

A Meeting of the
University Faculty Senate
Wednesday, December 10, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER

Professor and Chair Department of Science and Technology Studies and Speaker Bruce Lewenstein: “Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Bruce Lewenstein, Speaker of the Senate. I want to call the meeting to order. I realize as a result of typical Ithaca weather, people may wander in or slide in at various times, but in the interest of keeping things on time, I want to remind people that, as usual, there are no photos or tape recorders allowed during the meeting. Ask everyone to please silence your cell phones, but also your tablets and your computers and anything else that might issue noises during the meeting.

“When we have discussion, please wait for the microphone, and I will indicate who gets the microphone next, and at that time state your name and department. We need that for the minutes. There were no requests for Good and Welfare for the meeting, so I will use that time to allocate it to discussion, as the discussion moves along.

“Agenda for the day, you see we have a couple of large items on the agenda. Because we're guessing there's not a quorum -- doesn't look like we are anywhere close to a quorum. No. Not too close -- the first couple of items, which are consent items, we will simply indicate, but move past them without consent.

“So approval of the [minutes](#). If anybody has any corrections, please let us know, since we still have a last minute to change them. The final approval of the [professor of the practice title](#) in the College of Human Ecology still requires 60 days. That's done. So we will send a vote out for that by e-mail.

“And the [proposal from the graduate school of management](#) to transfer their title of clinical professor to professor of the practice, that will also get sent out for a vote. Next item on the agenda is dean of the faculty, Joe Burns.”

2. [REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF FACULTY](#)

The Irving Porter Church Professor of Engineering and Professor of Astronomy and Dean of the Faculty, Joseph Burns: “Thank you, Bruce, and thank you all for

coming. I appreciate it, under the circumstances of bad weather. I'm going to look to see who signed up, because you must be devoted folk; and therefore, you are eligible for committees and things like that.

(LAUGHTER)

“Okay, so we normally do hugs and stuff like that, but we're going to forego that, because everybody's got wet clothing and everybody knows one another as well. So we have as our gift to you, holiday gift, poinsettias, provided by Hortus Forum, a student-led organization, so it has that Cornell connection. It looks like -- I think we got 50 of them, so if you want to grab a couple on the way out, please do. Otherwise, I don't know what we'll do with them.

“So I can say a few words about the professor of the practice that's been an area of activity for us. As Bruce mentioned, the College of Human Ecology has gone through their procedure; they led the way, and we will now be approving that, presumably by electronic vote. [Subsequent note: This vote will be held for the February meeting]

“JGSM has also wanted to change just the title, so that they will now use professor of the practice, rather than clinical professor, unless a current Clinical Professor in JGSM wants to retain the title of clinical professor. That was posted this morning for comment, and we are going for a 60-day period there.

“The view was of both CAPP and the UFC that that was such a trivial change that basically we are giving an unofficial approval, but we'll wait for the 60 days, just because we don't want to break the law. There are lots of other colleges that are starting to consider professor of the practice; I know that the Engineering College, Arts and Sciences, Architecture and Planning are all doing so, so this is moving along quite rapidly.

“There has been a concern raised or question raised by the Graduate School as to whether or not being a Professor of the Practice allows you then to serve on graduate committees. And the judgment, at least from the UFC and CAPP, is that certainly somebody who's a professor of the practice can be a minor member of the committee, but the preference would be that you petition in order to become a chairman of a graduate committee.

“There's some question about whether the UFC has legislative authority over that or the Graduate Committee of the Graduate School does, and that's to be

discussed. We hope to meet with Barbara Knuth in the near future to discuss that issue.

“One of the other items that came in front of the Senate two months ago, if you remember, was as part of the Good and Welfare, Brian Chabot raised the issue of the flawed rollout, I would say, of Engaged Cornell, and so the UFC and myself and others have been talking to the President and Provost and the Interim Provost about Engaged Cornell and the implications for that. My impression is that they are saying basically that there was maybe overly enthusiastic perhaps rollout, and that there won't be courses required or there won't be necessarily a change in the percentage of faculty who are going to be involved in this.

“That said, there will be, in just eight days, a week from tomorrow, there will be a presentation and information session on how one might partake in funding these initiatives, if you want to do Engaged Cornell.

“The whole issue of the way that this was rolled out and the way the decision was made, for which the President takes full responsibility, raised the issue that maybe the faculty should have a mechanism whereby they are more involved with Alumni Affairs and Development as to setting priorities and so forth.

“And we are now in discussions with Charlie Phlegar, who's the Vice President for Alumni Affairs and Development, on ways to set priorities. And in that regard, I welcome input from the Senators as to what would be a preferred way and how we might go forth, so that we can present the faculty view, when we do meet further with Mr. Phlegar.

“The Educational Policy Committee, chaired by David Delchamps in the back row here, has been quite active over the last month. It's been considering the effects of the new calendar and questions that have been raised about the study period and exactly how we're going to handle some of the changes in the calendar and sort of trying to ward off people who wish to throw out the calendar within six months of its start.

“EPC also have worried a little bit about student resolutions that have come to us, who would like to see us write things about mental health on all syllabi and also to issues about rearranging the study period.

“The last issue on which Educational Policy Committee has been heavily involved is an issue about evening prelims. There's been a growing use of

evening prelims for the faculty and for the students, and it is getting very hard to find times to hold evening prelims without having many conflicts imposed upon your students.

“And so the EPC is starting to gather information as to what might be the best way to address this. It might be to try to expand -- at present, as you know, the present legislation says that you can only hold evening prelims during one period on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The thought is it might expand to two periods or maybe it should expand so that people can hold evening prelims on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday; but there are implications for things like lab courses, for example, that need to be considered in this.

“And there is also the view amongst the EPC members that we probably need to think a little bit about whether or not there should be some sort of regulation of evening prelims, that perhaps they're proliferating in unnecessary ways and putting stress on the students because of that. Is that pretty accurate, David?

“Let me go a little bit further, and then, if Bruce allows me, I will have time for questions. This is the time of year when our office gets lots of questions about is it legal to move my final exam to this time or that. I want to do final exams or have projects due during study week.

“We should do something about having people who give, quote, prelims, but they're really final exams during the week before school. There are a whole host of issues that are being raised, and many of these are rules that are in the Faculty Handbook and should not be violated, but we have very little power over this.

“So I just call upon your good will to follow the rules and to tell your colleagues that they should be following these rules. These were devised largely by the Educational Policy Committee, in order to make this system work better and be fairer for everyone; and to have a few renegades is not a good idea, so I encourage you to follow rules.

