

May 11, 2022 Faculty Forum

>> EVE DE ROSA: Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the --. The -- are members of the -- 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 the --, dispossession, and the honor of connection of the -- people past and present to these lands and waters. This land acknowledgment has been reviewed and approved by the traditional -- leadership. With that, we can start our conversation. As I mentioned to the few people who were here exactly at 3:30-- Maybe I should give it a few more minutes. Just saw you come in. We're just gonna have an informal conversation, so people can just put up their hand, and give feedback and statements, and whatever it is that you want to have as part of this conversation. Who wants to start? Okay. Thanks, Carl. Thanks for starting us off.

>> CARL FRANCK: Actually, I returned to the faculty senate for this semester, but what I've been seeing has been transparent to me. I have no objections. That's what I'm here to say.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Well, I can say that Charlie was seen by many as radically transparent, and I have continued and expanded on that transparency, so I'd like to think what we're doing is transparent, but obviously, there are other points of view and there are things we can do better, so let's hear from those who think that it's not as radically transparent as they would like. Thank you, Tracy.

>> TRACY STOKOL: Hi, Eve. Thanks for organizing these sessions. I think it's a good informal way to get feedback and encourage engagement. I do think that things are good, but I have been frustrated, like many other senators, at the lack of time given for discussion for important items. I don't want too much senate control. I don't think that's gonna help anything, the senate having to control everything in relation to the senate meeting, but I do think that more time should be allotted to some of the more controversial topics. Obviously, looking at this forum, I thought maybe you'd get great participation. I didn't come to the last one, so I don't know, but if these forums aren't cutting it, then either having additional senate meetings in the middle even though I

don't think any of us want additional senate meetings, but just having more of a time for discussion. If you call it a senate meeting, more people are likely to come than a faculty forum, I think, but again, I wasn't there at the beginning. I do think that the USC should report to the senate on their activities and be open to questions and answers, and I think that should be a fairly decent chunk of time so that they can address some of the concerns that multiple senators have brought up on several occasions because I do feel that the Senate is getting a little disenfranchised with a lot of the things that are happening that seem to be very top-down without much attempt at engagement, and when there is engagement, it seems like the decision's already been made in the Senate doesn't have any say in it.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Can I ask? What are those things that you think are perceived as top-down, rather than-- I would like to know, what are the things out of the-- [Crosstalk]

>> TRACY STOKOL: Historically, the college of business, right? That's one of the things that happened. The part-time degree program I think is another thing, and particularly when the Senate feels brushed off by the Provost [indiscernible] responses. You know, I think-- I'm not saying I disagree with a part-time degree program. I think it's good, but I think the faculty have raised several questions, and we've kind of been a little, you know, just sidelined a bit. I just think there could be more of an effort to really listen to what the Senate's saying, or at least come across and-- At least if it comes across to the Senate that extra yes we're talking about it, but you can keep talking forever and nothing will ever happen, so I do understand administration wants to move forward with some things, but again, open transparency. I don't think you're responsible for a lack of transparency, or Charlie, because, as you said, you both made efforts to increase it, but I do think that the administration and their dealings is less than transparent. I think often we are told at the last minute versus, "Hey, we're thinking about doing this. Let's really get your feedback before we move ahead," and it just seems to be done deals and the Senate rubberstamping in it, if they don't rubberstamp it, it doesn't really matter because they're gonna do it anyway. I'm not saying that with everything because I do think the administration does listen and does make some changes to the policies, but I think ongoing feedback and communication is fairly critical. Yes, I do want to give other people a chance to speak, but I-- Just one other thing I want to say. I don't think the USC should come every single meeting, but I

do think there should be regular attendance or at least presentation by the USC, and you can see how frequently that needs to be after that initial assessment where the senators have a chance ask the USC questions of things that have been bothering them.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Okay. So, thank you and I'll have a few questions, if you don't mind, just so that I understand. So, I can say the last faculty forum was about 40 people, and definitely heard new things that we hadn't heard in the Senate, so I really-- I think the way I was thinking about using faculty forum when it first came in was having a panel, like very formal, and the first one I created fell apart just before I was going to announce it. And so, in this new iteration of faculty form, I love it. So, I think this is what I'm going to do going forward is that something that looks like it needs more space in the faculty senate meeting that happened on the first Wednesday of the month. Two weeks later, that's the thing that will get an hour to an hour and 1/2 of discussion. So, maybe trying to do more of that, and I think it-- One of the things Charlie said to me immediately in taking this position, every other week is just too high of a frequency. People are burnt out. They can't do it. Please go back to monthly. But I think if we make those biweekly experiences voluntary, then those who want to be here will be here. So, I'm gonna give that a try and see what that does. In terms of the UFC, the way I've been picturing is that I was representing the UFC in the discussion and the UFC when I did my announcements. I think what I'm hearing from you is not me as chair of the UFC because I guess I had a Dean of faculty a UFC member. Would it be appropriate because half the UFC is senators and half are not? Would you want only to hear from the senator UFC? Like, what are you picturing for that? And then, my other question is from my point of view, and I'm an outsider to this world, so this is new for me. I see it as, "Hey, provost has this proposal that hasn't been enacted yet. I'm gonna get this on as many senate committee hands as I can. That seemed relevant. And so, we went to 4+5 Senate committees, and they all produced reports. All of those reports were pushed up to the Provost. How else could we-- Nothing has been implemented. There's not even a dean of the new school, so how else could something like that have had more faculty senate involvement? I think I want to get a picture of what that is so I can help implement that. So, two things. UFC coming, not me representing the UFC. Who, how? And then, if we have the something like what I-- Oh my god. This is something that's gonna have huge faculty implications. Let's get this on the committees and the committees come to the senate. What else would you want to see? I am not-- I just want

to hear from Tracy because she put those things forward.

