Prospective Part-time Bachelor's Degree for Non-traditional Students
Faculty Forum
March 30, 2022

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: ...Campus is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayog̱ohó:nǫ',
or the Cayuga Nation. The Gayog̱ohó:nǫ' 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 Gayog̱ohó:nǫ' dispossession and
honor the ongoing connection of Gayog̱ohó:nǫ' people, past and present, to these lands and
waters.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you. Welcome, everyone. Good afternoon. We're here today to talk
about the part-time bachelor's degree for nontraditional students. This is a proposal that came
from the Provost's Office. And I just wanted to give, for those of you who are not in the Senate,
just an overview of how it came to be that we're all here today together. The proposal was
created and shared with me at the end of October. And I shared it immediately with two Senate
committees, the Education Policy Committee and the Academic Programs and Policies
Committee. If you hear me refer to EPC, that's the Education Policy Committee. If you hear me
refer to CAPP, that is the Academic Programs and Policies Committee. I shared those with them
immediately in November, and then we brought two members of the--the two co-chairs of this
proposal committee, the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Avery August and the Vice Provost
for Undergraduate Education Lisa Nishii. And they came to the Senate and presented the
proposal. Then, in February, two of our Senate committees gave their report, and I've shared that
with everyone, the EPC and CAPP. And the issue of faculty labor came up, concerns around
faculty labor. So, we sent the proposal to the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of
Faculty Committee. We've now had three Senate committees give their insights on the proposal.
And I also gave it to the Financial Policies Committee. And I thought that they would probably
ask for some sort of financial modeling. They did not. They felt like it was premature. And so,
they didn't think that they should comment at this time. Four committees, three of which who
have come to the Senate. And in the March Senate, senators had requested more time to give
feedback. And so, I will share the minutes and a recording of this with the provost, and also, I'll

post it on our Senate, on our website, the Dean of Faculty website, as well. I wanted to let you know to be sure that everyone who's providing feedback today, that your comments are going to be shared broadly. And with that, I should just say that this is a conversation. There is, I think, a small enough group that we can... I don't have to limit anyone to a certain amount of time, but just to be respectful that there are a lot of voices in the room and to give everyone an opportunity to speak. And from that, I just--When you put your hand up, can you just let us know who you are, what your department is? And that's really the rules of the game today. And whomever wants to start, you can just put up your hand, and we can start the conversation. And Charlie, go for it. You need to unmute. You're muted.

>>Charlie Walcott: Here we are. I'm sorry. At the critical moment, things quit, as sometimes happens. It seems to me that there's a stage, a series of stages here, that we really ought to be considering. I think the first question is fundamentally, is this a good idea? Is this something that Cornell really ought to do? And if that is in the affirmative, and the faculty feel that this is an important thing to achieve, then it seems to be a whole wealth of details to be worked out, like how is it staffed, how is it going to be managed, and what kind of a degree? And I can make a long laundry list of issues, it seems to me, that need to be considered. But it seems to me, the very first point is, does the faculty approve of this? Is this something that we want to support in theory if the details if the details can be worked out? I don't know if we have actually achieved that decision, as far as I know. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you. Who else would like to share? OK, Mary Jo.

>>Mary Jo Dudley: Thank you. When I looked at who the intended population, why, and how many--I'm the director of the Cornell Farmworker Program. And among that is a particular mention of farmworkers, especially of New York State, and there are some issues in terms of the structure because it includes a summer on campus. And for farmworkers, agricultural production, harvesting, that overlaps heavily with summer. So, I don't really see that as a viable possibility. But one of the things that really struck me was... if there has been any reaching out to this proposed population to find out about their interests or viability for pursuing such a degree. Because if there has been, then there are certain ways in which it's structured that would exclude

farmworkers--I'll just speak for farmworkers--structurally. And so, it would be important that we're not saying we're going to serve a population when really, the way it's structured, there's no way that would happen. And so, the other piece of that structural piece is working adults. And so, a question would be, how many working adults have the summer off and could actually do that on-campus section? So, how it's designed structurally, for me, has several challenges. And then, the other piece of the document says the expectation is that financial aid will be offered for those in need. Does that mean full financial aid? Farmworkers, in particular, are a low-income population and do not have extra income for this kind of thing. So, I'm just wondering if that's been articulated in greater detail, or if this is just a think piece that's going to be sold to somebody to put money behind it. And if it is, then it should reflect the intended populations, the intended recipients of this program. And I personally don't know of any assessment that's been done with farmworkers. And we work with farmworkers every day year-round, and I don't know of any.

>>Eve De Rosa: Mary Jo, thank you for saying that. I want to share with everyone that I do not represent the program, so I am only here to gather our feedback and to provide it to those who are making the decisions. And so, I can't answer questions, but I think these are all valuable things that they have to think through before moving forward, if that's the choice they make. Thank you. Kurt, please go ahead.

