

## Faculty Senate meeting April 20, 2022

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Hello, everyone. I'd like to start this meeting with the land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq', the Cayuga Nation. The Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. Meeting is called to order. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, speaker. The first thing to do is to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2022 meeting. They have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. Are there any corrections? Hearing, seeing none. The minutes are approved as posted by unanimous consent. We now come to the portion of the meeting with announcements and updates. Just to give you a sense of what's happening, Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty from Psychology, will speak for five minutes, followed by Neema Kudva, chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee. And then, there will be five minutes for discussion in this first section. I turn it over to Eve.  
[BACKGROUND CHATTER]

>>EVE DE ROSA: Hello, everyone. It's been a comedy of errors today, so sorry for the technical issues. Next slide, please. Thank you, C.A. C.A. is going to be sharing slides for us today. I'm going to do this. OK. I just wanted to make a few announcements as representing sort of our actions and work over the last month. The vote results for the natatorium have been released to the Senate, and the president's response is posted publicly on the website. And as you can see, it was overwhelmingly approved. And it was overwhelmingly approved across the assemblies. I think the president and provost, in particular, are hearing a large amount of support for a new natatorium. And I wanted to also share that the faculty forum in my eyes was complete success, and I'm really appreciative of those of you who attended. And we had maybe 30-something people, 35 people, I think. But what was really important was that we had really rich conversation and discussion of the proposal. But also, there were new voices there that we hadn't heard before. And so, all of those commentaries and discussion were sent to the provost, also Vice Provost August and Nishii, as the co-chairs of who developed the proposal. And then, I just wanted to update the Senate on all of the work that we've been doing with the Research, Teaching Extension faculty taskforce. And that's co-chaired by Senators Kopko and Callister. And as I've mentioned to the Senate, what we've been working on are for RTE faculty now that there is a unified class of faculty, called Research, Teaching, and Extension, how do we get consistency of the titles and consistency in the standards for promotion and professional developments? That's one class of content. Another class of content is thinking about climate and inclusion. And then, the last class is, we now afford the honor of becoming emeritus faculty for Research, Teaching, and Extension faculty, but it was unclear sort of how they--once they have achieved that status, what next? And so, I've been meeting biweekly with academic HR to try to resolve those things for the faculty. One thing that you would never imagine is so difficult, but has been basically a conversation between the Dean of Faculty Office and the Institutional Research and Planning Office, a back-and-forth and collaboration, I'm going to call it, where it was almost impossible to get an accurate account of how many faculty we have that have RTE

titles. And so, we now have clarity on that. And part of the work that we've done is, RTE faculty will now be classed as such in Workday, which wasn't the case, and that's what made it so difficult to get an accurate count. Because a lot of RTE faculty have multiple titles, sometimes across multiple colleges. And so, we needed an accurate headcount for wherever their primary affiliation was. That's all been cleaned up. We now have a sense of who we are. And as you'll see, the university faculty are about 56%, and the RTE faculty are about 44%. And when you look at the distribution across research, teaching, and the extension, you can see that research and teaching are pretty equivalent, and then there's a small group of extension faculty. I've been working with academic HR, as I mentioned, sort of getting to the nitty-gritty details of titles and benefits and things like that, and getting Workday changed. But I've also been working with the University General Counsel, the vice president of human resources, the provost's office with the deputy provost and the vice provost of academic affairs, as well as the ombud's office, so that we're all having the same conversation. And this is really important, especially for the inclusion part. And once we have settled a few things, then I will go and speak to the deans about consistency within the colleges and possibly across the colleges. I just wanted to share that. And then, the other work of the taskforce itself is that they've been creating sort of a list of concerns that fit into the broad areas I already described. They're going to do a quick Qualtrics now that we know who this community is, and just verify that the taskforce is representing all of the concerns, this group of 20-ish people. And then, we'll take it to CISER and make sure that we're giving IRP appropriate and meaningful data. And then, we can move forward on working through those issues. And I think with that, I will move it on to Neem.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: C.A., can I have the next slide? Thank you. As all of you know, we have 9 open seats for elected positions, and 37 for appointed. We have a slate. The election will be two weeks from now, after the Nominations and Elections Committee has voted on the slate. But I just wanted to share it with you. There are two candidates for associate dean of faculty. Their statements are available on the website. Please feel free to go and look at it. Marilyn Miguel, from the College of Arts and Sciences, and Chelsea Specht, from CALS. Next slide, please. C.A.? We have four faculty members who have agreed to stand for election for the one position we have as faculty trustee. David Lee, from CALS and College of Business, Shirley Samuels from Literatures and English, Laurent Saloff-Coste, from Mathematics, and Charles Brittain from Philosophy. Next slide, please. And then, there's a number of faculty who have agreed to stand for election for the University Faculty Committee, for the Nominations and Elections Committee, for senators at large, both tenured and RTE. The elected faculty, the election is by the university faculty, so there's over 3,000 people who vote for the folks in these positions. There's one person who's missing from the University Faculty Committee list, Deb Cherney. My apologies for that. All the information, these statements, and links to biographies are available on the dean of faculty website. The elections will be two weeks from today. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: OK, we have some time for Q&A for the dean or the chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee. If you're online, in Zoom-land, and have a question, raise your virtual hand. If you're here and have a question or comment, just walk up to the microphones. And at this point, I'm not seeing anyone. OK, I see Risa Lieberwitz. Identify your affiliation and go on.

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: Great, thank you. Risa Lieberwitz, faculty senator from ILR. I wanted

to follow up on some of the remarks and report about the RTE faculty taskforce. And it may be that I didn't quite catch it. In terms of the--I understand that the taskforce is going to do a Qualtrics survey with regard to the concerns that RTE faculty have. And my sense was that it was to see if the taskforce's list of concerns are confirmed by others, or are there other concerns? I had a little bit of a question about--That seems to me to be very important. But I had a question just about how it would work. It sounded like it's not going to be all RTE faculty who are asked questions. Could you just clarify that a bit, Eve?