>> TRACY STOKOL: I think you doing a lot even, particularly with regard to the part-time degree program giving it to all committees, including the committee for academic status and professional [indiscernible]. It's such a mouthful. So, forgive my ignorance because I didn't actually realize you were the chair of UFC. I don't know all the hierarchy of all committees and everything, and I am ignorant on that, which I probably shouldn't be, but-- So, I think that from what my take, and certainly some of the other senators here attending they could speak up from their perspective, but I think from what I've been hearing is that the Senators just want more information about how the UFC establishes the agenda, and the items for discussion, and just would maybe like to open more of a dialogue. I'm fine with you being the representative. I do not have any issues with that.

>> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just more space.

>> TRACY STOKOL: Just more space and I think they just need to be a bit of time dedicating an upcoming faculty meeting to-- for the UC to kind of just engage with the entire Senate, not just the Senators on the committee. I certainly voted for a specific Senator who I thought would be really good for the UFC this year because I do feel there needs to be more feedback. Just to engage and say, "This is how we set the agenda. This is how we operate," because I think there are these questions that-- We don't even know how this works and we'd just like to hear more about it, and the nominations committee, and things like that. I don't think they should be, you know, micromanaging what these committees do because they are comprised mostly of senators. I have absolutely-- I think you're doing a great job personally, and you've definitely been reaching out and trying to engage a lot of committees. I do think that-- With the part-time degree program, I think there needs to be feedback from the administration to the Senate as to who is comprising such committee that searching for the new Dean, and who's gonna implement it, and who's on that so that they can look at it and go, "Okay. We think they're good representatives of this. This is encompassing," or at least be able to provide recommendations. Well, these people are great, but we think-- Did you consider adding these people that could bring valuable perspectives because I think hearing more voices, they might hear people they hadn't even thought of that

could bring a lot to such a committee. Particularly for such an important thing going forward. I think it's really important for the Senate, and the Senators, and the rest of the faculty to be more engaged in that and to hear more about it versus, "All right. Such committee's done. We've chosen this person. Yada, yada, yada." And without that feedback, I think that's what's been missing is that kind of, "This is what's been happening. We're gonna get back to the Senate and this is what has been happening." That's just my take on it.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Most definitely, we'll communicate that. I'm thinking maybe one of our first faculty fora, the first one after we restart the semester could be the UCF, and everybody gets to say, "These are the things on our minds for you to think about this year," and open the year that way with this more open conversation before we have our first Senate meeting.

>> TRACY STOKOL: Yeah. Another suggestion and I am gonna shut up, I promise. [Crosstalk] Not to dominate, but just another suggestion. When you brought that up, I thought of it. When I joined at first the committee for the academic status and professional status of the faculty. I can't even say it. I need to have it written in front of me. When I joined, I had no idea what they did. Really. Someone said, "I nominated you," and I'm like, "What do they do?" I think that just introducing to the Senators, maybe in a faculty forum, the chair of each of these committees goes, "Well, this is what I think our charge is." I think it would be really helpful because it would also allow faculty to know who to go to for some issues or what committees could be engaged. Nominations committee is pretty obvious, right?

>> EVE DE ROSA: I love it because one of the things that I had to do with a lot of new Senators was that, and so it could be an invitation where new Senators can come, learn what our-- We have 13 committees who work really hard, as you know. People are doing a lot of hard work that comes to then get formalized in the Senate, so it would be nice for people to know these 13 clusters, 12+ committees are working for you, the senate, and here's what they do, and here's the UFC. I love it. Thank you. Okay. Sorry. Carl.

>> CARL FRANCK: I have something to ask, but I think Kelly has had her hand up. I'll just say quicky, you brought into discussion to include our feelings about how things we do in the senate

get handled upstairs. That's my real concern. That's exactly-- Thank very much Tracy for her comments. asserted you handle spears and those who rule conjecture deductions for emerge Tracy for the comments. When my turn comes, I'll bring up two issues. One is what we did about antiracism and the other thing is about the play of the leaders. I'll just shut up and let other people talk first, but my deep concern is very much I don't really have any troubles with how the senate works, but I do have a lot of trouble with what the administration does with what we do. Thank you. I'll come back when it's my turn.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Kelly, go for it.

>> KELLY HUME: Can you hear me?

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yes.

>> KELLY HUME: I'm brand new this year. I feel like I don't understand the operation at all, a little bit thrown into the fire, some mild version of that. For me to have the faculty forum, if it feels a lot less intimidating. Trying to speak up at the Senate meetings is so confusing about when it's okay to talk, what I'm-- How am I gonna be sure it's two minutes? Are we discussing this concept or are we discussing this word and the resolution? It's very hard to figure out how to participate. My observation really isn't about transparency of what's happening at the meetings, but that I feel like I joined with no understanding about what-- about the University. About any of the committees or how it all comes together. I don't know if I was supposed to read something ahead of time or whatnot, but that's my-- That's been my main challenge for the engagement side of things.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I did something, but I still receive that feedback. You're not alone at all, and so I would wonder how would you, now that you have that perspective still, how would you feel if the first orientation to the Senate is a forum where we talk about this is what this role is. These are what the Senate committees do. Senate meetings are run in this way. Would that-- Here, you would have the space to just speak.

>> KELLY HUME: I think so. There wasn't an orientation, right?

>> EVE DE ROSA: No, I gave an orientation packet for you to read, but I didn't do an orientation in this form where we speak to each other.

