

Faculty Senate

May 18, 2022

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Hello, everyone. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn from Architecture, speaker of the senate. We begin with a land acknowledgment. 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. Our first order of business is to approve the minutes from the May 4, 2022 meeting. These have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. If there are any corrections, please raise your hand, or if you're on Zoom, raise your hand. Seeing, hearing none, the minutes are approved as posted by unanimous consent. I now turn over the floor to the Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa, for her presentation, and there will be a Q&A that follows.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Hello, everyone. Thank you for holding strong for the end of the semester. We added one more meeting just so that we could close some pending business. So, what I thought I could do today is just review some of the pending matters that we have ahead of us for this last faculty vote, give you an overview of our faculty elections, and open the floor for questions and answers, hopefully. I just want to share that we have a new associate dean of faculty, Chelsea Specht from plant biology. We have a new Faculty Trustee, David Lee from Applied Economics and Management. Three new University Faculty Committee members, Senator Debbie Cherney from Animal Science, Sarah Besky from ILR, Johannes Lehmann from Global Development. We have a new member of the Nominations and Elections Committee, Kenneth Roberts from Government. And then, we have three Senators-at-Large, Elisha Cohn, Allison Chartchyan. Please forgive me for the pronunciation. Allison's joining us again as Senator-at-Large. And Andy Horbal from the Library. Next slide. We were discussing the part-time bachelor's degree program, this prospective program. We've had ample discussion about it. We've had four or five senate committees have eyes on it, discuss it, bring it to the senate. So, the

UFC decided to resolve and formalize these discussions in a resolution. That resolution was approved. As you can see, I highlighted our-- We went backwards a little bit on our did not votes. I understand it's the end of the semester, but we do have three votes that we have to take after the senate meeting, so I would love to see that number go down. Next slide. Thank you. So, we have our three pending matters that we're gonna discuss today. The first is a posthumous awarding of either a degree or an academic certificate of enrollment. Many of you may not know, we've had quite a few student deaths. The student deaths are usually communicated in their own particular community, inside their college or inside their classrooms, so there may be a lack of awareness of this need. So, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has brought forward a resolution for us to consider and discuss today. We're going to see the revisions that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Educations need in response to the faculty feedback, discussions with the UFC, and our multiple senate discussions. So, she'll show the changes, and then we'll vote on this again post meeting. The last thing is the resolution brought from multiple senators. Again, we've discussed across multiple senate meetings as well as the faculty forum. This has been a very elucidating conversation around this, so we'll continue to discuss how do we increase the effectiveness of transparency of senate proceedings? Next slide. As Dean of Faculty, what I've been very struck by is community. So, the very first thing I was able to do in terms of our Cornell community was to collaborate with the office of the President and the office of the Vice President of Human Relations on a staff appreciation street fair. So, we put out a poll to our faculty, it was cosponsored by the faculty senate, asking faculty to contribute to this event to give gratitude to our staff getting us through the beginnings of the pandemic. Faculty and leadership all volunteered. No staff member had to help with setup, breakdown, serving food, street fair games and prizes. I want to thank you for all contributing to that event. It was a wonderful event. Next slide. The other thing I'm very, very struck by is the level of which we as faculty are contributing to governance. From this perspective, I get to see the workings of the senate committees, and they do tremendous work. On each of those committees, we have about ten people that represent perspectives from around the campus. A lot of work and discussion happens in that space before it's even brought to the senate formalization and discussion. So, I'm very appreciative of the hundreds of faculty that contribute to the senate committees, to all of you who are contributing to the faculty senate. My biggest gratitude goes to both Jill and CA. They allow for continuity across the different deans and associate deans. Thank you Jill and CA

as well. Next slide. I wanted to remind us of the work we've done. Part of the feedback that I've heard is having more space for discussion. Maybe in my sort of anxiousness to really get things done, I was really pushing the timing of things. We did get a lot of work done, but I will find ways to get space and discussing with the UFC, the University Faculty Committee, how do we get more space for discussion. With that in mind, what we have achieved, I class in terms of academic policy, academic initiatives. Another class are things that are directly impacting faculty, like tenure. The last, of course, the infamous natatorium that was brought to us by Senator Newman. What's lovely is that Senator Newman was able to work our PE Senate Committee, and with leadership, and with different assemblies. So, through coordinating with the other assemblies, we're all speaking with one voice. One update that I can make is that the provost is negotiating actively with Ithaca College, creating transportation for the Cornell community to be able to go and use the natatorium there. It's a national-- It's a place where they hold national meets, so it's of the standard that we're for Cornell in the near future. While they're fundraising around it, we'll have a solution. Next slide. So, we have three resolutions that we're going to vote on after the 20th of May. Those are the ones with the asterisks, the posthumous degree, the honors, the revision of the honors, and increasing the transparency and effectiveness of the senate. These are also things that I can picture coming back to the senate in the fall as well, these other ones that are not starred. One of the discussions that I'm having with the office of the provost in particular, the deputy provost in academic affairs, is how to get guidelines to new faculty so that they know where they should spend their energy when they're working on their scholarship for tenure. This has been particularly important discussion because we have now over the last couple of years created many spaces for new faculty where they are having to meet the criteria for excellence in multiple colleges with multiple cultures. So, this is an important conversation to have with associate deans and chairs, so this work will be happening over the summer and will come back to the senate in the fall. We are still having discussions with student campus life and PE Senate Committee on whether we should eliminate the swim test requirement. I can say that Williams and other Ivy Leagues have decided to eliminate their swim test because of the equity issue that we brought to the senate. So, we will continue those and we'll formalize them. The Senate Committee says they'll have a resolution for us in the fall. Student and campus life have decided to suspend the test for one more year. In terms of the RT Taskforce, we've accomplished a lot. We have-- We're able to say concretely what benefits will