>>Kurt Jordan: Thank you. I wanted to--I think this is a good place for me to follow Mary Jo because Indigenous students also received specific mention in the plan. I'm Kurt Jordan. I'm the director of the American Indian and Indigenous Studies Program, and I'm also faculty in anthropology. We, at AIISP, we approached this collectively. We were going to--We actually have written a two-page statement what we will submit to the provost and the dean of faculty and the committee members for the original report. I'm going to read a little bit here, so I'm going to perhaps speak a little bit longer than Mary Jo did. But I just wanted to summarize the document that we are going to present. And I think that we have some really serious concerns with the program as it's framed currently. Our faculty agreed with reports done by your faculty committees about the problematic aspects of the proposal, particularly staffing and labor. We also saw the potential for the creation of a two-tier system for both faculty and for degrees that

we really don't have at present. And then, we also felt that this was being presented largely as a done deal by the provost, that there's a lot about the next director of the School of Continuing Education is going to be tasked with impl--It really felt--And his clarification didn't really seem to relay our concerns. But additionally, the AIISP faculty raised three concerns because of the specific targeting of Indigenous students. First of all, our faculty were not asked to be on the committee despite having expertise. We do have a faculty member who's an expert in indigenous education. Mary Jo, I don't know whether you were consulted for any of your input about this. We certainly weren't. And again, I agree with Mary Jo that there really hasn't been any testing of whether this is something that's even desired by Indigenous populations. In theory, perhaps, but we don't have any hard date. AIISP has also been volunteered to provide engagement and social connection for the Indigenous students in the program. This was done without our consent or input. We also felt that targeting Indigenous students essentially required that the program should provide an option to take indigenous studies courses for students that are enrolled. And I think both our staff and our faculty are overtaxed at this point, and it felt very much like an unfunded mandate that was being imposed on us. [INAUDIBLE] that the optics and ethics of slabbing Indigenous students into a potentially second-tier degree program are quite problematic, and I think I really need to underscore that position. And our third and last point was that the original report, and Vice Provost Nishii's presentation to the Senate, both invoked what Lisa Nishii called a "distinctive commitment to Indigenous students" based on a moral act. And AIISP would like all Cornellians to know that a remote program of video-based learning is emphatically not adequate compensation in our eyes for Cornell's land [INAUDIBLE]. [INAUDIBLE] ancestors quite literally paid for Cornell. In other words, the money that was earned from indigenous lands formed the basis of Cornell's endowment and its operating budget for perhaps the first 30 years or so of its operation. Indigenous ancestors thus have literally paid for Cornell with their lands and their lives. And we view that their descendants should not be forced to pay a second time. And we would advocate for free-ride packages for students from the communities that have been affected by Cornell's land manipulation history, both for in-person education and should any such remote degree program be established. I think the overall feeling was to go to Charles Walcott's opening question that this would not be a good idea, and it should not be a priority for Cornell at this point in time. Thank you. And I apologize for the time that I've taken.

>>Eve De Rosa: Oh, no, thank you very much, Kurt. Risa.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yeah, thank you. I really appreciate all of the comments so far. Really important. And I have a lot of thoughts. I won't give them all now. I'm really interested in hearing what other people have to say, as well. And I wanted to start with Charlie's question of, is this a good idea? And it seems to me that what the idea is needs to be defined first. What are we assessing as being a good idea? That, for me, is a question of, what would be the goal of having this program? And there are multiple possibilities that one could take from reading the initial proposal. The one that seems to me would be the most desirable for having a new program would be one that is actually motivated by a democratic goal to expand access to higher education to as many people as we can, including underserved groups and populations. And if that's the goal, then what would that mean? I think we have to fill out more of, again, what is the idea that that would fulfill. I think it's presented to us as a democratic sort of goal, but as we've just heard, the people who would be perhaps most affected, in terms of who is potentially targeted as being served, that our colleagues weren't even consulted about it. So, I have my concerns in that way. And then, also, it seems to me, if the goal is to provide, as the proposal keeps saying, a first-rate education to more people and make Cornell more accessible, then I have real concerns with the immediate shift of the proposal to saying, "Well, the default position is basically an online program." There, the goal is connected to, what would this look like? So, it seems to me the goal of really providing a broad, broad access to as many people as possible is immediately undermined by shifting to an assumption that will use remote learning. And the assumptions in the proposal that remote learning is high quality, as opposed to something that we've needed to do on an exigent basis lately. And I have more to say about that, but I won't say more about that right now. Shifting back to what might a program look like if it really was trying to give full access to as many people as possible to a high-quality, excellent education, like we give to people who come to campus, I was thinking about the GI Bill model. The GI Bill had massive problems in terms of targeting men and particularly benefiting white men. It had all kinds of problems with it. But the underlying idea was to have what's been called kind of a massification of higher education. And so, if we really want to do this and provide options that are democratic ones, it seems to me that that's what we should be thinking about, is how do we fully fund people being able to take time and come to campus, and actually serve populations

who wouldn't otherwise come. That's what I wanted to put out there as kind of the thought aspect of this as an alternative to just shifting to, well, of course this would be a different sort of program.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Risa. Jonathan.