>> KELLY HUME: I got that in an email?

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yeah. Our first one. Yeah.

>> KELLY HUME: Doesn't ring any bells, but yes, I do think that would be helpful.

>> EVE DE ROSA: David.

>> DAVID ZAX: I'm in a different position. I've now been half a dozen years in the Senate. I still have no clue how it actually works. My impression is that the committee structure is completely broken. As I read in the faculty guidebook, it says, for example, the University faculty committee has responsibility to inform and consult the Senate on a regular and frequent basis. I don't think I've seen that happen in six years. I'm on the nominations and elections committee. My term is up at the end of this month. In the three years, I don't think I've ever seen a case where anyone has asked us to make nominations for an ad hoc committee. The process of nominating people for the regular committees is completely chaotic and generally involves giving a slew of names about 12 hours before they go live. Last year, we put together a proposal on a committee on admissions which was supposed to do supervisory. It is supposed to have at least one discussion in the faculty Senate each year, providing us with information so that we can make rational decisions about things like SATs. That clearly has not happened. What I see instead is that we get frequent presentations from folks in the central administration. This year in particular, Wendy Wilford showed up. The new counsel showed up where they spent 20 or 25 minutes doing happy talk, and then we asked them substantive questions, they go away. So, if you're asking me how the Senate make decisions, the short answer is we have whatever information somebody decides they're willing to offer us, and then we do votes on things where we don't fully understand what we're voting on.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Okay, I'll take one at a time. For the UFC. As I mentioned already. I was assuming, as the chair of the UFC, that I was representing those conversations, but apparently--

>> DAVID ZAX: It sends inform and consult.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Maybe it's more that we have to open up the Q&A. I'm totally happy to do that. The nominations and elections. As I understand it, I'm not on that committee in any sort of way. I'm not representative. The ADOF runs that they're the chair of that community. The dean of faculty's independent of that. As I understand it, they do get a slate of names and they have to go through thousands of names to get hundreds of people to do this voluntary service. I know they work really hard.

>> DAVID ZAX: I didn't say they didn't work very hard. What I said was that the-- Other than the initial discussion of give us a thousand names, the nominations and elections committee has no meetings and has no discussion about the slates.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Nema didn't say that there weren't any meetings, but I can't speak to that.

>> DAVID ZAX: Okay, this year we had a meeting in December.

>> EVE DE ROSA: They're saying there were three meetings, which is typical I believe.

>> DAVID ZAX: I believe there were two year this year that I was invited to. One in December. There may have been a second before the new year which collected names. There was 15 minutes of Zoom where we learned in February that we had nothing to discuss. And nothing else.

>> What I will do, I will have the new ADOF come to the Senate or have a faculty forum just about this. I think it's very standard for there to be three meetings over the year. I think that's just how it's always been done. It doesn't mean it can increase in frequency or change in terms of procedures. I think that's wonderful feedback. If you could give it in writing, that would even be

better because then I can use that to speak to the next ADOF about the importance of this committee. This is a critical committee and it's a committee that's elected in by the full faculty, so any feedback that you have I will forward that, for sure. Please do that. Then the ad hoc committees. There haven't been any new ad hoc committees. Those were formed by Charlie, but I certainly would go to nominations and elections for any ad hoc committee.

>> DAVID ZAX: All I can say is, three years, I've never seen it happen.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yeah, but I'm the new dean of faculty. I would never go and make that assessment myself. I would have the nominations and elections. Hundred percent guarantee you that. The admissions committee. They are still-- They actually don't have things to report, so they're still working through things with enrollment, but they do have an opportunity. I can have them come to the Senate on the 18th and discuss. Allen would be happy as the chair to come. I had actually on the slate for the last faculty meeting for our senate committees, a few of them to give reports, but I think we have more important things to do, so I'm just going to make those reports available to the Senators to read because I want us to have more space on the 18th. I can, I think, have it more protected next year. I do think it's important. I have had committee-- I don't think heart Charlie did this, but I have had chairs of Senate committees come. They came in September. Some came in November. I've had different committees come to the Senate, but I'm happy to do more of that. My picture, when I first started the position, was to have at least half of them come to the Senate in the final Senate meeting, but we just have too much work to do that we won't do that this year, but I will try to give more space to that next year forward. If you really do want admissions, I can share the annual report that the admissions committee makes with everybody or I can have them come to the Senate, but I do know their discussions are still open ended. Yes, there are a lot of acronyms. Have I done that faux pas? Sorry.

>> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: ADOF I have no idea what that stands for.

>> EVE DE ROSA: The associate Dean of faculty.

>> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought it was assistant--

>> EVE DE ROSA: I hate when others do it to me, so my apologies for that.

>> DAVID ZAX: If my may shove myself back in, the last question was, my impression was we have an unusual amount of time which gets used up by administrators doing happy talk.

>> EVE: Yes, I have done a time on it. Their happy talk is less than senate talk. I actually did an audit. It might feel like they are having more space--

>> DAVID ZAX: When confronted with real questions, they run away.

>> EVE DE ROSA: That might be true, but I can't control that. So, I give them our feedback and I would say, for example, with the honors and distinctions, what comes back to the Senate that's pending has changed. They have heard us. Yes, we have had more space than them in terms of time, but I agree that they haven't really been as movable. Some have, some haven't. I would say things that have moved would be an example of the honors and distinctions has tremendously from where it started. I think the provost in having to send his faux pas correction heard again. That's not sufficient. So, he's like-- Let me have this other chance at that letter. I can't control how they respond to our questions, but I can make sure that they hear us. I can make more space and I will make more space next year for the Senators. Between having these faculty fora and more space on the agenda, I think that we'll be able to at least articulate our point of view. Risa.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks, Eve. I actually-- I would like to talk about-- I saw that Mary Jo had put a really important comment in the chat, so I'm happy to move my space until after hers because I think it's directly relevant to what we're talking about.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yes, with the faculty fora--

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: I think Mary Jo has her hand up, so I was hoping to perhaps let her talk first.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Mary Jo.