>>EVE DE ROSA: Absolutely. We are going to send the Qualtrics to all RTE. We now know who they are and where they live, and so we're now capable of doing that. We wanted to do that work a little earlier in the semester, but now that I feel confident that we know who the population is, we can ask this question. Because the taskforce was concerned that there might be things that they're missing. And we didn't want to go to CISER and do the appropriate survey work without knowing that we're capturing all the concerns. And we want to also ultimately relate this back to the belonging data that's happening that actually inspired all of this work by Charlie [INDISCERNIBLE]. We know that RTE faculty had a lot of concerns. They had lowered values on the sense of belonging to Cornell. And so, that's what motivated all of this. And so, we're continuing that work.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm not seeing any other virtual or in-person hands raised. I think it's safe to move on to the next order of business, which is a proposal presentation of prospective part-time bachelor's degree for non-traditional students. We have a five-minute resolution presentation from Senator David Lee, University Faculty Committee from Applied Economics and Management, followed by lots of time for Senate discussion.

>>DAVID LEE: Thank you. I'm David Lee, Dyson School UFC and, by coincidence, or not a coincidence, I was on the original committee of the--committee to put together a report on the feasibility of this potential program. The background to the resolution should be up there. Next slide, I guess. I haven't seen the slides yet. Yeah. Background provides the chronological series of steps that have been taken since late October to bring this resolution to the Senate. In the interest of time, I'm not going to review the step-by-step, but it begins with the submission of the report from the administration at the end of October. There was a presentation of the draft proposal to the Senate by Lisa Nishii and Avery August in December at our December meeting. At our February meeting, CAPP and EPC reported back. CAPP was "very supportive of Cornell offering a part-time program for non-traditional students." And the EPC found "the proposal's motivating sentiments praiseworthy." But like CAPP, both identified some significant implementation questions that needed to be addressed. At our March meeting, AFPSF reported to the Senate in their summary of their report, and "applauded the clear accord of the proposal with the original promise of Cornell's founders of 'any person, any study'" in seeking to attract underserved communities. But that committee also identified a number of implementation issues. Today, on behalf of the UFC, I am presenting a resolution that the Faculty Senate approve in principle, in principle, the concept of Cornell creating a part-time bachelor's degree program. The second resolved, if we can move to the next slide... Actually, the next slide. Yeah. Second resolved... Clearly states that this approval is conditional on satisfying a number as yet unresolved implementation questions. The original ad hoc committee identified many of these same issues in its original report, and these and other matters were raised in the committee

reports. These have been discussed at length in our previous meetings, so I'm going to cite just three and not even really go into it in the interest of time, which were common elements of the committee reports. The committee reports each had a different flavor, and talked about different things, but there were three common elements as I read them. One is maintaining the quality of education in the program, particularly important given the fact that we're now in an online world, at least partially. And of course, we have a lot of experience with online education now. But also, the non-traditional nature of the students and their needs. Those may bring some unique concerns that will come up. Second were instructional issues, the importance of faculty developing the curriculum, the mix of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty teaching in the program, the tradeoffs between faculty teaching in the traditional, residential program versus the part-time program, and compensation issues, among other matters. And then, third was the matter of scaling, starting small and ramping up the scale of the program once we see what works, what doesn't work, instructional administrative issues that may arise, etc. All three of these committees suggested a pilot program, or a small-scale program initially. There are other implementation issues, as well, that were raised in the original report that came up in the three committee reports, the previous Senate meetings, and the forum. Again, the proposed resolution is directed toward approving the concept of the part-time degree program, subject to the next step of resolving these implementation issues. The third and fourth resolves speak to process. As you'll recall, there were some communication mishaps last month with the provost regarding the language in his letters in early March to the Senate committees that appeared to imply that the program was already going ahead in the broader context of hiring the next dean of the School of Continuing Education. His letter to senators that we all got on March 21 hopefully addressed those concerns. And I'll note specifically that he said implementation details "can only be achieved through a careful planning process undertaken by the leadership of SCE with consultation with the faculty and college leadership. Following development of a plan that addresses the issues outlined in the committees by the committees, the program will be brought back to the Senate for consideration before any decision is made to move forward with implementation." The third and fourth resolves pertain to faculty involvement at all stages of program planning, providing regular updates to the Senate on the resolution of the implementation questions, and the provost seeking approval of the Senate before the program has officially begun. We believe, the UFC, that this creates a process by which the faculty continue to be involved in a central way. We will continue to be informed as the process proceeds. And we will have the opportunity to approve the prospective program in the end before it proceeds. So, I would like to then move this resolution--I guess it's already moved--that we approve the prospective creation of a part-time bachelor's degree program, subject to the other resolves. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Discussion. We had an amendment submitted 24 hours ago by Ken Birman. And so, I think it's useful to bring that to the floor first. Since it hasn't been distributed, I think, Ken, if you could--

>>KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, I asked Jill if she would be able to--These are the slides I sent her. It's just two or three slides. This is intended as a friendly amendment in the sense that it could be adopted, I would hope, just by consent. Jill, next slide. You'll notice that in the resolution we were just shown, the word "approval" appeared three times. Jill, next slide. Next slide, please. Yep. The word "approval" has a special significance in the bylaws that set up the Senate. We are

actually only allowed to use "approval" for actions related to our own composition and conduct. And in contrast, the word "consent" is what's used in the bylaws when the Senate votes on university action. "Consent of the governed" is the phrase they use. Last slide, Jill. I would like to suggest to move that we amend what we've just seen. The three uses of "approval" would be changed to "consent." It forces slight rewordings of those sentences, as shown here. And then, that we vote on this version in which we would consent to the new program. And when the final details appear, we would still require that they be brought to us for further consultation, and again, an opportunity for us to consent. And my reason for suggesting this is because I feel that, otherwise, the motion that we've been shown is trying to do two things at one time. It's trying to assert a right of approval that we don't have under the bylaws, while also legitimately commenting on the new programs. We could debate, and perhaps should debate, whether the Senate should have actual approval authority over certain types of educational actions. But in the bylaws, we don't. And I feel that, by conflating these matters, the motion as written is confusing, and that this minor change would resolve that. And I'm not saying that we shouldn't have approval. I'm simply saying that we don't. That was my comment. I would need a person to second thing. We would then debate it. And then, later, when we vote, we would either be voting on the amended or the original motion based on the outcome of my amendment motion.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm looking for a second by someone raising their hand. And I see a second. Therefore, we can have a short discussion on the amendment, and then a vote, and then resume the discussion of the motion either as amended or not, depending on the outcome of the vote. Anyone who would like to speak in person, come up to the microphone. If you're in Zoom-land, raise your virtual hand. I'm not seeing any--OK, we have someone in-person. Speak.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're trying to pull it up again. It disappeared from the screens. Yeah. This is the first time I've seen this. Or I saw this just before the meeting. Somehow, I don't have deep philosophical objections to this, but it sort of softens--to my way of reading it, it sort of softens the motion, particularly the last line. "The provost offers an additional opportunity for consultation with and consent by the faculty." It softens it. I think one of the upshots of the discussions we've had since the December meeting on this and the mishap with communication with the provost that happened last month, one of the upshots of that was the need for the Senate to assert its role. I just... Somehow, in quick consultation here, it just seems that the language softens the meaning of the resolution. As for the approval, all we're doing is approving a concept. We're not approving anything. It's advisory to the provost in any case, so we're not approving anything, we're approving a concept. We could approve lots of concepts, so I really don't see the need for this, nor do I have any deep objections.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a Zoom speaker, Laurent Dubrueil. Identify your affiliation, please.

