Faculty Senate

May 4, 2022

>>Martha Pollack: [Due to technical difficulties, the recording didn't start until approximately 5 minutes into the meeting.] …talk about some of my key priorities and challenges, things I see coming down the pike. And actually, the timing is really good because, although it's a little bit hard for me to believe, I've just finished five years here at Cornell, and so I'm now looking to the next five years for that. And when I think about priorities--Look, universities are incredibly complicated organizations, and that complexity only increases as the university gets bigger and the university has bigger ambitions, of the kind that we have here at Cornell. And so, the list of priorities is really a very, very long one, as is the list of challenges. And I should say, I don't think challenges are bad. We're a university. It's our job to address challenges. We wouldn't be doing our job if we didn't see challenges. But for the sake of today's discussion, what I'm going to do is I'm going to highlight seven key opportunities and challenges to achieve them that I see coming down the pipeline. And I want to start with one that I know you all know I am incredibly passionate about, and is that student affordability and access. This is a complex issue. It reaches well beyond Cornell. It's an issue of national concern. But look, we have a foundational commitment to this, right? We were founded by someone, Ezra Cornell, who envisioned this university as standing in contrast to the other universities at that time that were mainly concerned with educating the offspring of wealthy people, the sons of wealthy people, to go into law and ministry. We were supposed to be a university for what today would be called the working and lower-income groups. And we continue today to take this very, very seriously. So, it's because of that, our undergraduate admissions is need-blind. When our admissions office looks at an application, they don't know whether the student is going to require financial aid. And when a student is admitted, we provide them with a package that meets their full need. Now, you can debate whether it's enough, but based on some pretty serious calculations, we provide them with a package of grants and loans and work study that not only takes care of their tuition, but also their room and board and living expenses. And more than half of our undergraduates do receive financial aid. And we've worked really hard over the past... really, even just before I got here, so let me say about six years, to reduce the loan component and increase the grant component of those packages, the grant, of course, being the part that doesn't need to be paid back. Now, look,

I don't think anyone in this room would disagree with the fact that a Cornell education is worth much, much more than sort of a crass return on investment, right? By getting this kind of education, we believe you're going to have a happier and healthier life, you're going to be a better citizen, you're going to be more engaged in your community. But even if you just look at the return on investment, a Cornell education is a very good investment. A Payscale--This is not me doing this calculation, outside groups. Payscale computed the 20-year net ROI for a Cornell education as somewhere between $725,000 and $900,000, depending--This is net of what you've spent, depending on how much aid you took. A new study by the Center on Education in the Workforce at Georgetown projects the 40-year NPV to be $1.6 million. Nonetheless, we do want to drive down the costs. And importantly, we want to increase diversity, especially socioeconomic diversity, which is where we're still not where we want to be. We're making progress. A simple measure--You can measure this lots of different ways. But if we just look at first-generation students, we've been doing pretty well. Over the past three years, we increased the number of first-generation students by 50%. It used to be 13% of our class. Now it's 19% overall. Nearly 20% in the class that's coming in, 2026, yeah, the class that's coming in this fall. But we still don't have level of socioeconomic diversity we want. We're still very highly skewed towards the top of the income distribution. And that's why I continue to push on affordability. And in the Greatest Good campaign, the philanthropic campaign now underway, that's a major goal. A major goal is to raise $500 million--We're more than halfway there. So far, we've raised $273 million--to do 3 things. Increase the number of students who get aid by 1,000. Now, we're growing by another 650 students anyway. We're not growing by 1,000. We're growing by 650. This is consistent with the new residence halls on North Campus. But we want, overall, in the student body, to have 1,000 more students with aid than we have today. Secondly, how are we going to do that? In part, we're going to do that by targeted recruiting, targeted yield management, really encouraging these students to come here once they're admitted, but also, we're going to do that by trying to reduce the average debt by 25%. And then, the third thing we want to do, the students who come from the lowest income families, already, it's basically free. They don't pay anything, except that they still have to contribute. They're supposed to work in the summer and contribute for their summer savings. And we want to make sure that at least one summer, at least one, out of their four years here--It'll be the three between the time they're here-- that expectation is waived, and they can do an internship or some other sort of career-related

activity. We do also have ambitious plans to raise financial aid at the graduate and professional school level. But there's not one overarching goal there because the needs, say, of a business school are just very, very different from the needs of, say, the vet school. So, that's all much more school-specific. That's priority number one, affordability. The second priority--Because this is really a campaign about people. I'm trying to keep this as a campaign about people. And the second priority is faculty hiring. This is critical, right? You, the faculty, you're our academic excellence. Everything rests on that. And as our student body has been growing, and will continue to grow--I'm far enough away from you guys. I'm going to take this off--we need to increase the number of faculty we have to teach them. And making sure that all of our faculty have time to balance their teaching responsibilities with all of their other responsibilities. Now, the hiring is all done in the schools and colleges. It's not done centrally. And Mike and the deans are working together on a number of aggressive hiring initiatives. Again, it's a campaign goal. The campaign goal mainly focuses on endowed chairs but we're not only interested in endowed chairs. We are interested in faculty growth everywhere. There are initiatives all over the place. There are initiatives in AI, in quantum computing and design technology. We've got a number of really wonderful cluster initiatives that are letting us diversify our faculty. The Pathways to Social Justice cohort came into the College of Human Ecology and brought in eight faculty who work on race, ethnicity, and the nature, persistence, and consequences of inequality. And kudos to Eve De Rosa for leading that initiative. There is a similar initiative in CALS, which is going to bring in at least five new faculty members on solution-based physical and/or social sciences to explicitly address systemic challenges facing historically marginalized communities. There's a similar effort. I saw Meejin here, coming out of the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning. And we have a really wonderful $16 million grant from the National Institutes of Health called the Faculty Institutional Recruitment for Sustainable Transformation First, which is going to support the hiring and retention of 10 new assistant professors over the next 5 years in 3 research clusters across a number of colleges. And Avery August has spearheaded that. It is a campaign about people. More access and more affordability for students, more socioeconomic diversity there, and growth in our faculty are among the top priorities. A third really important priority to me, and I want to thank the Faculty Senate for already doing a lot of the work on this, is the new part-time and online degree programs. Since I got here, really, since my inauguration speech, I've talked about academic innovation, academic verve, as I like to call it. And these new programs,

these potential new programs, these online degree programs, are an incredibly important part of that. And they're important for a number of reasons. They're so consistent with our core mission of reaching out to the world. We want to start with groups who otherwise wouldn't have access to a Cornell education, people in prison, adult working population who never got to college, and so on. Secondly, they are responsive to the growing calls for schools like ours to do more to contribute to the greater good by providing education to more than--We're a pretty big school, but we're still talking about 15,000 undergraduates. There are many, many more people who need what we can offer. And third, it really is going to help us stay at the forefront of higher education. Now, look, I never really thought--never, not really. I never thought that schools like ours were going to be replaced by Coursera or these online programs. I think after the pandemic, there's not even any discussion about that. You all saw how excited the students are to be here. This isn't a matter of competition. This is a matter of growing interest in a broader array of different kinds of educational mediums, different kinds of credentialing programs, different timelines, education that even our current residential students are going to want to follow them throughout their lifetime. And so, these new degree programs will help us learn from and stay at the cutting edge of that. As they say, I am very thankful to the senate committee that worked on this, that endorsed it, but also raised what I understand is sort of the central issue, right? The devil is always in the details. And the central issue is, how do we do this without, on the one hand, overburdening faculty? No one wants to do that. While, at the same time, preserving the quality and making sure that this is a high-quality program. I'm looking forward to the next exploration of this. It is, I think, a very, very important thing for Cornell. The fourth is the rollout of the racial justice and equitable futures programs, both the center and the course requirements. I understand that the search for the center's new director is underway. The search committee is being chaired by Vice Provost Avery August and Brooks School Dean Colleen Barry. Again, I'm really excited about this. We have faculty all over this university who are doing world-class research in this area. And I think when we bring them together in this new center, we can actually be the leader in understanding both the causes of racial inequity and, if you like, those items, those things we can do, the interventions, that will transform us into the future, into a more equitable future. Vice President August has is also leading the implementation committee for the undergraduate educational requirements. I know that a number of colleges have already developed these. Others are in the process of doing that. Fifth is a little more pedestrian, but