go for emeriti RTE. We're addressing, through a survey with [indiscernible], titles, professional development, and grievance procedures. We'll elucidate all of these things. This work is happening over the summer. We'll be able to come back to the senate with concrete steps. We still have out there with the ASPSF Senate Committee this one last part of the tenure project. Sorry, Charlie. We have that one-- That's funny. We have that one last pending matter about the chairs letters. So, the committee wanted more time with that. It's still very controversial, and they didn't feel like it was settled. So, that will come back to us as well. Next slide. We had President Pollack and Vice President Varner come to the senate in open forum. We've had new departments, The Human Center of Design, Design Tech, and the Real Estate Superdepartment come to the senate. We're moving forward as far as our job as the senate giving feedback on that Real Estate Superdepartment. AAP Design Tech is working on building faculty support across the campus. That one has not formally moved forward yet. The academic materials program has started. I want to assure faculty that it doesn't change anything for faculty. You still order and choose the academic materials that are appropriate for your pedagogy. Oh, this is for you, Senator Frank. There you are. At the end of this slide deck, we have an update from the Admissions Committee, Ad hoc Committee. They will be creating an annual report. The provost will also create a report on the antiracism work that's been happening over the past year. So, thank you for those suggestions. Then of course, the NYSED Credit Compliance. That's a very active process. As things become more concrete, that most certainly will be coming back to the senate. Next slide, please. As you can see, we did try to be responsive. We had eight planned Senate Committee meetings, which is the typical rhythm preCovid. In response to the presence of the Delta variant, the Omicron variant, we've had to pivot more than once, so we've added listening sessions, senate meetings. Then, in response to the senators asking for more space to discuss issues we've had two faculty fora. Moving forward-- The UFC's been discussing the feedback from the senate, the feedback from the faculty forum on effectiveness of transparency. Thinking of ways that we can improve those without the procedures that were necessarily outlined in the pending resolution. One that came to us from Kelly Hume, Senator Hume, is a formal new senator orientation. So, we will do that. In that, we will describe the OPUF, the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, and we'll also describe parliamentary procedures. So hopefully, we'll be able to have senators feel better prepared to contribute. We will also have the university faculty come to the very first meeting, and then have somebody

other than me. I am the Chair of the University Faculty Committee. Rather than me updating you on the discussions of the university faculty, we will have another member come to the senate every month. We'll give within and more space between meetings also for discussion. There was also a request from Senator Zax to have more formal in-person meetings for the nominations and elections committee. So, we can do that. I hear very strongly that there needs to be more consultation between university administration and the senate. Next slide. We are very fortunate to have a guest of honor here, Charlie Van Loan. We just want to thank both Neema and Charlie. They've worked as a team from 2019 to 2021. That's a very important time for the university. They guided the faculty through the beginnings of the pandemic and also through discussions about racial equity, justice and equity. So, thank you both, Charlie and Neema. This is bittersweet for me because Neema has been such a wise person for me in helping me make the transition to this is role. So, thank you, Neema, for all that you're given. Your passion, your conscientiousness, and your wicked sense of humor. Thank you. With that, next slide. I wanted this to be a surprise. This is from the UFC. We wanted to honor Neema and thank her for her service. I'm just gonna read the resolution. Whereas, Professor Neema has served three years as Associate Dean of the Faculty; and Whereas, the Office of the Dean of the University Faculty works for thousands of faculty; and Whereas, Professor Kudva has served the University Faculty with great dedication in representing the interests of faculty to the administration, the Board of Trustees, and the broader university community; shepherding countless resolutions to the Senate floor, and being available to faculty, students, and others to help resolve various challenges that arose during the last three years most of which were overwhelmed with covid-19 concerns; and Whereas, Professor Kudva brought to the job unique perspectives of diversity, inclusion, and student life; and Whereas, Professor Kudva, as Chair of the Nominations and Elections Senate Committee, has likely invited almost every faculty member at the University to join Senate Committees; and Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate on behalf of all the faculty extends its sincere gratitude and heartfelt thanks to Professor Kudva for the valuable service she has rendered during the past three years as Associate Dean.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, we need to bring just a modicum of formality to this. It is a resolution after all. Normally, resolutions are distributed to the faculty in advance. In his case, due to the needs for a certain degree of secrecy and surprise, we are springing it on you at this

meeting and therefore, I am going to use the tool of unanimous consent, which operates with these five special words. If there are no objections, I would like to bring this resolution for a vote and approve it via unanimous consent. I look around, I see no objections. Therefore, this resolution is approved. I must add that I am here because of an email from Neema who said, "Yeah, we need a speaker. Would you do it?" So thank you, Neema.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Neema is nine hours ahead of us in India right now. Very sleep deprived, but thank you very, very much.

>> NEEMA KUDVA: The thank, Eve. Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, everybody. It's been an honor. To do this-- It's the monsoons that started here. So, if you can't hear me, that's what's going on, but thank you, everybody. I am deeply touched and deeply honored. Thank you.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Next slide, please. We are open for how much longer?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have until about 3:59, so maybe nine minutes of Q&A.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Anybody who's in person, please come up. If you have questions or if you have comments. Anybody and Zoomland on anything that I've mentioned? \Okay.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We look so eagerly. Ken Berman, you're on. Identify your department, please.

>> KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, computer science. Thank you very much for the summary. I thought it was wonderful summary. I'm curious about your reaction to something. At the beginning of the Senate session, there was a lot of discussion about the use of chat. You are very anxious about it. I'm just wondering if you're comfortable with how that's worked out. Personally, I am, I know it was important to you. I thought it might be nice to hear your thoughts on how in the end it went.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Thank you Ken for that. As everybody knows, I asked for us to try to, to the

best of our ability, to re-create the in person experience. Presuming that when we are in person because I've never experienced it, but I presume that when somebody is speaking on the floor, everybody would be paying attention and not writing, and thinking about other things, and talking to others. My idea was, let's not have the chat so that we can all attend to the person who's speaking. What pushed me to do that as well is that I knew lovely Jill here used to edit the chat and remove toxic comments. Between trying to re-create the in person experience, decreasing the toxicity I'll call it for now, for lack of a better term, I thought that we could have this open forum. Obviously, there was a movement to bring back the chat, so what I did was I brought it back in a way that we are all-- There is no backroom conversations that are happening. All of it is transparent. There is sunlight on whatever conversations that are happening and we publicly post them. Charlie was radically transparent, so we're going to continue that radical and build on it, that radical transparency. I think it's worked very well to have the chat available to everyone. Everyone could see it and it's publicly posted. I felt like I was a good compromise.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other questions, comments?

>> UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There actually is one from Wendy in chat.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Okay. Wendy, do you want to say it out loud? Here she is.