>>Jonathan: Yeah, I want to reiterate something that Charlie said fairly early, is that we're talking right now about a lot of things, and Risa sort of blended two of those things together. I think we need to make a decision whether we think this is a good idea or not. And I recognize what Risa's saying that we don't really know what they mean by what this program is going to be, but I think we need to take that first step, saying, "Is this a good idea? Is this not?" And not worry about, in a sense, how we're going to do about it. And we cannot avoid the devils in the detail component of it, but we should sort of think. Do we want to be able to convey education, degrees, however you want to argue it, to a larger population than that are now able to access a Cornell education? This is going to sound very prejudice, but right now, we're basically... we're servicing a population that is either wealthy, entitled--that could be an "and entitled"--or, and/or a group of people that have the time that they can do this. Now, that's not the way you should be sort of thinking about this. But in essence, those are the type of students that have the ability to get here right now. And I think the proposal here is, how can we reach a larger needed group of people, or people that need this kind of education, and how do we do it right? But we need to make the first decision about, should we do this? And the devil is in the details. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Jonathan. Mary.

>>Mary Katzenstein: Oh, golly. I realize that there's probably not that much information that's now widely shared about the program that I've been associated with for a long time, which is the Cornell Prison Education Program. But maybe I should back up and say that I'm a professor emeritus in the government department, but I'm a senator representing CAPE, which is the committee for professors emeritus. But what I really want to do is to talk about how this would impact the program I have been associated with for quite a long time, which is the Prison Education Program, the Cornell CPEP as it's called. CPEP every year graduates for the AA

degree about 24, 25, somewhat more number of people, some of whom are actually part of the Indigenous population at the local prison facilities. And the problem that CPEP students face is that they acquire Cornell credits, but they cannot acquire a Cornell degree because this kind of program has not been available to the prison education students. So, this has been a real obstacle for the Cornell Prison Education Program. If this program were to come into fruition, this would be a huge boom for the Cornell Prison students. And at the moment, the Cornell prison students do not--I mean, this is an extraordinary part of the program--they do not have to pay tuition. Tuition is free. They do get Cornell credits. But we have any number of students who now have 80, 90, some even over 120, Cornell credits, but because we haven't had a way to do this, they have not had possibilities of getting a Cornell degree because Cornell does not offer an associate's degree, and the access to a Cornell BA degree has not been available. So, this would not involve any future outlay of resources because we have a faculty that's been teaching, either voluntarily or for some pay, over many years. It would not involve any more Cornell faculty time than has already been made possible. It would not involve any more Cornell resources. But what it would involve, and I really appreciate Charlie and Jonathan and others talking to this, it would really be the recognition of a real democratic goal, which is the making available a Cornell degree to a population that has not ever had access to higher education. For the Cornell Prison Education Program, this would be huge.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Mary. Mark.

>>Mark Lewis: Thank you for the recognition. I'm just trying to understand and clarify what the issues were that were raised earlier. Charlie laid out, I think, a pretty clear way of thinking about this. The first question to me is exactly as Charlie has described. Is it something we should be doing? The executive summary that I'm reading says, "By nontraditional, we mean students who are at least four years post-secondary and for whom a full-time residential experience in Ithaca would not be an option due to their work location of residence or other barriers." It's really talking about people that cannot do this residential program that we normally see, and we love and appreciate. Now, it is true that later on there is clarification that does include farmworkers discussion and those Indigenous populations. But it really is talking about people that cannot get here to be able to be on campus or a residential experience. So, I'm confused by the other

extension of this to all people, when I'm thinking about a particular population that can't get here. So, I really think we should focus on the first question first. Is it something we should be thinking about? And then, if it turns out the details cannot be worked out, fair enough, we won't pursue it. But to start out and say, "Well, I don't know that this is a good idea because it can't serve all the issues that we've had, we have in other populations," does not seem like a fair explanation of what the executive summary is as charges with the committee. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you for that clarification. It is a good reminder for the fact that it's about expanding access for--We're on this isolated island here in Central New York, and expanding access beyond that is sort of what the guiding principle is. Risa.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to address that, what Mark just said. What I was trying to raise was to pose the question somewhat differently to say, if we expand thinking about the goal of--If we think about the goal of expanding education in a more democratic way, that there may be ways to ask the question differently. That is, my view is that there may be some people who cannot come to campus, but that, if we want to look at ways to expand the possibilities for people to come to campus, that there are assumptions being made that, "Oh, there just are some people who can't come to campus." But the fact is, this is a very wealthy institution, and it can provide a lot of possibilities for people to actually have access to campus that otherwise they wouldn't be able to have without being subsidized sufficiently. I think that there are a lot of assumptions here that, well, the way the world works, a lot of people can't come to campus, and we're just going to assume that everybody in the populations who are identified cannot come here. And I just think that's a mistake. And that's why I was thinking about kind of the GI Bill model of saying, "You may have thought you weren't able to actually pursue a higher education possibility," but there might be ways that we can really think democratically that are far more based on a notion of subsidizing people and making sure that they can come. Along with that, it seems to me, is also an assumption that I'm making, which is that in-person education is far better than shifting as a default to asynchronous, remote education with some possibilities of synchronous, remote education. And thinking about the Prison Education Program, and Mary can correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding is that that is all in-person, and that it's really important to serve populations who might not be able to otherwise get access