important, and that's IT. Good IT systems are just essential to enabling a modern university, or really any modern organization, to run smoothly. And let me be frank about it. In many cases, our systems need a refresh. They need to be modernized. So, our IT leadership has been actively working on a strategic plan that includes a five-year roadmap for critical upgrades, with a goal of beginning implementation next year in FY23. We want to make sure that our systems are robust, that they're easy to use, that they enhance everyone's work, they don't get in the way of them, and that they provide all of us the information we need to run this university well. Also importantly, cybersecurity is just a huge issue. And we need to make sure that everyone's data is protected. So, this is another priority. Number six out of seven is always a priority for us, and that's sustainability. I am really proud of the fact that we have now earned a platinum rating from AASHE--AASHE is the American Association for Sustainability in Higher Education--for the third time. We've earned it for the third time. We are the only university to have gained it three consecutive years. And in fact, there are only nine universities in total in the whole world that have that platinum rating. We're also--This is actually my favorite ranking of all. We're number four on the Sierra Club's cool schools ranking, which rates our teaching, our research, and our operations. And students pay attention to that. They want to go to a cool school. We're going to continue to address questions of sustainability, not just across operations but in teaching and research. But as an example of where we're addressing it in operations, drilling for the Cornell University Observatory Borehole--This is sort of the next step in Earth Source Heating, which you've all heard about--begins later this month. And then, my last goal, my seventh priority, I'm not going to say a lot about this because, so far, it's a pretty nascent idea, but it's something I'm spending a lot of time thinking about and talking to people about, and I'd welcome thoughts on. I'm just thinking more and more about how we engage our students in two things that, in the end, I think are actually interrelated and are very, very important. The first is how to help them develop what we would all refer to, I think, as resilience. The students don't like that term. I'm going to call it a growth mindset, being better able to deal with the slings and arrows of--What is it? I'm not an English major--slings and arrows of un-something fortune. Outrageous fortune, thank you. The slings and ar--The veterinarian knows. But at the same time, also help ensure that they are thinking more deeply and in a more nuanced way about assaults on freedom of expression, which, today, are coming from both ends of the political spectrum. This is a place, of course, that cherishes and thrives on different ideas. And a key part of the Cornell education is

about how to learn from difference, and how to engage with difference, and how to communicate across difference. I don't need to tell you that freedom of speech is essential to all of that. And learning to balance the right to freedom of speech with the imperative to exercise it responsibly and respectfully, that's just essential to our students' ability to thrive. And I also see that as a really important part of developing resilience. And that's something I just think we need to be taking very seriously as we try to educate the next generation of future leaders and future citizens. As I say, I'm not sure where this is going to take us, but I am increasingly concerned that these are issues that it's just incumbent upon us as educators to take on with all of our students. So, those are the seven goals. And with that, I will take questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you're online in Zoom-land, raise your digital hand. If you're here and have a question, come up to the microphone. Just come up. And keep social distance if there are more than one. We're going to start with the Zoom. Buz Barstow, unmute yourself. And try to keep it short.

>>Buz Barstow: Thank you so much. First of all, President Pollack, I really want to thank you for addressing in such detail issues about affordability and access, and also about sort of upgrading IT systems at the school. I was hoping to ask two questions, but in the interest of keeping it short, I'll ask one. In addition to the sort of adding more faculty, have you given more thought to enhancing faculty productivity, as well, so that we can teach more students, we're less burdened by administrative tasks, by filling out web forms?

>>Martha Pollack: Yeah, yeah. No, it's a really good question. And actually, I'm pleased that you mentioned the IT because that's part of it. Now, let me be honest. We are all slammed with increasing numbers of federal requirements. And basically, my job is to make sure that when there's a federal requirement that could land one of you in jail, we make you fill out the boring, stupid forms to keep you out of jail. [LAUGHING] I can't do anything about that. But what we can try to do is streamline the processes that you have to use to do that. For example, if we had better IT systems, maybe we could prepopulate some of those forms for you so that all you have to do is look through them. I don't actually know what's available, but that's why I have people looking at, what can we do to simplify the things we have to do? Of course, we are always

trying, and we don't always do as well as we should, but we need all of us, at every level, not just at my level, to be looking at everything we ask faculty and staff to do, and say, "Is this really needed?" And if not, could we stop? And I want to declare success on the fact that you don't have to fill out that thing every morning saying, "No, I don't have symptoms of COVID, and I can come in."

>>Buz Barstow: I appreciate it. If I could make one more point, as well, it would be... And it relates to exactly that point you raised about me not going to jail. Is there something we can do to engender a healthier relationship between the universities and the federal government to sort of build trust, for instance?

>>Martha Pollack: It's a really good question. We have some wonderful people in Washington. We don't have a lot because it's not a place where we want to spend a lot of money. But let me take that under advisement and talk to Diane Miller, who's our key point person in Washington, and see if she has any good ideas about it. It's a real drag that the flight that used to go to Washington now only goes to Newark. It makes it much harder to go back and forth. But that's an aside.

>>Buz Barstow: I appreciate your answers. And again, thank you so much for bringing up affordability.

>>Martha Pollack: Thank you, Buz.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I'm going to ask the in-person speaker to identify himself and his affiliation. And then, we'll go back online to Ashleigh Newman.

>>Bill Crepet: Thank you. I'm Bill Crepet, plant biology in SIPS. And I have a simple question, maybe a pedestrian one, but something that's a real issue out there. And that is, how can we address our relatively mediocre rankings in the national polls? I know it's a game. I know people game it. But it really winds up important.

>>Martha Pollack: Yeah. Let me... I have a long answer to that. I'm going to give the abbreviate answer. First of all, it doesn't actually impact us. Who's looking at it? It's not students. We're admitting--I'd like to admit a higher percentage. We're rejecting lots and lots and lots of students. It's not donors. Donors are giving us money through the roof. It's not faculty. We're attracting really good faculty. People say it matters, but I don't know that it matters. But secondly, I don't want to throw a fellow univer--I've always hated the rankings because--not all the rankings. When I talk about the cool school ranking, when they're objective, measurable, smart metrics. The U.S. News & World Report ranking is pernicious. It's not just dumb, it's pernicious. So, as 1 example, 10% of that ranking is how much you spend per student. If you want affordability and you want to keep tuition costs down, you get penalized. I have always said that I'm willing to do whatever I can within the bounds of what makes sense academically and intellectually, but I'm not going to do something just to go up in the ranking. There was recently a pretty damning--I don't want to throw them under the bus, but there was a pretty damning analysis of Columbia's ranking done by a mathematician there. And you should take a look at that--You can just google "Columbia ranking"--not only to see how you could play games and shouldn't, but also to see why those rankings are so bad. I have to say, I just disagree with the premise. It's not what I think we need to worry about.

