

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2022

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Hello, my name is Jonathan Ochshorn from the Department of Architecture, speaker of the Faculty Senate. I start with the land acknowledgment. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq̓. The Cayuga Nation. The Gayogohó:nq̓ are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and alliance of six sovereign nations with the historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy predates the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq̓' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq̓' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. Gavel in hand, call to order. We have an approval of minutes from December 8, 2021, as you know the minutes have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. So if there are any corrections, let me know now through raising your hand either virtually or in person. And seeing none, by way of unanimous consent, the minutes are approved as posted. We now have Senate announcements and updates, our first speaker is the Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Hi everyone. Thank you to those who are here and braved the sunshine to be here in person. We have what I wanted to use today to allow for a lot of discussion. So we only have five minutes to just review a few things. This is our first meeting of the semester, and I unfortunately have to open with sad news. So we have the sad news that Professor Steven Beer, who was a previous speaker of the Senate, passed away in our time between our meeting in December and now. So for the colleagues who knew him well, and for all of us, we would like to just take a moment and remember him and his contributions to the Faculty Senate. [No audio] And we have better news about another previous speaker of the Senate. And it is my sort of great excitement to announce that Professor Bruce Lewenstein is our new ombudsman, and we want to thank our previous ombudsman Charlie Wolcott for all the wonderful contributions that he has made to the Cornell Community, and we are looking forward to Bruce serving in this role and having the same level of wisdom that Charlie had all of our constituents. I just want to let you know that the new general counsel for the University will come to the Senate and introduce herself and we will have an opportunity for us to have a conversation with her, so we are looking forward to welcoming her into the Senate. I just want to give some, it's almost like a curated list beyond what is on our agenda but just to give you a flavor of the things that will be coming this

semester that we are working on actively and not everything obviously is on the slide but I just want to give you a flavor of what we are thinking about. So the RTE task force is moving forward, we are hoping they will have a summer report at the end of the semester to bring to the Senate. But in parallel, and working with academic HR, to get clarity to titles and the means for promotion and working on inclusion and sense of community for RTE and also the benefits for RTE and emeritus. So there are many things to work through that were not quite finished when we welcomed RTE faculty voting rights into the Faculty Senate. So that work is happening, and I just want to open it up that we are still taking feedback from faculty on the honors and distinction proposal, we want to take that feedback in and have the VP UE revise the proposal if needed and bring it to the Senate for vote. But I didn't want to bring it to the Senate without finishing the feedback and I know for example, the emeriti wanted to create their own summary of their feedback for the proposal. And so we are still welcoming feedback and I just want you to know that. One of the pleasures of this position is that we have 12 Senate committees. And I would not have expected that to be such a pleasurable experience, but I went around to each chair to understand sort of what their mission is, and what they want to achieve through the position. And if there were barriers. So I wanted to give you an example of one barrier that came through that process of me visiting basically with each Senate committee. And so the ROTC committee saw that ROTC students on campus are having an uneven experience. And so in some colleges, their work with the military and the four branches of the military, they get credit for it and in other places and other colleges they do not. So we are working with the vice provost of Outreach and Extension and also the committee and see if we can work with that problem for our students. How am I doing on time Jonathan?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Two minutes more.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I've got plenty of time. So, a little intimidating meeting with the four branches of the military, but I did it and we found a constructive exercise that we think can help the students on campus. And then the last thing I wanted to share is that the Global Hubs conversation is still happening as well. And so thanks to the resolution that we brought and approved, we have reached out to the vice provost of International Affairs, and we are working with Mark Milstein and the International Council, the Global Hubs have the salon, and the first salon happened last week. And out of that interaction, there are two new sites that may be coming up. So I went to the VP IA just to say, let's bring the faculty in who are interested in hubs, and they can present to the Senate and the Senate can ask them questions so I asked for

some of the faculty who are interested in these new sites to come to the Senate in the next month. And so we can start the conversation before the hubs are actually created for why, and how and what can be created through the Global Hubs. And that is all I have for today, and we're going to move forward to our agenda. We have committee reports on the part time bachelor's potential I guess, part-time program for nontraditional students and so we are going to ask the Senate committee chairs to come up and give a brief report and then have the option for senators to ask questions.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. As Eve says, our next order of business is the discussion of part-time bachelor's degree for nontraditional students. I think we are starting with Mark Milstein, Management and Organizations and Chair of the Academic Programs and Policies Committee I assume, in Zoom Land somewhere. So unmute yourself if you are there Mark.

>> Yes he is there.

>> Five Minutes.

>> MARK MILSTEIN: Can you hear me now? Is that okay? Can I get a thumbs up if somebody can hear me? Good, okay thank you. Good afternoon, sorry I cannot be there in person, I'm actually scheduled to teach right now. I got my students out doing a project. So I just wanted to convey the summary of the CAPP discussions on the proposal for the part-time program. In general, on the positive side, the committee was very supportive of the proposal, found it effectively discussed why Cornell would have such a program. In particular, viewing it as consistent with the institutional goal of educating any person in any study, and also aligning with the changing market conditions that we can all see out there. That is the prevalence of nontraditional students that are seeking four-year university degrees, and the competitive realities out in the marketplace where other institutions, peer institutions are already responding to that market demand. On the other side of the discussion, there were concerns with the proposal. The proposal, it was good on the why but it lacked the discussion on the how. In particular, there were really five issues that the committee ended up honing in on. One was prioritization and program decision-making and in particular, really thinking that there needs to be an emphasis on quality as a function of both content delivery and student support. Concerned that a focus or overfocus on say the financial liability and the profitability of the

program, could end up superseding some of the other issues and undermining the quality. The second one was the quality of education. In particular, the need to really think through faculty and department engagement, given the participation of the faculty who have the expertise and participation of departments, where knowledge and expertise is housed for the different disciplines. It was seen as really critical for the success of the program. Third concern was around the methods of instruction. The proposal discusses coming out of the pandemic, we know a lot more than we did about virtual instruction, and we can be successful at it. But there are limits, there are limits to the effectiveness of virtual and modular instruction and that really ought to be taken into account overall if the program moves forward. The fourth issue was around scaling. The program as proposed seemed extremely complex with multiple disciplines being launched at one time, and there was a discussion over whether it would not be better overall for the growth of the program to start simply and then build out as the success is understood. The last piece was about accessibility of the program. The types of students the target demographics of the program would be aimed towards, may not have access to the basic infrastructure necessary for an effective and efficient learning program that is primarily virtual and we did learn as an institution throughout the last couple of years with the pandemic is while people may have some of the hardware necessary for connecting, without the proper Internet connections, without the high-speed Internet connections, the actual connection to virtual learning can be problematic. And so many of the demographics that are the target demographics for that program, would likely be facing a lot of those infrastructure problems. So I will stop there and take any questions that people have.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We will have five minutes of questions after Sen. David Delchamps talks. He is from Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Chair of the Education Policy Committee and is right here in person. In Schwartz Auditorium. Five minutes and then we will have five minutes for discussion. Either mic.