If you see, as a couple of people have pointed out to me, if you see violations in the rules, why don't you alert my office? We don't have a bossy authority or anything like that, but we would like to at least be informed of this, so that we can see how many violations are around and what's going on, and try to get a way to make this system work a little bit better.”

Speaker Lewenstein: "We have two questions in line. Are you ready for questions?"

Dean Burns: "I'm finished, except I'm going to say Happy Holidays, so I don't forget it."

Speaker Lewenstein: "So I call first here -- we need a microphone for the minutes."

Professor John Weiss, History Department: "You anticipated what I was going to complain about, Joe, in the matter of giving final exams in the final week of classes. That can have a pretty deleterious effect on somebody who is not giving that exam. And when I had that occur -- must have been about ten years before, and I went to the Dean of the Faculty, and he said hey, work it out yourself with the other faculty members. So in fact, I did.

This particular student ended up taking the exam in a car, as he drove along a trip he had planned, so I would reinforce what you say about not giving the final exams on the last week of classes."

Dean Burns: "Thank you. Our view is also that sometimes these are done quietly, and at least the people who organize their department's operations ought to at least know about them. And if the faculty are not doing that, I'm happy to pass the word along."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Birman."

Professor Kenneth Birman, Computer Science: "When I taught 1200 students during 2013, I would say that our allocation scheme for final exams and evening exams caused typically hundreds, sometimes 400 or 450 conflicts. And of course, the faculty member is forced to innovate. So I kind of resent the implication here that it's a renegade faculty issue. The problem is inept scheduling on the part of the university, and that's what's causing the issue."

Dean Burns: "I don't entirely agree with you. I listen to a lot more complaints than you do."

Professor Birman: "Well, I heard hundreds of complaints."

Dean Burns: "I agree with you that there are scheduling issues and there are issues with the facilities that are available, and I think there are good reasons. I confess that I have certainly violated faculty rules, before I ever became Dean, of course."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Miller."

Professor Richard Miller, Philosophy: "This is about Engaged Cornell. My impression from what you said is that the UFC is accepting what happened as a done deal -- unfortunate -- and procedures with different priorities are the ones that are going to urge on the administration. I think that's wrong.

"I think that Professor Chabot was asking that after the fact we exercise our own initiative to consider Engage Cornell and what we think it should be like and shouldn't be like. I think we can take that initiative in a spirit of improving Cornell's education without asking the permission of the administration, though I hope that they would give it.

"And I think that this is a job, because it's university-wide for deliberation of the senate as a whole, which I hope will be planned. Now, maybe that is in the works. I liked it when it said faculty consideration there, but I wanted to urge that as -- well, what I think is the right response."

Dean Burns: "Maybe I misspoke or didn't say it very well, Dick. What happened is the UFC did talk to these individuals, got a better idea that there was much more faculty involvement in the original proposal, realized that we control what courses get credit, realized that we don't have to do these things; and realized that, if there are funds available and people want to take advantage of these funds to do educationally good things, we endorse that fully, but we want to also sort of stay involved in it. I don't know if that's different from what you are saying."

Professor Miller: "-- -- and discussion, even resolution, because this is such a large university issue, would be heard. I am not sure that this is a good idea, good use of funds, a good set of incentives, because there hasn't been a faculty senate discussion."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you, Dean Burns. Next item on the agenda is Cornell's handling of allegations of sexual violence, and I'm pleased to welcome judicial administrator Mary Beth Grant and Police Chief Kathy Zoner, who I

understand was in Washington this morning and -- oh, yesterday morning. Second senate meeting in two days; I see."

3. CORNELL'S HANDLING OF ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Judicial Administrator Mary Beth Grant: "Yeah, I feel very intimidated by speaking with our star celebrity from D.C., but this is actually great for us. We appreciate the invitation to speak to you all. And what we are going to do, we have 40 minutes allotted, so we want to speak for about 20 minutes, then allow about 20 minutes for questions. So wherever we are at 10 after, we are just going to stop, and the rest of the slides, you can look at, without conversation.

"So here's what we think we are going to cover. First of all, we want to make sure that we let you know what the overview of Cornell's approach is; not just what the aspect is for investigating cases, but what we are doing with prevention and education efforts as well; what the reporting obligations are for faculty members, and it also applies to other types of employees of the university, but since you are faculty; and then resources for respondents and complainants in the process.

"But this is the one thing. If you remember nothing else, remember this web site: Share.cornell.edu. It stands for Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Education, and it's what was created as a one-stop shopping place for everyone to learn about these issues.

"So here's the big picture. I should back up by saying I recognize a number of people in the audience have been working on these issues for many years, as has Chief Zoner, and as have I in our professional roles.

"And do you prefer to be called Chief Zoner or -- we always call each other KZ and MB, so that's what we will use; but KZ has just been in Washington testifying, because there's a lot of federal interest right now about the ways that institutions respond to sexual assault. And I understand that the UVA case is what sort of got the attention of this body, to invite us to come, but we have all been working on these issues a lot longer, so where the types of things we are doing at Cornell are not just in response to the federal government; we are hoping that's the floor and we are shooting for the mountains, not even just the roof. We are really trying to do a lot more.

“Here's some of the things that we are doing. Do you want to talk about CSVP and –“

Police Chief Kathy Zoner: “The Council on Sexual Violence Prevention was put together more recently. So let me talk about the Public Safety Advisory Committee, or the PSAC. And two of your membership are on that Public Safety Advisory Committee. It meets in accordance with law, so the design and makeup of that particular committee is set in law. It was set in law a long time ago. It's no longer valid as a construct.

“The purpose of the meeting is that people of all factions of the university; faculty, staff and students get together, and discuss safety concerns. That group advises my offices on what we could be doing better. We have primarily built around sexual assault, but it has expanded into general safety, and a lot of policy and procedural questions and answers can happen in that committee.

“It is so restrictive in its inclusiveness that the Council on Sexual Violence Prevention was actually created to do what that law intended, which is to get as many voices as we could. So the Public Safety Advisory is two faculty, two staff, and two students. It has to be one-third of each, and each member has to be approved by the faculty -- the staff and students have to be approved by the largest governing student body. So for us, it would be the assemblies. Then the faculty senate has to recommend, but the faculty members are appointed by the president.

“It can't be less than 50% women, and it has to meet at least once a year and has to write a written report to the president. Those are the basic functional guidelines. If you can see where that could be very restrictive, two students -- you have to do it in multiples of three. You have to have the balance on the membership and, quite honestly, that's not the way we work here.

“The Council of Sexual Violence Prevention has not only that mission, but the greater, larger mission of dealing with institutional issues, systemic issues, problem-solving issues on a level that is inclusive of different types of students, different types of faculty, alumni, local police, as well as our offices; a very broad range of people. I think there's a membership of about 40 or so.