>>Bill Crepet: [INDISCERNIBLE]

>>Martha Pollack: No, our acceptance rate is remarkably low. It's lower than I would like. I think it's discouraging to high school students in a way.

>>Bill Crepet: It's fallen over the last few years.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Ashleigh Newman, identify your affiliation, please.

>>Ashleigh Newman: Hi. Ashleigh Newman. I'm a senator at large, and my home is in the Population Medicine Diagnostic Sciences. President Pollack, thank you. And my question is, I was hoping that you might be able to elaborate on the response that you sent to the Faculty Senate regarding resolution 180, which was the inclusion and prioritization of the new

natatorium in the capital campaign. And I appreciate how you said that the campaign is about people. And I wanted to make sure that it's noted that every assembly on Cornell's campus did overwhelmingly vote in support of a resolution in support of our Faculty Senate resolution. To me, the people on Cornell's campus have spoken, and that this is very important to them and many different groups, faculty, staff, students, as well as retirees, professor emeriti, etc. So, I was just hoping that you may be able to elaborate because you didn't address the question of the capital campaign and whether or not you want to elaborate on what creative funding approaches may be...

>>Martha Pollack: Yeah. I do appreciate the importance of this. It is true that every assembly passed this. We are aware of it. We do want to work to find the funding for it. But I don't want to just give a fast, little answer. I could just say, "Sure, we'll add it to the list of capital campaign priorities." We have and we will. But I want to be transparent and honest. We've done the analysis, and we don't just sort of go out there and say, "Here are our priorities." We talk to our donors, donors who could fund something of this size. Because this would be expensive. This would be more than $50 million. And we don't, at this time, see any donors who would fund this. In particular, because the donors who would be most likely to fund this are funding the previous really big athletic-related facility, which is the fieldhouse. So, what we are looking for are, are there other ways? Could we partially do this through the campaign? And could we find money that we might have spent on something else to do this? Could we do this--People will hate this, and I'm not sure we would do it, but could we charge a small fee to those who could afford it? Really, we're putting everything on the table. So, it's not at all that I'm not sympathetic. It's the opposite. I don't want to just--I didn't want to just say, "Oh, yeah, we'll make it a capital priority," and then I never come back to you, when I know realistically that that's not going to get us there. Does that help?

>>Ashleigh Newman: Yeah, it helps. And that's actually good to hear because I feel, at this point, it's mainly been reaching out to athletic department donors only, and not more broadly across the entire university. So, is that, in fact--

>>Martha Pollack: No, no, no, no, no, no. That's just not correct. We look at--I want to be

honest, right? If I have a really high-end donor, who's ready to make a really big gift for affordability or endowed chairs, I'm not, at this moment, going to pull them off and say, "Oh, would you consider a pool instead?" But it's not that we only look at athletic department donors at all. We look at all of our major donors. We are trying there. We are working. But I guess what I'm trying to say, and I feel like I'm not being very clear about it, is, the answer is, yes, we are making it a priority, but we're not stopping with saying, "Oh, we'll just put it as a priority in the campaign. And if we don't get it, too bad." We're looking for other ways to fund it, as well.

>>Ashleigh Newman: Thank you. I appreciate hearing it is a priority. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I think we have time for one more in-person question. Identify yourself.

>>Wendy Wilcox: Wendy Wilcox. I'm the faculty senator from the library. And I apologize, [INDISCERNIBLE], where they put the administration on the spot. But I'm very happy to hear about the priority for student affordability, faculty hiring. But there's a big gap in staff. I know this is the Faculty Senate, but staff salaries are too low. And I represent obviously library staff, the academics, but also, we have a ton of staff, and we need to see their salaries increase. There needs to be a boost. There's becoming such a compression with the student wages, for the baseline student wages, and some of our lower staff.

>>Martha Pollack: Yeah. Yeah. Look, I'm sympathetic to that. What we are always trying to do is balance multiple needs, staff salaries, faculty salaries, student tuition, new swimming pools, more mental health for the students. I am aware of that. We actually bumped up the SIP pool for staff this year. Didn't go as high as we wanted. It's not that we're not aware of it. It's just we are trying to balance so many needs. I appreciate your raising it. And we are aware of it. Thank you, all, very much. I hear you have a reception at 5:00. I'll come back.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you, President Pollack. We're going to now move on to the next agenda item, a proposal for a new design technology department in the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning. We have a joint presentation for 10 minutes, and then 10 minutes of senate discussion. Professors Jenny Sabin in Architecture and Wendy Ju in Information Science. Jenny,

are you first?

>>Jenny Sabin: Great, thank you. My name is Jenny Sabin, associate professor of architecture in AAP. And I'm joined by my colleague, Wendy Ju, who is in information science at Cornell Tech. It's our pleasure today to provide a brief update on the university-wide design and technology initiative, specifically on our proposal for the creation of a new Department of Design and Technology to be housed at AAP. Three years ago, just to give you a bit of context, together with the support of Dean Meejin Yoon, we started researching the design and tech space across the university to better understand what we are currently doing in these areas. What we discovered was remarkable, both in its breadth and the diversity of topics being taught, researched, and initiated, from game design to robotics to health tech to storytelling to systems design and beyond. And this diagram, which is very much a work-in-progress, represents the comprehensive, collaborative web of faculty, students, and staff currently engaged in design and technology across our campuses, formalized through courses, minors, and initiatives, that serves as an important foundation and starting point for the design and tech university-wide initiative. Next, please. The proposal for a new Department of Design and Technology at AAP is one outcome of over a year and a half of work collaboratively developed by a multi-disciplinary and multi-college faculty taskforce and two years of conversations between the deans of AAP, Human Ecology, Engineering, Bowers CIS, and Cornell Tech on how best to strengthen and expand design education and design research and emerging technologies at Cornell. And this is the charge that we launched with. The new Department of Design and Technology at AAP will importantly be a node within a collaborative, university-wide initiative for the advancement of the design arts, design research, technological innovation, scholarship, and collaboration across disciplinary boundaries at Cornell.

>>Wendy Ju: The new department will advance design and technology broadly alongside other design units at Cornell, including HCD, Engineering, CIS, and Cornell Tech. Importantly, the department will be represented by a network of faculty from across the university. Cornell faculty affiliates, invited fellows, and new joint hires, collectively known as the design tech faculty and fellows, will share resources, engage in collaborative research and workshops, and co-teach transdisciplinary design studios and seminars. The department will apply in advance to

AAP's expertise in the design [INAUDIBLE] arts theory and history [INAUDIBLE] towards actualizing digital tools, products, materials, visualizations, and environments by bridging disciplines and domains.

>>Jenny Sabin: Specifically, we will build upon AAP's strengths in computational design, AI, augmented design, design and XR technologies, digital and robotic fabrication, data visualization and simulation, and bio-inspired design, and sustainable-plus responsive materials.