>> DAVID DELCHAMPS: Am I close enough to the mic?

>> Stand closer.

>> DAVID DELCHAMPS: Is that good? Okay, my name is David Delchamps, Electrical Computer Engineering the Chair of the Educational Policy Committee.

>> Whoops, sorry. Can you say that again I had a problem hearing you.

>> Ok, test.

>> I can hear you, I'm wondering if you can repeat the question.

>> Mark, I'm not asking questions. Jonathan decided to have me report from EPC and the people can ask questions to both of us.

>> Got it.

>> DAVID DELCHAMPS: That's weird. Let's start this over again. Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, and we met twice about this and they were really good meetings. Well attended, animated discussion etc. And I deliberately didn't report from CAPP before I wrote up the report and I was happy to see that there was a lot of intersection between the kinds of issues, especially the negative things that the two committees focused on and the tone with which they address them. But as the case may be, there are some differences. First of all, we felt that the sentiment, the animated sentiment was excellent. It is very praiseworthy and laudable to try to get some semblance of a Cornell experience, that carries a credential extended to a population that now does not have a normal opportunity to go into a four-year residential program, and the populations they identified were you know compelling, interesting groups of people and we have Cornell that has long experience with incarcerated individuals to the Cornell prison education program that has been going on for quite some time. A lot of good experience with that and that was one of the demographics that were mentioned among the list of groups. And that is great, it would be great to do that. But one thing that we sort of thought number one, what are these people going to get, well this is going to be a completely asynchronous virtual thing. And our committee was unanimous in saying that asynchronous and virtual is unfortunately inevitably inferior to residential. Therefore, whatever these people get in terms of credential, it is going to have an asterisk. It should have an asterisk. There was conflicting, it was sort of info about whether the provost wanted an asterisk or wanted no asterisk after these things, we thought it was really important because if you look at some of the other programs at peer institutions for example Harvard, Harvard has a special degree that is awarded by and taught by people in their extension, their version of extension and we are thinking that is what this is going to look like. That is thing number one. Thing number two that

we are a little worried about is who is it exactly for it? Now the groups they mentioned in the write-up at first, incarcerated individuals, children of migrant workers, mid-career adults who never had a chance to go to college, etc., there is a lot of financial aid that is going to have to happen there. And where's that money going to come from? Is it going to dig into the financial aid budget for the students here? And the provost said no this is going to be a closed system, the folks in this program who pay full price are going to subsidize the folks who need aid, so we immediately asked, where are the full price people coming from? These groups you mentioned here are not really full price type people, and the provost said that there are a lot of international folks who have money, would love to have a Cornell degree, and so we are thinking aha, so maybe that is who we should be thinking of? The wealthy industrialists from other countries paying full price are subsidizing folks in the US. We were not really sure. We thought we had to settle the issue before moving forward with this. What is the mix going to look like? And people were sort of scratching their heads and thinking what could possibly go wrong? If you have say the crown prince of wherever, says I paid, where's my degree? Well you did not pass enough courses, well fix that. We were visualizing all the things that might happen. But then again this could all be worked out. Who knows? Another thing so basically we are worried about, what are we doing for these people? That is the one, is it going to be a degree with an asterisk with an extension or not. Whom are we doing this for? Who is going to be in this group, what is the mix of people going to be? And then how. How is this going to happen? And that I think is what Mark's committee focused on an awful lot and we were worried about as well, creating I mean Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Lisa Nishii mentioned that there is a lot of online content available at Cornell that we can use right away in this program. But there is not nearly enough for the program on a scale of what the proposal outlines. And creating such content is a huge time's sake. It is a huge time's sake, and you know so where's that time going to come from for faculty members? We are already full-time doing our full-time jobs. That is a question, an open question. An important question. One minute. Okay, and how are we going to do it? I think that is a really important and one other thing that I do want to mention really briefly at the end here. I did not want to lay heavy emphasis on this, but committee members at an EPC a lot of us have experience teaching professional master students. I do not personally myself but others do. Professional master students and others both at a distance, locally, and a lot of painful compromises happen when you teach those audiences. And really, a lot of the time you're thinking this is good enough. It is good enough, I'm going to bite the bullet and pass this person. You know we would hate to see a situation where a faculty member teaching this program felt pressure from the central administration to give a certain number of passing grades

even when they thought their standards were being compromised. This is not to denigrate the folks to whom this program is directed, because for example, the prisoners do better on plant science than our residential students but the prisoners have the bandwidth for that. And working adults maybe do not. So I will leave it at that and if you have questions. I will stand here.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes thank you David, we are taking questions for five minutes. If you are on Zoom, please raise your virtual hand and I am looking at the computer to see if there are any hands. If you are in person, walk down to one of the two microphones, the one not occupied by Professor Delchamps.

>> I can move to the other one if you want to use this.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ok I think we are supposed to start Zoom, so Richard [indiscernible] you are first in line. Unmute and try to make it brief.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: I have two questions, both are with admissions. So, how are you going, how is everybody coming? What are the standards for admission into this program, and it is a closed system. So, you might have to make it balanced, will there be revenue balances, will you have weaker admission standards for those who can pay? And those who are full rate? Or not full rate? Are you giving them scholarships? So if you're going to do this type of thing, then you would need numbers. So, are you going to reduce the standard so that you get the numbers you need to make this work? I see this, those are the questions, those are the worries. It does not look like an asterisk really does this, you would probably need several.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So Mark or David, just chime in.

>> DAVID DELCHAMPS: I think the admissions thing, that is something a detail, I hate to call it a detail that the proposal problematic thing and people, part of that underlying question is that, that people are thinking about the same kind of question that Richard just raised about every going to have different standards for folks that can pay, and the folks that can't pay. And I think that was an implicit concern in EPC's discussion.

>> MARK MILSTEIN: Yeah, I would reflect that quality of education and scaling where those topics came up.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ok we have an in person, identify yourself and your department.

>> WALKER WHITE: I am Walker White, from computer science, I do not know if either of you can answer this but we do actually have a significant nontraditional presence here at Cornell, it's called employees that do the continuing education program. I have had them in my courses all the time. If we make a program like this, is it going to cost Cornell to shunt them into this program as opposed to away from the traditional courses that they're in right now?

>> EVE DE ROSA: So I can say that when this was being considered, I shared with the University assembly which has both the student assembly graduate student assembly and the employee assembly, I mentioned the program and that this conversation has started and they were enthusiastic. So the employee assembly was like can we join in?