>> MARY JO DUDLEY: Thanks. I just wanted to-- I had a question. We had a really interesting faculty forum where we discussed the various perspectives about the part-time bachelor's degree for nontraditional students. I think what was super interesting about that was that we had the engagement of groups that interact on a daily basis with the proposed beneficiaries of the program. That was useful because I think you will remember hopefully that there were different perspectives on that. The way the proposal was originally articulated, it seemed to be geared for this subset of people, broad subset of people, Native Americans, incarcerated individuals, farmworkers, but the proposal was articulated without any discussion of those of us who interact with these populations on a daily basis. The forum was interesting because we got to present it that and talk about it. What was unclear to me, and is still a little unclear to me, is how that discussion comes back into the faculty Senate follow-up conversation other than proposed amendments, which are really a reduction of points made in that discussion. I think for increased transparency, it would be nice to have more of those perspectives brought into the larger meeting because otherwise, it's kind of where did this proposal come from? It didn't come from the proposed beneficiaries. Somebody is cooking up a plan, not really talking with the proposed beneficiaries. There's maybe some subset of the proposed beneficiaries. And then the Senate votes on it, moves on it, blah, blah. I think it's really critical that if we can't include that piece in the discussion, then it might really influence how people understand this proposal. So, I didn't see how that feeds back, and so I'm wondering if you could clarify that. Yes, of course. We sent all of the audio and chat to the Provost office as the people who got created the proposal. All the Senators received audio and chat. All of that and it's publicly posted. Then the UFC communicated everything to the Provost that they heard in the faculty forum, and then the UFC created a resolution that said we believe in principle in this idea, but we need faculty involvement. We need all these things articulated and brought back to the Senate. That resolution then had two meetings thus far, and we'll have a third-- No, just two. Two meetings where we discuss one potential amendment of the language of that resolution and another on the next meeting. We revised it and then there was additional amendment that was put forward. That was then voted on, so that we now have a resolution that states that in principle this is a good idea, but please more faculty involvement. Come back the Senate. Tell us how you solved these

problems. That is where this is sitting. There is no program, and there is no-- At the moment, there isn't a dean of the school continuing ed. Faculty are on that community which they weren't initially, but we do have that. We Senate representation. It hasn't gone anywhere since then, but at least the Senate has articulated between the Senate committees, the faculty forum. All of that feedback has been given to the Provost. The UFC then articulated that and formalized that in a resolution, and the Senate as of today-- Is that when voting ends? Later today? Will vote on that resolution. Mary Jo, one of the things that is so important about that forum is that your voice was there. The people who work with indigenous communities, that voice was there, so that was clear that that was a new voice that was not in the Senate meetings.

>> MARY JO DUDLEY: It raises the question of how these things are even developed without interacting or discussing with those of us who are at Cornell who do this work every day.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yes, that has been a request. I can't say demand, but we have advised the Provost that he should do such moving forward.

>> MARY JO DUDLEY: Thank you.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Of course. Risa.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I have a few quick points. One is with regard to the point that Tracy raised at the beginning, and others have raised, which is the need for more time at the Senate meetings. We've never had a real full discussion. For example, of the part-time program that's been proposed. We've had dots of time where we've never really been able to have the common room full discussion that we started having in the forum, but it's not part of the Senate discussion and debate. I think we really need to figure out how to expand those time allotments for really important issues. One thought might be having two hour meetings rather than trying to have too many meetings. Perhaps extending it to two hours would be something to consider because I think there is a sense of frustration that we don't have enough time to have these discussions. That's one perhaps easy way to expand some of the time because the forums. I like having forms. I like having discussions, but they're not Senate debates. I think we need to have

real Senate debates about the issues. The other thing that I wanted to-- I just wanted to put out my stuff there so that I could just finish with all of that-- is about I think the questions are not only about transparency and getting more information, which many have addressed, but also effectiveness of governance, which I think David was talking about and other people have been talking about as well, top-down approach. How can we be more effective when the faculty Senate does speak when we do adopt resolutions? For example, how can we be more effective in following up because I think that we adopt resolutions, but oftentimes we don't really have about them again. They just sort of go into the ether. That's challenging, and I think using the Senate committee is a good idea. I agree with you to follow up, but I think there are other ways to do it. One I want to suggest is think about building alliances more between the faculty Senate and other governance bodies on campus. I think that then enables us to all speak with a louder voice. The other thing on alliance that I want to mention is about the Cornell AAUP chapter where we have an example of really effective faculty governance when the AAUP chapter endorsed a stronger academic freedom statement for Cornell, which was based on a AAUP policies. Just in terms of acronyms, for those who don't know, it's American Association of University Professors, which was founded originally nationally in 1915, and Cornell is actually one of first chapters at the time. The AAUP chapter at Cornell was really instrumental in working with the Senate and with the administration to have the Senate vote for that stronger academic freedom statement based on principles which ultimately was approved by the Board of Trustees. I think it's an example of what we can do when we stand together because we stand for the same principles of academic freedom, strong faculty governance, and job security for all faculty. That's what I'd like to see us do more because attempts to divide us only undermine our ability to achieve the sorts of goals that we share. I've been unhappy at seeing some attempts to divide us when it should be just the opposite. When we worked together, I believe we are stronger.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I can say that academic freedom work that happened last year in the Senate I thought was beautiful. I agree, it was clear that it was a collaboration with counsel, the Senate, and a Senate committee, and the AUP. I did think that was really brilliant. I agree. I think it is important thing about building alliances. I see there are natural places with the university assembly and student assembly. I'm not sure for this one with employee's assembly, but definitely the other two where some of these academic policies that we're bringing forward with