>>Wendy Ju: We are already piloting this vision and mission. AAP has been collaborating with Cornell Tech for the past three years, and this collaboration demonstrates that there is already hunger and a need for design and technology. Based on the findings from this three-year successful pilot collaboration, a new MS in design and technology was proposed in the spring of 2022, and is positively supported by Cornell Tech and Architecture faculty, along with the graduate field of architecture and the general committee of the graduate school. We are poised to be leaders in the design and tech space through applied creativity, and our students are already pioneering the space. This slide highlights several of the collaborative courses that our AAP and Cornell Tech students have taken together. Jenny Sabin: The new Department in Design and Technology will better allow us to bring together the field's contributing disciplines and methodologies, coalesce partners across design and technology in both academia and in the industry, and capitalize on Cornell's distinct strengths in professional education, design, hands-on learning, and impact focused design research. Go ahead and hit play, please. To be housed in AAP and work collaboratively with CIS, the College of Human Ecology, Engineering, ANS, and Cornell Tech, the department will fill a need for timely design technology research and education, and will spearhead rigorous multidirectional and multidisciplinary investigations and teaching that can help shape the future trajectories of applied design and research. The new department will also be the home to the new MS in design technology, in collaboration with Cornell Tech, and promote a culture of multidisciplinary teaching and training across departments and colleges in Ithaca, including co-mentoring students and project-based learning to expand offerings in emerging technology areas critical to enhance the university's impact on this growing field. The new MS in design technology builds upon the current MS in matter design computation, which is currently housed in the graduate field of architecture program,

started by myself and supported by affiliated faculty since 2016. The new MS in design technology builds upon the foundation and transdisciplinary mission of the current MDC program, refines the foundation courses in the first year, and importantly, provides a new stream that makes stronger links to industry and practice through a formal collaboration with Cornell Tech. This will importantly bolster the primary program objectives in hybrid thinking and design to prepare our students for emerging careers in both the academy and in practice and industry. The reimagined MS in design technology is the first of several collaborative degree offerings that will be part of the new university-wide design and technology radical collaboration initiative recently announced.

>>Wendy Ju: The university recently announced Design and Technology as a radical collaboration initiative. The new department will catalyze multidisciplinary expertise, exploration, innovation, and collaboration in several collective emerging technology areas, including design and materials, design and interactions, and design and environments. This synergistic and cross-disciplinary approach will pioneer new modes, methods, and applications, and redefining existing practices in the advancement of experimental design and technology.

>>Jenny Sabin: The success of the three-year pilot program with Cornell Tech and the MSMDC program demonstrates that we are educating broader design leaders that engage and develop hybrid creative synthetic thinking and design through generative processes, digital fabrication, emerging technologies, and applications across disciplines.

>>Wendy Ju: The Department for Design and Technology envision to create a more robust and structural link between design and research, and applied design in education. The benefits of developing a unique department will position the unit to successfully compete for NSF, DOE, and/or NIH program grants that will contribute to institutional recognition, domestically and internationally, and create a catalytic context for pedagogy in design and research in the world. We've done our homework to understand our peers, which include MIT, Carnegie Mellon, Stanford University. And what sets us apart from our peers?

>>Jenny Sabin: We have the breadth, the creative imagination, and design excellence, as

demonstrated by our world-renowned, highly-ranked programs in architecture, art, and planning. Design and technology at Cornell is poised for significant enhancement as the university re-envisions its position to maximize Cornell's impacts on design technology education, industry, practice, and policy. And importantly, the new Department of Design and Technology will be a node within a collaborative, university-wide initiative, working together across departments and colleges for the advancement of the design arts, design research, technological innovation, scholarship, and collaboration across disciplinary boundaries at Cornell. Thank you. And with that, we're happy to take questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you're in Zoom-land, raise your digital hand. If you're here and have a comment or question, please step up to the front. We typically start on Zoom while people step up to the front. I see Denise Green. Identify your affiliation, please.

>>Denise Green: Hi, Denise Green, senator for Human Centered Design. I want to start by saying it's really wonderful that design has been integrated into the Cornell and tech initiative. And I really applaud my colleagues in creating a successful program there. The Department of Design and Technology's supporting documents, that we received just yesterday, appear to bring aspects of this program to our Ithaca campus, as we just heard, expanded with undergraduate opportunities. But a department like this would be redundant in Ithaca where we already have departments of science and technology studies and Human Centered Design, along with other entities that offer design and tech-related courses, like an [INAUDIBLE], computer science, and then the Bovay Program in history and ethics of engineering. Design has been taught in human ecology since 1915, and weaves an interdisciplinary perspective that critically, creatively, and concretely engages technologies, and have an impressive scholarly record to show for this, including already many NSF grants and DOD, etc. My colleagues and I publish and talk to journals, we run state-of-the-art studios and laboratories where we innovate with smart tech styles, nanotechnologies, geo-tech styles, biomedical materials, fashion and protective apparel. The very field of functional apparel design was founded here at Cornell, where design, tech, and science intersect to improve lives, whether it's firefighter turnout gear or PPE for workers. Our department also includes practicing designers who bring aesthetics to their own technologies, whether innovating sustainable approaches, improving garment sizing systems, or scaling up

natural dye production, to name a few. Our social science and humanities scholars bring critical perspectives to design and tech with several new courses supported by Engaged Cornell and industry partners that enable us to bring students to factories and innovation centers around the world, and offer new classes in entrepreneurship. [INAUDIBLE], sustainability, social justice, and even historical perspectives on technologies through our collaboration with the Public History Initiative. All this to say, there's a vibrant and thriving design department already in existence at Cornell here and now. My understanding from HCD representatives on the design and tech faculty taskforce is that they were only made aware of this proposal last Friday, and were told it was recommended by the provost. So, is this yet another attempt by the provost to undermine the College of Human Ecology by creating a competing entity? We don't need more departments to radically collaborate. And I propose, instead, we explore a cross-college major in design and tech, and perhaps a graduate field as a starting place. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Professor Sabin, would you like to respond? If not, you can respond later. Your choice.

>>Jenny Sabin: Well, if I could respond. I do think that the specific text of what we were proposing to bring up in today's faculty was made available last Friday, but we have actually been working on this initiative for quite some time. And we actually had the participation of all the deans, including the dean for College of Human Ecology. And this has been something that is wonderful that there is this department. The focus is really here on maximizing the ability to bring together the things that are going on currently outside of really College of Human Ecology. And so, I think there are a lot of people that we would also like to involve now that we are out of this starting phase, when we move out of just having a taskforce and starting to engage the rest of the university. And so, I think... I just want to kind of question some of the things that you're saying about the scheduling and the awareness that your department and your college has had for this initiative.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an in-person speaker. Identify yourself.

>>Wendy Ju: [INAUDIBLE] I was just going to add, thank you, Denise, for your comments and

question. And I just want to emphasize again, as Wendy pointed out, that this is one outcome of many that the faculty taskforce has been working on collaboratively for over two years now. And we will have ample time to work together to ensure that we're not overlapping, that things are not redundant, that we look for synergies and really build upon our strengths together, and really treat this as a collaborative department that can engage in new initiatives, and also build upon those that are already in existence.

>>Rhonda Gilmore: Rhonda Gilmore, Human Centered Design, Design and Environmental Analysis. Today, I feel compelled to speak as a member of over 50 design educators that are already here at Cornell, teaching what we believe is a valuable and critical set of skills and theories. While we support this proposal to expand design education and the College of Art, Architecture, and Planning, we believe that this proposal and its sponsors may not fully understand that design is already established at Cornell, making AAP's department name proposal excessively redundant, may I say moot. The Department of Design and Environmental Analysis was formed over 60 years ago in the College of Human Ecology, whose mission has always been to better understand and improve the human condition. Our faculty in the Department of Human Centered Design has millions in NSF and NIH funding, has a flourishing master's program, a flourishing PhD program, and we have taught design technology for over 20 years. We have over 4,000 alumni currently practicing and promoting evidence-based design around the world, using data and research to create design solutions responding to actual human needs. We do not code and create temporal installations. We actually build designs that support the human condition. However, it would seem that while we have followed protocols and policies to build our design department at Cornell, which is the only undergraduate design program in the ivy league, AAP has not followed protocols and policy. This is the first time you have proposed this new department to the Faculty Senate even though this department name has been listed in the class course roster for several months, a clear indication of academic manipulation. The naming of your department strikes me as a shameless attempt at circumventing due process and an attempt to stake your claim to design at Cornell by calling yourselves design technologies. Why not list your department as DT? If you call yourselves design technologies, this will only serve to further confuse students who can now choose from more than 100 courses here at Cornell teaching design. Why won't you truly welcome radical

collaboration with our department and join with us, rather than being a design opportunist? Thank you.