>> WALKER WHITE: I guess my question is because we are talking about this, my question is because this is asynchronous, does this deny them the ability to take the classes in person right? Because they had to jump through hoops with their supervisor, is this an argument for the supervisor to deny them the in person class now if we have something like this?

>> Excellent question.

>> Mark any comments?

>> MARK MILSTEIN: No it has been a while since I read it, and we had our discussion back before back kind of late in the fall, my recollection was it did not affect the current employee program. But I would have to go back and look at that.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we are over time but I would like to take one more question than make up one of the other topics. Zoom [INDISCERNIBLE].

>> UNKNOWN: Thank you. So briefly, I would say that I applaud the goal and ambition I taught in prison when I was in my 20s. One of my doctoral degrees was from a university that was based on the idea that nontraditional students should be able to graduate. But, on the basis of what I heard and what I read from the two comments, I would say that this looks like as it is, as

a way to sell the grant, the Cornell grants and ensure your degree and the close circular system in terms of financing, loops rather like [indiscernible] to use a kind of charitable goal and social diversity idea as a facade to have students who would pay full price for the low level degree. So again, based on the information I have, from what you both said, it looks like a very very bad idea as it is now.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Comments? David or Mark?

>> MARK MILSTEIN: I think the only thing I would say is I think the proposal was written in a way to answer the question of why would we do this? And it was knowingly short on the how, I know for the CAPP Committee, you know we want to recognize that, in the feedback that we were providing. That we recognize the why, the why is solid, that answer makes sense to all of us. The how, the devil is in the details. And there are a lot of concerns that should be treated very carefully in terms of specifying it out. If it is going to move forward.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I have been told that people are asking for more time for this discussion. I welcome you to give feedback on the website for today's Senate meeting. I would love for this dialogue to continue and so we can bring it back to the Senate because the Finance Committee and the Academic Freedom and Professional Status, a faculty committee, also have the report under consideration. So it will be back in March and we will continue the conversation, but please put your comments in writing online. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We are going to move on to the discussion of new Research Administration Support Systems, RASS, with the presentation by Myles Gideon, manager of the institutional review board, IRB, in five minutes. Is Myles online?

>> MYLES GIDEON: I am. Thank you so much. I am here. So thanks for having me, I know I only have a few minutes. I will go quickly. My name is Myles, I am the manager of the IRB administrative team within the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, and I just wanted to briefly share about our new online system that launched last week. Next slide please. So, RASS stands for Research Administration Support Systems for those of you who have sponsored research, you may already know RASS from the grants and contract portion, but we now have a new section and new module for institutional review board, for human participant projects. There will be other modules up there within the coming years as well. But we are excited to be there

for now. So those of you who conduct human research, you know that we have been using Word and PDF forms for far too many years, so this is a much needed upgrade to an online system where we have a smart forum, and a clear transparent workflow where everything is just entered by the researcher on this webpage and they will get to see what is happening with the IRB review process, correspond with the IRB committee members, and administrative staff through this online portal. And receive their approvals that way as well. So everything is in one place instead of sort of all over the place as it has been and we are very excited about that. And another really nice connection of course is that the IRB protocols that are funded externally will have a nice close connection with a sponsored proposal and awards which are also in RASS.

Next slide. Just briefly about the functionality, researchers can create all sorts of protocols of various types also the same smart form, the system has logic built in, so it will ask questions that will help the researcher lead to various outcomes so for collaborative research for example, where the researcher is actually requesting that the Cornell's IRB relies on another IRB, that type of reliance agreement protocol can be created in the same place as a full-blown IRB protocol. And the system has an auto review type ability which I think is really neat. And also, some submissions related to those protocols will happen within the same protocol record which is also different from before. So amendments are basically just existing approved protocols and there is version control. I did want to note that all active protocols that were processed in our old system and through our old forms have been migrated to RASS. It's primarily metadata,, so we have been trying to communicate with our researchers about this for a couple of months. For the first time that a researcher comes to RASS IRB to amend their existing protocols, there will be a number of fields that look like they're empty. And so that first time they come in, they will need to spend some time filling in and basically the gaps of the existing protocols. We have a variety of ways to support people on that which I will get to and another slide or two. Next slide please. So really quick I want to show you what it looks like, as you see the IRB module is right next to grants and contracts, it's on the same platform, and yeah, it is nice and clean and neat.

Next slide. In terms of that training and support, our IT staff have been wonderful and created a whole bunch of step-by-step written how-to documents to guide researchers through various parts of the process, different tasks within the system, from finding a protocol that already exists to responding to IRB review comments, we have conducted a few zoom training sessions already and we have recordings of those on our website, we are hosting for now at least twice weekly RASS IRB specifically office hours through zoom, and our staff are available for additional training and support as needed. There is a website called the RASS guide site where all these how to and support documentation and all of this documentation is available. Next

slide. So this is what that RASS guide slide looks like, and their other parts , not just IRB. If you click on the IRB tab at the top, it looks like. You have all of those how-to documents as well as a link to the zoom training you know basically as much information as we hope will be well. Next slide. So we have two email addresses, one is system related questions and what is just basically reaching the IRB status, we have a web page where we have been giving a bunch of information the last couple months about a transition so I want to include that link as well. And last but not least, last slide please. Just noting that these are my colleague functional teams within ARIA, I want to include those websites as well for those of you who may be interested. Thanks so much.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Presentation, presentation of the new external contracts addendum, and maybe eight minutes for Senate discussion after that, to make up some time. I have two people listed, Mark Hurwitz, and Robert Hoon. Presumably both online?

>> MARK HURWITZ: Yes we are both here and I will talk us through the addendum and Robert will correct me if necessary. So, let's just go on to the next slide. Get things out of my way here. So, we have new federal requirements for sponsored research that are part of this trend that is going to continue. There are a lot of national security concerns, related to foreign influence and there are concerns related to basically double dipping external contracts and contracts with the same type of research not being recorded through the normal channels. So, NSF requires all PIs to identify all their current and pending projects regardless of the source of funding. So not just their sponsored projects, anything. NIH is requiring external foreign contracts related to research to be uploaded to the NIH for their review. So the foreign entity is any organization with representatives outside of the US, foreign subsidiaries, or subsidiaries of foreign parent companies and any external contracts is anything that is not part of faculty members Cornell employment duties. Next slide. So, the reason we need a contract addendum is to make sure that all contracts that are not vetted through Cornell in the normal way, recognize that faculty have pre-existing primary employment obligations to Cornell. Faculty have federal disclosure and regulatory obligations that a consulting contract or other external contracts with a different entity may trample on. May not recognize. And so the addendum simply makes sure that the faculty members are not inadvertently violating any of their obligations. It allows us to avoid doing something more invasive, such as scrutinizing contracts or participating in the development of external contracts which nobody wants. We do not want to do so, and so having this addendum will provide the protection that is necessary and will not cause any hiccups in