>> WENDY WILCOX: Sorry. Here I am. I'm sitting. I was just saying that I had attended several meetings in person, and the chat was really difficult if you're trying to attend a meeting in person. I ended up just logging in on my computer. I think is a fantastic feature if everyone's online, but it really doesn't work for the folks that are in person. I kind of see both sides of this where hopefully, we will have more in person people attending, although obviously there's a great convenience to attending remotely.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I kind of want to keep that going even the most pandemic. I'm comfortable because part of what I think is also important is that we do have all the voices here. So, people from the tech campus and the Geneva campus. I just want them all to be able to come here and join the conversation. So, I want to keep the hybrid, and hopefully more and more people will

come in person. I have been trying to reward the in-person attendees with tickets to the faculty's soup. I might keep that going. Those of you in Zoomland didn't know about it. Anybody else? Jill said that in the chat. There was also a discussion of the annual reports. Absolutely all of them will be shared with the Senate. We have the 13 Senate committees, we have the ad hoc admissions committee, and we have the ad hoc RTE committee. Both of those are extended from when Charlie was the Dean of Faculty. I will be sharing all of those with the senators once they come in in the next few weeks, and they'll be publicly posted. Yes, it's all the Senate committee annual reports, not just the one that went to the Board of Trustees from our office. If there are no more comments and Lisa Nishii is here--

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I can't see. If someone could check on the Zoom list. Is she here? We can move on to three pending resolutions. Thanks. We're gonna start with posthumous academic awards. They'll be about 20 minutes or so, including substantial discussion, and then we will move onto the next resolution. So, Lisa, you can start.

>> LISA NISHII: Okay, great. Thank you. Hi, Charlie. I'm bummed that I'm not there to see you. I heard that you are there. Our first topic today is a policy to be able to award posthumous degrees and certificates. Over the years, and this year has unfortunately been no exception, the families of students who died prior to graduating have asked Cornell whether it be possible for us to award a degree posthumously, but because we don't have a policy about this, we repeatedly had said no. In an effort to address this, I'm proposing to you today that we adopt such a policy that would enable us to award posthumous degrees and certificates. This proposal, you should know, was developed in collaboration with college associate deans, the council's office, and the university registrar's office. By the way, Rhonda, who was able to join us today. Thank you, Rhonda. Our university registrar is the author of a goto article on best practices for awarding posthumous degrees, so we are in good hands in this regard. Establishing university wide criteria and processes for conferring both posthumous awards, that is a degree and certificate, creates a consistent approach across academic departments. Next, please. Academic units, college that is. Just for rationale here. Conferring a posthumous degree. It's common practice at other institutions including our Ivy League peers. It offers a means to recognize and commemorate a deceased student's engagement in our campus community and affords us the opportunity to have

a compassionate interaction with grieving family and friends in a way that's currently not possible. The awarding of a posthumous degree can really help bring closure to a tragic situation for family and for friends of the deceased student as well as for the University. Next, please. To accomplish these goals, a posthumous certificate, similar to a degree, a certificate would be available to students who enrolled at Cornell, but are not eligible for posthumous degree because they have not completed the required amount of coursework in order to be eligible for a posthumous degree. Next, please. Sorry that was-- Basic details of the awards. Posthumous degrees will be awarded at the bachelor's, master's, professional, sorry profession is left out of that slide, and doctoral levels. The posthumous certificate would indicate a student's enrollment period at Cornell. Posthumous awards must be approved by the college or school dean before it could be awarded. The specifications of both types of awards, a degree and a certificate, would be based upon standards and procedures that align with recognized national best practices and they, we have checked, would adhere to New York State Department of Education requirements. Next, please. Here's the resolution. Be it resolved that Cornell University will establish two posthumous awards, a degree and a certificate; Be it further resolved that the Office of the University Registrar will operationalize and publish both awards, and in consultation with the college deans, will set the terms and conditions such as award eligibility criteria and processes for requesting and conferring such awards. Next, please. There we go. We're done. We can open it up for questions and discussions. I'm going to rely on Rhonda to help me with specifics.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Anyone in person, please walk up to the microphones. If you're on Zoom, raise your digital hand. I know it's not my place to say this, but I couldn't help but notice that there is a funny comma that description, which maybe it should have been a colon because I'm reading it as if there are four things being proposed rather than two. In other words, two awards, a degree, and a certificate. Sounds to me like four things. So, I found it just a tad confusing.

>> LISA NISHII: It's two. We can revise the grammar. There's a degree and then there's a certificate.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I get it, it was just a bit confusing.

>> LISA NISHII: Thank you for that.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I see a comment from the zoom audience. Start with Stephen Vider.

>> STEPHEN VIDER: Thank you. I'm Stephen Vider. I'm in the history department. I think overall, this seems like a good, and important, and meaningful resolution. I just have a question about whether there are any guidance of the best practices or any thoughts to posthumous degrees for LGBTQ students. I'm thinking of cases where a student on campus might identify by a different name or different pronoun than their parents and family might know. We saw the tensions like this one during the pandemic when students had to go back home. I'm just curious again to know more about essentially who determines what name is used for a posthumous degree and who this is really for.

>> RHONDA KITCH: Lisa, if you're okay, I'd be happy to take that one. Stephen, that's an outstanding question and something that we've closely-- We've actually made some changes within the office of the university registrar to better align with national best practices regarding diploma considerations. I arrived to campus in the middle of January 2020. I'm learning a lot, and reviewing a lot, and going from there. One of the pieces that-- This is a pretty traditional kind of stance that was in place for decades at many institutions was to issue a diploma only in the student's legal name. However, in about the last 15 years, that practice has dramatically shifted. Adopting allowing students to adopt the chosen name and have that be considered-- I like to refer to it as what's your diploma name? We made a change in practice on that about two years ago that we allow students to choose a diploma name and that be reflected on their diploma. From a retroactive standpoint, because we know that there are a number of situations that have occurred over the past handful of years that we've denied families or instances for posthumous degree requests. I'm prepared-- We collate and [indiscernible]. I'm prepared that we can do a query in the last five years and work with respective colleges and academic departments. To me, there is a close relationship there. It's not just about the college registrar piece. How that comes into the advising conversation and what that might be some appropriate

steps forward. To your point Stephen, I would want that to be very reflective of-- Let's talk about this from a, individual student, case-by-case perspective. What's the best opportunity forward in each situation and have that reflected accordingly?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. Harold Hodes. Identify your department, please.

>> HAROLD HODES: Harold Hodes, Philosophy. This sounds great. I would like to know something about what sort of criteria our peer institutions have been using. For example, is there a minimum length of enrollment that would be required for getting a certificate? What might be the possible cutoffs between a certificate and a degree? Just to have some ballpark ideas about what other places are doing.