to higher ed to actually be in person. So, in that way, the "details" are really, I think, part of thinking about whether we can really move to making it possible for more people to have access to higher education who otherwise would not be able to because we're not subsidizing it.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK, thank you, Risa. Mary, do you mind if I have Wendy and Mary--Wendy go, and then come back to you?

>>Mary Katzenstein: Of course.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK, thank you. Wendy.

>>Wendy Wilcox: Sorry, Mary. I just think... Not to belabor the point. I do think, though, there's this fundamental, is this a good idea? What does this push us toward? I think, for me, that's an easy answer. Yes, this is a good idea. You're targeting people who... Mark, can you turn your volume down? You're targeting people who--

>>Wendy Wilcox: I know, there's a little echo going on here. That you're targeting folks who aren't thinking they can come to campus, and for whatever reason. They may think this because they're a farmworker who feels that they do need to be helping their family, or you have an Indigenous population who want to stay on the reservation, you have active military who are literally out of the country. The goal here is, how can we make this accessible to these types of students? Will they maybe later think, "Oh, when my circumstances change and I can come to campus, that could always still be part of it"? That's the beauty of creating this, perhaps, synergy between the two different programs. But it is about, can we target some populations that may believe they don't have, or belong, or have access to a Cornell education? And then, in terms of the logistics, I think all of these logistics are very programmatically specific. I am working with CPEP because we're hiring a librarian that will be focused on supporting CPEP. The way we're going to support CPEP is entirely different than the way you would support the military program. CPEP cannot be online. They have to be in a closed environment that there's no online access. They can't be on the internet. However, maybe active military will be an entirely different environment. So, I don't want us to get so focused on the details of this because it's going to be

specific to each individual program. That's all I have to say.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK, thanks, Wendy. Mary.

>>Mary Katzenstein: Just very quickly, I just wanted to apologize. I didn't mean to overlook Risa's use of the term "democratic" because I do think that's a really important, major goal to flag, and I want to thank Risa for utilizing that language. Again, I just want to emphasize how important this would be for a population that is huge in New York State. It's huge in this part of the county. I can't emphasize enough how important this would be for the local--for CPEP. And it's true that we are now teaching in person, but over the longer run, it's possible that we would be able to teach remotely, which isn't the most desirable method of instruction, but it might be possible to have happen, in which case we could greatly expand the percentage of students who would be incorporated in the program. Thanks.

>>Eve De Rosa: Mary Jo.

>>Mary Jo Dudley: Yeah, I appreciate what Wendy had to say, which is, let's push ourselves toward democratizing education in a way that's viable and effective. I think one of the problems, farmworkers often live in rural areas where there's no internet access. They do not own computers. During COVID, the school districts had to send out the hotspots so that the children could go to school. And I think the key issue is that if we want to pursue this goal, then we have to engage with the target populations in a systematic way and structure the plan in accordance with their needs and possibilities. This is just underscoring the "devil is in the details," and those of us who are probably most familiar with the target populations weren't consulted in any meaningful way. For many of our farmworkers in New York State, their primary language is Spanish. Is that going to be taken into account? I know in our work, we strive to meet--we partner with farmworkers, first of all, so that we're addressing farmworker-identified priorities. But also, we work that--how we do that is framed within a culturally competent, accessible way. And so, I don't see that built in to this proposal. I don't see that you're just going to be able to take a faculty member and say, "OK, you're going to teach this now and necessarily be successful." I think the... The university, if they really wanted to invest in meeting the needs of

farmworkers and their families, they would invest in the programs that are doing that, they would put resources into the programs that are doing that. And frankly, they are not doing that now. They do not pay--The university does not pay one person's full salary. So, it's kind of this giant jump. We're not going to pay for anybody's salary to do this work, but we're going to create this nontraditional program. And I'm sorry, it's just a huge jump. Not to pull away from Wendy's point, which I fully agree with. If we want to meet the needs of these populations, how would we go about that in a systematic way that actually meets their needs, that actually addresses this gap? And I think what's missing right now is, in some sense, it appears that a decision has been made, and then we're going to rubber stamp it, or we're going to be--What I'm concerned about is, I will be put in a position of having to make it run successfully. That's my concern. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you. And Wendy, let's let Richard go, and then we'll come back to you. Richard.