“So you can see, the overlap and the members of the Public Safety Advisory Committee are also members for the Council On Sexual Violence Prevention. So while the Public Safety Advisory Committee will keep us in compliance with

laws written, the Council On Sexual Violence Prevention will bring forward the questions, concerns, the workings of the university.

“There are a number of different working groups that are specifically tackling different areas for education, outreach, and research. There's our policy, a number of things, just to look at things and perhaps make recommendations and suggestions to the appropriate bodies.”

Judicial Administrator Grant: “I think that the design of the council having different working groups is allowing more in-depth work, rather than just having all the work done in a meeting of 40 people. The individual work, figuring out what research do we need, how can this be applied in the classroom, how can we improve policies.”

Chief Zoner: “Also, to be clear, the working groups include -- you don't have to be on a council in order to be in the working group. So we have expanded more opportunities for more people who want to be involved, who want to have their voices heard, to be included. And all we need to know is an interest, so that we can help direct somebody towards where they want to make their impact.”

Judicial Administrator Grant: “The revisions to Policy 6.4 were reported quite a bit in the -- well, “The Sun,” also in “The Chronicle,” I think. I don't know what other publications you look at. There's folks in the room that serve on those panels that help decide those cases.

“Policy 6.4 is the policy that governs investigations of sexual harassment, sexual assault and other types of discrimination, and that's been in place for faculty and staff members since the mid-'90s. And we are in our second year now of having it apply for students; but for students, it only applies for sexual assault and sexual harassment.

“The process is different from the process in the campus code of conduct in that everything happens either in small groups or going before panels in writing, rather than having live hearings before a hearing board or a review board. And there are differences that we'll talk about in a minute about lower standard of proof.

“The lower standard of proof was one of the aspects of the federal guidelines that we had to follow, went down to preponderance of the evidence, rather than the higher standard of proof of clear and convincing evidence that's in the code of

conduct. And that's the main reason it was removed from the code of conduct, because folks felt like they wanted to keep the code of conduct the way it was and still be able to address the federal guidance about sexual assault and sexual harassment cases.

"We are in our second year now of using it, so about a year and a half, I would say about a dozen, maybe a little more cases have gone through the entire process. And we are working out the ways that it can be improved, primarily making sure that there's even more transparency, providing -- essentially opening the files to both parties, so they have the opportunity to see all information that is going to be used by the review panel in making their decision, to make sure there are no surprises for the parties and that they have adequate opportunity to make sure their own voices are heard, that the appropriate questions are asked.

"There's no direct/cross-examination, so we provide opportunities for each party to say what questions have we not asked that you want to make sure we ask of the other party. We want to make sure that it's completely a fair process, and yet a non-intimidating process and one that people feel comfortable using.

"The major disadvantage we've discovered about it is that it is a lot longer. It takes a lot more time than going before a hearing board panel. It's not something we anticipated; but in balance, it seems like it's working and we'll continue to improve.

"So one of the things that's different now a little bit is the way that we coordinate the work between our two offices. Couple of slides down, we are going to talk more specifically about the ways that the criminal justice system works compared to the ways that an on-campus administrative investigation works, but that's something that we're continually working at so that we are in support of each other's investigations and work, trying not to duplicate efforts; but at the same time, not taking any actions in either of our worlds that have a negative impact on the other one. So we'll talk more about that in a minute.

"Then the other big part of the big picture is that we are talking more about environmental change. We had a speaker a couple of weeks ago from Yale. As some of you may know, Yale was one of the first institutions to really cause a lot of headlines when they had a report against them, a complaint filed by the office of civil rights, the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights.

“When I spoke with the speaker from Yale to talk about -- she has this concept of moving upstream, where we are not just dealing with the response to the incident or even not just dealing with what to do in the moment and had to make sure you had consent in the moment, but really moving upstream and talking about how can we have a culture of respect of good relationships of romance, I think they even have in their thing, but to really think differently about what sexual encounters should look like in many different facets.

“One of the things that I was amused by, when we were talking about some of the -- I think fraternity men at Yale had this chant that was a disrespectful, sarcastic thing about consent, where they said things like no means yes and yes means anal; clearly indicates they understand what consent is because of the backwards way in which they were saying it.

“And Professor Boyd, who was talking with us, said that that complaint never would have come forward, it never would have been videotaped by the people who saw it, had they already not been doing the culture shift. So I think that's important for us to remember.

“We will have more complaints because of all of the efforts that we are taking, and that's a good thing. We shouldn't be alarmed by the spikes in complaints. It will expose some of the flaws in our community, and that's a good thing, because then we can address it. So I think that's worth sharing. They got themselves in trouble. Good for them.

“Okay, I just wanted to very quickly hit on some of the research. And anybody who's interested, I can send specific sites. I ran out of time today when I was working on this. There are obviously ways that we can all improve our understanding about sexual assaults, where the myths are, where the reality is. And I'm trying to collect more of a body of that work, particularly the research, thinking coming to speak to a group of faculty members where research is your gig; but also, there's a symposium April 28th that's specifically targeting research and faculty members.

“So if you are interested in that, Lynette Chappell-Williams is organizing that; but a couple of key pieces of research that I wanted to make sure you were all aware of, because it's stuff that during my time as J.A. I learned and didn't know, and I was already pretty knowledgeable about this area before I started this job, but always learning.

“So the first thing that we have to know is that there are predators on campus. The Lesak research -- is anyone familiar with David Lesak's work? He's a professor in Massachusetts. He also is the head of a group called One In Six for male survivors of sexual violence, because that's the statistic, that one in six men, by the time they die, will have been assaulted. And he did research about predatory behavior.

“I'm really trying to look at comparing what is happening on campuses and in other situations, other than the research that had been done, like of people who were convicted and were incarcerated, which tends to be a different type of crime, and the research that Lesak did, that was replicated by the Navy, was that about 3% of the male population -- it was only on men and we know there are female perpetrators as well -- about 3% of men have predatory nature and are committing multiple assaults.

“So the good news is 97%, as we would expect, most people are not engaging in this behavior, but the bad news is that the people who are, are doing it over and over again. So it's something we need to be concerned about.

“Just a footnote to that; I think that is useful information as we are doing education outreach prevention work, not so useful when we get to the adjudication process, because we can't assume and profile somebody and assume that the person is a predator because they have been accused of misconduct; but for educational efforts, I think it is very useful.