>> RHONDA KITCH: Absolutely, Harold. That was an extensive part of my research and my review when I wrote the article several years ago. The distinction piece really is-- Certificate of enrollment is really about a student was enrolled at the time of their death or they could have been on a leave of absence, but they were in good academic standing. If it was their first semester, they would qualify for a certificate of enrollment. That's really just honoring that they were part of our campus community. In terms of rewarding a degree, there would be substantially more investment. Most institutions, I've seen anywhere from 60 to 75 as minimums. Some institutions have it even steeper. Some institutions would say it about 75 percent of degree completion at the time of death. We are looking at about the midpoint and clustering around what most of our peers are doing and looking at about the 75 percent complete, 75 percent of their degree requirements. We collaborated and connected with graduate school and how that translates for doctoral students. There's also, to be quite honest, there is an exception criteria for eligibility. We know that there are situations. A student can come in and they're sitting at 73.5 percent degree completion. Are we really gonna say that say-- Let's say they passed away very recently. Are we really gonna say, "Had you completed the semester, you would've been over the 75 percent threshold." There's some judgment call there. That's where there's-- All of this stems from recommendation from the dean and would move forward through a review and approval process throughout the college and dean's office. Our office would be upon recommendation from the dean. We would help operationalize that. That's really what we're looking at from a

degree completion standpoint.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I just want to represent the conversation that happened on the University faculty community. Lisa and her team brought forward a really detailed resolution where they had given a lot of thought and used examples from across different Ivy+ institutions, what standards they used. The feedback from the University Faculty Committee was to request that she put forward a more general resolution and that it's for the colleges and schools to define best practices for themselves.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other comments or questions? Kathryn Caggiano, identify your department.

>> KATHRYN CAGGIANO: Thank you. Kathryn Caggiano, ORIE and Engineering. It is really a question having to do with the-- I'm so sorry. Something just happened and went right out of my head exactly what I was gonna ask. My apologies. For those of you who are familiar with senior moments, one just happened to me. Sorry about that.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: David Lee, identify your department.

>> DAVID LEE: David Lee, Dyson School. While Kathryn is collecting herself. I'll give her a moment. I had the same question as Harold, only how would it work with a PhD? In other words, one could do all of one's coursework and still have this minor thing called a dissertation left. What are the standard practices among other schools regarding PhD, for example?

>> RHONDA KITCH: That's another great question, David. Very thoughtful. What institutional threshold is in those situations would be the committee chair would make the recommendation and milestone determination, make that recommendation to the dean, and move forward. There is latitude there, but the committee chair would certainly be much more invested and involved in understanding of where the student was in that process and be able to best comment to what would be the best recommendation.

>> DAVID LEE: Okay.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Back to Kathryn Caggiano.

>> KATHRYN CAGGIANO: Thank you. Apologies for that. I'm learning to actually write down my question now. My question is, is this a process whereby we would, or the administration would proactively contact the families to ask whether this is something, or is this the kind of thing that would be engaged on requests only from the families?

>> RHONDA KITCH: Kathryn, from of sensitivity standpoint, I think of this as a bigger picture piece because this is about how we as an institution are going to recognize a student and connect with a family. In my experience, there have been situations where the family really wants no additional contact and they're really just wanting closure there. In other circumstances, if it's a certificate, that's something that could be presented rather nimbly. Maybe it's given as the family if moving their student out of the residence hall. There's really some wild times that this is happening. From its degree standpoint, that sort of actually ties in quite frequently with-- How might it pair from a commencement recognition standpoint. Families have different respects and wishes in that regard. I look at this being-- OUR is looking to operationalize this with many different campus stakeholders, and partners, and how we can be support through it, but really they're in that collaborative, holistic approach, thinking about-- Chances are, somebody from STL who has been working closely with the family is going have some level of understanding of how to take some next steps and determine what might the temperature check for the family be in terms of moving forward and making some recommendations. At the same time, it's not something you want to say very briefly after a student's death, "We'll get the posthumous degree on order." There's pieces and nuances to that. There's process, there's thoughtfulness, and there's time and place. There's some institutions, quite honestly, that would not award a posthumous degree until the timing and sequencing would happen when the student would be graduating with their respective graduating class. Other institutions, and what we're proposing, is to live that little more broad and open. The timing and sequence of the student has a semester and 1/2 left, that can be rewarded sooner. It gives us more flexibility overall, but I think of this as very collaborative and multiple people weighing in in terms of what some next steps would be. Quite

honestly, be advising. The advising team might have some good lens on that as well.

>> KATHRYN CAGGIANO: If I'm hearing you, it's really just dependent upon the situation engagement with the family, but this isn't something we're necessarily saying you have to come to us. Okay. Thank you.

>> RHONDA KITCH: Very case-by-case and review very collaboratively. I'm gonna be really candid. I think that our lack of a policy has brought us to a place of-- It feels like we're not very compassionate and empathetic when we have had reach outs from families requesting if there's something that can be done, whether it's from a certificate standpoint or degree standpoint or ultimately a degree standpoint. The state has concerns about us preceding and awarding a degree without a posthumous degree policy. Our approach-- Multiple people have been a part of this development. Our approach is to really provide compassionate, empathetic potentials for families and our former students that have unfortunately passed before they graduated.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think we're going to move on to next resolution also talked about by Lisa Nishii. Awards of honors to Cornell's undergraduate students. Before we start, just to remind to remind the people in Zoom to mute yourself after you've finished speaking. Lisa, you're back on.