any kind of normal contracting arrangement. So, one of the notes got cut off, it is important to note that while Cornell medicine already requires all external contracts to include the addendum, and to be retained by the college, the addendum has been used by I think faculty for quite some time now and whenever they ask for a review by counsel to help them with the contract. And I forget what the last note was. We will go on to the next one. Next slide please. Okay, so how can you be trampling on pre-existing obligations, by entering into external employment or consulting arrangements which you are by rights allowed to do, it can raise many issues. And so some of these are real perceived conflicts of interest, and commitment, that possibly cause problems with federal funding disclosures because for instance if NIH is reading your contract, and it has something untoward in it, that can be a problem. Their commercial entities are constantly trying to grab onto as much IP as they can. If you do not review your contract or read it carefully, you may find that you are giving away Cornell IP which puts the researcher, you, in an awkward situation. And as for control regardless of whether it applies to all citizens of the United States, and you really do not want to enter into a contract that does not explicitly agree that is going to abide by export control law. Move on. This is not complicated. The addendum itself is one page, it is I believe included in the materials for this meeting. It just briefly states facts. It does not go into any details about the particular contract, it just says these are things that need to be paid attention to. And have to be agreed to by both sides of the contract. Next slide please. Okay. So, it's hard to write out all of the cases in which the contract is absolutely needed. And this presentation is part of starting to socialize the idea. But we have come up with a list of exceptions. These are the things that absolutely do not put the addendum in the contract, we are not addressing part-time faculty at this time, it may be that that will happen in the future, but most part-time faculty have large external commitments so we do not want to cause problems in any of that. Contracts unrelated to work for the University, it actually came up as a question of I'm using my house as an Airbnb, driving the addendum in that? Absolutely not. Contracts with Cornell or its units, like sponsored research, anything that goes through Cornell to get approved are taken care of, you do not need this, this would be a redundant piece of the contract for those cases. Traditional scholarship activities or things that Cornell has no rights in such as the publishing agreements or any book deals you want to make use of your educational materials, have nothing to do with that. And although consulting and being an expert in some cases, in most cases, does require the addendum. If you're serving as a consultant or an expert witness in litigation, no you don't need the addendum. Next slide. A question that comes up a lot is well are we going to have problems with corporations accepting this addendum? And the answer is no, because it is a statement of fact. There is nothing in the

addendum that can be disputed by any other party, so these are a set of examples of organizations that have had no trouble accepting the addendum. Next slide. And so, we are expecting to update the faculty handbook, and have this all settled in May. Today we are introducing it to the Faculty Senate. We're going to spend March and April answering questions that arise from the Senate and other parties. Hopefully use that to create a set of frequently asked questions and put up on the webpage with the addendum itself and get it all done by May. I believe that is it.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we have eaten up a lot of time on that presentation, but I will accept questions from the in person or zoom audience, if I see any hands raised, which I do not yet. We have an in person, so if there's nobody in zoom, introduce yourself and your department affiliation.

>> BUZ BARSTOW: Thank you I am Buz Barstow, from Biological and Environmental Engineering. Less of a specific question more of like an overview question about research administration and the administrative burden on research. What are we if anybody can speak from, what are we doing to reduce the administrative burden on faculty? This seems like it is adding to it, we know already that it is a significant problem, more and more of our time is getting eaten up with paperwork, less and less is being put.

>> MARK HURWITZ I can address that. Actually we are very aware of that, we are trying to take on more of the administrative burden and not burden faculty anymore than absolutely necessary. The addendum is sort of a compromise between having faculty review their external contracts, we do not want to do that. We just want to provide a simple and clear means of dealing with this new scrutiny from these federal sponsors. So, one of the things that is happening is sponsors of research are demanding more and more. We are trying to keep up with that and trying to take on as much of the burden as we can, and we think this addendum is a very simple way to reduce the worry about the federal sponsors and what they are demanding through external contacts. So we could go on in other areas, I would be happy to talk about that. But I do not think we have the time for in this discussion.

>> ROBERT HOON: The only thing I might add is again this is outside of your Cornell responsibilities, so this is external consulting advising board service on your what is 20% time, that usually implicates questions about conflict and commitment etc., so in the absence of the

addendum, what you do is inadvertently agree to terms that actually trample on your pre-existing obligations to either the feds, or to Cornell. So this keeps everyone, this true ups those agreements, regardless of what they say. So we reconciled those conflicting or contra indicating thoughts.

>> Thank you very much.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think we need to move on to the next order of business, we have two proposal presentations. The first, a 10 minute presentation with 10 minutes of Senate discussion after that, on the question of a new natatorium and the "Do the Greatest Good" Capital Campaign, Sen. Ashleigh Newman, Department of Population Medicine and Diagnostic science. 10 minutes. Presumably from zoom.

>> ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Yes I am here, thank you. Next slide please. So I want to start off with the reality that unless we act now, Cornell will be without a functioning pool. Sorry my screen just changed on me. Thanks. The Cornell pools have a finite lifespan that is estimated to end in 2025, and the process of construction, planning of a new pool would take at least 10 years. So we have a time gap problem. Therefore the goal of this resolution is to provide tracks on the current state of the pools, and implore the administration to act to make a new natatorium a priority. Next slide please. You may be asking yourself, why should I care? This is a varsity problem or I do not swim. Well you may be interested to know that 742 faculty staff and retirees swam in open swim in 2018 to 2019, and that is the last year that we have complete data prior to the covert shutdowns. 1875 students swam during open swim in that time. And then you have an additional approximately 600 students that are part of the variety of these groups listed here. My personal connection to this issue is that I swam growing up my entire life, I was a four year varsity swimmer at Cornell and co captain in my senior year, and I happened to be my husband while I was swimming at Cornell and he is now the head coach of the team. I believe in the benefits of swimming. Next slide please. The benefits of aquatic exercise certainly are physical in nature, but also certainly in regards to mental health. It has been shown that swimming improves self-esteem and college students, it is a preventative measure to combat depression, winter blues, and the more severe seasonal affective disorder. And I will be coming back to this later in the presentation. Next slide. The existing pools at Cornell are at Teagle Hall which is imaged above as well as Helen Newman Hall which is imaged below. Teagle was built in 1951, as the male only athletic facility in Helen Newman was built as the female only facility and due