honors and distinctions, now that it's been revised, we'll see how the senate response, but the students have come to me-- I had a few of them yesterday at the UA say that they're really happy with how it's been revised. They have this reflexive-- This is going to be terrible. And now they saw the data. Even in the UA meeting, they were looking at the data, coming over to me saying, "Wow, this is really cool. I think we're gonna take it up ourselves." Ashley said, "I have his concern." Here are the Senate committees you should speak to. Here are the senators you might want to speak to. Work together on a resolution, then we'll go shop it across the assemblies. I think that's another example of something that we're speaking with the unified voice. I do think there are spaces for building alliances. I've seen it in action for what you did last year. I thought it was very beautiful, so I'm very happy to try to work on that. More time. We spent between just inside the Senate itself. I think there's the least 30 to 40 minutes. Maybe that's not enough on the part-time BA. Then we also had an hour and 1/2 faculty forum. I think part of what I hear is that the faculty forum conversation didn't feel satisfying, but I think that's the space for debate. I think that would be wonderful for the debate to continue. We had 30+ minutes in the Senate meeting itself to discuss that resolution, and then we had an hour and 1/2. I just feel like that's pretty good for a semester. I hear you, but then what would it look like? Maybe I'm not understanding. I thought I was being responsive by bringing it back to a senate meeting, bringing it to a faculty forum, bringing in new voices, taking all that feedback and giving it to the Provost, having written resolution come from the UFC to formalize conversations. What else would you have wanted to see I think is what I'm missing. It's obviously, I think I'm being responsive, but maybe not responsive enough.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: This isn't directed specifically to you. The point is that we are talking about this for the UFC and the faculty together. It's really not directed to what you should've done, but what should we think about doing more broadly, including with the UFC. I haven't exactly-- I don't know exactly your time comes from, but at least part of that was a university administrations.

>> EVE DE ROSA: That was us. I separated--

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: It's more of the little dabs of five minutes on the agenda. Five minutes

on the agenda. What we really need to do is to carve out a significant amount of time to really delve into a full discussion rather than beep, beep, beep.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Rather than-- I think he was 15 to 20 and then another 15 across two meetings. You're saying let's have the full half-hour.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Let's really do discussion and debate, and the points that Mary Jo raised and I've raised, which is the forum is great to have forms, but it's not Senate debate. So, if the Senators are going to vote on something, it should be a Senate debate. That is what a number of people have raised about having a full discussion. I know there's always a frustration about the things we want to cover on agendas with time, but we really need to do that for important programs.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I think what I'm hearing is it's better to have the old half-hour than two 15 minute bouts or something like that. Okay. Richard.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Eve. Just note that this form is on the resolution involving the transparency of faculty Senate proceedings and the University faculty committee is an important part of that. There are two of nine members here. It seems to me that it would be better if we're going to have a full discussion and so forth that it be in the full faculty Senate where hopefully more members of the UFC would come and be able to speak to it. Some of the specifics need to be reviewed. Agenda setting is really important in any legislative body. The resolution forum we're discussing was originally submitted at the beginning of the academic year. Only now is coming to the faculty Senate for deliberations. At the very least, in the transparency of UFC, University faculty committee proceedings, there should have been an explanation, a real explanation about why and how that didn't happen. We also had last semester, a discussion about the chat. We finally were able to restore the chat through vote but it was impossible to get the University faculty committee to report that resolution. It has to be done through a point of order. A year ago, more than a year ago now, the University embarked on the planning, and expansion, and now the realization of the global hubs initiative. That's been going on for over a year. We have never, the faculty Senate, been given the chance to vote on this

initiative. When David says Wendy Woolford comes and talks to us and gives a show and tell, it's just a show and tell. That is not consultation of the faculty Senate. We've past repeatedly resolutions asking that this faculty Senate be consulted on this program and it's been nothing has happened. These are major issues. The global hub system, for example, involves three real questions about the application of the statement of academic freedom to Cornell programs abroad. We've individually tried to get information. A statement of formal commitment of some sort from the central administration, and this has always been denied, side stepped, ignored. There are real questions. These aren't questions of detail or minutia. These are real questions that go to the heart of Cornell University as an academic mission, as an intellectual community. The very bones and fibers of what we should be as an intellectual community, and we can't get at it. Transparency is one thing. Transparency resolution doesn't demand nor force anybody to do anything. It just says explain to us why you are not. That I think is a really important point. Observation. I've served on the university assembly for three years. Last year, I was the vice president for operations. As vice president for operations in the executive committee university assembly, I could watch and compare the very procedures under which the student assembly, the employee assembly, the professional and graduate student assembly, the way they operate. They are much more transparent. The agenda is open. There is a provision. For example, in the university assembly for new business at the very beginning of every session in which new issues can be brought up and discussed. There is nothing like that. In fact, our agenda is really weird sometimes. Supposedly, sometime on Friday before the meeting on Wednesday, there would be an agenda that we'll be informed about and told about. That is not very much time to devise-- Let's do this. Let's have this response, amendment, resolution, or something. It's even worse than that. The agenda sometimes changes the day before. Sometimes, I've seen it happen in the past year, even the day of. When Martha last semester came in. She was a last-minute addition to the-- I'm sorry.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I am sorry. I am gonna tell you that whatever comes out on Friday is the agenda. The presenter may change or I add a good of the order, but the content does not change.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: This is a matter of fact. The content does change. The lack of transparency. The lack of ability to somehow adjust-- Illustrate it this way. We have two out of