“Second article that I would encourage folks to look at talks about the issue of when there's a sexual assault, that there's often very clear communication about the wishes of the person that winds up being the complainant, but that there's willful disregard on the part of the respondent. And this goes against the myth that really what we are dealing with is a lot of miscommunication, that people are drunk and don't really quite state their needs well enough.

“There are so many ways, both out loud, oral communication, as well as the nonverbal stuff, to indicate somebody is interested or not interested. And what this study suggests, and there are others as well, that the communication is very clear, but the person who is intent on engaging in the activity ignores that clear communication and figures that it will work out okay; they won't get reported. They don't really see it as that bad; just keep pursuing.

"I got to hurry. Okay. Trauma is often worse in acquaintance rape situations. We think the stranger rapes are going to be worse, but it's also worse because of the loss of trust in acquaintance rapes. There's ongoing trauma, and that is important to know as you get requests for accommodations in classrooms. And we already talked about the symposium. So all right."

Chief Zoner: "So key differences between the criminal justice system and on-campus adjudications. Obviously, there's the philosophical. What impact is each one going to have; people's belief in which system was better or not better. The criminal justice system focuses on state and federal law, as opposed to campus judicial systems, which go towards policy violations or code violations.

"Constitutional protections exist in criminal justice systems. They don't necessarily exist in the campus adjudication systems, but fairness might still exist outside of the constitutional. So it's kind of why the campus adjudications were honed in on as a potentially more impactful way of handling things.

"On the other hand, the burden of proof, and something Mary Beth mentioned earlier, was the burden of proof is much less in campus adjudications. It is much higher in criminal courts. It is actually the lowest burden of proof on campus and the highest burden of proof in criminal court systems.

"So given that juxtaposition, there are problems with the speed in which a campus administrative investigation has to go on -- the target date to get it completed is 60 days, and that's very fast. You all know the criminal justice system doesn't work that fast.

"Sometimes the best way to investigate a criminal case is to hold things confidential and close, because evidence doesn't get destroyed, evidence that you need, evidence that you need to present, evidence that needs to be verified has to be presented gets destroyed over time. So each investigation has the potential to butt up against the other one.

"The faster working of the campus judicial administration could uncover information too quickly for it to be effective in a criminal court system. So then you have a complainant who may see their perpetrator removed from their school system, but never see the justice inside the criminal justice system. So you may end up actually sending that perpetrator off to another school, to another area, to continue to be one of the 3% that Mary Beth talked about earlier.

“Again, just to hone back in on the evidentiary issues, there's also a level of evidence that is much more acceptable in a campus judicial hearing that would be absolutely inadmissible in a criminal justice system and, as Mary Beth also mentioned earlier, that personal cross-examination is not -- it is done by paperwork.

“You kind of fly paper airplanes back and forth with oh, no -- when you are done showing either party the statement, it kind of gets communicated back and forth in writing in the campus judicial hearings, as opposed to actually facing your accuser in the criminal justice system.”

Judicial Administrator: “The cross-examinations also include tough questions by the members of our office, but it takes away the drama of an attorney --”

Chief Zoner: “There's a protective aspect of it that is good in the campus judicial hearing, but it does also create a lag time.”

Judicial Administrator Grant: “We are actually almost finished. The confidentiality stuff, this is a really big issue and new for many people. If a student comes to you and says I need to talk to you confidentiality, you can't promise confidentiality if he or she reveals to you that he or she has been assaulted or somebody is harassing him or her.

“You need to consult with a Title IX coordinator, which is me, Alan Mittman, Anita Brenner or Lynette Chappell-Williams, but feel free to just call me. These other folks can be confidential. So if the student really doesn't want anyone else no know and really wants to take control of to whom they will report and under what conditions they want to go forward, the counseling, the religious people, victims' advocate, LGBT and women's resource and the ombudsman are the places that they can go.

The other thing is even if a student doesn't want to file a formal complaint, we can still collectively work to support them by giving changing in housing, offering no contact orders, sometimes changing classes. It's all case-by-case, but you may get calls sometimes saying let this person take a final in a different room. We don't want them to be in the same room as their perpetrator, or we are moving housing or we need to change sections for people. So we all work that out together.

“And then the resources for each party, you can look at. This is posted online, and just remember the SHARE web site. We didn't do too badly. Thank you for the reminder.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Floor is open for questions. Please wait for the microphone and, as in the past, we will hold to about two minutes per question; and Sam, the parliamentarian, will let you know. We will start here with Mike Fontaine.”

Professor Michael Fontaine, Department of Classics and Associate Dean of the Faculty: “I think this is a very serious issue, and I have asked a couple people before we came in, I understand the burden of proof is different within the university and the state law and the federal law; but as a matter of policy, why do we not automatically refer every complaint of rape automatically to the police? Because otherwise, we are falling a-foul of the law.

“If somebody's accused of rape and is found guilty, that individual should go to jail. If that person is accused of rape, not found guilty, that person should be able to clear his name. Why are we not doing this, even though the government is telling us we should be doing this on our own?”

Chief Zoner: “The rationale presented before, and it has merit, is that we are playing catch-up; that there is a distrust with the law enforcement system to include engagement with officers of the first line, but also with the criminal justice system in general, because of the burden of proof and because you are often in a situation where it is one person's word against another person, that we have systemic issues that need to be hopefully cleaned up in that regard. Nobody knows the answer to that.

“So Title IX's pursuance of justice is in a contained environment of the educational environment, so they are sectioning off a piece of that, where they have authority and control and saying this is how you will manage it, and this is the best way to manage it. So we will see changes, as they come forward.

“Our hope is that we will continue to build trust in our community. And I think with the increase in reporting that we have seen, we are seeing that has a positive impact, and that they can be held simultaneously and one isn't exclusive of the other. The only reason you don't see us up there as a confidential resource is because we are not. We are responsible employees; but when we learn of it, it

goes to the criminal justice system up and until we have someone we can't work with anymore, because they don't want to work with us anymore.

"I think what you are talking about is on the utopian end of the bell curve, but we have seen some movement across that bell curve much more towards the middle. So that's our goal. We are not there yet, and there has to be a safe place for landing for complaints to allow people to continue to move freely through the world before they can get to a place where the justice system actually works for them."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "I was just going to add to that, what we do, though, is every complainant receives in writing information about how to go forward with the criminal complaint, should he or she wish to do so. We certainly encourage that. I had somebody who recently wanted to speak to an IPD officer, have got their phone number, handpicked the one that would be the most gentle and be able to help, and the complainant was in the IPD office the next day. So we really try to support that as much as possible.

"From a complainant's perspective, it's really important in thinking about sort of a trauma-centric approach to all this work. One of the things that's important for people who have been traumatized by a loss of power is to try to give him or her back as much power as possible. So we don't want to be in the position where we are dictating to that person, you have to do this.