>>Richard Bensel: Yeah, thanks, Eve. I wanted to bring up some of the issues that were in the reports and have been a discussion before because I think they bear on the advisability, as Charlie put it, the advisability of whether we do this or not. And that should come first. The first is, if you're going to have a program like this, you're going to have what looks to me like a parallel university, you're going to have courses in a lot of stuff, and you're going to have to have them distributed in the way that we distribute them at the Ithaca campus. That's a big commitment in faculty. That's a big commitment in resources. Secondly, you're going to have this problem of distinguishing, and this came up in the reports, the degree that's going to be offered in this dual program, distinguishing it from the degree that's offered on the Ithaca campus. If you don't distinguish them, you're going--And this is going to be inevitable because of the distinction, and the two student populations, and their ability to work full-time on their studies. If you don't distinguish it, you're going to cheapen that Cornell degree. Not disagreeing with my colleague Risa, but this democratic notion, this can have a real problem for Cornell's reputation in the long run. Availability of education to other groups, that's fine, but you've got to figure out how you're going to do this without harming the home program. Third thing, faculty choice. Are you going to force faculty to do this? Or how are you going to recruit them? Because

this is going to be a dual program. If it's online, you're going to have in-person teaching, you're going to have online teaching. How are you going to get faculty to do this? If faculty don't want to do this, and my experience has been that some faculty really do, and other faculty don't, how are you going to staff these programs? And with that staffing program is the observation that we're already short of faculty on the home front. The problem of staffing a whole other dual-degree program on top of shortages we already have, without this kind of dragooning of faculty, I don't see how that's going to work at all. Last thing is something we haven't discussed. It's been brought up several times, but it's admissions. The program, as it was originally presented to the faculty, said that it was going to be self-sustaining, that there were going to be two populations. There would be the population that could not pay their way, and they would be admitted. But there would be also wealthy applicants who then would pay full rate and subsidize the others so that the program would be self-sustaining. I haven't seen much on that lately. But the way in which it was designed, I'm really suspicious of the way in which this might actually be a Trojan horse for wealthy donors to get Cornell degrees when otherwise they could not be admitted or have a place in it. I don't know. But the admissions program, the admissions part of it, and the self-sustaining part of it, that really needs attention. So, for all these reasons, I can't see how this works.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Richard. Wendy.

>>Wendy Wilcox: It's not our job to figure out how it works right now. It's our job to say, "Is there a purpose for this kind of program?" And I just believe there is. You are talking about populations that have been unserved right here. And I'm sympathetic to what Mary Jo is talking about. But this isn't about what currently exists. In my opinion, this is about what could we create to fulfill an interesting need and hit people that are completely held out of the Ivy League market. And I have to remind myself to not get defensive of this idea that we're cheapening the Cornell brand or doing this. The Cornell brand is an exclusive brand. It's an exclusive, expensive brand. And the people that we invite, who may be from underrepresented groups, have to conform in order to participate and benefit from our exclusive brand. We're not suggesting we cheapen the program. We're not suggesting that instead of getting a Cornell degree, they should take advantage of the associate's programs that might be available in CPEP or in the migrant

farmworkers. We're saying we believe that Cornell value is inclusion and accessibility of the Ivy League education for these groups that just can't get to it, they can't get to it. And I think, at the end of the day, let's start with that. Is that something that we value? It seems like it is because if I go back to any person, any study, that is right there. And I keep going back to, is this a good idea? Should we do this? And then, every step in pursuit of this good idea becomes, how do we make sure that both Cornell and the students that are part of this program get the best of Cornell? And I think, again, I go back to what we're going to be struggling with with the CPEP and the library. It's a lot of work, and the way to make sure that it's done well is to start out really, really small. And I guess maybe I'm being naïve, but I feel like I saw this beautiful proposal in that proposal. These are the people that we think could really benefit from our program. Are we going to, out of the gate, be able to do all that? No way. No way! It's going to take years to be able to do it well. But I think you can pursue that better goal. I don't know. At the end of the day, I was energized by this idea that it's a mountain that we would have to climb to get there. But I think... I feel like everybody's going like, "Ugh, the mountain's too big. There's too much to do it. Let's not climb it." And I feel like, well, we got to climb it. We got to do something more, because if we don't, some other Ivy is going to do it. And it fits perfectly with our mission. That's my soapbox.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Mary. [LAUGHING] Sorry. Wendy and Mary, yeah. And sorry, just before you start, anybody else who hasn't gone, please feel free to put up your hand. I'll do Mary and then David.

>>Mary Katzenstein: Well, why doesn't David go first?

>>Eve De Rosa: Oh, OK.