the nine members of the UFC in this faculty forum. If they don't know how faculty see or don't see, don't understand, realize, interpret what they're doing, there is no hope for reform. Have to keep track about whether or not to attend faculty Senate meetings. I haven't done that, but I'd be really interested to see what attendance looks like whether or not they're just completely separate from and largely uninformed as to what Senators as a body have as concerns. These things have gone on for a long time. I do think the agenda setting, the explanations for it, I do think that when faculty Senators submit a resolution, it should not be delayed for eight months or five months. It was adopted in December, it was also delayed or denied altogether, as in the case of the chat resolution. These resolutions sponsored by faculty Senators are the right of Senators to bring before the body. This has been denied.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Let's start one at a time. The UFC. Half of them are Senators, half are not Senators. I send all audio, chat, everything UFC so they see it. Obviously, is publicly posted as well. This is a voluntary space, so there is no mandatory attendance, but only four of our UFC members are Senators. There is no expense expectation that the other four have to come to the Senate, but they get all the information and they listen to the audio. I know that for a fact. They also receive the Senate summaries that I send. That's one thing. I have it made it a mission to get that agenda out on Fridays because I remember in the summer I met with the executive committee of the AAUP. This is one of your things. That is something I can do. What I can't do is maybe 9 AM because there's a lot to coordinate between the UFC meeting, making sure people's schedules-- There's a lot of calendar scheduling and all the stuff that has to happen to make that possible from Friday to Wednesday, but if there was something that you saw on the agenda that you wanted to respond to and you don't have the time to do it by Wednesday, there is the next month, and we're gonna also have fora, so there's still time. In terms of the resolution that was sent to me before I ever had my first Senate meeting, that resolution-- Richard, of the 6+ resolutions that you brought forward, all but one has come to the Senate as far as I know. This is the one. The reason it didn't come to the Senate immediately, but is being discussed by us today and has been discussed in a Senate meeting already, is because there were red flags for me as a new person to the Senate and there was new counsel at the University. She started in August, I believe. This came to me before-- just after she started. The red flags. These are things that-- Let's make clear, first of all. The resolution that was given to me in the fall that caused my red

flags is not the resolution in front of everyone today. That one, the things that caused red flags are actually removed. That fall semester red flags, every single one of those have been removed, but there are some additional ones that I do think would handcuff me and handcuff any future dean of faculty. I think there are aspirations that we could work towards and try to integrate those things, but to have those in writing and have those as a resolution, I think is a very difficult thing for whoever is gonna be the dean of faculty. I don't want to handcuff anybody else. Those red flags were things like making the University faculty open to the public. That's just not in the bylaws. It's an authority that was delegated to the UFC to set the agenda. So, making them public was a red flag and something concerning, and has in fact been removed. Having the agenda approved by the faculty senate the meeting before, again, is not tenable. It's been removed. I want to make very clear that what was presented to me as a new dean of faculty before I've ever had a Senate meeting is not the resolution in front of us today. Even the resolution in front of us today, I do find it very problematic and I do think it would make the job of whoever is in this position more difficult. I think will be handcuffing. I'm going to go down the list and then, of course, we'll have a conversation. I have sent every single one of your resolutions. We have actually approved a resolution about the global hubs that you wrote. It's resolution 179. Consultation with the faculty Senate with respect to its global hubs. The one resolution I received has been approved, and it was approved by the Senate, and has been communicated to both the VP of international affairs and the Provost. I guess I'll leave it at that. But I will say the reason why I removed the chat, and this something that people didn't share with people. She had to do a lot of editing of nastiness. There was a lot of back talk that was happening between Senators in the chat. I thought that's terrible. It's toxic. Let's shine light on this. Let's make it that there's no chat and people attend to whoever's speaking on the floor. Let's make this as if we're all in person again. That was my goal. I didn't want to bring the chat back at all. Clearly-- It was very clear I communicated that I felt that this isn't a healthy space for Senators, so I made it that if we're gonna have a chat, let's make it that it's public to everyone and we post is as is never editing. So, that's what we've done. I think that's full transparency and trying our best to make it as transparent as possible. Yes, I did resist the chat. I was the one who asked the UFC not to bring it forward because I felt like that codified in some way the toxicity that was being seen. We don't want that. We want this to be a healthy, constructive space where people listen to each other. It wasn't that. People were typing on one topic while somebody else was speaking about

another. To minimize that, I felt one way to recreate the public experience is to not have a chat, but we have a compromise. I'm willing to keep that compromise for us to have a public engagement. That's all I would share.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Eve. The resolution that was-- The original resolution that was revised, that was the one that was before the UFC for eight months, or whatever, and the vice president, when she finally delivered an opinion on that resolution, it was the original resolution and there wasn't an opinion. It was like seven words. It was obvious that nothing had happened in the office of the Cornell legal counsel. Nothing had happened with that resolution. That it was changed is irrelevant. The delay was all. It was on the original resolution for which there was never a legal opinion issued. The second thing is--

>> EVE DE ROSA: I'm gonna disagree on that. [Crosstalk]