>>Jenny Sabin: Thank you for your opinion.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Any responses? We have another in-person speaker if there's no immediate response. Identify yourself.

>>Yasser Gowayed: Yasser Gowayed, professor and chair of Human Centered Design. I'm here to support my colleagues of the department who all believe that without coordination and collaboration among design faculty, this proposal for the department would be redundant and only could confuse our students and collaborators. We do not believe that this collaboration happened with our representative of the taskforce. They were informed last Friday that the department is in formation, and this document that is in your hands was shared with them at the time. In my view, it's another top-down approach to create an academic entity, ignoring input from faculty. As we all know, this approach could create problems that are hard to resolve. I'm here to promote the idea of a proper bottom-up approach, one that faculty built together. Working from the bottom up is a sure way to success of any unit. And we are at HCD a good example of that. In the fall of 2020, Dean Dunifon asked us, "Charge the faculty in the Department of Design and Environmental Analysis and Fiber Science and Apparel Design. Work on the idea of integrating design programs in the College of Human Ecology." We formed a committee, which, in six months, came back with a decision and a faculty vote. The new department was formed last fall. As the chair of this department, I can say that the way faculty interact and promote the wellbeing of their department is just amazing. Even to me, who was already in academia for over 30 years now, the simple fact is that the faculty in HCD feel ownership of their department because they made it happen. At this point, I think this proposal lacks coordination. I invite the leaders of this proposal to work with other units on campus. Let's work together to create an entity that truly elevates the profile of design at Cornell, where faculty feel ownership.

>>Jenny Sabin: Thank you, Yasser.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have maybe two minutes if there's a short response. If not...

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If Dean Meejin Yoon from AAP, just two minutes if you could do that.

>>Meejin Yoon: I am Dean Meejin Yoon--so weird to use the word "dean"--of Architecture, Art, and Planning. I wanted to address the question of the design subject code. I think that was referred to earlier. I believe that we've used that code since 2019 or 2020, when we initiated the design tech collaboration with Cornell Tech. And we've had two degrees, the matter design computation program that Jenny started herself many years ago, and a BFA in design communication, as well. And we found that that subject code enabled us to collaborate within our college in the areas that fell between the cracks, let's say between architecture, art, and planning, that were very broadly designed. So, from my perspective as the dean, I would share that we very much need in our college a department that can bridge not only our domains but also can work collaboratively with Cornell Tech and collaboratively here at Ithaca. And there are areas within both art and architecture that don't necessarily fit squarely in architecture and art now. And the best example of that is Jenny's program in matter design computation. And the kind of students it attracts are very, very multidisciplinary. And so, I would say the use of the term... The subject code did not come about three months ago. It came about three years ago. And we are very excited to have an entity that can collaborate with other departments in Ithaca and New York.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I think we're going to have to move on to our next agenda item. I'm going to have to move to the other microphone so I know what I'm talking about. My agenda. OK, thank you. The next agenda item is a proposal for a new real estate department in the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning, and the SC Johnson College of Business. There will be a 10-minute presentation by Suzanne Charles, City and Regional Planning, followed by 10 minutes of discussion. Suzanne Charles.

>>Suzanne Charles: This is Suzanne. I'm on Zoom.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK, you can start.

>>Suzanne Charles: Yes. And is someone going to run the slides for me? OK, great, great. Hello. On behalf of the faculty planning committee, I'm here today to introduce an exciting proposal to substantially strengthen real estate education and research at Cornell. The proposal creates a super department of real estate that more fully draws upon the complementary strengths of the SC Johnson College of Business and the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning, AAP. A super department of real estate at Cornell will marshal multidisciplinary expertise from the two colleges to squarely address the most pressing issues facing the real estate industry in the world. Real estate has a storied 30-year-long history at Cornell. Long before the Baker Program in Real Estate, as we know it today, faculty and the Real Estate Advisory Board set up the Foundations of Real Estate Education and Research at Cornell. Next slide, please. The founders of the real estate program, Bob Abrams, Brad Olson, Paul Rubacha, Jack Corgel, Crocker Liu, Michael Tomlin, and many others, as well as deans, chairs, and DGSs, devoted considerable energy over the years to make our graduate real estate program one of the most highly regarded in the country. Next slide, please. In 2012, the gift from Richard Baker endowed the Baker Program in Real Estate. The Baker Program is managed presently through a complicated and rather outdated memorandum of understanding, an MOU, between the Nolan School and AAP. The program is currently jointly administered by the Nolan School and the Department of City and Regional Planning within the AAP. The Baker Program straddles CRP and the Nolan School through the MOU, sometimes [INDISCERNIBLE]. 3 self-studies and reviews of real estate at Cornell have been done over the past 15 years or so, in 2009, 2013, and most recently, in the fall of 2021, a review that I co-chaired with Alex Susskind of the business school. The studies highlight substantial strengths, as well as weakness, such as an inefficient governance structure through the MOU, a lack of clarity and focus among programmatic and cocurricular activities, limited resources for supplementary programs, such as [INAUDIBLE], industry engagement, and career services, and a lack of administrative focus and support. As someone who's been a part of the Baker Program for the past seven years, in my view, the arrangement under the MOU doesn't adequately serve our students nor support our groundbreaking research. Next slide, please. Real estate is a critical component of economies worldwide. The value of global commercial and residential real estate is roughly $260 trillion. Real estate is the world's most significant store of

wealth, more valuable than all global equities and debt securities combined, valued at almost four times that of global GDP. The impact of real estate on national economies, as well as on individual households, can't be overstated. Moreover, the world faces unprecedented climate, social, and economic crises. Real estate professionals are key figures in creating and maintaining the built environment. They have an unwavering responsibility to address urgent environmental, social, and governance issues. And importantly, real estate professionals have the power to effect meaningful change. Transformational real estate practitioners must not only be skilled in the tools and techniques of current real estate practice, but they must also be critical of existing practices and able to recognize the opportunities, possibilities, and constraints affecting the practice. Real estate is necessarily a multidisciplinary endeavor. It requires engagement with the disciplines of design, planning, finance, asset management, policy, and law, among others, to produce students who are forward-thinking leaders in the field, and to contribute cutting-edge research that meaningfully affects practice and policy. Slide, please. Building on years of reflection, particularly the self-studies and external reviews, the 2021 self-study team converted into the faculty planning committee. We approached this task with three guiding principles in mind. First, to maintain the competitive strength of the existing programs. Two, to fortify the governance structure from an MOU to a super department structure. Three, to amplify programs with dedicated academic leadership and faculty, and an opportunity for funding support through a named endowment in addition to the existing Baker Program endowment and tuition revenue. Next slide, please. Our proposal would create a new super department of real estate. Super, or I suppose we could call it joint, because it would operate under the auspices of both the SC Johnson College of Business and the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning. The overarching principle of the new super department is an integrative and multidisciplinary vision that is designed to weave together finance, development in the built environment, [INAUDIBLE] diversity of the two colleges. The two departments [INAUDIBLE], offer expanded industry and alumni engagement, [INAUDIBLE], and advance the larger fields and the future of real estate programs and pursuits at Cornell. The new department would be led by a chair, a leading scholar with a multidisciplinary ethos. An initial group of inaugural faculty from the College of Business and from AAP would be jointly appointed, remaining in their current tenure home departments, but with a joint appointment in the new real estate department. New faculty hires would have their tenure homes within the real estate department, but would be tethered to one of the two