>>David Delchamps: Just quickly. Wendy, Harvard does this, so other Ivies do it already. Part of the reason it's easier for Harvard is that they're in the city, and people go to night school, blah blah blah. But they have a whole separate sort of faculty teaching these students. They're extension folk. And that's one thing I wanted to say. Another thing I wanted to say in response to the folks from the AIISP Program, in EPC, that actually came up. We were saying, we're reading

the proposal, and someone said, "What I didn't understand about this proposal, they say working adults, they're listing all these people who can't come to a residential program because they have lives that don't allow it, and then they just said, 'And Native Americans.' Why are they part of this list? Can't they just apply to Cornell just like other people? Why is it, by identity, they're now included in groups of people who can't make it to a residential program?" And we thought that was kind of a weird kind of way of writing the proposal that was kind of a red herring. And we didn't comment on it in our report because we thought it distracted from the major issues we saw. But we also thought, and this is for Mary, that the CPEP is so far along, and it's so successful, that this is going to look way different for the prison population than it's going to look for these other populations. And therefore, it seemed to us that maybe if we were going to start on something that was doable, which is way smaller than what the proposal proposes, then we would start with, say, the prison population--take that program and see how we can turn it into a degree program, and then maybe do something for veterans. We are now opening up shop for all these people. And wealthy, international students, please apply. We need you to subsidize our unwealthy Americans. That's basically where we came down on that.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, David. And thank you for representing EPC's conversation, things that we couldn't have known from the written report. Mary?

>>Mary Katzenstein: Well, I wanted to second what Wendy was saying, and also what David and Wendy are both pointing to, which is there is so--I think we do have to commit to a general objective here and not think that we can really realize all the details. There are lots of big controversial issues here. Does this cheapen a Cornell degree? Well, I guess, somebody can correct me if I'm wrong, I think George Washington offers a parallel degree. A number of universities do. Harvard has an extension course. Does this cheapen their degree? Well, that's a possibility. That's something that would have to be really discussed and worked out. But I don't think there's a yes/no answer to that. I do want to emphasize that, with the Cornell Prison Education Program, it took us probably seven or eight years to really forge some sense of how it would be staffed, how it would be financed. It's not something that I think we can work out in advance. I think we really do have to think and commit ourselves to whether this is in broad outline, given our democratic values, something that we want to do or not.

>>Eve De Rosa: And I should mention, Brown, Columbia, UPenn, Harvard, all have comparable continuing education degrees. Neema?

>>Neema Kudva: Thank you, Eve. I was actually going to mention that, because Columbia has GS, which is very well-known and quite large, and all the other schools that you talked about. I just want to sort of, I think, support what both Mary and Wendy are saying. For me, the central impulse of the program is to democratize education, to use Risa's language. And it seems to me that when Charlie laid out the challenge, do we agree to this or not, I don't hear... Speaking for myself as a faculty member, I think it's an important impulse. I think it's an impulse that we should support, that we should work through. Like Mary points out, this is going to take a long time to build out. What's important to me is to hear how we're going to be putting safeguards. How are we going to make sure that it keeps coming back to us as it starts to get designed out? How are we going to make sure that if prisons decide that we can do online education, how are we going to make that work? How are we going to meet the needs of farmworkers if they're going to be part of the program, like Mary Jo pointed out? Or like Kurt pointed out, I don't think Indigenous populations should be part of this kind of a program unless they're fully funded and if they choose to join. But we should really push for meeting our responsibilities in the full-fledged program. I think all these challenges, we need to keep them at the forefront of the conversation, make a space in the Senate where we record this, keep returning to it, and hold people's feet to the fire, but not knock down the program because we're not willing to take on the challenge of meeting the needs of education and democratization for this century. That, for me, feels just unacceptable. I wanted to say that.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you. Risa?

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yeah, thanks. I want to build on some things that Neema just said because I think that it gets at one of the reasons why I think that talking about the goal of such a program is... let's say overlapping with what it would look like, kind of question, not the details. But what would it look like? And Neema said build in certain safeguards. And the way that I was thinking about it, actually, before you said that, Neema, which I think connects to that, is that there may

be certain conditions that the Senate, for example, if it favors moving forward on a program and program development, that the Senate might want to build in, in terms of things like what the nature of consultation should look like, not only with the Senate and the governance bodies and how often, but as Mary Jo has been emphasizing, to say if we have a democratic goal, then the democratic process should be part of that. And before diving into the program to actually consult with the people who are experts on campus around education for different populations, as well as the populations who might be served in the future, as Mary Jo is saying, what is it you would need to actually engage in such a program? It seems to me that conditioning that's on starting small is one of those kinds of safeguards or parameters that having adequate funding is an essential safeguard or parameter or condition that the issue of faculty labor, I would say, is also an important condition. That is that this should not be used as a way of growing or expanding non-tenured-track lines. What we should be doing is building in more job security for all faculty, including the growth of tenured-track lines, so that if we really want a democratic project, it has to be done with the democratic process, but that if it's a democratic goal, that it should also be conditioned on creating a program that is actually equally valuable to those who would be students in it. I don't worry about whatever one might call a brand. I don't think in those terms. But I do think in terms of democracy going with equal rights and the ideas that those who would be in the program as students should have an equal right to the education that we think in the highest quality. Thanks.