to these gender specific construction, even with modifications that have made since then, they have inadequate bathrooms and showers for the opposite gender, but as well as for transgender and gender nonconforming persons. In addition, the pools are also not handicap accessible. Next slide. So what are the other issues facing our pools? We have an imbalance in supply and demand. There is a large demand on pool time, all the groups are listed in that first slide, and as well as groups that cannot get pool time because they're not enough hours in the day and space. The pools are aged, and failing. And therefore, the swimming pool turnover rate for example is the amount of time it takes for all the water in the pool to go through the filtration system. And that is far longer than what it needs to be based on the high usage of the pools. This has been a contributor to poor water quality, it's been cloudy and unsafe to swim in and that has resulted in an increase in frequency of closures that have started around 2019. Teagle Hall also needs a new roof. And that has been estimated to cost between \$10 and \$12 million, the entire roof structure has asbestos material and when there have been leaks, that is certainly a problem. So the pools are 71 and 59 years old. And they have had all the improvements that can be done to prolong their life. And that is estimated to be an additional five years in 2025. That money that was spent in 2020 actually included structural support and that includes wooden beams that were replaced underneath the pools to help hold them up because they were engineeringly not sound. The decision was made to use wood beams instead of steel beams to save money because it wasn't going to be worth the investment to pay for steel, when the pools themselves would not last as long as the steel beams would. The process of approval, fundraising, planning, and instruction can take up to 10 years. Therefore, even if we started today with the process, that would put us at 2032, and then a potential seven year time gap where we would have no pools on campus. Next slide. I have been asked in discussions with multiple people, why does Cornell need a 50 m pool? Why not save money and build a six lane 25 yard pool similar to what we already have? The short answer is that it would not solve the supply and demand issue that we have at Cornell. I have two examples of our peer institution pools listed here. Above is Princeton built in 1990 and below is Brown's built in 2012. Both of these 50 m pools have what we call bulkheads which are placed perpendicular to the length of the 50 m distance and what that allows for is the ability to quarantine off the pool into multiple sections and therefore you can have for example, a PE class happening in one area, open swim happening in one area, and then down in the diving well, diving practice or scuba diving class all at the same time. So you're increasing the number of groups that can use the pool at one time as well as giving them more optimal hours of availability. Next slide. You may say schools like Princeton and Brown have larger endowments, they can afford pools like these. And we cannot.

But if you look at our New York peer institutions Ithaca College imaged here, and Colgate University, both pools have a pool with the ability to have bulkhead separation that we talked about and were funded by help from Cornell alumni. It's also interesting to note that some people say well, we do not need a big or as nice of a pool as IC, and I would argue we do because Cornell has two and a half more times faculty than IC, and four and a half times more students. Next slide. A Cornell University, without a pool would be simply an embarrassment. We'd be the only Ivy League non-Ivy League peer regional college university without one. Many community colleges, as well as TC3, have a pool. Without a pool, that would mean the termination of all aquatic activities that have previously been listed including beginning swimming at Cornell, in which people of color consist of 89.7% of enrolled students. It has been shown that participation in formal swimming lessons reduces drowning risk, and we know that people of color are at a disproportionate risk of drowning than white people and this is largely due to an unequal access in swimming lessons. Next slide. Beginning swimming at Cornell has high praise and course evaluations from students. One student said I left the course gaining a whole new life skill. I had a few traumatic experiences with drowning as a child and never thought I would be able to learn how to swim. One student actually wrote a column in the Cornell Daily Sun, arguing against this test only to then enroll in beginning swimming and learn how to swim, and then write a retraction column about her change of perspective. Next slide. In 2020, Cornell published its mental health review for a final report. And it stated what we know that Cornell has a culture of competition that may take on an unhealthy cycle of expectation and behavior that could reach traumatizing levels for faculty and staff. It is important to note that when asked for the recommendations, undergraduate graduate professionals prioritize the need for access to free physical fitness opportunities to cope with stress, and build resilience. And with Ithaca's climate, students want free and convenient indoor fitness options. It is important to note that swimming at Cornell is a free activity unlike using any of the fitness centers on campus which require a paid membership. I was thrilled to read the recommendations then under well-being, to prioritize fundraising for free physical fitness under affordability within the Capital Campaign to then only read below that, virtual fitness classes and virtual augmented reality proposed in lieu of the fitness center. And I think it goes without stating that there is no virtual equivalent for any aquatic activity, and I certainly cannot swim in my living room. Next slide. A new natatorium would therefore do an enormous amount of good benefiting students, faculty staff and retirees, physical and mental health. Despite talks of a new pool at Cornell, since the 1980s, and pools that could fail at any time, and a new natatorium is still not a University priority item and is not included in the Capital Campaign. The Capital Campaign is the only way to

prevent Cornell from having to pay for the entire project in the event of a catastrophic failure of both pools. Therefore we are asking for the ability to reach major donors across Cornell with the assistance of Alumni Affairs and Development, to try to make this project a reality. Next slide. I would like to thank the fellow cosponsors of this resolution that I have listed here as well as the support of the Faculty Advisory Committee On Athletics And Physical Education. Next slide. And I have the entire resolution here that we can certainly leave up during the discussion, but one thing I want to highlight is really we feel that it is important to provide an inviting modern safe and accessible environment for aquatic activity provide Cornell students faculty, and staff the ability to exercise year-round which is a proven positive contributor to mental health. Thank you and I'm happy to take any questions.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If there's anyone in person, come up to the microphone. If you are in zoom, please raise your digital hand. We are going to take a question or comment from Richard [indiscernible] on zoom and then we have an in person.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: I will be really brief, I strongly support this. I am appalled that the central administration has not planned ahead to resolve this problem of a pool, and I think that is something that should be taken into account. We are playing catch-up, but I think it is an excellent idea, excellent proposal and I appreciate it and a very strong presentation.

>> Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead in person and identify yourself.

>> BUZ BARSTOW: Buz Barstow, Biological and Environmental Engineering. Thank you so much for your presentation, I think you really laid out the arguments in favor of a new swimming pool really coherently. When I first read the resolution, over email a few days ago, my initial response to it was very negative. I used Teagle and Newman almost every day when I was a grad student here. They're kind of depressing but I think exercising every day made me a better person. But despite that, my initial response to it was, is this just another luxury amenity? And I worry deeply that we spent way too much money on amenities, we do not spend enough of it on our core mission. But in discussion with my colleagues, I think my sort of skepticism about this has been reversed and so I just want to say I think a lot of my colleagues are very much in favor of this, and I really recommend it.

>> Thank you. We have a zoom Courtney Roby, unmute yourself.

>> COURTNEY ROBY: Thank you very much. that actually was a great presentation, you made a very strong case for the value of pools, at the same time I guess I am mindful on President Pollack's visit where she described the priorities of the current Capital Campaign as being staffing, and I think that we have all felt even before the pandemic, that there were staffing shortages at almost every level of the University, and since the pandemic, it has just been exasperated. So I guess I'm afraid it is a comment more than a question, I cannot get my mind away from thinking about the shortages and hiring new staff that might result from diverting spending to the pool. But, I agree, it would in an ideal world be great if we had better pools.