colleges. The new chair, the inaugural faculty, and the new faculty hires would build the department over the coming years. The department would administer the current NPS degree-- That's the Baker Program degree--as well as potentially research degrees, such as an MS and a PhD. This is a really exciting opportunity to re-envision real estate at Cornell. No other real estate program in the country formally combines these disciplines the way we can do within a super department of real estate. Thank you for your attention. Dean Yoon and the faculty planning committee, I understand it, Alex, Sophie, and Alexei, are in the room, I believe. And we're here to answer any questions that you have. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you're online with a question, please raise your digital hand. If you're in person with a comment or question, step up to the microphone. Go ahead. I don't see anyone online, so if there's someone in person.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK. Lieberwitz online.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Did you just call on me, Jonathan?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes, I did.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: OK, thanks. I have a question about what the senate's being asked to do. And this actually pertains to both presentations that we had. Clearly, there were very strong feelings that were presented from the last presentation. I'll be interested to hear what people have to say about this one, as well. But my question is more of, for both of these proposed new departments that we're hearing about, what is the senate being asked to do? Are we going to be asked to approve them? What would be the timing on this? I'm interested in hearing the presentations, but I find it useful to hear about what the process is going to be and what we're being asked to do.

>>Eve De Rosa: I can answer that. We will be, on May 18, we will bring forward more information from the departments. They'll come back to the senate, and we will have a vote. And then, this will be forwarded to the provost, and the provost will forward it to the board of trustees.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Are there other comments or questions? OK, seeing none. I think we will move on to the next agenda item. This is a motion that was introduced previously, prospective part-time bachelor's degree for nontraditional students. I have to spend a minute or two because there have been some complications in the parliamentary procedures that we should undertake since there have been a couple of amendments made. And we discussed this, and unless there are objections, I propose to look at both of the amendments and vote on which of them should be adopted, and then, discuss both of them before the vote, of course. After that, we will discuss whether it be amendment that is chosen should be attached to the motion. That is, should the motion amended? And we'll vote on that, as well. The actual motion, whether or amended or not, will not be up for a vote at this meeting, but later this month. I'd like to start with the discussion of the two amendments. And I believe that we'll have David Lee, from the University Faculty Committee, presenting the proposed amendment from the UFC, followed by an amendment offered by Richard Bensel and Risa Lieberwitz. And they will discuss that. Then, I'm proposing to have maybe each of the presenters responding to the others' presentation. And then, bring it to a vote. Perhaps we can start with David Lee. Is there a slide that shows the two, or either one of them?

>>Eve De Rosa: Can I just take a few minutes?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yeah, Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty.

>>Eve De Rosa: I just wanted to make clear that the timeline. We presented in the April 20 meeting the UFC resolution. And then, on the 27, we submitted a revised version based on feedback from the Faculty Senate. And that was shared with all the senators. On May 2, Senators Lieberwitz and Bensel submitted some proposed change to our amended resolution. And then, we incorporated some language from theirs into our amended resolution. So, there have been three iterations for the UFC, the original that you saw on April 20, the revised one you saw on April 27, and then today, we're going to show you one that integrates the two proposed amended. I thought the most efficient way for us to do this is to see the third revision and the proposed language from Senators Lieberwitz and Bensel. And I should make clear that none of

the whereases have changed. It's just purely the resolution.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: David Lee, maybe talk about the UFC resolution or amendment.

>>David Lee: Thank you. I have to bend over here. This is, I think, the third time I've spoken to the senate on this matter, including the town hall we had, so I'll be brief. President Pollack talked about the background far more eloquently than I can. And so, I would just refer you to her comments, which echoed many of our own comments at earlier meetings. Basically, as Dean De Rosa explains, we've tried to take into account comments from this body, from the committees, and from the town hall, and make some edits in the original motion. What we're going to be looking at are some edits. We've tried to put this together in a way that's coherent. So, please bear with me for a second. As Eve says, the wherases have not changed. The whereases provide basically the justification, the rationale, for proceeding. And again, I'd refer you to President Pollack's comments a few minutes ago about the rationale, in terms of providing innovative education, moving forward, and serving communities that historically have been underserved. If we could move to the next. Oh, we got it, OK. Yeah, that's it, OK. Let me indicate specifically the changes we have made. We retain a positive recommendation that we support, we urge you to support this, by virtue of the first be it resolved, recommending approval in principle of the concept of Cornell creating a part-time bachelor's degree program. And I emphasize the words "in principle" again. We've had some discussion about that. And that's really--it's a simple phrase, but we mean what it says. We have changed the language a little bit to--I think Laurent Dubrueil was the one who suggested terming this in terms of recommendations. So, we've tried to do that. And so, we say, we are proposing, "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends approval, in principle, of the concept of Cornell creating a part-time bachelor's degree program." We also continue that rewording, reframing as a recommendation, in the second be it further resolved, that this recommendation is subject to satisfying a number of as yet unresolved implementation issues, which we then spell out. We spell out some of them. Now, this, of course, is what was the subject of our discussion at some length last time. I'm not going to go into the substance here other than to say that this is really the--this reflects the concerns of the three senate committees that have looked into this issue and issued reports. It reflects the concerns of the original committee that the provost put together to look at this whole idea, on which I served.

And we ended, as I've reminded everyone in the past, we ended that report talking about the second phase and implementation phase, and the implementation issues that would have to be addressed for this to succeed. And many of those issues, and other issues, have been brought up by the three senate committee reports. Again, the second be it further resolved says that this recommendation is subject to etc., etc. Again, it's simple language. That is what it states, and we're covered. We're essentially covered in terms of the resolution of those issues. The language around recommendation, is changed. We have also introduced language in the fourth be it further resolved, the last be it further resolved. And I'm just going to read that. There are two changes there. One is to introduce language. And we appreciate the suggestions of Richard Bensel and Risa Lieberwitz. And we basically borrowed their language from an earlier version they submitted to us a few days ago. And we've also changed the language from "seek," the provost seeking approval, to soliciting the approval of this senate. Again, at the suggestion of Laurent Dubrueil. And so, we end up with a fourth be it further resolved that reads as follows, if I can read it myself here, "Be it further resolved"--This is the last one--"that the provost, at the conclusion of the program planning process, solicit the approval of the Faculty Senate and explain how the implementation questions and problems raised by the Faculty Senate committees were addressed before commencement of the part-time bachelor's degree program." Basically, those are the changes. I realize that what you see up here looks a little messy, but everything should be OK at this point, subject to questions you may have. Basically, what we have here is a positive affirmation of the importance of this idea, this concept, which we believe is innovative, which, again, addresses the needs and the populations of underserved students or students that have been underserved in the past. Second, we cover ourselves, quote unquote, by virtue of the second be it further resolved in the sense of, this approval is conditional, or this recommendation is conditional on addressing those implementation issues, which we all recognize are important. And then, thirdly and finally, by virtue of the final be it further resolved, we resolve that the provost, at the conclusion of the program process, come back to the senate for its approval. That's basically it in a nutshell. And after, I'm happy to talk about it further. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: The way we'll proceed is, we're going to now present the alternate amendment from Richard Bensel and Risa Lieberwitz. I'm not sure which of you would like to speak, but just unmute yourself and talk about your alternate amendment.