>>Eve De Rosa: And Mark, I'm going to go to Eric and then come back to you. Eric.

>>Eric Cheyfitz: Thanks, I'll be brief. A lot of people spoke. I don't think this is the way to democratize education, by the way. That takes great systemic changes, and they're not about to happen. The society itself is becoming de-democratized, so the income inequality embedded in all of this is, of course, really, really important. I read all the committee reports, and it seems to me that the questions they raised, the problems they raised, counteract trying to amount a program at this time. There were questions of ethics, of access. What about all the people? We haven't even provided uniform internet for people around this country, so who's going to have access to this? You want poor populations to have access to this, but they don't have internet access, basically. I was out on the Navajo Reservation for quite some time, and let me tell you

that there's no running water on the Navajo Reservation. There's no electricity on the Navajo Reservation. So, that internet access is problematic, to say the least, and that's an understatement. So, I don't see this happening under the conditions that obtain at present. I think, indeed, the committee reports, although they all acknowledge a good idea, essentially, when they started to raise the questions they raised, that good idea does not seem to me to be realizable within the parameters that exist today.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Eric. Mark.

>>Mark Lewis: Thanks for recognizing me. I have my headphones in now, so I won't disturb my wife. The thing I would say about this is, I agree with everything Neema has described, and I think I agree with what Risa was saying, part of it. But I think what we're looking at, then, is, in my opinion, answered in the affirmative to what Charlie's original question was, but with strong advice and lots of constraints put in place. Some of the things that Richard relayed, things like we have to make sure that faculty are not forced to do this, that's a constraint. You cannot force people to do things they do not want to do. Is it going to be self-sustaining? Again, that's constraint. You put that as a constraint. These are all things, I think, that have to be a part of the constraint set. But the problem is still solvable, or may be solvable, if we just put the effort into trying to solve it. And I want to be realistic. I'm not trying to solve Eric's issue, because that's a much bigger one. I'm just trying to solve the problem as phrased in the committee's executive summary. And so, I feel like we can at least converge on allowing people to attempt to solve the problem, but I think Risa's right. We should be thinking about what constraints need to be put in place. I'm not sure she and I would agree on what those would be. That's fair. But the process, moving forward, should include those ideas of advice and constraint before we move any further. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: I don't see any other hands up, so I just want to give an invitation for others. OK, David, go for it.

>>David Lee: Yes, thanks, Eve. Yeah, I didn't raise my hand earlier. I was on the committee that put together the report, the initial report. So, I wanted to sort of hear what the feeling was out

there. I just wanted to make three different observations. One was that I think Wendy best articulated the point of this report. It wasn't to address all the issues that arise in a possible program. It was more of a visionary-type report in the sense of trying to look at the idea and answer the question "is this a good idea?", to then pursue and try to work out and see if the implementation questions merit going forward. I think the committee, the three Senate committees, looked at it, and they all agreed, as I read those reports, not that the implementation issues were overwhelmingly negative, but that the idea was good, but that the implementation issues do need to be worked on. And in fact, that's exactly how we concluded that report. If you look at page 14 of the report, next to the last section, "questions for phase two exploration," the issues we listed, I'll just take a second a list them. Organizational structure and leadership, degree name and associated New York State Department of Education requirements, accreditation requirements, specific admissions criteria, concrete details about specific majors and concentrations to be offered, faculty compensation including a mix of tenured-track and non-tenured-track faculty, advising. And that's something, interestingly, that hasn't come up. But the whole advising question is really an important issue. I think there was unanimity in the initial committee that this would only work if there was a real commitment, given the nature of the student population, to really high-level, high-input advising. That's another issue. The tuition model, which raises all sorts of issues, perhaps most importantly, or one of the important issues being financial aid, and what's the financial aid policy going to be? And then, transfer credits and articulation agreements. We didn't cover all--In that report, we didn't address or bring up all of the implementation questions. I think that probably would have been humanly impossible. Some of them that didn't occur to me have come up just today, and came up in the Senate initial discussion a couple weeks ago. I agree that there are implementation issues. I think some are perhaps, really, what I might call dealbreakers in the sense that if they don't look positive, then the question really does arise whether Cornell should go ahead. Others, I think, are more strictly administrative, implementation types of questions that I think can be addressed, a lot of sort of mid-level administrative questions. But some of those dealbreakers, at least for me, personally, would be the financial modeling. Does the financial modeling work or not? It's as simple as that. And it's part of that financial aid policy and thinking through for what financial aid policy would be. That's one issue. The faculty role that Risa and others brought up. What exactly would be the mix of tenured-track and non-tenured-track faculty? I think it's important, certainly, that tenured-