>> RICHARD BENSEL: You're interrupting me, Eve.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I just wanted to correct something that your resolution was corrected after the vice president came to the Senate and said the delegated authority of the Dean of faculty and the UFC are embedded into the bylaws.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: What she said, more accurately, is she said the authority that she had to review the resolution was not in section 2 of whatever the acronym is. I asked her in the meeting. I said, "Is the University Council referred to in that section, which is a half page long?" She did not know. The problem here is that the whole referral to the legal counsel looks like a charade. It looks like an excuse not to bring this forward. Eight months for a legal opinion? Uh-uh. This does not make any sense.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Can I answer that? Maybe we'll do one at a time now. I would say it's my fault because I gave her the grace and space because we were dealing with Covid, and we had the delta variant, we had the omicron variant, and so I did not pursue this until the omicron variant had gone down. I said, "Can you come to the Senate and can you address this?" And she

did. That is why it sat with her. I gave it to her because I saw red flags. I knew she had to learn the Cornell bylaws. We're dealing with delta, we're dealing with omicron. Clearly she is not able to look at this. When I felt like she could, I asked her to do so, and she [indiscernible] the Senate.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: I understand that we are all human, and that we make mistakes, and we have things, considerations that we think are important, and other people do not see it the same way. This resolution, as all resolutions are, are the rights of the senators in the faculty Senate. They are not susceptible to personal interpretation, delay, to all of these other things. We all make mistakes and we'd all been forgiven for those mistakes, but these are rights. They are not something where you say, "I didn't feel good this day, so it doesn't happen." They're global hubs. Yes, we passed the resolution. It said that until Cornell administration comes before the faculty Senate for discussion and vote, further elaboration of construction of these hubs should be stopped. Yes, we passed that. As far as I know, this is David's time point, nothing has happened. The problem here is clearly central administration wants to proceed with the global hubs program. They want to ignore, set aside, have us not debate or deliberate upon some of the problematic aspects of this program. There is no doubt of what the forces are that are preventing the resolution coming before the faculty Senate. What we need through the resolution is to have explanations coming forward for the delay. The failure to report.

>> EVE DE ROSA: There is no outstanding global hubs resolution that hasn't come to the Senate.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: Of course not.

>> EVE DE ROSA: We've already given our advice.

>> RICHARD BENSEL: We have not given our consent to the program. It should be the task of the University faculty committee to make certain that new academic programs be approved, deliberated, discussed in the faculty Senate before they proceed. That should be the task of the UFC.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I can say that one of our Senate committees is present in the discussion with the VPIA. The vice Provost of international affairs. The chair of cap is part of those conversations. We passed the resolution, we approved it, I brought it to the Senate, it was approved, I communicated it, and our Senate committee is present and does discussions, but I want to say the other thing before and then I'm gonna go to Carl and then Risa because we are over time. I want to say that me giving the new vice president grace to deal with Covid outbreaks on the semester when there's something that's truly internal politics. I think that was appropriate choice. I will own that. I will not put that on the UFC. That's 100 percent me, but let's note that when I finally did bring it, counsel came, you revised it, I brought it immediately to the next faculty Senate meeting. I just want to clear the record on that. Global hubs. We have passed the resolution. We have passed all of our feedback to the VPIA. She has put the chair of our Senate committee on her international counsel. Yes, there can be more and I will continue those conversations, but we have been putting our voice forward in front of them. I'm gonna move to Carl and then Risa, and that will be it.

>> CARL FRANCK: Thanks very much. I could not agree more with Richard at this point and just want to go back to this. At the end of the-- A year ago, we worked very hard on this portion that came up about the hotel school and the [indiscernible]. We bent over backwards to do something. At the end, we felt it was a victory. Then, the administration went off and took it before the trustees and approved it. When I saw Pres. Pollock at the graduation, I was a poignant moment because we were having graduations again. I told her just think about China. I noticed that they did do-- We were sucker punched as far as I'm concerned. That was a big sucker punch.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Those are the two pending.

>> CARL FRANCK: That was one 160. 160 was a resolution-- I just can't you how disappointed I was because I held so strongly about how well the administration had delivered on Covid and kept up staff employment, but this was just a kick in the face. I'll just leave it at that. You'll notice one thing though. Pres. Pollock had written in response to the assembly's response. She wrote back to them and said we will not accept this resolution that you passed. I was just checking to see. I think Allison made this point that the administration has to respond to these

resolutions. At the very least, as a courtesy and say as they did with the student assembly. We are ignoring you. And then you can use that. Right now as we are talking, the Senate hasn't voted on abortion. We'll see where people stand. I think Richard's point is extremely well taken. What we have to do is get the administration to respond in writing.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Carl, she did and it's been shared with the Senate.

>> CARL FRANCK: Wait a minute. I went back to look at the actions of the Senate. It has to be right there where anybody could go back and find it.

>> EVE DE ROSA: That's typically what we could do. We can double check.

>> CARL FRANCK: Okay. While we were talking, I was looking on the Senate website and I cannot find it.

>> EVE DE ROSA: That's what we've been doing is in the Senate meeting where the resolution was approved, we put the letter and response.

>> CARL FRANCK: I couldn't find it. I apologize.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I will verify that. [Crosstalk]

>> CARL FRANCK: The other thing is the expression happy talk-- When President Pollack what just talking to us, she listed these priorities. What amazed me in retrospect is she mentioned the antiracism center. That was a no-brainer we could all agree on just to have the antiracism center. I have to tell you in our department, we had lots of discussion about the question of student training on antiracism faculty training. We were just tearing our hearts out also exposing ourselves to each other. This is all supposed to be implemented starting in fall. The only thing she mentioned was the no-brainer. She said nothing about the other stuff. Looking back on it, that's another-- It's easy to say here because you're all receptive, but it's another kick in the face because we-- Look at how many—Risa and Richard had really worked hard on this thing, so I

think this issue-- I will be a better senator if I can find the responses readily, but I couldn't. I thought I was pretty good at this.