>>Richard Bensel: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And thank you, David. You've done a lot of work on this. And I realize that in minor ways, we have different conclusions. But I really appreciate your work and cooperation. This slide is in error. Everything from differences on the left, to the end, is incorrect. We submitted our slides, but they were not used in the construction of this slide. So, I want all the senators to ignore this representation of the amendment we offer. In a nutshell, you will find it in the chat. And that is basically what our amendment does, is take and substitute our language for the first two resolveds. I can... Where are we here? I can read that to you. Be it resolved that any Faculty Senate vote to approve, in principle or otherwise, Cornell's creation of a part-time bachelor's degree program will be withheld until the Cornell administration addresses and solves the implementation questions and problems raised by the Faculty Senate committees, and presents its explanations to the senate for review. These issues include maintenance of academic excellence and quality, the financial feasibility of the program, the appropriate mix of online and in-person instruction, faculty roles and labor, and addressing specific needs of prospective underrepresented groups noted in the proposal, among other matters. In the faculty forum on part-time degree program, David Lee himself raised a number of serious problems with the way that the proposal had been constructed and described, and so have the faculty committees. Our feeling in offering this amendment is that we do not have enough positive information from the central administration as to the design and feasibility of the part-time degree program to support it in principle, which is the reason why we have changed the major--one major and one minor change that our amendment makes. The major change is to reserve support--well, not reserve, but to omit approval of the program in principle just because we don't have enough information to figure out what that program looks like in principle. And the second is to strengthen the role of the faculty committees in the further discussion of the part-time degree program and how it might operate. The serious problems, and David Lee described them well in the faculty forum, one of them is financing. This doesn't look like something we can launch at the moment when we have serious problems with financing our own faculty and classrooms, and so forth and so on. Those are serious problems. And this looks like another expensive program in which the central administration has not explained its purposes. The other is, there are serious questions raised by the committees about feasibility and whether it would work.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Excuse me. I think we need to just talk about the amendments. The content of the motion can be discussed after the amendments.

>>Richard Bensel: The amendment, Jonathan, does, in principle, I'm describing why we don't believe, in principle, we can go forward. I think that's germane, actually, as the amendment says. But anyway, I thank David for his work. And I took his objections and reservations, along with the senate committee's, to heart. That's the purpose.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Jonathan, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I just wanted to clarify something on what our proposed amendment does. As Richard said, he put it in the chat, what it does, which is basically eliminating, as it says on this slide, the first be it resolved that's crossed out. The second one is what he put into the chat. But what we did not propose is to have the two "be it further resolveds" that are showing up on your screen. Those, in our amendment, are eliminated so that the only proposal for our amended resolution is that one paragraph that says, "Be it resolved that any Faculty Senate vote to approve, in principle or otherwise," etc. I just wanted to make that clear. Thanks.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. What I'd like to do now is have David Lee respond for a minute, if possible, and then get back to you and Richard if there is any last response, and then bring it to a vote.

>>David Lee: Thank you. And thank you for your interest in this, Richard and Risa. Two comments and two reasons why I would not support personally, nor would I urge anyone to vote for the second resolution. One is, we're saying that the Faculty Senate is putting itself forward as "withholding support." Is that the way we want to record our passion for education and innovation in education? I just think that the notion, the core point here of the second resolution, is withholding support. It just strikes me as a very odd way of proceeding. I've looked over about 12 or 13 years of resolutions. The Faculty Senate has never come up with something like that. I just think it's inappropriate. The second point I have is the--The second argument I would make is, the term "solving the problems." We use the word "addressing the problems," but to argue, as

this motion does, that the implementation process would somehow solve all the problems associated with a prospective program, I just think is extraordinarily unrealistic. There are many parties that are interested in this. Richard, as a professor of government, would know that compromise is the essence of governance. And I just can't imagine that every party to this is going to be 100% happy, and all problems will be solved. I've been around Cornell a long time. I just can't imagine that happening. So, I think on both those scores, I think the language is unfortunate, and really just doesn't... it doesn't sound right, withholding support as a resolution of this INAUDIBLE] body. And I think it's profoundly unrealistic to think that all problems will be solved, and thus, we should withhold support until some point in the future, when that might be forthcoming. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Richard or Risa, just a quick response if you'd like.

>>Richard Bensel: Yes, let me respond. I thank David for his observations. In part, this is a problem, of course, of trust. We have done things like this before. We have had the central administration come in and describe things, and then they just do them without us approving it. In part, this is a matter of trust. It's not a matter of theoretical or passionate objection to the problem. It's a matter of trust and retaining the ability of the Faculty Senate to effectively advise and consent to programs that are created. Once the planning is done, once it's presented to us as a fait accompli, that is a problem. And so, we just believe that there should be more information. As to believing that we can solve all problems at any point in time, of course not. Nobody believes that. Yes, as a professor of government, a professor of philosophy, of social science, political culture, all kinds of things, there's no way I believe that we can solve all problems. But we can certainly have a better description of how these problems might be solved before we consent to it. And that is the real question. There's been very little communication since the faculty forum from the central administration on the questions we raised. And I just think we should ask the central administration for more information and a better contemplation of the problems we have before we proceed.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Eve, are you able to describe how the vote will proceed? I just want to clarify that the vote is only to choose which amendment would be considered. It

doesn't even guarantee that the amendment will be attached to the motion, only that we will consider one rather than the other. So, everyone should vote for one amendment or the other, even if they don't want either of the amendments. Because you'll have a chance to vote for the motion alone or the motion as amended in a second vote. This is just a preference for which amendment to consider.

>>Richard Bensel: Jonathan, just a correction. I see the two resolveds have been eliminated on the right side. It's really the chat version, the amendment, that's correct.

>>Eve De Rosa: Richard, verbatim it's exactly the same. You read it out loud, and it was verbatim. There were no mistakes. I misunderstood that you did not agree with these last three and four. What we're going to do is submit to the senate the two different amendments. We'll vote which of these is preferable. And then, we'll put that amendment against the original resolution. And then, which of those are preferable? And then, whatever ultimately... Ultimately, whatever gets approved by the senate will go to a vote. Thank you. We're going to do in person for you guys. And then, we're going to do a Zoom poll. OK... We need to see the screenshare or the poll. We're trying to... We precompiled them, but I'm not sure where they are.

>>Ken Birman: Eve, could I just ask a question about precisely what we're voting on? This is Ken Birman, computer science. And by the way, Laurent, thank you for your [INAUDIBLE], and David, for your work to integrate them. I think that was quite healthy. What you just popped up asked about the version from last month and the amended version. But we've just heard about two amendments proposed.

>>Eve De Rosa: What we're having right now, if you could share the slide that we were just on. On the left side is the UFC revised amendment. That's one of them. And then, on the other side is proposal from Senators Bensel and Lieberwitz. And at this time, all we're voting, left versus right, which is preferable.

>>Ken Birman: And does the vote that we're doing identify them as "vote for the left" or "vote for the right"? Or will it say--

>>Eve De Rosa: It says "vote for the UFC-sponsored" or "vote for the Senators Bensel and Lieberwitz-sponsored."