>> LISA NISHII: Thank you. I think this is my third time talking to all of you about this resolution. I think by now, you are quite familiar with it, but we will have some time to discuss the resolution a little bit more. I will just go over the actual wording of the resolution with you because I don't think we got a chance to do that at the April 20 meeting. Just as a reminder, there are three interrelated parts to this resolution. One has to do with what we're calling with scholarship based awards, honors that based not just on GPA, but GPA and some other academic activity as defined locally. Often, this might be a senior thesis or project. Second component is Dean's list. The third are honors based on GPA only. Next, please. Here we go with the wording of the resolution. Whereas in addition to Latin honors and dean's list, across Cornell's undergraduate colleges and schools, there are eight other types of honors and distinctions awarded with various titles; a few are based solely upon GPA, but most are based upon GPA as

well as performance in an academic activity such as research or an honors thesis, with some awarded at the level of the degree versus others at the level of the major; Basically, there's a lot of variance in how we do things. Whereas at all the other Ivies, awards for an academic activity such as an honors thesis are conferred as distinctions or honors at the department level, not as Latin honors; Next, please. Dean's list. Whereas because dean's list is awarded repeatedly, it continuously promotes the centrality of high grades, thereby increasing student academic stress and encouraging students to have a grade-centric approach to their education; Whereas, unlike Latin honors, the majority of other Ivies do not have dean's list, so there is no concern that eliminating its award would put our students at a lesser footing, vis-à-vis students at the other Ivies; Next, please. Whereas there is inconsistency across Cornell's colleges and schools in the conferral of honors based on GPA, including whether they are awarded. All colleges right now except AAP and ILR confer GPA-based honors; There's also variability in what they are called; and the eligibility criteria; and this enormous disparity is unintended, confusing to both students, and people who read Cornell transcripts, and inequitable; Whereas the divergent approaches to the award of GPA-based honors should be replaced with a single approach so that all colleges and schools would confer Latin honors on the bases of the same percentiles at the degree level; Whereas currently across Cornell's undergraduate colleges and schools, such GPA-only honors are already awarded at the level of the degree; Whereas all of the other Ivies except for Princeton confer Latin honors at the degree level, based solely upon GPA, and five of the Ivies use percentiles as the eligibility criteria; Be it resolved that colleges and schools continue to award distinctions at the level of the degree or major based on academic activities they choose or a combination of GPA and academic activities, but not GPA-alone, which shall be conferred as degree Latin Honors; but the nomenclature used across schools be aligned through a single naming convention. This is one part I want to bring to your attention. After the feedback we received at the last faculty senate meeting and in subsequent consultation with the UFC, we decided to revise the label that was proposed previously, which was distinction and X, and change it to Honors, High Honors, and Highest Honors; I think that should be changed in the first part of this first be it resolved clause. Also, I have to apologize. We had some supplemental slides that were from the April 20 Faculty Senate meeting posted on the senate website where I made these changes to use the working Honors instead of distinction and X, but I did fail to make the changes on a critical slide, slide 8, which provided a summary of the old and new

criteria and labels for these scholarship based awards. There may be some confusion, but the wording would be Honors, High Honors, and Highest Honors based on the feedback we received. Second bullet. Be it further resolved that dean's list be eliminated; Be it finally resolved that the current divergent approaches to the award of Latin honors be replaced with a single approach so that all colleges and schools confer Latin honors based on percentiles in the colleges and schools, as follows: Summa cum laude, top 5%, Magna cum laude, next 10%, and Cum laude would be the next 15%. I think that is our last slide. Opening it up for questions.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Raise your hand if you're in Zoom or step up. I see someone in person. Identify yourself and your affiliation.

>> ROBERT TRAVERS: Yes, thank you very much. I'm Robert from the history department and I'm the director of undergraduate studies in history. I was one of those who was concerned of the effects of policy on departmental research based Latin honors. I'm grateful to the vice provost for trying to accommodate those concerns. I still feel strongly opposed to this measure. For students I work with, I see no educational benefits from tying Latin honors to the GPA. Instead, I'm concerned that by further stressing grades and GPA as a measure of educational achievement, this policy will have negative educational outcomes. We are replacing-- I'm very much in favor abolishing the dean's list. We're replacing one grade centric view with another grade centric view. Grades are limited measure of learning outcomes. Students already feel under tremendous pressure to prioritize their GPA. The pressure on grades is detrimental for student learning. For example, when a student would benefit from taking a class that may result in a lower grade, may be a challenging class, and the student may learn more from that class. I think this is going in the wrong direction from my point of view. I'd just like to quickly make a second point. I know how fortunate I am to work at Cornell. In recent years, I've felt repeatedly undermined as a classroom teacher by central administration making educational policies without adequate prior consultation with departments and teaching faculty. I'm very grateful to the dean for emphasizing consultation with the faculty Senate, but do feel that there needs to be done at the policy level before these policies come to the Senate to engage with teaching. I very much hope the EPC of the Senate can work with central administration to develop more consultative protocols before these policies are issued. Thanks very much.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Other comments or questions?

>> EVE DE ROSA: May respond to that?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I just wanted to point out that there are already is a GPA based award that's conferred within the College of Arts and Sciences. It's just right now, the label would be changed from distinction in all subjects to Latin honors so that it's consistent both with the other colleges and schools at Cornell and also with our Ivy peers. The other point that I wanted to make was about your concern whether or not this would make students too grade focused and lose the value of the independent research that's associated with the landowners right now in the College of Arts and Sciences. It's only college where that's the case right now and where it's awarded at the level of the major. Other data from Cals, which was quite interesting. The data for us to be able to look at where in Cals prior to the year 2000, they did not offer any awards based on GPA alone. It was only possible to earn honors based on GPA plus scholarship. In 2000, they introduced GPA only awards. There was a moment for us to see whether or not in fact that lessens the motivation for students to engage in research. There is no discernible pattern to indicate that that's the case. Also in 2000, they changed the label of the thesis based honors from honors to distinction I think it was. I have so much of my head, I can't keep it straight. The change in label also does not seem to have a measurable effect. That's the most relevant data I could share related to that concern.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Risa Lieberwitz.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Hi. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I have a question about the sponsors. This is unusual as a resolution coming from the senate because the sponsors of the resolution are all from the administration at different levels. One question I have is it says college and school deans. I wonder if it's every college and school dean. I'm not sure exactly what it's comprised of and what the numbers are of the administrators who are sponsoring this resolution. Of course, I

recognize that the administrators are members of the university faculty who can sponsor resolutions, but I'd like some clarity on that, please.

>> EVE DE ROSA: This has been in the making for about three years or so. We've just been combing through tons and tons of data just to try to understand the landscape, which has been incredibly confusing. There's been some changes in rules in the associate dean positions across colleges and schools, across that time period. So the number of associate deans involved greater than the number of colleges. This is an undergraduate. Those are for undergraduate degrees. In our associate dean meetings, we almost always have representation from the professional schools and graduate schools as well. Student services leaders have also been an active part of this conversation. This has been presented multiple times to the college deans as well. Again, it's been a long process.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: I'm just asking, what are the numbers of people who are sponsoring?