"Sometimes, the cases are really fuzzy and really unclear, and they will be put through the ringer in the criminal justice system because of all of the more challenging aspects of it that Chief Zoner already mentioned."

Professor Fontaine: "You kept saying "we," or "there is" a lack of trust in the criminal justice -- who is the we that you mean? We at Cornell, or individuals in our --"

Chief Zoner: "I'm sure there are people at Cornell, absolutely, but I think what you are hearing is, is a global conversation that in many aspects and many people who feel that the system does not work well for them, that there is a case for revision in the systems."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Kessler."

Professor Andre Kessler, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "We just had a faculty field meeting and discussed exactly the issues that was just discussed here, and there was quite a bit confusion about -- and this has to do with your multifaceted approach to it, which I appreciate and is probably good, but it creates a confusion about who to approach if there's a case.

"And so there's two different things. From a student's perspective, it is not clear where to go first, if something happens. And from the faculty's perspective, especially because we have the obligation to report any kind of case that we are aware of, where do we report that to; in particular, if we wanted not to be right out into the open. So to a person that actually can keep it confidential eventually. So I see there's some sort of confusion about where to go first."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "For the faculty, it is much easier to answer than for the students. For a faculty member, you should go to a Title IX coordinator, and that is not confidential in the sense of if the names that you provided us, maybe the person who's accused, we have seen before, we would need to take some action, even if the complainant doesn't want to.

"What would happen, so you know the process, what a complainant can expect, if you come to me and say or call. It doesn't have to be an in-person interview -- and say I just spoke with Jane Doe, who has reported that she was sexually assaulted by Jane Smith, and Miss Smith is a student at CALS, and they are together in CALS, and we need to separate them and how can we give them support.

"And I say, wow, Jane Smith again? She was just in here last week. Then I am going to need to reach out to Jane Doe, even though she's indicated she doesn't want to go forward. So I go ahead and reach out to the person who is the potential complainant, through an e-mail, sort of vague; I understand something bad happened -- and I am intentionally vague, because of it being e-mail -- I want to lend you support. If you want to talk about this more, here's my contact information. I attach a sheet of information. Get in touch with me, if you want to.

"Sometimes I will then contact them again in six weeks, because if that person shows up at a party, doing the same kinds of activities again, complainant can change his or her mind. So usually I do two -- not always, but usually two outreach to the potential complainant.

“But suppose I don't hear anything back from Jane Doe, and a year later, I have another complaint against Jane Smith. Well, then I'm going to reach out to Jane Doe again and say, you know, just checking in. We don't want to force people to talk to us, if they don't want to, but we do want to make sure that they are aware of their resources.

“So your other question was, where does a complainant go? It depends on how sure they are that they want to file a complaint or not. If they are sure they want to file a complaint, they can come to either one of our offices first. And we get them to the other office, if they want to do more. If they are really not sure, I would send them to the victims advocate.”

Chief Zoner: “And you, as faculty, must give it to the Title IX coordinator. So if you are engaged in a conversation, it sounds like -- I think Building a Culture of Respect at Cornell is an excellent job. If you haven't seen the film yet, it goes through role-playing scenarios that I think are really effective in saying how do you have a conversation with someone and not get so much information; knowing that a confidential conversation's coming forward, not getting so much information that you are obligated to then act in a way that might break that confidentiality, but getting enough information, you get them to the right resource.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “Senator in the red blouse.”

Judicial Administrator: “Just to do a shout-out to Professor Bowman, who has really helped us over the years develop our ways of improving.”

Professor Cynthia Bowman, Law School: “As Mary Beth also knows, I and a couple of my colleagues really loudly opposed the revisions to Policy 6.4, largely on grounds that, in my experience, the system we had was working quite well and that there needs to be a certain amount of due process, which is now denied by not having a hearing with rights, such as cross-examination, and the serious problem with the change in the burden of proof.

“And I remember I used to always end those things by saying you are wanting to not be sued, but you are going to get sued, because these students are then going to go to court and say you violated our rights. And I have noticed that there have been suits across the country brought, based on that. And I wonder, has Cornell been sued?”

Judicial Administrator Grant: "Not to my knowledge. I think I would know. There's certainly been threats of suits, but I think you are absolutely right that we are going to get sued by complainants, we are going to get sued by respondents. And the reason is because we are really trying to be fair to everyone, and nobody is ever going to be happy.

"These are not the kinds of situations where people can say, all right, there's some middle ground. It's pretty much a zero-sum game in these kind of situations, compared to other kind of situations.

"I think the other reason we are going to get sued -- and I'm working on this -- we don't have the opportunity to ever enter into agreements in this process, compared to the campus code of conduct process, so most of the cases that we had under the campus code of conduct would be resolved by agreement, partly because both parties were afraid of losing before a board. And now that's not an option. All the cases are going to the panels, and some are supportive of the complainant. Some are supportive of the respondent, so sort of you look at the overall fairness. It's not like the boards are coming down one way or another, but I believe that mediation types of things -- not strictly mediation where you have people in the room and there's an imbalance of power, but if people are able to come to agreement, they are less likely to feel frustrated down the road and they have more control over the outcome, and we are not experiencing that right now. So I'm surprised we haven't been sued on every single case, even if we do everything exactly right."

Unidentified Speaker: "I had a question for -- I know your last name. You both probably know that the Harvard law faculty printed -- had an op ed in "The Boston Globe," signed by many members of the faculty, making the points like Kevin and I were making last year. And I wondered, if you are getting questions, if you are going to Congressional hearings about this, whether all they're concerned with is are you going to just get rid of all of this, or whether there's any concern about due process.

"And I'll tell you, I received a call from the White House about that last week, because the guy in the White House studied with us, people that signed that letter, and they are really concerned about it."

Chief Zoner: "Right. There are definitely conversations about protecting rights, due process. Those are not lost in the conversations. The legislation that I'm aware of that I have been asked to talk about the differences mostly between law

enforcement and on-campus adjudications are more around the campus adjudication process, and in support of OCR's, VAWA, and CASA. All of those are there, but I do hear voices at the table that carry your messages as well; that voice is not eradicated, it is not not being invited to the table in number.

"I will be completely honest, and you can look at the testimony; I think you can see podcasts, I think you can see information in the roundtables as well that while the concerns are complainants have not been getting due process in the criminal justice system, there's still plenty of conversation that respondents will not get due process in the types of adjudication systems that are set forth by OCR right now."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "I will also say that anecdotally, when I was at the last J.A. gathering last summer, a number of people were sharing the stories of being investigated by OCR. And all of us were expressing concern that OCR was so focused on complainants' rights, which they should be, but they were not concerned about the rights of respondents.