>>LAURENT DUBRUEIL: Romance studies, I'm the faculty senator for romance studies. I, too, I'm discovering the new wording. But I was wondering why you used "consent" rather than "recommend." If I'm looking right now at article 13 of the bylaws, about the university faculty, I found that the functions of the university faculty shall be to consider etc., and to recommend to the board of trustees, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of degrees. And it seems to me that we are

dealing with the establishment or modification of a degree. And so, why not using the term that appears in article 13 of the bylaws that is recommending to the board of trustees?

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Laurent. If I could respond.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Sure.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I read the same language and thought about that. It seemed to me that the more operative language was that the role of the Senate is to provide the consent of the governed in the--I could quote it at more length. And so, I used that term. But you're absolutely right. The other term could have been used. The term, I think, that cannot be used here is "approval" because it's used in the Senate enabling legislation in a very specific, somewhat legalistic way. Actually, I fully understand the prior comment that the group that proposed this motion intended approval in that sense. But I don't believe that a reasonable reading of the enabling--it would appear that the enabling legislation deliberately limits our ability. And while I think we can and should debate that at some point, for this purpose, for the purpose of commenting on this program, I'm urging that we not combine the two questions, not conflate them, and simply adopt the language that relates to what we are permitted to do. But you're quite right. Instead of "consent," one could reword this around "recommendation." It just leads to different wording.

>>LAURENT DUBRUEIL: If I may. "Recommending" to the board of trustees might be stronger than "consenting," if we had to change.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, just a brief response. I like Laurent's suggestion. If we're going to change it at all, I think "recommendation," "recommending," and "recommend," I think that's stronger language than consent, which seems a fairly passive word. I'm not sure we can do it on the fly here, but I'm sure we can find a way, with all the wordsmithers here, to adjust the language so that the word "recommend" features prominently, particularly with the final resolves. That's going to take some tinkering, but I think the word "recommendation," or "recommend," or "recommends," I think that provides the strength of the language that, I think, we want or we intended, whereas I don't think "consent" does."

>>KEN BIRMAN: If I may. Under the rules of the Senate, because I've introduced this as a motion for amendment, and I personally find that "consent" is an easier word, also, I worked out the wording, it seems to me that we should vote this up or down. If you wish to amend your own motion while we do this, you can come up with wording that uses "recommendation." It's not totally clear to me how to do that with proper English. But then, we could discuss that change. But I think there--We're supposed to deal with one motion at a time. And the motion to amend has to be voted up or down first. And I'm not proposing to change my wording, even though I fully understand the point you're making.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a speaker online, Richard Bensel.

>>RICHARD BENSEL: Actually, Risa's ahead of me. So, let her go first.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm skipping people that have talked already. Then we'll get back to Risa.

>>RICHARD BENSEL: Oh, I see. David, I have another question. You were very effective in the discussion forum, and you went through a number of problems with this proposal. And you were very articulate. You called some of them deal-breakers, if I remember correctly. And when you called them deal-breakers, one of them was financing, and so forth and so on. In light of that, I have two questions. One is, have the respective Faculty Senate committees actually commented on this resolution? Another question is, did the provost respond to your critique of the program? And the last question actually comes in reference to whatever we might do with this language. Why couldn't we just strike that first resolve altogether? It doesn't seem possible to me to launch this as a pilot program. How do you do that? You have a... I have no idea how you grant a degree to students in a pilot program, or even figure out how it works.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Richard, with due respect, there's a motion on the floor to amend, and right now, we're supposed to debate and vote on the motion.

>>RICHARD BENSEL: Sorry to interrupt, but you're incorrect about this. If I wished--And I'm not doing that now. I'm asking David a question. But if I wished, a motion to strike that first resolve would be in order--

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't believe that's true. In order to make sure I understood the rules as-- [CROSSTALK]

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Excuse me, folks. Can I interrupt? The amendment is being debated. After the amendment is voted on, we resume our discussion of the motion either as amended or not. At that point, another amendment, if it's not substantive, can be introduced. But right now, I believe that the comments should be germane to the amendment only. Risa, do you have a comment about the amendment?

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I've just done a quick search through the OPUF, the Organization Procedures of the University Faculty, and I've also looked at the bylaws, as Laurent said he did too. But just on OPUF, the term "approved" is also used. There is nothing in there that seems to me to require that we... Let's see... that supports that we use a term like that we "consent" to certain types of things. The term "approved" is used in different ways with regard to the faculty voting on different things.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well--

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: And so--Excuse me, I'm speaking.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: And so, it seems to me that there's very little to support using a term like "consent" here. I agree with the critiques that it's very passive. And it seems to me that we can assert our approval or our non-approval, whether in principle or otherwise, of proposals that

are put before us, and that the university administration will then be very clear at different points when we vote on what we approve of and what we do not approve of. I think that a term "recommendation" is certainly better than "consent" because "recommend" is more active, and then they'll know what we recommend and what we don't recommend. So, I think I could certainly live with that. But I think "consent" is really not appropriate here.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry I interrupted.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a speaker in person. Excuse me. Let's have the speaker in person so that we can distribute the conversation.

>>DURBA GHOSH: Great, thank you so much. I'm talking to an empty room, but it's so that you can see me on the screen looking at you. I'm Durba Ghosh. I'm a member of the University Faculty Committee. I would move that we vote on the amendment. It's pretty simple. We vote yes or no to accept this amendment. I think the more substantive conversation is about the resolution itself, and I think we should move to that. Could I make that motion to vote on this amendment?

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: You're asking a parliamentary question. I think that motion to move requires a majority vote or something like that. I'd prefer if there's no other people that need to talk, we can just move to that vote.