>>Ken Birman: Thank you.

>>Unidentified speaker: That's not what my ballot says.

>>Eve De Rosa: Oh, what does it say? Oh, original versus--No, not that one. It's the one before that.

>>Ken Birman: Anyhow, it vanished, so that one's not up right now.

>>Eve De Rosa: I think they're pulling up the incorrect poll.

>>Ken Birman: OK, that looked better, but it vanished, also.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK, are we good? Sorry, everyone, technical difficulties. How you doing, Joel? Were you able to pull it? Yeah?

>>Unidentified speaker: Which amendment do you support, UFC-sponsored or Senator Bensel/Lieberwitz-sponsored?

>>Eve De Rosa: OK. How many approve of the UFC-sponsored in the room? And only senators vote, by the way. 20. And then, put your hand up in the room if you support the Senators Bensel and Lieberwitz-sponsored. OK, thank you, everyone.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK. And? OK, it's 50 to 21, so the UFC resolution will move forward. And now, next slide, please. We will have the next vote. We'll submit another poll to you. We're looking at--This is the resolution from the April 20 senate meeting, versus the amended one that you just voted forward, where the UFC responded to both the senate feedback and also integrated

language from the proposal from Senators and Lieberwitz. At this time, the poll will ask you whether you're going to go with the original UFC-sponsored from April 20 or the amended from today.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And let me emphasize that you're not voting for the motion. You're just voting for which version of the motion, amended or unamended, you will eventually vote on.

>>Eve De Rosa: Yes. And for today, we're just ending there. What is the resolution that we would like to vote on, from April 20 or from today? OK, how many would like to go with April 20, the original UFC-sponsored resolution? OK, and how many will go for the amended version? OK, thank you. 63 to 6. We will send a link to everyone, and we will all vote on this revised, amended resolution from the University Faculty Committee. Thank you all for your patience. Appreciated.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And Eve, we have maybe two or three minutes, if you wanted to say anything on the transparency and effectiveness of Faculty Senate proceedings.

>>Eve De Rosa: Actually, we could do that. Next slide. We were supposed--Next slide. We were supposed to spend the 15 minutes discussing the resolution from our April 20 meeting. We have an entire hour together just to talk about this next Wednesday. Everyone's invited. It's not mandatory. But anyone who wants to continue this conversation, please come. 3:30 to 4:30 over Zoom. And we're inviting other faculty, as well as senators. And we do have a few minutes left if anybody wants to say a few words. Put your hand up if you'd like to say anything for the last few minutes.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have literally a minute. Go ahead. And identify yourself.

>>Durba Ghosh: Sure. I'm Durba Ghosh. I'm faculty in the history department, and I've been a member of the University Faculty Committee since 2016. I'm just finishing a second of a three-year term. And it's been a lot of fun. I'll just say that it's an elected position, as are all the positions on the University Faculty Committee. This resolution, as you can see, came up in the

fall semester about three weeks. And it was handed to the UFC about three weeks after Dean Eve De Rosa took office. And I have to confess that having been on the UFC for a number of years, I was really surprised to see the resolution. Maybe I'll just recap, for those of you who haven't been involved in the Faculty Senate, just how much the Faculty Senate and the UFC has diversified in the last six years. When I started in the UFC in 2016, Charlie Van Loan had just been elected. I should tell you that the UFC was spectacularly undiverse. And I won't give you the details, but it was very undiverse. And then, Charlie Van Loan and the associate dean of faculty, Chris Schaffer, really made an effort to diversify the university Faculty Senate. They also tried to diversify all the committees that serve with the senate. There have been several big changes, and I'll give you a few of them. One is that, while Charlie Van Loan was dean of faculty, he recorded meetings so that we have a full transcript of what we talk about. We have a recording of the audio. This was all before we had Zoom meetings. And we now have a recording of the chat. In addition, he and Chris Schaffer designed a system by which anyone could post comments to resolutions that were pending. That was an important expansion of access. Another thing that they did was that they included the RTE faculty. And so, the Faculty Senate expanded very dramatically in terms of its membership. I won't go into the dynamics of that, but I'll just say that it meant that there were a lot more women in faculty of color. OK, I'll be quick. All right, I'll just say that these measures were really important, and so it was really demoralizing to get this resolution, in particular, because it wasn't really clear what was at stake, right? Because from where I stood, it felt like the Faculty Senate had gotten more transparent. I will just say that it's been really demoralizing the last few meetings, and especially that slide that we saw last week, that it's a half a dozen people that speak the most in Faculty Senate meetings. And so, I'm going to urge you to vote no on this resolution. I don't think it's going to increase the transparency of the senate. I think, in fact, it looks a lot more like surveillance, and it looks like surveillance of the dean of faculty, who, I just will note, is the first Black female dean of faculty. She's just about to boot me. But I like her anyway. And maybe one other thing I'll just say is, the effectiveness question, and you can see the two different versions. We're not going to become more effective if we have to approve the agenda at every single meeting, and approve the slate of ad hoc committee members. Maybe some of you think that will make for transparency and effectiveness, but we already don't have enough time to talk about the issues that we talk about. And so, I'm going to urge very strongly that when this comes up for a vote, which it surely

should this semester, that you all vote it down. And I'll stop there.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK, unless there are objections, I would like to let Risa Lieberwitz talk for two minutes. And then, we will adjourn. Risa, can you hear me?

>>Risa Lieberwitz: I can hear you. Yeah. Thank you. I'm disappointed that we had no time to really talk about the resolution. I don't know who's going to be coming the next time. And I don't have--I had asked for time to respond to the dean of faculty's comments the last time that we met. And I was told that I would have time. Two minutes is not sufficient, so I'm not going to try to respond to the comments from the dean of faculty last time. I just want to take this moment to reiterate that what's in front of you, with regard to the resolution, is the current resolution, which you have posted in the senate webpage. It's not the initial resolution. It's the current resolution. And these are common-sense ways to provide greater information to the senate, and for the senate to be more involved in setting meeting agendas and approving ad hoc committee recommendations. Because we don't have that kind of involvement. And the idea here is to actually try to involve more people. The problem, as a number of people have pointed out, is that the discussion times on the agenda are too short. They don't allow adequate time for discussions on important policy matters. And this includes the issue of the proposed part-time bachelor's degree program. And so, there are always people who would like to speak, but the allotment of the time on the agenda doesn't allow for it. And so, I would just urge people to read the resolution, to consider that it's common-sense ways to build on any improvements that we do have. Are these the only improvements that could be made? No. I hope that we can continue having more discussions about improvements that we can make so that everybody can speak and can participate and can really be involved in important policy discussions. For example, today, when we heard disagreement about one of the proposed new departments, I found that absolutely fascinating because I had no idea that faculty were feeling that way in opposition. So, the problem is not that the same people speak. I think that the way to encourage people to speak is to have enough time for everybody. I think it's very odd to criticize people who speak as a way of encouraging other people to speak. What I'd like us to do is to think about, again, common-sense ways to open the process and to have more engagement. And I look forward to our being able to have that discussion further.

>>Eve De Rosa: I welcome that. I absolutely was focusing on the 100+ senators who have never spoken. And that was the focus of my data. And we have a forum next week. For a full hour, we get to talk just about this resolution. It will come back on May 18, as well. There's plenty of opportunity. And you can publicly post on our website right where it's posted. I welcome all of you here to the reception right outside. And thank you all for participating and your contributions. Appreciate it. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. And we're adjourned.

>>Unidentified speaker: Risa, you're doing exceptional work.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]