>> EVE DE ROSA: You could see Jill's frown because it's been an effort to do. We'll make sure--

>> CARL FRANCK: I have to get retrained. I'll be back if it isn't there because that's my job.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Don't worry about it. I have it highlighted right here. We have been posting them publicly. I will say also that the Office of Equity Development and Diversity has been handed the faculty education piece. Maybe there's space on the 18th for them to come back to us. I will do that. I will ask if somebody from that office can come and represent the work that's been happening. I know that each college is overseeing their own student education piece. All of those things I know are moving forward, but they're not executed yet. I agree, the implementation has been very slow.

>> CARL FRANCK: The fall will be here one way or another.

>> EVE DE ROSA: The second fall. I will ask OFDD. You had two other things initially. I wrote it down. Let's see.

>> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One was the Uyghurs.

>> CARL FRANCK: Yeah, the Uyghurs.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Uyghurs and antiracism.

>> CARL FRANCK: That was it. [Crosstalk] We got outmaneuvered on the Uyghurs. We got sucker punched and I don't like that. I don't like being sucker punched.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Risa. And this'll be the last thing.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you and thanks to everybody for staying later. Following up on some of these last comments about implementation. Two quick points. One is the UFC reporting to the Senate. In addition, I think it would be really important for providing information that includes information about what the UFC hears from the Provost and the president. I was on the UFC for many years. There was a lot of information, we could get out of them. We would sometimes get information from the Provost, in particular when ideas were being floated before they came to us as a proposal.

>> EVE DE ROSA: That is actually what I've been doing, but I hear you. I will have somebody else represent.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: My point is that it's not about-- Again, it's the UFC and you as a whole, but the UFC itself plays a very important function. For example, I would like to hear from the UFC about what are the conversations that you have with the Provost and the president? I am well aware from being on the UFC that the Provost and president will oftentimes try to impose confidentiality on those bodies and say, "We'll tell you this, but you can't tell anybody else." I think that is a broad problem throughout the University. I think we need a push back on that. One way is to have these regular reports so that we get into the habit of sharing information and moving away, particularly in a University where it's all about openness, moving away from this habit of things being called confidential simply because the administration doesn't want the information to be shared.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I have been trying to do that. I'm saying I, meaning the UFC, has been trying to do that through what I bring to the Senate. I have been very open with our conversation what we've been discussing with the Provost.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: I don't know what you've been discussing with the Provost. All I know is I don't think we get sufficient information. Having been on the UFC, my sense is that there are probably more things that can be shared. What I would recommend to you and the UFC is to look for those items to say what can be shared? You, and I, and the rest of the executive

committee on the AAUP-- Actually, it was an early meeting. I think you mentioned something about publishing minutes from the UFC meetings. I think that would be very useful. I hope that will happen because then we can also know what to ask about as well. That's an issue of getting things early as well. Getting that information early. The other thing I want to highlight is that issue of implementation. It is not sufficient for faculty governance work well for us to adopt resolutions, have them go to the administration, and then administration answers and says, "It's done now," because then we'll just go away. The point is that we put into place these mechanisms of governance so that we can follow up. What is the UFC doing to enforce and implement our recommendations about global hubs? Global hubs recommendations had much more than just putting somebody on that committee. It also has a resolution about the order of the process. Accommodations issues which we had multiple votes on resolutions, including accommodations with regards to Covid, but it was more generally. One of the resolutions was setting up a working so that we can have more transparent and fair accommodations processes in universities, which we heard from students, faculty, and staff were opaque, confusing, and unsatisfactory. Whatever happened to that? Nothing. So, it's the UFC and the dean of faculty's office that should be at the lead of saying, "How do we enforce these? How we push back? And how to report to the Senate about what we are doing?" That's the kind of activism that I think would lift morale of people to know that our faculty governance process is not just letting things go, but that we continue to push for strong, effective governance.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Thank you Risa for that. I will say that, Carl, every resolution has been passed this year. You will see the president or the Provost response right there. I can't say what happened in 160 last year, but I can say for this academic year that's been in effect.

>> CARL FRANCK: Okay. That we should be retroactive with responses on the earlier ones.

>> EVE DE ROSA: We actually are revamping our website, so we're gonna clean things up. We'll make sure that that's always the case.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: You've had responses to everybody's comments. I just wondered if you have a response to what I just laid out.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I thank you for that. I agree with you, and I think that I can actively work more to push. The global hubs, I made sure that CAPP was involved. I do actually respond. I have conversations with the Provost pushing, giving our feedback. I do do those things personally. The UFC has also done that as a committee. I can say that. We can continue to do that. But in terms of more, maybe there are strategies that you have that we can think about together. I'm totally open to that.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: That's where alliances come in.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Definitely. I've been pushing, the UFC's been pushing. As we think of it, we've been transparent in what those conversations have been, but if you have strategies that you think, alliances for example, we'll think about how to execute those things.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: That's great. AAUP chapter's ready to do it. We're there for governance.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Okay, Of course, I've invited myself to the AAUP. I'm happy to go any time.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: It's open to all faculty members to join. So, if anybody would like to join the AAUP.

>> EVE DE ROSA: As in a faculty, not as a member, but I'm happy to come.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: If anybody's ever interested in learning more about it, all faculty, and all academic professionals, and graduate students are eligible to be members. It's easy to join.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Thank you all, and have a good evening, and enjoy this beautiful weather.