>> EVE DE ROSA: I'd have to count.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: I'm sorry. I'll just follow up with one question on that. The rules for the senate require 25 faculty to sponsor it. I just didn't know if it was within that. I'm curious generally, but also that specifically.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yeah, if you think that we probably on average throughout this process, 11 to 13 colleges and schools represented, associate deans, and turnover, and deans, we get to the 25.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, let's move on to Stephen Vider.

>> STEPHEN VIDER: Thank you. I'm Stephen Vider in the history department. This actually builds on a comment in the chat from actual Alexander Blackman about concern about issuing or doing the percentiles at the college level rather than the department level, whether that might favor certain majors over others. One specific concern that I have had is unlike some, but not all

of our peer institutions, Cornell gives A+ where a student can get above a 4.0. As a relatively new faculty member, it's never been clear to me how common or not an A+ is. When I look at student transcripts, I see that there's a lot of variability among individual faculty and among departments about how common an A+, how easy it is to get an A+. I worry that a GPA percentile based Latin honor is going to reveal some inequity. I wonder if there has been any-- Looking at the grade ranges across departments in colleges to see if in fact some majors would have-- There'd be a bias for some majors over others.

>> EVE DE ROSA: We did look at that. I agree with you. I think there is inconsistency in whether A+ are awarded. That does lead to GPAs greater than 4.0. I think that's a separate conversation in terms of what is our convert policy as a university when it comes to grading? Should there be more consistency on whether or not an A+ is possible because those differences show up in the ways that you've just mentioned. We did look at GPAs across departments. We collaborated with arts and sciences as the largest college and also where concerns were expressed to take a look at the GPAs across colleges. Of course, there is variability across majors. Some are a little bit overrepresented, some are a little bit underrepresented proportionately. In terms of the students who currently receive honors based on GPA, it's the top 30 percent in arts and sciences that get this honor right now. It doesn't quite follow the pattern I think some people may have been assuming and have expressed. For example, would students in STEM be disadvantaged? The data suggests that the majors-- There isn't a huge amount of variability. Of the majors most underrepresented among graduates with distinctions, this is the top 30 percent, one is a STEM major. I coded all the majors. One is a STEM major, three are social sciences, and one is arts and humanities. When you look at the five majors most overrepresented among graduates with distinction right now, two are STEM, one is a social science major, and two are arts and humanities majors. There isn't a clear pattern that I saw there.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Steve Marschner.

>> STEVE MARSCHNER: Thank you. I just wanted to sort of tease apart two different issues in the focus on grades. One is just generally whether it's useful to focus on students on grades, but also the problem that students in comparing their grades fell in competition with one another,

which I find is often a very negative aspect of student culture that's not helpful. One of the things that the proposal seems to be doing is changing from a prior practice that was mostly using fixed thresholds for these honors to one that is mandating to always be percentile based. With the percentile set up, of course, the only way one person could get honors is by beating somebody else who then doesn't. This seems like it puts a focus on a competition in a way that the fixed thresholds don't. I'm just wondering if that's something that has entered the discussion.

>> EVE DE ROSA: We talked a lot about it. We identified various pros and cons with the GPA-based threshold versus the percentile-based threshold, as you mentioned, and ultimately decided to proceed with a proposal based on percentiles for a few reasons. One, it is much more common across institutions to do it based on percentiles. If you do it based on a fixed GPA, say we put this policy in place, and then some changes made with whether or not A pluses are granted, the means are going to shift. The students' GPAs will shift over time. We felt that the percentiles had fewer disadvantages associated with them. I agree with you completely with the concern about whether or not would increase competition among students. Ultimately, we felt that it's across 120 credits, so it's so distal. How I compare relative to you in this class is, especially if you're in different colleges, different majors, you're taking different sets of classes across the 120 credits. There isn't such a clear line of sight between how we compare this class to the ultimate percentile for a student lens. That's how we ultimately felt. Maybe it would be okay from a competition standpoint. Five of the six Ivies that prefer Latin honors at the level of degree do use percentiles, so this really just kind of puts us in line.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Harold Hodes, I think you have last question or comment.

>> HAROLD HODES: It would certainly be a bad thing if this would deform how students approach selecting their courses. Students are going to say, "Well, I really want to get honors, so I'm going to select my courses in this way, rather than that way." This makes me wonder whether the 30 percent is too high. It sounds high to me. I would think that if only 20 or 15 percent of graduates got honors, it might be less likely that students would think of honors as something I should aim for. They might be more likely to think of it as, "Wow, someone gets it. That person is super," and be less likely to want to guide their education by the target of getting honors. I'm

just putting out the idea that maybe 30 percent is too high

>> EVE DE ROSA: Right now, these awards already exist. We're actually taking away what we've heard is the most salient type of honor, the dean's list, that drives students' semester to semester course choices in the way that you described. We are not adding any more GPA based honors. We're just trying to align them across colleges and schools.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we're gonna move to our last order of business, which is discussion of increasing the transparency and effectiveness of faculty senate proceedings. We are gonna start with Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa for a couple of minutes, then others should raise your hand if you want to speak to the subject for two minutes apiece.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Hi, everyone. Thank you for sticking it out for this last senate meeting. I can see from our attendance that people are exhausted. This is our last topic for discussion, and then we're ready for our break. Thank you for the feedback that we've received through the senate meetings and also the faculty forum. I think what I would like to express is that the University Faculty Committee has been considering all the feedback and we're thinking of ways how to increase the transparency and effectiveness of the faculty senate. As VP Varna expressed, 165 years ago, the Board of Trustees delegated authority to the University Faculty Committee at the executive committee of this body of the senate. Delegated the authority to create the agenda. I would like for those standards to continue in a way that doesn't handcuff the Dean of Faculty. Imagine you're a graduate where you are coordinating through your four faculty members and you are trying to get everyone's schedule so you can have that one meeting together a semester. The University Faculty Committee, 11 faculty members, 11 different schedules, and we have to find time twice a month to meet. Once with the Provost and once to set the agenda. There are procedures that are suggested in this resolution that make it almost impossible for us to meet that monthly standard of having a faculty meeting once a month, senate meeting once a month. I do think that there are ways for us to improve the effectiveness and the transparency, but I don't think that these are the procedures for that. I gave you examples of things that we have been considering. We are continuing and take in more, but I do oppose this resolution and I'm asking for grace from the senators to allow the UFC and for me to try to respond and then give us the

space to make those improvements without these particular procedures. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Raise your hand if you'd like to speak for couple of minutes on this subject. Laurent Dubreuil.