>>DURBA GHOSH: Professor Benseal says I can call the question.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to respond on a factual matter that Risa raised. Approval is used--

>>DURBA GHOSH: Excuse me. I guess I just want to resolve. If we call the question, I think we can vote, right? Because I think the question that Professor Birman wants to refer to has to do with the substance of the original resolution, right? So, if I've called the question, let's just vote on this amendment, yes or no, and then we'll move on.

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. No, I was going to respond to Risa.

>>DURBA GHOSH: Well, I've called the question, though. Right, I've just called the question, so we vote on it now. Right? Yeah. In the room I'm in, I see a lot of head-nodding.  
[LAUGHING]

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We'll have time for discussion after the amendment is voted on. And I think there are some procedural issues involving the Zoom people voting and the people in the room. And I'm going to turn it over to Neema to organize the vote.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: Jill's going to launch a poll to everyone on Zoom, if you're a senator, please vote in zoom yes, no. There's the vote. And for those in the room, I'll just call out the vote. Please raise your hands. We'll count. Oh, you have just a minute, so just do it fast.

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: Excuse me, I'm sorry. I think this is a point of order what we're asked to vote on.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: You're being asked to vote on--

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: ...discussion of the amendment, which is not what we're voting on.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: No, no, no, no, no. Risa, you're being asked to vote on whether we're going to amend, whether we're going to accept the amendment or not. That's what we're voting on right now.

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: No, I understand. But that's not what's coming up in front of me.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: Senators only. It says "motion to amend."

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: It says, "Do you support discussion of this amendment?"

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No, that's incorrect.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: Oh, that's incorrect. [BACKGROUND CHATTER] Oh, OK. The language of that should be--Jonathan, what should the language be? It shouldn't say, "Do you s"--We're doing this because we just received the amendment shortly before the Senate meeting. Instead of saying, "Do you support discussion of this amendment"--

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: To approve the amendment.

>>NEEMAKUDVA: Thank you for pointing out. It should be...

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: To approve the amendment.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: Do you support approval of the amendment? Yes, if you support the approval. No, if you... And then, abstain. We will change--We will put an amendment on that... I can't hear and talk at the same time. We will change that in the record. Risa, does that make sense? OK, she's going to launch a new poll. And for all of us in the room here, there will be a new poll launched. For all of us in the room here, yes in the amendment, please raise your hands. [BACKGROUND CHATTER] You are in favor of the amendment? OK, one, two, three. Three in favor. Against the amendment. Nine against. Abstain? OK. Thank you. [BACKGROUND CHATTER]

>>JILL SHORT: We have 49 votes. So, we still have 20 people to vote.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: OK, there's 20 people left to vote. Can you please vote? Those of you in Zoom-land. 20 of you still need to vote. [BACKGROUND CHATTER] If you've switched your Zoom on and gone to get coffee, can you come back and vote? This is why we like things in person. We still have 25--

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: That microphone is not live. [BACKGROUND CHATTER] Just 12 have not voted.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: How many?

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: 12 have not voted.

>>NEEMA KUDVA: Now it's 12. 12 more people to vote in Zoom-land, please. [BACKGROUND CHATTER] [INDISCERNIBLE] This is like my classes. [LAUGHTER] Half the kids just go to sleep. They just switch on the camera. Risa, you can say that the [INDISCERNIBLE] same thing that the students do. [LAUGHTER] One more. They may not even be there. OK, it came in. OK.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The amendment does not carry by a vote of 31 to 24, with some extensions. Now we move on to the discussion of the main motion, which is the motion unamended. We'll take speakers from Zoom or in-person. Typically, we go to Zoom first if there is a hand up. Richard, two minutes, please.

>>RICHARD BENDEL: Yes, just to repeat the questions I had before and the comments. David gave a really nice overview of the proposal and its problems in the discussion forum. And he referred to many of the problems as deal-breakers. And they were very serious. This proposal for a pilot program doesn't make much sense to me. I don't know what a pilot degree looks like, or how you would do a curriculum that's a pilot. I wonder, therefore, and I'm asking David three questions. One is, did the committees that reviewed this legislation and reported on it, have they written an opinion of this resolution? The second one, has the provost responded to the discussion in the discussion forum, particularly David's really quite incisive reservations? And the third one is, David, would you be opposed to just striking that first resolve and saying that approval--and then be it resolved, approval is subject to satisfying a number of conditions? I really don't like giving blank check on this, or almost a blank check. I realize that you've put a lot of work into this, and the wording is careful. But it is far too... far too vague, considering the objections the committees and you yourself have made.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: David Delchamps.

>>DAVID DELCHAMPS: OK, can you hear me? I hope you can hear me. I'm speaking as an individual faculty member, and not as the EPC chair, about this. I think the... Personally, I think this resolution isn't worded strongly enough. And I think, sort of, that's what Richard was saying in a certain sense. And like Richard, I respect the UFC's effort in coming up with careful wording, and I'm sure they put lots of time into it, and they were really careful. But just two examples, rather than referring to program planning, I would have rather seen the resolution refer to, say, feasibility study or something along those lines. And rather than provost seek approval of the faculty Senate, I'd rather have it say, "The provost solicit, or gain, approval of the faculty Senate before commencement," because, honestly, all of our committees came through with essentially the same list of reservations, or at least, at the core, the same ones, plus some others that were unique to each of the committees' specialties. And honestly, something on the scope of the original proposal is just way beyond what the EPC at least thought could possibly be done in

a short amount of time. And honestly, I think this should be worded more strongly. But if this is the best we can do, I don't know.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: OK, let me interrupt. We're running out of time. This is not going to be voted on today, but at the next faculty meeting. I'd like to let two other comments that I see online, and then move on to the next item. I hope you can be brief, Debbie Cherney and then Steven Jackson.

>>DEBBIE CHERNEY: Debbie Cherney, animal science. I have no problem with that first be it resolved because it says "in principle." And I think that's the caveat that protects the Senate from giving them a blank check. And it isn't something that immediately antagonizes jump in, we have to approve this, but satisfying a number of yet unresolved questions. It just says, "OK, we can work on it, and in principle, we're going to accept it."

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Steven?

>>STEVEN JACKSON: Just to say that I agree on the point about strengthening the language somewhat. This comes partly from the experience of being on CAPP, which wrote, actually, a report that kind of looked like this. It said, "We like the ideas behind the program, but there's this problem, this problem, this problem, and this problem." And the interpretation of that was, "Oh, great, CAPP approves," right? So, I think that we need to be careful with language that suggests that the Senate approval is somehow given in advance. And I know that the in principle maybe covers that, but we need in language like "in principle" in the CAPP report, too, and it seemed to not be interpreted in the way we meant it to be interpreted. So, I would support a slightly enhanced or strengthened version of this. [CROSSTALK]

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I was going to say, a quick response from David Lee, and then we'll move on.