>> Thank you, also online, Beth Milles.

>> BETH MILLES: I just want to provide a comment and I thought about it, first of all that was a fantastic presentation and I feel like the moment we are living in is so obvious that although it might seem like a luxury, to look at things like mental wellness and the accessibility of mental health, and swimming, is just not something I want to overlook. I fully support the proposal and my anecdote is I went to Cornell undergrad in the 80s, and discovered swimming when I did not think I was a person who could exercise and since I was 19 years old, I've been swimming a mile every day and it has changed my life and nobody believed it, and it's something I held onto in the pandemic. And I teach is to my students as well as the performing arts that our wellness is so important, so I fully support and I thank you for the presentation I agree that hearing what you had to say is very compelling.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Abby Cohn online.

>> ABBY COHN: Hi Ashleigh, it was a terrific presentation and as you know I strongly support the resolution, I think to me, one of the issues is that we often think there is a zero sum gain when we are doing fundraising, and I just do not think that is true. I think what has gone on for example with the tech campus has shown that. That was a big fear that we all had and I think what we are really asking for is access to alums and to potentially major donors just to make the pitch really. And you have done I think a beautiful job here, and I think we are really asking is, can we articulate this need and concern to a broader audience? You just never know who's out

there who might be interested. I also think you know we have a way of fundraising at Cornell where we focus primarily on major donors and it is absolutely the case for projects that we would need a major anchor donor to start fundraising. But I also think there's a lot of room for crowdsourcing and my own vision is that we can each buy a tile, we have this beautiful new pool and we could have a wall of tiles that speaks to how many of us have been touched by swimming and how critically important it is to be.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Risa Lieberwitz.

>> RISA LIEBWERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz ILR. So I am certainly in support of having a good pool, but I was thinking to what Courtney had said more broadly, but fitting these issues into a broader context, of the importance of expression, physical expression and artistic expression, including swimming and including dancing, including using all of those things that are so important to make life worth living, and to take care of our mental and physical and emotional health. And it made me think about cuts that occurred, I don't remember what year it was, and the cuts that were made in the dance program, which affected me a lot. Because I relied on the dance program very much for the joy of taking those classes. And so it seems to me that it would be a really good idea to think holistically about those sorts of programs and how do we join together to support those as a whole as opposed to you now, only the pool separated from the benefits the ways in which these other activities are as important, not as a competition between the two, but that also implicates those questions of staffing and you know academic programs.

>> ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Absolutely, I would just, if I can, I actually grew up dancing as well. And one thing to Abby's point, is we simply just want the opportunity to ask out donors who don't know that this is a need. And that we may have a Cornell with no pools and unfortunately a pool is such an expensive item and a dance studio with floors and mirrors is less expensive and all of the other fitness centers on campus have had upgrades in recent years and have been brought up more to modern standards, and we are kind of just asking to include these in bringing them up to this day and age and making them safe and accessible.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have another 20 minutes on a related question on the swim test requirements, five minutes from the Faculty Advisory Committee On Athletics And Physical Education, and then five minutes from Brian Lombardi Student And Campus Life, and

10 minutes for discussion. So I'm not exactly sure who is talking on behalf of the Faculty Advisory Committee On Athletics And Physical Education, make yourself available in person, and identify yourself.

>> FRANK ROSSI: Yes thank you. I am Frank Rossi, I am an Associate Professor Of Horticulture In School Of Integrated Point Science. Great, thank you sorry about that. Yeah, so I think you got some slides to present, I am chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee On Athletics And Physical Ed, I have been on the committee for about 12 years and presented to the Faculty Senate on a number of issues and it is sort of ironic that we are proposing it tonight for the pool which is very interesting and I know Ryan appreciates the irony on that as well. So let me start with the slides, I believe there are some slides in there. Thank you very much. You know, this was started as long as Cornell is old. Something because around the idea that it was related to preventable deaths, drowning was a significant cause of unintentional deaths in the United States, the CDC reports that 10 people die every day from drowning, and there was this thought at Cornell that it was something and it comes right out of the resolution that created this swim test, that we if make it a life skill it will then be something that are Cornell students will not struggle with. So that was the original rationale when whoever started the whole thing got us into this mess, that is what they were well-intentioned I guess to say that. I will take the next slide. So, like all of us, the best data we've got probably that is useful is the most pre COVID. So, big shout out to Jen Gudaz, one of our associate athletic directors in the athletic department that oversees the pool and is a certified pool operator and all the wonderful things that we are fortunate to have experts. A pool system usually needs people like that to keep them running. So, this is our data from the last couple of years, for the freshmen that are required to take the test. Out of the gate, you can see the numbers are pretty significant, but overall about 2800 kids pass the test and we have about 0.6-0.7 percent fail rate for the ones that take it. And then presumably they are going into some lesson and other people who go directly into the swim PE class. Next slide. If you do not take it your freshman year, apparently you have to pay 100 bucks. It's not a big revenue stream for the University, I do not imagine, but they made a couple bucks on it. But generally it's less than 10% of the swim tests are administered by let me say, a well oiled machine over at the pools. As a matter of fact, I will just depart and tell a story. Jen Gudaz and Dutch before her who oversaw this I don't want to say 100 years but pretty darn close to 100 years, would describe the times where she would work with people at other Ivy's, University of Arizona and University California Davis, to get our kids to pass the test remotely. So I want to just let you know that this is a well oiled machine that has been underway for a

really long time. And they know what they are doing and you can see the numbers of failures or money things the data reflects. Next slide. So here is the data that I was asked to provide by the leadership of the Faculty Senate and we are so glad we asked this question. I commend Ryan for asking it, us for pursuing it, and it fosters good conversation about something that is not so clear-cut. It can be looked at from multiple perspectives, particularly through the lens of a DEI lens. These are the students in fall of '19 and '18 that enrolled in the swimming class presumably because they were not confident or failed the swim test. So, you can see that as was indicated by absolutely spectacular presentation by Ashleigh Newman I would say, represents the under represented minorities and women, women that are in this class the data really speaks for itself, it's really overwhelmingly saying these are the people that when they get this, they say all right I have to learn how to swim. And so the next slide, then talks about the accommodations we make for this and again, not to minimize them all, but in the scheme of 2800 tests, to have four that had to go through this process, I really think speaks to the fact that this is actually working pretty good as it's been designed to do. It does raise the question, I think that I was asked early on, that data shows clearly it is women and underrepresented minorities that have to learn to swim when they get here. I think there might be one more. Yep, that's it. So thank you very much, and we'll just save discussion for the end.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And is Ryan Lombardi speaking?