>> LAURENT DUBREUIL: Thank you. Laurent Dubreuil from Romance Studies. I'm one of the cosponsors of this resolution that was put in the strange case of limbo for many months. The Dean of Faculty in her opening statements today said that she wanted to continue this radical transparency. That's a quote, radical transparency. I understand that it was related to the chat, but I believe it's a larger concern. If we agree on that, that we need more radical transparency, there should be ways for doing it. Trust me or trust the University Faculty Committee that we will do the best we can, which is the presentation we just had from Eve, strikes me as a strange move. It's not about people, individual people. It's about institutions and it's about the mechanisms for going into more democratic direction. Basically, we can be run as a corporation with some discussion than top down decisions. That's pretty much the idea of the university as it has been performed over the last few years and probably more than the past few years. We can act as a more democratic party. In this sense, more transparency includes more discussions. Faculty fora are a thing, but more discussions at the Senate level and probably more discussion about what we could discuss.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Someone asked if they could see the resolution as it is. It's the one on the right. Jill can show that. There is space for faculty to come and solicit or provide feedback to the University Faculty Committee. There is never an opportunity. No one is preventing anyone from coming to the University Faculty Committee with things that they would like to discuss. Sorry, Laurent. I'm blanking on what your other concern is.

>> LAURENT DUBREUIL: When you speak about grace, for instance, leave us the space to do that. You understand that what you are doing is putting things on a personal level. That's really not what we want to do. We need more institutional-- more space in the institutional mechanisms, not to trust you, or your successor, or the people because precisely that was part of the discussion that we had before, or the non-discussion that we had before. It's not about the

individual's want, currently the Dean of Faculty and so on. It's about ensuring something in the long run. That's why trust me cannot be the answer if you want to move forward, not for this year, next year, but for longer term.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do you want to respond? Afterwards, we'll go to Durba Ghosh.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I just want to quickly say that having-- Some of these I already do. I do give a copy of the agenda every Friday, not every Friday morning. If there are topics that the faculty would like to bring to the University Faculty Committee, there is ample opportunity. No one is preventing that from happening. I'm not sure why this is at a personal discretion. The mechanisms have been here 165 years. Nothing has changed. Why now, and why like this? I just don't think that these are necessarily procedures that will improve the effectiveness and transparency.

>> LAURENT DUBREUIL: I know I should shut up, but I would just say one sentence. We have seen over the last 5 to 10 years a move toward a more authoritarian handling of all decisions coming from the central administration. Therefore, even though it's not absolutely presented. Therefore, there is a need for more pushback coming from the university faculty and the faculty in general against those moves. That's precisely what we are discussing here. It's trying to have more power in these questions of being run like a corporation.

>> EVE DE ROSA: What I would say, Laurent, is that these procedures that are listed here don't improve that.

>> LAURENT DUBREUIL: That is what you say. I understand that is what you think.

>> Eve De Rosa: That is between the university administration. None of these things that have been proposed actually make an improvement in that space

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Durba. Durba, can you unmute yourself and begin?

>> DURBA GHOSH: Sorry, too many buttons to look at. I'm Durba Ghosh. I'm faculty in the history department. I'm also completing two terms as a member of the University Faculty Committee. I think I'll start by saying that there are two versions of this resolution. The one on the left was the one that was submitted to the UFC and Dean Eve De Rosa three weeks after she took office last summer. It has been framed in various comments as quote unquote common sense, or just now by Laurent as democratizing the senate. If that is really the case, I'm surprised that this resolution has not been raised in the 150 years of the faculty senate. When this resolution was submitted, it read to me in particular, and others obviously, that there were concerns already before Dean De Rosa had even shared a single UFC or faculty senate meeting that she needed to be watched, that she needed to be reformed in her approach for setting the agenda and appointing ad hoc committees. I would direct you to the provisions that are on the left the way that the resolution has changed. If you read the chat right now, Sen. Bensel seems to be very concerned that you not see the previous version of this resolution. I think the previous version gives you a sense of the motivation behind this resolution. If the goal of this is transparency or effectiveness, I don't think that we are going to get there through the provisions of this resolution. I think I'll just end by reminding you that the members of the UFC, the Associate Dean of Faculty, the Dean of Faculty are all voted on by the entire faculty. In fact, we just had an election in which people were invited to vote for their preferred candidates. I'll just speak for myself. When I joined the UFC, it was spectacularly undiverse, and I do not want to explain who was on that group then. The UFC has become a lot more diverse. The faculty senate has become a lot more diverse. If I can just speak as a historian. Sometimes the language of transparency seems to grow when groups become more diverse. I would say that the language of transparency is something that I agree with and I sign on for. I'm not sure that this is generating transparency. I think is generating surveillance on a University Faculty Committee that has become more diverse.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman.

>> KEN BIRMAN: Thank you. Ken Birman, Computer Science. I found myself torn between the two different views that are being expressed. It's odd. I was hoping I could just say that I agreed with Laurent, but then he started talking about the authoritarian nature, which is

something I don't agree with, but I actually do feel that there is a legitimate issue here of a lack of understanding of the UFC deliberations meeting by meeting. The reason it's important to us is that the UFC has had a tremendous amount of control over which resolutions reach the senate, which ones don't. Drafted resolutions on its own in the last couple of years, [indiscernible] senate resolutions, which often didn't actually reflect things the senate had discussed. The committee on candidates does a triage of some sort, but we don't necessarily know what they started with or what the basis of that actually was. Thinking back much earlier, I could give more and more, I won't, but I could give more and more examples of situations where what we've seen in the senate has been very heavily filtered by well-intended decisions by the UFC that, I don't want to say exceed the limits of the executive group, but certainly stretch the limits. I think the suggestion that we see minutes is not a particularly onerous one to impose. This is intended as our executive committee speaking on our behalf. I actually support greater transparency. I'm comfortable with the wording of the resolution. I'll end up voting for it. I could imagine other wordings, but what fundamentally troubles me-- Durba, let me just say I was happy to hear all of your comments. It's simply that we have to trust, Laurent made this point, seeing minutes would free us to read the minutes and remove that element of asking ourselves, "Am I being properly representative by this committee that I have voted to put in place?" Ultimately, I support this even though I do not feel that the administration is so heavily authoritarian. We could still agree on something. I agree with Laurent fundamentally.