>>DAVID DELCHAMPS: Thank you. Thanks for the comments. I certainly can't respond to all of them in two minutes. I thank Richard for his kind words, but I would certainly not view this as a blank check. Richard used the word "blank check." That's absolutely not what is contained in the second be it resolved. In fact, the reason that's there is to represent the views of both the original committee on which I served, along with a number of other faculty, and the three Senate committees, all of which have identified implementation questions. As a practical matter, we strive for simplicity in these resolutions. And so, listing 10 or 12, or whatever the number of implementation questions in the second be it resolved is just not--it's just not practical. And so, that's why we did identify several of them. Those were some of the ones that cross cut the three committee reports. That's why they're in there. And then it says "among other matters." I think, really--I don't think--In fact, in response to the proposed amendment, I made a comment about strength of language. I thought we pretty much have ourselves covered here. And as to Richard's first point, or one of his points about removing the first be it resolved is we can't really do that because that's tied to the second. We're proving it in principle. As Debbie says, the word "in principle" is deliberately there. And then, there's a list of several major issues, major implementation questions. And there are other implementation questions, financial feasibility, financial aid, teaching requirements, and so on and so forth. I realize I haven't--I like the word

"solicit" in the last be it further resolved. I like that. But I think that's--I'll just leave it at that.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're going to move on. We have Lisa Nishii, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, talking on award of honors and distinctions to Cornell undergrad students, after which we will have time for a discussion. Right here.

>>LISA NISHII: Oh, OK. I'm just getting to the stage where I need to where reading glasses. Good afternoon, everybody. Nice to be here in person. I'd like to talk today... about our proposal on the award of honors and distinctions. Next. OK. I want to set the stage by reminding you that the primary motivation underlying this proposal is the fact that there's a lot of disparity across our colleges in how awards and distinctions, honors and distinctions, are currently awarded. If you take a look here at this table, I actually found this quite interesting. The percentage of our students who are in cross-college majors is really, really high. And it's these students who really notice the disparities across colleges the most. That's the context within which these discussions took place. Next, please. OK. The proposed changes really have to do with fundamentally simplifying and aligning what's happening across colleges. The feedback and questions that we've received from the Faculty Senate really helped us to see that there are some important points in our proposal that may not have been clear. And so, today, I'm going to just present it a little bit differently. The content is exactly the same, but in the proposal, we kind of organized it based on the label, so Latin honors and other honors. Today, I'm going to present it in a different way, which is separating it based on really the type of honors. The first will be awards honors that are based just on GPA, and the second is GPA-plus, like plus thesis, and so on. There are three components of the proposal. The first is to replace the current divergent approaches that we see across colleges in the award of honors based on GPA only, with a standard approach across all the colleges and schools. This means using a consistent label and criteria across the colleges, and to do that based on percentile scores. And this would be the Latin honors. The second part is for the colleges and schools to continue to make local decisions about awarding honors based on GPA-plus, that is plus a research project, honors thesis, or whatever it might be. But to use a common naming convention across colleges that might look something like "distinction in X," like distinction in research, for example. And the third part is to eliminate Dean's List. OK, next, please. I thought it might be helpful to give you some context when we looked at our ivy peers. And what we see is quite consistent with what we're proposing here in this proposal. When you look at GPA-only honors, they are awarded at the degree level not at the level of the major, at all of our ivy peers except Princeton, and using the Latin honors label. The completion of an honors thesis or independent project is associated with the award of honors at the department level at all of our ivy peers, not at the level of the degree. And they're not referred to as Latin honors. There's a variety of labels, like we have here currently, like honors in distinction and department honors and so on and so forth. I should also say, actually--It's not on this slide, but five of our seven ivy peers do not have Dean's List. Next, please. OK, here is a summary table that shows you really how things look right now. And you can see that it's quite different across colleges. If you look at the box on the right, that provides a summary of the pattern. All undergraduate colleges, except AAP and ILR, currently award honors at the level of the degree based just on GPA. All undergraduate colleges award Dean's List, right now, every semester, again, based on GPA. But the criteria are quite different across the colleges. The criteria used to determine honors at the level of the degree varies, also, quite a bit across colleges. Some use percentiles, some use absolute GPA. And the level at which it's pegged, or the level of selectivity, also

differs across colleges. And the labels vary. Three colleges use Latin honors, and two use distinction-type of language. Next, please. OK, here, what's in blue is what you just saw. It's what's in place. And the green columns show you what it would look like if we follow the proposal. And if you focus on the red boxes, that's where the changes really would show up. The labels change for Arts and Sciences, Human Ecology. AAP and ILR did not have honors, so this an introduction of a new thing for them at the level of the degree. The standard approach here across all colleges, as I said before, is that all would offer Latin honors at the level of the degree using uniform criteria. Next, please. Now I'm going to switch over, talk about the honors based on GPA-plus, where the plus is defined at the local level. And what you'll see here again, if you look at the box on the right, it summarizes the patterns here. All undergraduate colleges award honors based on some achievement beyond the GPA. That's currently the case right now. The criteria vary. And the labels vary. Arts and Sciences is the only college to use Latin honors at the level of the major. Remember, this label is used by three of our undergraduate colleges at the level of the degree for GPA only. And some are awarded at the level of the degree, and others at the level of major. And in some colleges, it's only available for students in some majors. For example, in AAP, it's only available in urban and regional studies. Next, please. Here is what it would look like if we were to follow the proposed changes. Really, the only thing that's changing here is in the first green column. It's a change in the labels that are used. But the discretion still remains at the local level. And honors based on GPA-plus could be awarded at the degree or the level of the major. Next, please. I want to address some of the concerns that were raised by senators. They all seem to be focused on the GPA-only type of honors. The first is, due to significant variability in GPA across majors, conferring Latin honors at the level of the degree could result in inequities, which begs the question, should Latin honors instead be awarded at the level of the major? It seemed like this may be a particularly acute concern within the College of Arts and Sciences. For example, might STEM students be disadvantaged? Second concern, if Latin honors are based solely on GPA, students will no longer be motivated to do research. Again, I think this was a concern in Arts and Sciences. And the third is that proposed changes will exacerbate grade obsession. Next, please. Some counterpoints to consider. Related to the first concern that was expressed, in every case, current GPA-only honors are awarded at the level of the degree, not at the level of the major. Course requirements for majors only account for about one-third of the total credits required for graduation. So, students in the same college have a lot of other credits not determined by the major. Some majors are too small for it to be meaningful to award GPA honors at the level of the major. So, a major with four graduates, for example, what does it mean to graduate in the top 5% or 15%? And awarding GPA honors at the level of the major could actually introduce some other inequities that's worth thinking about. So, students in cross-college majors can be held to very different degree-level requirements. Some students could be awarded honors with a much lower GPA, depending on the distribution within their major. Also, I thought I should--I will show you some data that we have from Arts and Sciences that suggests that actually differences across majors are not large and do not conform with expectations stated by some. Next, please. I'll show you here... The most relevant data, I think, to look at is the data currently available for students who graduate with distinction. This is the top 30% of graduates in Arts and Sciences. And in the box there, you'll see a summary, which is that I've disguised the department IDs here. But what we see is that, of the majors that are underrepresented among the students who graduate with distinction, there's only one STEM major. There are three social sciences majors, and one arts and humanities major. If you look at the majors that are overrepresented among graduates with distinction, there are two traditional