>> RYAN LOMBARDI: I am. Thank you. Can you hear me okay? All right terrific, thanks everyone good afternoon, pleased to be with you today. Next slide. With my colleague Frank, really eager to be here to just ask this question of the Faculty Senate perspective on whether or not passing a swimming test should continue to be a condition of graduation from Cornell and I will frame why I think we asked that question now after a two-year pause given COVID of administering this test, I think it is always wise to think critically about the things we have in place. I do not hope to determine whether or not swimming is a valuable life skill. I fully agree. I think I swam before I walked and I definitely swam better before I walked well. Next slide. So, the history a little more detail, it was instituted in 1905 for men to prepare them to be effective soldiers, this was a time in which military training was also required. Instituted in 1920 by the first woman director sports and PE, but as I understand it, according to page 77 of the faculty handbook, the University faculty ultimately established these two universal requirements both the swim test and the PE, the two semesters of physical education which is why we thought it would be good to bring this to the Faculty Senate since it derived from the faculty as well. Slide.

We are one of three ivy's that maintains this requirement, a lot of the ivy's had it back in the day and there are three remaining ivy's including us, Columbia, and Dartmouth. Next slide. In addition to the test, students do have to complete two physical education courses over the course of their time as undergraduates, they choose from nearly 50 options of wide variety of classes that you might expect, some of the typical ones, and some you might not expect like meditation and yoga and things like that. Next slide. As Frank indicated, drowning is a leading cause among unintentional death according to the CDC, gives you little more perspective on that frame and the intensity of that against other common causes of unintentional death. Next slide. As Frank also said, students are encouraged to complete this test during the first year of enrollment in frequent clinics are offered to make sure that can happen. Next slide. Currently, transfer students are not required to complete the swim test, so this is only for students who matriculate as first-time new undergraduate students at Cornell. Next slide. So this has been paused since March 2020, you can expect why we had to pause this when we effectively sent all the students home, we have not restarted it, because every semester we have begun, we were not sure if we're going to be able to continue that semester given the roller coaster of COVID that we've been on. But it is our intention to resume the administration requirement this coming fall of 2022. Next slide. You already heard about the accommodations data, just four exemptions have been granted over those preceding years prior to COVID pause. Next slide. Students who do not pass, or want to swim are required to enroll in the beginning swimming class as Frank mentioned. Course evaluations are positive, even Prof. Newman references this, students cite high quality of instruction, increased levels of comfort, all the good things. Next slide. To underscore Frank's point, if you look at the three semesters of cumulative enrollment preceding the COVID pause, there is a disproportionate number of students of color, and women that enroll in PE 1000, if you break this up to domestic versus international numbers go slightly but if you look at only domestic student, they go down modestly if you look at international students. Next slide. So this data does underscore a perception that my colleagues and I have heard that this requirement disproportionately impacts people of color, and our staff do report anecdotes in their interactions with students that this added stress, it is perceived to be added stress for some students of color. So in summary, the next slide. Swim tests have been around as Frank said for many many years. More than 100, it is unquestionably a valuable life skill. We know that about 88% of our undergraduates have to go through this. We take out or transfer students since they are not required to. We know that women and students of color take PE 1100 at very high rates and we experience that the test may be perceived as an added hurdle for students of color. Last slide. So again, we are here to get feedback and ask the

question. I look forward to and appreciate the work of the [indiscernible] and plan to continue discussions with Frank and his committee subsequent to this meeting, to determine what if any future adjustments might be made or not. So I appreciate hearing feedback. I know Frank would be glad to answer questions as well.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. If there's anyone in person with a comment or question, come to the microphone. If you are in zoom, raise your hand. We have a person.

>> FRANK ROSSI: No no, I was going to if there was a question, I can answer.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. I'm not seeing any raised hands. I will be just a few seconds more. [Indiscernible] online.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> KENT HUBBELL: Well some of you know me as having been a Dean of Students from 2001-2015, and I certainly see the value of having all students learn to swim. But, the anxiety and the pain and the difficulty of the small number of students who fail the test and have phobic reactions to swimming, made me very concerned about having it as a requirement, especially one attached to academic performance in the form of graduation. So, while I urge all students to be able to swim, I am reluctant to support the notion that it will become a requirement for graduation. I think that that is more than we should expect from our students, and from the institution.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you, any other comments?

>> BUZ BARSTOW: Thank you very much, Buz Barstow, biological and environmental engineering. I want to offer a counterpoint to that. I completely accept the arguments for removing the swim test requirement, but I think that for my own perspective, there is value in taking people outside of their comfort zones and learning to operate outside of their comfort

zone. I think it is an extremely valuable skill that we have got to teach our students. It could be in the form of a swim test, could be in the form of a 5 mile run, it could be something else. But, I cannot overstress how valuable I think that experience is. No matter what physical or mental form it takes.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Ashleigh Newman?

>> ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Just a quick comment, I would say that I am in support of continuing to swim. I think it is important to note that the beginning swimming PE credit still counts towards the graduation requirement that all undergraduate students have to do. So at least all students have to do PE class, and by taking the beginning swimming, it still fulfills that graduation requirement that all students have. And that's it.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: [indiscernible] online.

>> UNIDENTIFIED: I have more of a question, what is our enrollment year, are we going to have a vote? Or do you just want to hear what we're thinking? I don't know if the question is for Ryan or Frank.

>> RYAN LOMBARDI: I do not want to, Frank is coming up. I don't want to step, I think that any action would come out of CAPP subsequent to this conversation so I think this is more about us hearing feedback so that the committee that Frank chairs can determine whether to take action. Frank is that accurate?

>> FRANK ROSSI: 100%. Yes, that is right. I think this thing got a little bit of a life of its own, and I think working for the committee is the best way now to retrench. But I do think we should hear from everybody, that is what we gathered to do here right? So I think I'm with you 100% Ryan, we should hear from people. And we will come back and craft something that maybe will become a resolution.

>> UNIDENTIFIED: So let me say, in my personal opinion, I truly think that knowing how to swim is a great thing. But my general approach, and I think it's not only for this test, but I'd generally believe that we put much too many requirements on her students and that includes you know, so many things that we put on them on the orientation and everything, so my general approach

is the minimum requirements for the students.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Wendy Wilcox?