>> EVE DE ROSA: The offer the minutes. I'm sorry can't remember the formal name of the type of minutes. This is something that I offered that is actually not articulated in this resolution. There is no place in this resolution that says that they're asking the UFC to produce minutes. That was an offer on my part. I'm happy to do that. I'll tell you in an email with the type of payment minutes are because I can't remember the formal name of them.

>> Ken Birman: I took that to the content of the UFC meetings, but that would be a wonderful gesture. If this is struck down but you take that step, I think will be responsive to my concern at least, but I don't know how else to express my concern except by voting.

>> EVE DE ROSA: The other thing is that we do, the UFC has discussed that a member beside

myself as chair of the UFC will come and represent the monthly discussions that happen at each Senate meeting.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Risa Lieberwitz.

>> RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I want to address a couple things. First, I am very happy to hear that somebody from the UFC is going to come to the meetings and report. I think that this resolution has probably helped the UFC to think about doing that. I'm really glad to see that UFC is responding to it. I just want to point out that in 2007, there was a governance review committee. I was on that. I chaired that. A number of faculty members who have been active in governance on it. We put out a report. One of the things that we suggested doing was to expand the UFC in ways, not numbers, but in ways that were more diverse in terms of people coming who are not senators, people being elected. That's why we have the non-senators on there. We've been reviewing governance with the eye towards effectiveness for a very long time. One of the things we suggested in that report as well were the regular reports by the UFC, which did occur for a while. It kind of fell off. I think it's great that it's coming back again. We've been looking at these issues for a long time. I want to emphasize that this is really is about trying to make our governance processes responsive to the faculty and for the faculty to be engaged with the governance processes in ways that are active engagement all towards a flow of information so that we can work together to create agendas and to follow up on our resolutions in ways that address the problems that we continue to run into with the administration, not consulting with us, not giving us information, not being responsive to resolutions. One of the things we can do is to improve our institutional processes. The resolution that you have before you is the resolution. It's not two resolutions, it's one resolution. I do think these are common sense things. Having the UFC post a draft of the agenda I think is only to the good that will encourage people to respond to it to give ideas about not only what's on the agenda for the UFC to consider before finalizing it, but also the allocation of time on the agenda, ideas about priorities. Seems to me these are all to the good and that the nominations and election committee with regard to the nominations of faculty for ad hoc committees. That's something that doesn't come to the Senate now, so we are we are recommending that that be part of what we adopt because ad hoc committees are so important. I do think these are common sense. I do think

that these are institutional kinds of changes that can really encourage more participation. Thanks.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Alex Nading.

>> ALEX NADING: Alex Nading from the Department of Anthropology and an alternate senator. I've been serving this semester and following this with great interest because I'm one of those people who didn't have an orientation as a senator. In thinking about that and thinking about this resolution, the one thing that occurs to me is that not only orientation but basic participation and engagement in faculty democracies, such as it is, is improving, but still needs improvement across the university. I don't think this resolution actually goes in any direction to actually improving that because what it does is create more opportunities for those few faculty, it seems to me, who do have a great deal of time to peruse detailed agendas and offer feedback on them to be participants, whereas what I think we really should be working on if we want to increase transparency, if we want a voice before administration that is in fact the corporation and not a democracy, then I think what we need to do is work together as engaged faculty senators with our colleagues who aren't in the senate who only have a few minutes in the semester to think about faculty governance. Tell them why it's important to vote. Tell them why it's important to pay attention to things that are coming out. I think that representative activity is more effective in that than the flattened democracy that's imagined here. Even though I appreciate the spirit of this, I can't support this resolution for that reason, in addition to the ones that have been listed by Durba and others. I just wanted to say that. Thanks.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a few more minutes Neema Kudva. You're on.

>> NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Jonathan. Alex, thank you for expressing those emotions, those perspectives because I completely agree with it. This is the last time I'm in the senate as someone who's elected to the body. When I see that less than 25 percent of our colleagues even vote for the elected positions, it really worries me. When we're talking about transparency, we're talking about more engagement of our colleagues, I completely agree with Alex. It's about bringing-- It's about taking perspectives back to our departments. It's about understanding how the institution works. It's about really thinking about how we do an orientation, which I know the

Dean of Faculty has already begun to organize. This year, the Dean of Faculty for the first time actually sent an orientation package for every new senator who came aboard so they could understand what the system was. I'm with Alex and with Durba. I think for all of you who are going to vote on this, or the 34 percent of you who typically vote on these things, think about what you're actually doing when you don't talk to your colleagues, when you don't talk take this back. It's not just about this body. It's about bringing the entire faculty on board to really think through these questions. Even in my college, I want to ask my fellow senators who are here right now. How many of you even bring this up in your faculty meetings? I don't hear it. For me, I served in the senate because I was so appalled at the lack of engagement of all of us in faculty governance. Fighting with the Dean of Faculty about these issues, send me an agenda 24 hours before she actually posts it seems to me almost absurd. At one level, I completely agree with the spirit of the resolution. We want the senate to be more participatory. We want to bring people in, but these are not the mechanisms to do this by. The mechanism to do this by are to really bring more colleagues on board in every committee, in every one of our faculty meetings, to really do that. If we want the central administration to take us seriously and to be part of what they're doing, then we need to step up. 25 percent of us vote in elections and we are worried about getting an agenda 24 hours earlier. The two things just don't come together for me. I wanted to say this, my last little thing in the senate. I really wish that all of us, all of us who are elected in these positions, learn to bring more people in, not squabble within each other for 12 hours more on an agenda second meeting

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Mark Lewis, you literally have one minute before we adjourn.

>> MARK LEWIS: I hope I don't take that much. I'm sorry, my camera seemed to be flickering. I'm one of the elected members, one of the more diverse elected members of the University Faculty Committee that Durba was speaking about earlier. I just wanted to point out that I think that both versions of this bill, this resolution are pertinent here. It tells me something about the implications or why this was done. I don't think that we can just look at one and say this is a nice version after we've had some back and forth with the Dean of Faculty and made a cleaner so that sounds better. I think what really is important to say is that many of the people that were putting this resolution forward were on the ballot to be elected to some of these positions and were not

elected, and now they want us to comb and to give an opportunity for them to dig through all the little details of what's being put forward to change it. In my opinion, I think that-- I'm obviously gonna vote against it. I think the timing is important. I think the people that have put this forward are important. I think the first version is important. I vehemently against it. I support every word that Durba, and Neema, and Alex said earlier. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we're out of time. So, the meeting in respect of everyone's time is adjourned.