"As a group, we are all saying we are sticking to our profession. We know that being balanced and being fair is absolutely important. So we have those internal conversations within our profession, and also within our office.

"And part of the reason we've made some -- I wouldn't say substantial changes, but doing more things in writing, being more transparent with discovery types of stuff are for those reasons; because we don't want respondents to feel like they are being blind-sided. That's not fair either. We want to be sure we are fair to both parties. It is a different process, but I think it's still a fair process. It has a different feel."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Professor Birman."

Professor Birman: "In the spirit of transparency, it seems to me that presentations like this would really benefit, if you could bring us statistics -- and specifically I know that through studies, we have estimates of the frequency of sexual assault. We have an estimate of how often those are reported. If we were shown those kinds of statistics and the frequency of reports and the frequency of campus adjudication.

"And as Mike said -- I tend to agree with him -- the frequency with which things were pursued through the judicial system, the external one, and led to

convictions, I think first of all, we would understand better the degree to which the campus has its hand around this issue, that you could respond to people that feel there's an effort to brush things -- to pressure people into some sort of mediating solution, when that might not be appropriate in many cases."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "I can recite you some statistics, if that's helpful."

Professor Birman: "I think it would be useful to come back periodically with statistics and try to look at a process of improvement over time."

Chief Zoner: "You could look at the annual Clery Report. You all get a notice of it when it comes out. They are about six months behind in their statistics, because those statistics close out December, as opposed to the fiscal year, but we publish them every August. They hold three years' worth of statistics.

"You can look at trends. They track the Clery reportable crimes, which I'm happy to come back and do something on that if you would like; but among that are sexual assaults, so you can see the reports of. You can't see the rest of the things we are talking about the transparency on."

Professor Birman: "I understand they are available to us. I'm suggesting you may bring them to us."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "So between 1990 and 2005, there are about three reported sexual assaults a year to the J.A.'s office. That doesn't mean to Gannett or any other places. Just the J.A.'s office.

"Starting around '07, '08, '09, it went up to about ten. Starting in around 2011, it bounced up a little bit more. By 2011, 2012, it was 23. Last year was 18. So far this year is 20.

"More funding for us, please. And that's just sexual assault; not interpersonal violence, not stalking and not harassment."

Professor Christine Shoemaker, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "So I thought this is a very interesting discussion, but I think that when you talk, you knew what you were talking about, but I'm not sure all of us understood the subtleties. So let me simplify what I think both of you were saying, and you can correct me.

"I think what you were saying; if a woman is attacked, that if she comes and talks to somebody from the university staff, a psychologist or whatever, that she's protected, she's less threatened, and she may in fact be much more likely to be willing to go to the police after that type of counseling; whereas if she's just told that she's supposed to go immediately to the police, she may refuse to do so.

"And I think that's the argument that you guys are making, that you are not trying to prevent women from going to the police; you are trying to protect them emotionally, immediately, but also encouraging them to actually -- now, you were saying some really important things, too, about certain sections of the law and so forth, of the campus code.

"So what part of that do you disagree with? You think they should go immediately to the police? Is that what you are saying?"

Unidentified Speaker: "No, and partly because they won't. If we make people just go to the police, everything is going underground again. I'm not sure, if I had a daughter, I would advise her to go into the criminal justice system here and be cross-examined in a criminal court; however, we are a university, and the campus code is about a code of conduct, how we treat one another.

And I thought we were doing a rather good job adjudicating cases where we needed to separate somebody from this body and to protect the victim of sexual assault by fairly creative class changes, suspension until she's graduated, all kind of things like that.

So they are two separate processes, but also in the course of that -- and I'm sure Mary Beth would agree -- there are sexual predators, yes, but there's also a bunch of young schlemiels, who have gotten totally drunk, never had sex before, haven't got a clue, are 18 years old, and they need to have some kind of due process protection; these cases where both of them are blind drunk, et cetera.

"So Mary Beth and I were trying to address that by getting out the word in "Cornell Sun," et cetera, like at your risk to have sex when you're both drunk, right. So I think there's a role for campus code adjudications, but the way they are right now is they are just sort of slurped into this bureaucratic process, which doesn't have the aspects of the American justice system that I think are essential to assure protection for both parties. Did I make it clear?"

"And I think to your point as well, an 18-year-old coming to campus brings with them their cultural upbringing, their sociology, their ideology around women

and misogyny and respect and civility. And in two hours in orientation, we are going to undo that, right? It is not happening.

“So some of the things that I'm bringing, when I go down and talk in that arena is that's nice that you are targeting college campuses, and there's a place for that; but the real place is in the middle schools, the high schools, it's in our systems that are continually educating our children at a young age to it's okay for me to take a toy from Mary Beth, because boys will be boys.

“And that conversation's still out there. It has lessened, so it is no longer quite as brutal as it used to be, but there are many conversations that are taking that trend as well.”

Speaker Lewenstein: “About one minute left, so Professor Delchamps.”

Professor David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering: “KZ, you extol the virtues of the respected Cornell video. I took the class. I e-mailed Mary Beth about an issue I had with it, and I would just like to bring this up, because it's a faculty thing.

“What are faculty members required to do under certain circumstances? It makes very clear that faculty members are required to report to a Title IX person when someone has told them about an assault, but then it asks the question, are you obliged to report when someone tells you about harassment, which is different from assault.

“Now, assault is not black and white necessarily, but it's much closer to black and white than harassment is. Harassment could be I feel uncomfortable in my lab group, because there's this sexist jerk who's the group leader. Now, if someone says that to me, you know, now I have to report that to Title IX -- I got that question wrong. I said I don't have to report harassment, but I do have to report assault.

“So I think I would strongly advise, suggest, whatever, unless I'm really missing the point here, in the future -- and Mary Beth, you remember our exchange about this? Anyway, what do I have to report, what don't I have to report? I didn't think I had to report harassment. I knew I had to report assault, but now I find out from the video I am supposed to report harassment.”

Judicial Administrator Grant: "You do. And the reason is, in addition to doing individual complaints, we can sometimes do environmental studies, where -- just doing one on an athletic team, we have done some within the Greek system, done some in labs -- there's something that's amiss here, but it is not necessarily an individual. It could be a bigger picture."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Unfortunately, we are out of time, although I know there are other speakers, but we have other items on the agenda."

Judicial Administrator Grant: "I'm happy to wait outside for a few minutes. I saw hands up that we weren't able to address, so I'm happy to carry on the conversation."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Thank you."