STEM majors in there, one social science major, and two arts and humanities. It doesn't follow a clear pattern based on the disciplinary buckets. Next, please. Second concern, will students no longer be interested in doing research if they can earn Latin honors just based on GPA? The underlying assumption here, I think, is that students are driven to do an honors thesis really because of the award they will receive, and that, perhaps, they're more motivated by an award that has the Latin honors label. I want to remind you that we already have awards that are based on GPA alone. So, we're not actually introducing anything new here. Somebody suggested we look at some historical CALS data, which I think is really interesting. And you see here, the reason this is interesting to look at is because before 2000 in CALS, students could not earn any kind of honors based on GPA alone. They had to do an honors thesis. In 2000, they introduced 2 types of awards that were based on GPA only, Dean's List and Latin honors. And you see I put the vertical line there. It's true, there's a little bit of a dip in 2000, but it goes back up. And there isn't a really clear pattern here. I think there are other factors at play that shape the number of students who are pursuing research theses. Next, please. One alternative, I think, that's implied here is whether or not the degree level of Latin honors should be contingent not only on a GPA, but also the completion of an honors thesis. But again, new inequities could be introduced because there are a lot of departments that don't offer the option to complete an honors thesis, and not all departments have the faculty capacity to meet student demand. Next, please. The last concern here was that the proposed changes would exacerbate grade obsession. And I think the underlying assumption here is that the proposal alters the awards landscape by increasing opportunities for awards based solely on grades. But really, actually, what the proposal does is it-it takes away, it reduces the number of GPA-based honors by proposing that we eliminate the Dean's List. And I also want to share that it's not clear that Latin honors have more cache or more of an influence on student behavior. In fact, professional academic advisors in the colleges tell us that the Dean's List is what students talk about the most and that influences their course selection the most. Last slide, next, please. One other concern we heard was that the students voiced some concern that perhaps eliminating the Dean's List might disadvantage them relative to students from peer institutions. But as it turns out, most of our peer institutions don't have Dean's List. And so, we don't think that's a big reason for concern. I think that's it. Thank you. This was just a backup slide. Yeah. Next slide. OK.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We don't have too much time, but if there are a couple of short comments, we can... OK, we have someone. I'm going to take the Harold Hodes online while someone in person comes to the mic.

>>HAROLD HODES: Well, just a couple of thoughts, first of all, about the motivation for these changes. It seems to be guided by the idea that uniformity is something we want. But why should we want uniformity? Different departments have different cultures. I think it's perfectly OK to have different departments following different standards when it comes to honors. I agree that there can be these outlying cases where, in certain--And the same applies to uniformity across colleges. I realize that there can be some exceptional cases, but perhaps we should be making some recommendations regarding avoiding cases where there's an absurd number of honors given or where there are absurdly few honors given. But for the most part, I don't see any special value in uniformity. I think it's a perfectly OK thing for different colleges and different departments to have different standards according to their culture.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have an in-person speaker.

>>CARL FRANCK: Carl Frank, physics. And I apologize for coming. I've just been put on the Senate and I didn't study the earlier discussion. So, my question is, the elimination of Dean's List, it seems to me the Dean's List provides an "atta boy, atta girl" kind of thing as you move along. And I don't quite understand the objections to it.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

>>LISA NISHII: The discussion really centered around the fact that the Dean's List happens every semester, so it's really salient to students, and that it was a greater source of stress as a result, as opposed to something that's eight semesters down the road and just isn't front and center as much. And there's a lot of parental pressure about Dean's List, also.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think we could do two really short ones. I'm going to go online to Kathryn Caggiano, and then in-person, and then we have to move on. I encourage all of you to write your comments online on the dean of faculty's website. Go ahead, online.

>>KATHRYN CAGGIANO: Yes, thank you. Really, I guess I have more of a question for Lisa, and this relates somewhat to the last speaker's comment. And my question is, I guess, do students have any way of understanding what their class rank is? And forgive me, maybe I should know the answer to this, but I don't. And I guess there is a little bit of a concern that if they don't have any visibility to this whatsoever, that essentially they don't have any understanding of where they fit in the lineup. And while I understand the need to--We want to try and get rid of some of that competition. At the same time, this sort of removes all... kind of calibration, I think, for a student for understanding this, and for their parents. And at the end, right, to just sort of, at graduation, suddenly be like, "Oh, congratulations. You were in the top 15%," when you thought you were in the top 5, may end up actually just having unintended consequences. I guess I would just wonder that.

>>LISA NISHII: I don't know if there is a way. It might vary across colleges for students to see where they stand. They look at historical data and get a sense for where those markers, the percentile markers, would fall. But I think that's really a big part of the spirit of this proposal, which is, what we're hearing is students aren't taking classes because they want to explore their avoiding risks when it comes to course enrollment because they're so concerned about the GPA. And so, it's hard to do both at the same time. There are probably ways for them to get a sense for where they are, generally.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: One last comment in-person.

>>CHARLES WALCOTT: I applaud the idea of uniformity across the colleges. That seems to me to be important in terms of how we do this. But I am sad at the thought that individual research, scholarship, or projects would play kind of a secondary role in the honors. Perhaps there could be some degree of honors given on the basis of grade point average, and the higher levels could be reserved for those that have gone way above and beyond with some kind of individual project.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Identify yourself.

