense that I think we can all share concern about cases in the past where procedures were not followed, but the procedure in the previous motion and the procedure that Wendy outlined are very different from the prior absence of procedure.

And I think that not only is the current proposal one of overreach, it's one that kind of says well, there was a screwup in the past, so let's overreach now. And I don't think that's the right way to move forward. I think there have been very productive conversations to put in place, a much more substantive process. So, that's my comment.

I guess I'm feeling a little -- you know, I think it's -- I applaud the Senate for trying to do this hybrid, but I also am feeling a little disjointed, and I have to admit to not understanding the basis on which we withdrew the other motion. Was it because Wendy acknowledged that that is already effectively the procedure that has been endorsed?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Neema, Associate Dean, will respond.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. Thank you, Abby. I mean, David can join me, too, because he was the one who presented -- I mean, the motion for withdrawal. But my understanding is that, you know, in the summer, we had worked with Wendy, with the provost's office, and they changed the process. And the provost now has -- the provost's office and the VPIA now has put into place -- has yeah, put into practice what the Senate was suggesting, what the UFC was asking for, in that resolution. And so, yes. The -- that's the basis.

ABBY COHN: So, that procedure --

NEEMA KUDVA: As I understand it.

ABBY COHN: -- and the form and all the rest of it is now --

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. It's all in --

ABBY COHN: -- accepted?

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. I mean, and Wendy and Mike are both on the call, so they can speak up as well. But from what was -- we know that that entire process has been implemented.

ABBY COHN: So, that means if this current motion were voted down, we have the new procedures in place and agreed to and endorsed?

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes.

ABBY COHN: Okay. And that's the basis on which we don't need to vote on them because we've already moved [indiscernible].

NEEMA KUDVA: We've already -- yeah. I mean, Mike and Wendy should just confirm this for everybody, but you know, the process has been put into place. The five questions are included --

ABBY COHN: [indiscernible] we vote -- yeah. So, if we vote against the current motion, we're not going back to not having anything.

NEEMA KUDVA: No. No.

ABBY COHN: We have the collaborative -- the result of the collaborative work over the last many months to reach an agreed upon procedure, and that procedure is what is now in place.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. So, 160 -- so, 160 is in place. 161 is in place, which is actually important because it has -- I think it has the sense of the Senate that you really -- that the Senate must be a part of any vetting process that takes place. That deliberation in the Senate has to be really important. So, 160 is in place. 161 is in place. And then all the other practices that I just outlined, they're all in place already.

And I think I saw Mike or Wendy with the little yellow hand go up. So, they should just speak up.

WENDY WOLFORD: So, I'll jump in and just say, Abby, that yes, I would agree with Neema that we worked on the resolution, and that those components of it have been accepted. I would only maybe qualify that according to former process, there was not a screwup in terms of how previous dual degrees have gone forward. So, every dual degree -- and we only have four -- every dual degree did go through CAPP.

The question that was up in the air, or that wasn't totally clear in the way the process was handled before, was how CAPP might decide to take a dual degree proposal to the full Senate. Right?

So, the question now is for CAPP to decide under what conditions, and how, to bring this to the full Senate for review of the overview of the degree. So, the degree that we talked about, the PKU degree, did go through CAPP and was unanimously approved by CAPP. So, it was a matter of us to sit down and think about, you know, when the -- a degree like that should still go through the full Senate.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We don't have any Good of the Order today, so I'd like to maybe give Richard Bensel the last word in response.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have Laurent Dubreuil also in line. So, why don't you go first, then -

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's been waiting.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And if we do two minutes each, we'll be just in time.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Laurent Dubreuil, faculty senator for Romance Studies. And in small [indiscernible] to some extent. There will necessarily be disagreements about the interpretation of Article 13, certainly on the side of those who think that the Faculty Senate have more voice, or should have more voice, than what is being presented to us repeatedly. However, that doesn't change the fact that if you look at the bylaws, it's true that we recommend. We are not deciding in the last line of order.

So, it's a bit strange to me to see that there is such an insistence coming from the Central Administration about stripping down the very little possibility we have as the faculty to weigh in. And I would like to say since I heard the word inappropriate before for defying these resolution, that I find it's inappropriate to have the Central Administration responding to a resolution that has not been discussed, amended, and voted upon. I would be more interested in having the Central Administration responding to the reservations we put forward, such as the ones we discussed in the last special meeting of the Faculty Senate. On this, I stop. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you.

RICHARD BENDEL: Yes. I want to just note it's not a technical issue to say Neema and Wendy have just suggested that if we vote down the resolution I have proposed, that the Central Administration can declare the policy by fiat. This is wrong. If they want to declare, to design a policy that's an alternative to the one that we have proposed, they bring it before the Faculty Senate. This is just one more effort to disable, to mute, to undermine, destroy the role of the faculty at Cornell University on education policy.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'd just like to make a few announcements before adjourning. You're encouraged to continue this conversation on the Dean of Faculty website, which will be open for the next two weeks. So, you can make your comments there, and all faculty -- and all faculty can read them there.

On behalf of the Dean of Faculty and the Associate Dean, I want to thank everyone for their patience as we worked through some tough technical difficulties with this hybrid method. And since I'm new to this as well, thank you for your patience with the Speaker.

And then finally, just a reminder, there is a reception somewhere out by the College of Human Ecology. I've been told north of Van Rensselaer. And you're all encouraged, both from Zoomland and in person, to walk over there. I'm sure if it was raining, the rain will stop. Meeting is adjourned.