Dean Burns: "In preparing today's agenda, we attempted to get several people from the Counsel's office to also come. They had other engagements. There were four invitations, all turned down, but they did say that if there are legal questions that anyone wants addressed, they would be happy to address them. And that came from Nora Salvatore, who handles these cases, and also Nelson Roth.

That's on my notes. We need people on these review panels, because we are getting more business, and we don't want to overburden those who are there. So if you would like to serve or feel obligated to serve, we would like your assistance."

Speaker Lewenstein: "So the last item on our agenda is Yael Levitte from the provost's office to talk about the meeting times issue."

4. SHOULD THE SENATE'S MEETING TIME BE MOVED TO BE MORE FAMILY FRIENDLY

Yael Levitte, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity: So I would like to thank you for inviting me to speak here. How do I change -- it wasn't lost on many of your colleagues, the irony that I was at 5:30 talking about early meeting times, especially since I do have to get kids to swim team in half an hour.

“So I would say that just to give you a context of how we got to even talk with you about that, I was the director of ADVANCE for quite a few years before I came into this position, and I received increasingly more complaints, more from women faculty, but also from men who are in dual career situations, saying that a lot of the departments at Cornell have business meeting after 5-- I'm not talking about colloquia.

“I understand that our lives are complicated in this university, but that the business meeting, where decisions were made were done at 4:30 or after, where our childcare centers close much earlier. And that had impact on who had voice in the business decisions at the university.

“So that increased pressure on my office to go to faculty meetings, to talk to chairs, to just appease various unhappy faculty members; got me to look at the data, and I looked at the data that concerned me. And that is the data I will share with you.

“I shared the data with the deans and the provost at various stages; first two, three years ago. And everybody was in agreement -- I think it was in a chairs meeting -- that something should be done. Some departments have moved since.

“And then last year, a year ago, the provost and deans basically agreed to create a core meeting time for the university for business times. It is not a policy. It is agreement that this is the right thing to do, to increase the voice of individuals who increasingly we hire.

“Twenty years ago, we had about 15% or 20% women. We now have 30% women. So we want their voice to be heard at various junctures of business meetings. So I looked at the faculty work/life survey of 2010. That's a survey that had about at 65% response rate. So not a bad response rate.

“And when we saw that faculty -- there's a question there: “in the past twelve months, how stressful did you find a whole bunch of things.” One of the things was meeting times. And the meeting times, about 48%, nearly half the faculty, men and women, said that meeting times were a source of stress. 10% of them said it was very stressful. And women, of course, were slightly more stressed by the meeting times.

“We found also the sandwich generation, people who not only deal with kids, but also deal with their elderly parents, were even more stressed. 57% of our

faculty, associate professors said that meeting times was stressful. I think 15% of them said it was very stressful.

“And so we looked at that data. We looked also at how it impacted women and minorities, and I will give you that information in a minute; but based on these data, the provost and the deans and associate deans decided that it was the right thing to do, to ask departments to move to core meeting times 8:30 to 5:00.

“And I know some departments have huge courses and a lot of logistics, so we basically said why don't you take a year to try and figure out one hour a week where you won't teach and you will have your business meetings, and we found out that -- I think at this point, 95% of the departments complied, found it feasible option. And then we started hearing from individuals, but it's still 4:30 to 6:00, at the senate.

“So we decided to come here. First we talked with Joe, but let's urge the senate to also reconsider, think about who can participate in the broader faculty governance, who cannot. I can tell you that when this item came this week on faculty's e-mails, I got a lot of e-mails with a lot of “hell, yeah, go.” So I think people have a very kind of visceral reaction to this.

“So just to give you some more data, why is this stressful; again, most childcare centers at Cornell, in Ithaca close -- and after-school programs, so we are really talking about people who have kids under 12 years old, because older kids is usually manage by themselves; but people with younger children do not have usually care after 5:30.

“And I can think when this was sent out, someone said to me, name three centers that close at 5:00. I can actually name them. So if your child care center closes at 5:00 or 5:30, you have to be out of here at 5:00 or 5:30 or pay for a babysitter.

“And then we also saw that increasingly, there's elder care responsibility and caregivers. Also, elder individuals also have to sometimes leave and go home. I'm sorry I'm rushing, but I am really at a rush to finish at 6:00.

“I would say that this impacts women more than it impacts men. And why is that? First of all, the faculty work/life survey showed us that more women faculty on our campus are in dual career couples than men. You can see 90% of our women faculty who are married are married to someone else who also works; whereas only 67% of our men are in that kind of relationship. And that

affects, of course, if two people are working, somebody needs to tend for the kids.

“Then there's various categories in the survey. Some of them are paid employee. And our assumption is that someone who's like us, a paid employee and has certain meetings to go, compared to a self-employed person, has less flexibility. We notice that more women are married to individuals who are paid employees, who have a structure that they have to adhere to.

“And then we looked at couples who live and work in the same community, in Ithaca or Newfield, and we noticed that among women, 55% live in the same community as their spouse; whereas 83% of men live in the same community as their spouse. This affects, of course, travel times to child care centers and home.

“And then we looked at faculty members who lives completely apart; that is at least part of the year, they do not live in Ithaca. And I'm sure some of you are familiar of colleagues who one person lives here, another lives in California and New York and Boulder. I can think of a lot of these individuals.

“Twenty-seven percent of women faculty who are married who responded to the survey said that, at least part of the year, they do not live with their spouses. And 19% of them said -- so this comes up to 55, 27 and 19. So 19% said yes, both of us live in Ithaca; but one of us works in Syracuse, one of us has to travel for more than an hour. So you can see that there are clear differences between how this impacts women and men and the travel times they have.

“And then we also noticed it also has a differential impact on underrepresented minority faculty, who actually quite mirror the picture that we see for women faculty. And so you see that, as I said, 27% of women live apart from their spouses, at least part of the year. 22% of underrepresented minority faculty have those experiences.

“Currently caring for or anticipating care of an elderly relative, you can see that women and underrepresented minorities take care at a higher rate than men. And then that, of course, relates to people's satisfaction with their life outside of Cornell. So you can see that women and underrepresented minorities are not as happy with their work/life balance as men are.

“I would say, except for the fact that Cornell won for years Working Mother Magazine award; and every year that award came out, I would get so much hate

mail, that it was really painful, from I guess those individuals who experienced a very different -- had a very different experience.

"But if you look at faculty governance, I just looked at the web site. Maybe it is not updated, but about one in five of senators are women. About one in three of faculty are women. In 2012, when we started dealing with this issue, we looked at faculty senate times, and only Cornell and Princeton had faculty senate times that started after 4:00 p.m. Princeton is still at 4:30, so I am hoping that they will be the last bastion.