>>CHARLES WALCOTT: I'm sorry. Charles Walcott, neurobiology and behavior.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're going to move on--Thank you, Lisa--to our last agenda item, increasing the transparency and effectiveness of faculty-centered proceedings. The resolution presentation is by Senator Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Five minutes, followed by dean of faculty response, followed by Senate discussion. Risa.

>>RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks, Jonathan Thanks for the time to present this. You have the resolution name right there. Can we get to the next slide, please? OK, great. Rather than just launch into the resolution, which everybody's had a chance to take a look at, I thought it'd be useful first to just set out the goals, the main goals, of the resolution. And then, on the next slide, as you'll see, after this, it'll also be the benefits that the sponsors see in this resolution. I didn't list all the sponsors on the slide, but it's right there for you on the Senate website. I'd also mention that this resolution has been endorsed by the Cornell chapter of the AAUP. The goals of the resolution, I think, are quite straightforward, as is the resolution. And these are ideas for how to increase the effectiveness of faculty governance here through the Faculty Senate proceedings. How do we increase information transparency and effectiveness? And these are procedural changes. First, with regard to setting Senate meeting agendas, secondly, increasing communications by both the dean of faculty and the University Faculty Committee to the Faculty Senate, and third goal here is to ensure Senate participation and consent in the creation of ad hoc committees. Next slide, please. And so, what would be the benefits for doing this? Well, a lot of it has to do with increasing engagement, and I think there are different ways to increase engagement of the Faculty Senate with the dean of faculty and with the UFC. One of the ways here, the second benefit, would be to increase the flow of information that comes from the dean of faculty and the UFC to the Senate in regard to areas that, as a Senate, we really don't have access to. So, sharing that information would be helpful to us to increase engagement. And I've been on the UFC before, so I know a lot of substantive and very important things are discussed in there. And it would be useful for us to learn about the UFC meetings, what happens in them, and that includes meetings with the provost, the president, and other members of the administration. And then, the third benefit would also be to increase the communications by the dean of faculty and the UFC to the Senate with regard to what is happening--what steps are being taken to implement Senate-adopted resolutions. Because we have resolutions, they get adopted, but they--We need the updates to see what are we doing, so that when they're adopted, we can take action, so that the Cornell administration will not only respond to say what they think about it, but also, we'd like, when the Cornell administration is called upon to take certain action, to find out what are we doing as governance bodies to take steps to implement those resolutions. Next slide. I'm not going to go through all the whereases. I just put them here in case anybody wanted to refer to them at some point in the discussion. Next slide, as well, whereases, if you could move to that. And I would emphasize this one from OPUF, the top one about the UFC having the responsibility to inform and consult the Senate on a regular and frequent basis. Next slide. And so, here, we have the first resolved slide of the two resolved--We have another slide, so everything's good on there. To promote the goals that I talked about, to enhance the benefits that I talked about, the resolved clauses try to meet that. First resolved that faculty shall publish

the agenda of each Faculty Senate meeting no later than the morning of the Friday before the Faculty Senate meeting. And then, resolved in relation to that, that one week before the Senate meeting agenda is published, that the dean of faculty shall post on the Senate website and send to the Senate a draft agenda. And by doing that, seeking, along with that, seeking comments, suggestions, and proposed amendments regarding both the content and the time allocations in the draft agenda, again, to increase that engagement and improve on our governance processes. Final slide. The next resolution regards reports at every Faculty Senate meeting with time for questions to fully inform the Senate of the content of the UFC meetings and provide updates about measures taken to implement resolutions adopted by the Senate. And I already talked about that earlier with regard to the benefits. And then, finally, resolved that the Nominations and Elections Committee shall nominate members and chairs of ad hoc committees, and that the dean of faculty shall submit such nominations to the Senate for its approval or rejection. And this is in line with the fact that this already happens with regard to standing committees and some other committees. But given the importance of ad hoc committees, we thought that that would also be useful, again, to increase engagement. So, hopefully these are straightforward and, I think, commonsense kinds of things, with the ultimate goal to increase the Senate's influence in our governance in ways that address the sort of educational policy issues and other related sorts of issues that were provided in the bylaws as part of our purview. Thanks very much.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Eve De Rosa.

>>EVE DE ROSA: C.A., could I have the next slide? I guess the thing that I want to remind the Senate is, for the past 150+ years, we've had university-wide representation in two different ways. For the university-wide elections, where we have almost 3,000 faculty members voting, we had the trustees designate authority to the dean of faculty, the associate dean of faculty, the UFC, and also the Nominations and Elections Committee. And when you look at who sits in these positions, we have great representation across the colleges, campuses, departments. And we also have very good representation, senators and non-senators. So, I feel like there's a lot of diversity in terms of the voices that are contributing to these university-wide elected positions. And it's been like that for a very long time, so part of me asks, "Why now?" And I can say, as a new dean of faculty, that I think that new senators and the new dean of faculty have inherited a place that isn't as effective as it could be. And are these the solutions and procedures that would afford a more effective Faculty Senate? We also have great representation, and very importantly, we have the senators, and we represent 3 campuses, 10 colleges, and 13 colleges and schools, and about 80 departments. Next slide, please, Sie. I would like to argue what could increase the effectiveness of the Senate is more representation in terms of the voices that we hear. I could have plotted this many ways. The way that I would like to plot this, and why I made this choice, is I'm highlighting that red bar. On the y-axis, you have the number of senators, on the x-axis, the number of contributions to the Senate conversation. And as you can see, sitting at 0, of our 130 senators, almost 100 have not given voice to any of the conversation that we have in the Senate. And that's the thing that I think will improve the effectiveness of the Senate. You can see way out in the tail, if this was an empirical study--I'm a psychologist, neuroscientist--I wouldn't consider the data that's sitting out there, two-plus standard deviations away from the mean. Those are minority voices, yet they've had overrepresentation for the conversations we've had here. And so, there are eight senators who sponsored this resolution. The AAUP, as you just