>> WENDY WILCOX: Thanks. First I just want to emphasize that I do agree with Alex's point on chat that students of color first and first gen students already have many experiences outside of their comfort zone, so I do not think that that should be a motivating factor. Second, on your data firemen were correct, the number of fails for the swim test were actually relatively low. So it wasn't clear to me, I do not recall seeing how many enrollments that number was related to, the beginning of swimming. So it says to me that maybe there is a disparity between actual people that fail the test versus people who enroll in the beginning swimming, which says to me like it is not a significant number of people that are actually failing. So why do we have this arbitrary condition for graduation in place if people want to take a swimming class as the PE, they have the opportunity itself, it is part of graduation, that seems sufficient enough.

>> FRANK ROSSI: I believe there is between and do not quote me, I am not going to get taped and recorded and we will come back and get you specific numbers, somewhere I remember the 80 – 100 kids enrolled in the swimming lessons right out of the gate. Those numbers represent the percentage of it. I think the slide might have an end value on it, but I do not know for sure. But, to your point, it is a small number, it is not a big number as you can see from the number of tests administered, pretty consistently every year. The majority of kids are getting and passing it out of the gate.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you, I'm going to go out of order since Abby has talked already. We will get her second, first Debbie Cherney.

>> DEBBIE CHERNEY: Debbie Cherney, Department of Animal Science, it does have something that kind of binds all of the students and the other thing is that those that are drowning aren't the under represented minorities. So while it adds a little stress, it's kind of nice to think that we might be saving some of our alumni from drowning.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Abby Cohn?

>> ABBY COHN: So I guess two things, one is procedurally, this is a graduation requirement, I

think that it would eventually have to go to the EPC and the EPC would have to bring that to us just procedurally. So I guess what I'm hearing, I agree with almost everything that has been said, but I think the question I would like to ask or suggest is it seems like the current mechanism to achieve the goal that we have all seemed to be in consensus about, is not effective. So the question is what is the alternative mechanism? What are we going to do instead to invite and encourage those individuals who would fail a swim test or are not strong enough swimmers so that they really could be in a dangerous situation to see it as a life skill that we are endorsing and saying this is one of the things you should do at Cornell is gain this life skill? So I would like, I am not opposed based on everything I've heard, to us eliminating it, but I would like us to counterbalance that with a really proactive fall for engagement and how are we going to achieve what we are not effectively achieving right now?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you, I do not see any more hands up. So I think we can move on.

>> WENDY WILCOX: I just want to ask the question related to what Abby was saying. I know all these PE courses, there is an additional cost for everything that you register for. What is the additional cost for PE, the swimming or the beginning swimming course?

>> RYAN LOMBARDI: I will just say I do not know the answer, but I will say not all PE does have an additional cost, there are a number of PE courses that do not have a cost. I do not know the whether PE 1100 has an additional cost but I will make sure to get the information.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we have "Good of the Order," two speakers and I think we can give them an extra minute each. Richard Bensel government on thoughts of the Faculty Senate agenda, for three minutes, followed by Risa Lieberwitz Global Hubs. So Richard you are on.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you Jonathan. I will be, I'm going to take all of that three minutes. I circulated a message to the Senators and I have asked for feedback on a problem that faces the Faculty Senate. We had a proposed resolution that was introduced September 17, 2021 and it has never been recorded to the Senate. It is now five months and counting, this bottling up faculty resolutions by the UFC, this is a serious problem. No Democratic body could tolerate this kind of agenda control. The question is what are we going to do about it? Those of you who are

online who have not received this message, let me know. And I will send it to you, I am always perfecting that list. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Risa?

>> RISA LIEBWERTWITZ: Thank you, Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. So, I wanted to talk about global health, but before getting into that, I want to mention that I think it would be really good if dean of faculty gives announcements that we build in some time to have some questions and answers discussions at that point because that would have been a good time to raise the points that I now am having to raise in "Good of the Order". So, I hope you can do that in the future. But what I wanted to remind people of is that the Faculty Senate did pass a resolution that passed on December 1, the Senate voted in favor of a resolution to help faculty consultation, in regard to Global Hubs. And in particular in that resolution that was adopted on December 1, it was proposed in November and voted positively and approved on December 1, there was a specific, resolved that asked the CAPP Committee to report back to the Senate with regard to both the procedure, that could be used in regard to the approvals of the global hub, and the role of the faculty as well as the substitute criteria and standards that should be used in evaluating whether to approve Global Hubs. And we were told that CAPP would report back in December to the Senate about that. Now I understand that CAPP is busy and I really appreciate the reports that they made today with regard to the issue of the part-time program, opposed to the part-time program and there's a lot more to be said about that. This is not a criticism of CAPP, it's really a reminder that this is still an outstanding resolution that needs to be implemented and from what I have heard from the dean of faculty today, I did not hear with regard to what is coming to the Senate, a reference to CAPP coming back to us to report on the procedure and the substituted criteria and standards for Global Hubs. So I wanted to raise that, and since I think I have time, I wanted to raise one other point. Again that I would have asked faculty, had we had some time after the announcements. And that is that I think we are into nomination season with regard to elections, for various openings and that would include faculty trustee, as well as the associate Dean of Faculty, and by my count, there's three UFC seats that would be filled through elections, so I think good be really helpful if we could know as the faculty generally and certainly the Faculty Senate, how to propose nominations and self nominations. I hope that there will be a general call to the faculty for nominations for these openings so that we can get a lot of input in that way as well as directions of who to send those types of nominations and self nominations to. So thank you very much.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a couple of minutes, Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I have two minutes and I will try to address all of those. Risa I think that is a wonderful suggestion for you to give space for questions and answers for my announcement and updates. I'm happy to build that into our Senate meetings going forward. Richard, I just wanted to say that of all the proposals that were pending, from Charlie Van Loan as dean of faculty, and in the three that were sent to me in September, there is only one that is outstanding and that resolution is sitting with the new General Counsel and so she is working through the bylaws and wants to get feedback on that before taking it to the UFC. So it has been mentioned to the UFC, but they have not had a chance to consider it yet because I have asked for the Council to give feedback on bylaws and implications for the bylaws. So, it will come to us, just not yet. Risa, yes so CAPP I think it was a little ambitious of me to promise that CAPP would be able to come to the Senate in December, seven days after we passed it to say that they know exactly how they are going to intersect with the International Council on Global Hubs. Mark Milstein, the Chair Of Academic Programs And Procedures Policies, excuse me, committee the CAPP Committee, is a voting member of the International Council and all Global Hubs go through the International Council. So, he is definitely part of it. And the idea that I brought up where the faculty members as part of the [indiscernible] those two countries would go to CAPP and those faculty members will present why they're excited about these hubs and what the locations are and how they would be implement it through the CAPP and these faculty members will come to the Senate but I think the timeline is a lot slower than 92 submitted and so I cannot promise when but CAPP will come back to the Faculty Senate with what they think are the correct implementations for how to consider the Global Hubs.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you, it's 5:00. We are by rule adjourned.