"And I can say that senate meeting times are mentioned at various meetings about work/life. So on Monday, we had an associate professor orientation. There were 70 associate professors, people who -- it was orientation sponsored by my office about how to think about promotion. And actually individuals in the room talked about this, you know, the increased service demands for associate professors.

"And people said, "and the senate still has their meetings at 4:30." So at that meeting, it was kind of the last bastion of 4:30 meetings, because we said the university is trying to move to more family-friendly, providing more access and voice to individuals from various backgrounds.

"So I would say, John Siliciano, who I report to, said: "remember, the provost's office does not oversee the senate." And I see that. All I can do is the data speaks for itself, I think. In order to increase access and voice for women and underrepresented minorities in this campus, and to make people feel included in the process of the governance process and the decision-making process, we need to increase the access; and so therefore, I urge you to consider convening at a core meeting time.

"I was so gung ho on that, that I shared with Joe various buildings that have large rooms before 5:00, because there was some discussion about class times and large rooms. So we're happy to support, answer any questions and talk to you."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Questions?"

Unidentified Speaker: "So I think your office does a real service in terms of getting departments to move colloquium times and meeting times, and I think the enlightened chair will take steps to give family-friendly teaching assignments and hours of the day and so on, but I sort of don't feel that there will be a net

reduction in stress, if you move the senate to the middle of the day, because 5:30 is jammed right now.

“And I just feel that teaching and research are our primo obligations, and especially for a young person, that we ought to clear that space out, so they can do what I would consider the heart of their jobs and so on.

“I'm also skeptical; are there people really clambering to serve in the senate? I only have my own department to speak of. It's sort of like, if we had a show of hands, who would like to do it, not many would come up, and you are sort of asked to do it. And also, when are you going to stage this? I mean, what time of the day would you do this?

Associate Provost Levitte: “3:45.”

Unidentified Speaker: “But that's going to knock out a teaching slot for somebody. So I don't see a positive gain.”

Associate Provost Levitte: “I guess we don't see -- the questions why are people not clambering. Might that have to do with the perception that, to a certain extent, not a place where they can participate fully. I would say it is not only young people, it is not only assistant professors. Increasingly women delay their child-bearing years. So it's associate professor; they are expected to do service. They might not want to do the senate, but they might still be expected.

“I could tell you there were quite a few people who used to be senators who wrote to me and said “those meeting times were gruesome for me.” For some people, these 8:00 to 4:45 maybe are the holy hours of teaching and research. For some people, they said we have other committees and other things we do in those hours.

“So I would say that if we want that participation, and are people clambering; I could tell you, I get a lot of comments about that. It's a concern for individuals who do want to have a voice on Engaged Cornell or various other things that are discussed here.”

Professor Robert Thorne, Department of Physics: “Just wondering, is there any data on how, from institutions that have moved to their senate meeting times earlier or meeting times earlier, on what impact that's had on actual attendance at those meetings? Because I know, for example, in Physics, we have moved

seminars and other meetings into the core hours, and the result is that certainly at some meetings where we didn't have the special slot set aside, but because there are no possible ways to set aside a special slot, attendance has gone down. These are meetings we were voting on important things."

Associate Provost Levitte: "I don't have data about whether it changed in institutions. I would say that I have heard that Arts and Sciences has been trying to do these all-faculty meetings to vote at 4:30 on the professor of practice and couldn't get a quorum. So I would suggest doing it at lunchtime, when people bring their sandwiches.

"I don't have systematic data. I have systematic data to show that 4:30, this room -- well, today it is also the school district has closed down the after-school activities, so that might be why you have less participation, but I would say that I see evidence that when it is late, a lot of people do not show up. And I hear people who want to participate feel they are unable to participate.

"So I don't have the counter-data to show that when you move things to lunchtime -- and some departments, people said no. When it was at lunchtime, people showed up. Everybody has to eat sometime, and they bring their sandwiches and have a discussion around the sandwich, a brown bag faculty meeting.

"I do events; I usually do them at lunch, as a lot of you know. I can get between 30 to 80 faculty. If I do them at 3:00 or 4:00, I get much fewer. So I don't know. It's all anecdotal."

Professor Delchamps: "Quick anecdote; a female faculty member from another department about a year and a half ago was asked whether she was interested in standing for election to the UFC. She came to talk to me about what it was like to be on the UFC, because I was going off UFC at the time. She asked when do they meet. I said 5:00. And she said, 'Sorry; that's a deal-breaker.' She couldn't stand for election even.

"Now, originally I thought, when I heard about this thing of the impossibility of finding a time during the day when no one is teaching, and I thought about that. Being someone who teaches a lot of 2:55 to 4:10 classes and would probably be, quote, unquote disenfranchised at least part of the time by such a change, that I wasn't so broken up about it necessarily.

"I mean, I was thinking hey, well, those semesters when I teach 2:55 to 4:10, ECE sends some other senator. And what that's going to do is broaden the participation of faculty in this joyous occasion we have every month.

"And Charlie, I agree with you. I don't think anybody in EC has ever asked to be in the senate. We are asked to be in the senate. And so I'm okay with it now, even if one out of two semesters I won't make any of the meetings."

Associate Provost Levitte: "I'm happy to hear that you are okay with it."

Professor Fontaine: "I just want to say thank you. I agree completely. Only issue we didn't hear about is the symbolic action that if the university wants to do official business, it ought to be done within official business hours. That's not to say department colloquia, that sort of thing can't be done later, if your department, like mine, is unwilling to change them. I get that; but official university business, seems like a business-type thing.

"If the answer is just get a babysitter from the 5:30 to 6:30, I can tell you that doesn't work, because mine canceled this morning. So it causes utter chaos for men and women alike. And I think this is an important change, so thank you."

Professor Clare Fewtrell, Molecular Medicine: "I don't often get comments from my faculty about senate matters, but I did get one on this particular issue. He said we should definitely change. He also pointed out that many of the buses to sort of more remote areas stop running, and so this is also a green issue."

Associate Provost Levitte: "Right. And I can say that some people link that to the -- the array of e-mails I got around these issues were very broad. People said well, if you move it from 4:30, you could move it to a building that would be more accessible and so on and so forth, so you could do more good."

Speaker Lewenstein: "Any other questions? Thank you very much. So I will take speaker's prerogative to say when I was first a senator, I had to leave at 5:30, because I had to get to my kids to pick them up.

"The last piece of business that's being urged upon me by the dean of the faculty is to please take a Poinsettia on your way out, and in addition to that, wish you all a happy holiday season and a good new year. And I declare the meeting adjourned."

(MEETING ADJOURNED)