learned, and I didn't know until now, also endorses this resolution. And there's a huge overlap between the senators who sponsor this resolution and the AAUP. Your presence here in the Senate is to represent the departmental voice. So, when you have senators that have dual allegiances, which of those allegiances are being voiced here at the Senate? You can see, as a conservative estimate, because I didn't include all the zeros in my statistics, that we have six of those red stars represent over half of the contributions to the Senate. Next slide, please. Yes, we do want to increase the effectiveness of shared governance. It's a critical need. But are these the procedures that are going to do it? And are they going to... As a new dean of faculty, a lot of people thought, why would you go into such an environment? I don't think it would be a surprise to anyone to think that the Senate is held in high regard by everyone because some new senators have been very intimidated by the happenings, not just the procedures of the Senate, but also the... top-down... I guess, top-down communications, we'll call them, telling people how to think, telling people how to vote. And as a value of mine, I want people to come to this as their own intelligent, informed selves, and be able to ask questions freely. And we're not getting that. So, right now, we have an overrepresentation of a few voices in the conversation. And my concern is that there will be an inadvertent exacerbation of that on the agenda. And it might amplify those same voices. As the chair of the University Faculty Committee, I do give, in every Senate meeting, an update on the work that's been happening. And as you see from our packed agendas, we have a lot of work to do. And I'm happy to take in this information. We can expand discussion, no problem. I already send out the agenda on Fridays, not Friday morning because I am a researcher and I have only so many hours, but Friday. So, if I send it at 5:00PM versus 9:00AM, is that going to improve the effectiveness of the Senate? And I guess my last thing is, the ad hoc committees go through the Nominations and Elections Committee. They're already brought to the Senate for approval. For example, the huge slate is always brought to the Senate, the very first Senate meeting, when I did it, as well as Charlie before me and all the other deans before me. So, many of these things, I think, would be a part of a conversation. I'm happy to aim and try my best to do 9:00AM. But my concern is that, if I send it at 9:05, is that then cause for a censure? Am I going to be handcuffed? Are we handcuffing future deans of faculty? I'm not really worried about myself. So, I think there are going to be inadvertent complexities and difficulties for future deans of faculty. I think we can embed these things in the culture. I'm happy to give more space to discussion. And that's pretty much my response.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a little bit of time for faculty discussion, in-person or online. I see Richard Bensel, even though he's spoken before. There's no one else, so Richard, go ahead.

>>RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Jonathan. This resolution, just to remind us, was held up for seven months by the UFC. And during that time, the dean of faculty said that she was in discussions with the general counsel, Vice President Varner. So... Huh.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are you muted?

>>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's muted. You can just tell him.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Richard, you're muted.

>>RICHARD BENSEL: Sorry about that. Yes, reminding ourselves that this resolution was held up for seven months by the dean of faculty and the University Faculty Committee. During that time, the dean of faculty said she was consulting with Vice President Varner, the general counsel of the university. The results of that discussion, that seven-month consideration, is in the chat. It ended up not being an opinion. During the last meeting, I asked Vice President Varner whether she understood or had read section two of the OPUF, and whether the general counsel was mentioned in that section, and she did not know. So, we didn't have an opinion, and we didn't have any indication that, actually, the general counsel had read it. To have discussions, yes, as the chat says, we need more Senate meetings. But we also need to get resolutions before the Senate. And as far as the participation goes, the resolutions that have been offered, when we can get them to the Senate, they pass. That says something about the representativeness of those resolutions. The Faculty Senate has voted for them. The real problem is the UFC and irresponsiveness to faculty sentiment and not scheduling enough meetings.

>>EVE DE ROSA: I just will give a brief response. Of the six resolutions that you've signed on, Richard, five of them have actually come to the Senate. This one resolution, pending resolution, was given to Vice President Varner when she first arrived, and I gave her the grace of learning New York State and Cornell bylaws. And so, I did not push her, and the UFC did not hold anything away from anyone. And this resolution, let's remember, what you sent to me, before I had ever even started a Senate meeting, was a totally different resolution. This has been revised and softened. And so, let's remember, this is not the resolution that was given to me days after becoming dean of faculty. The resolution that was given to me days after becoming the new dean of faculty, not for all of the other previous dean of faculties that have existed before me, asked for the UFC to be completely public. A dean of faculty needs an executive committee. A dean of faculty needs to be able to... be able to speak about things in an open manner and show some leadership. An entirely public UFC would not allow that.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have just four minutes. Ashleigh Newman and then Abby Cohen, if you could talk briefly.

>>ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to comment. I've, in the last several months, spoken at every assembly on campus regarding the natatorium resolution, and I've been able to see the differences in how all these different assemblies, student assembly, employee assembly, university assembly, etc. run. And I was struck by the fact that at all these other meetings, that I had much more time to answer questions, and there was much more robust discussion. And so, I felt like I was actually really able to get into the depths of the issues at a much more deep level. Whereas, at the Faculty Senate, there were a few opportunities for people to share their opinion, but not much of a dialog. And I think the main reason for that is that we have really jampacked agendas here. This is my first year in a Faculty Senate, so that's what the sense is. And then, I was surprised to see how frequently all the other assemblies meet. The student assembly, I think, is weekly, which I was shocked to see. I'm not exactly sure on the frequency of the other meetings, but I think that the increased frequency of meetings allows for more robust discussion. So, maybe senators, I don't know if as a group, as a whole, if we are willing to take more time out of our schedule to meet more frequently, but that is the thing that I think would increase discussion, which I definitely see value in improving in the Faculty Senate. One comment I had about the resolution is, I do think that there's a stitch of micromanaging in

there. In the other groups that I'm in, there are committees that have a call for agenda items. You send in agenda items, but then that's it. There's not really a back-and-forth, "I have a comment." "That should be five minutes." "No, 10 minutes." I do think there needs to be some trust placed in leadership to allocate time based on all of the complexities of the discussion. So, I would agree for a call of agenda items, but not necessarily an online back-and-forth, because I think that could get cumbersome. That's all. Thank you.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we have time just for Abby Cohen.

>>ABBY COHN: I appreciate all the issues that are being raised here. But I am opposed to this resolution. I think it's not the right way to address or improve the need for more discussion, the need for better communication, and the question of how we will rebuild trust. I think it would be very unfortunate to pass this resolution. I would rather see us take to heart the issues that need to be addressed here, and think of a more constructive and creative way to address them. And I do think it's important to remember that the dean of faculty and all of the members of the UFC are elected by us, and we need to trust them to represent us. Thank you.

>>EVE DE ROSA: And I am happy--I have an open-door policy. Every faculty member who's ever asked to meet with me I've met with. I've had multiple meetings with the executive committee of the AAUP. I've invited myself to their meetings. I am very open and willing to hear and learn and continue the conversation. But I don't think this is necessarily the tool.

>>JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have a tradition of ending meetings on time, so I would encourage everyone to write their comments on the dean of faculty website to continue the discussion. And since there's only 10 more seconds, meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**