track faculty are the ones that design the curricula and play a leading role in terms of the leadership. I think it would be unrealistic to expect that non-tenured-track faculty are not going to be involved at all. And they may have a major role. I don't think that's necessarily bad at all. But that would have to be worked out. The type of degree is another issue. Is it a "regular Cornell degree" or is it a different degree, much like Harvard's? And there are lots more implementation questions. There's no need to--I don't have to go through them all. A lot of you have brought up a lot of these issues. I know I've been taking notes just for my own edification and to make sure that I hear where everybody's coming from. I think the question, as several of you have posed for the Faculty Senate, is, do we have enough, between the initial committee report and three different Senate committees chiming in on this, do we have enough information to answer the question, "do we agree in principle that this is a good idea, enough so that we can ratify what appeared to be, unfortunately, the provost's initial decision that this was going ahead anyway?" He corrected that in his subsequent letter, and I think that he apologized for the wording in that initial letter, and indicated not only would the Senate be consulted in the future, but the whole thing would come back to the Senate when the implementation issues had been worked out for further discussion and, presumably, a thumbs-up/thumbs-down type of thing. But I don't know when that would be. I would just urge everyone that the initial report, nor the committee reports, I suspect, are expected to address all these implementation questions, some of which go into great detail. And as someone said, there are a lot of very, very specific questions of interest perhaps to just one program. That takes time. And I would hope that we... going back to the initial point, which was exactly as Wendy was saying, is expanding opportunities for education consistent with Cornell's historical legacy of trying to do that from the 19th century on, I guess, our committee was unanimous in feeling that something like this was in that spirit and was a good idea in principle. And so, there are a lot of implementation questions, clearly, that need attention. Thanks.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thanks, David. Mary Jo and then Eric.

>>Mary Jo Dudley: David, can I ask you a question, just a clarifying question, since you were on this committee? I noticed, in the chat, that Jonathan had raised that the administration is going to move forward with this whether we're part of it or not. We don't want to become sidelined or

being a roadblock. And I take his comments with great seriousness. And do you have a reading on that? Because if so, then what is the mechanism, right? If this is going to go forward anyway, let's say--And maybe you know, or maybe you don't know--but how is it possible to build in or restructure the plan so it's appropriate for the intended beneficiaries?

>>David Lee: It's been some months since we really were diving into this, Mary Jo, and so, I don't have any word other than--And I don't remember. The letter from the provost a couple weeks ago, clarifying his earlier letter to the committees that looked at the proposal, I don't know what the distribution on that was. Eve, was that to the whole faculties or just to the committees?

>>Eve De Rosa: That was actually just to the Senate. The entire Senate received it.

>>David Lee: Mary Jo, basically, the issue was that the--I'll give you the short version. The provost sent a thank-you letter early in March to the members of the first two committees, and then, I think, later, the third committee that had--the Senate committees that had looked at this. And in that letter, he said something to the effect that this issue would be the subject--would be going ahead and would be basically on the plate of the new dean of the School of Summer and Continuing Education. This was wrapped up in the issue of the hiring of the new dean of the School of Summer and Continuing Education. And so, that was the issue that some people legitimately took issue with because it appeared to be written as if we're going ahead with this, come hell or high water. Then, in a second letter, I don't know, a week ago, 10 days ago or so, I can't remember, the provost clarified what he meant and apologized for writing it in that way, and said, as I recall--It's not in front of me. I'm just going by my memory here--said that, in fact, it would be--This is not over and done with. A definitive decision has not been made. This will come back to the Senate. And in fact, not only will the Senate be kept informed, but he will come back at the end of the day, when the implementation issues have been fully addressed, to seek that approval or not. Maybe I was reading that last part into it. I don't think so, though. Anyway, Mary Jo, to answer your question, as I recall, that's sort of the status of things. Maybe Eve or Neema or someone could correct me if any of that's wrong.

>>Eve De Rosa: Mark also provided a PDF in the chat for whomever wants to see the

clarification statement. And at this moment, there's an interim, I guess, director of the School of Continuing Education. And so, it's a person who's retiring, and they need to replace them. And I think this person, whomever they hire, would be looking into whether this is a good idea. So, I don't think that that's been taken off the table. But whether it will be implemented is a different question. Doug, you haven't said anything yet, so please go ahead.

>>Doug Antczak: Thanks, Eve. This is Doug Antczak from the Veterinary College. I'd like some clarification from Mary about the Prison Education Program. Do I understand correctly that the courses are taught in person, not online, but they're taught off campus?

>>Mary Katzenstein: That's correct, except during COVID, during which time we did try to do some online.

>>Doug Antczak: Right, but the students don't come to campus?

>>Mary Katzenstein: Correct.

>>Doug Antczak: And they're not online. They're in person, and the faculty are in place. That sounds like that component of an unusual degree path is already in place.

>>Mary Katzenstein: That's right. But what isn't in place is the ability to get a Cornell credential.

>>Doug Antczak: Right. Well, it seems to me, I wonder how much of this discussion is about how the provost has proposed this to us, and about the merits of the proposal. What I hear is that almost everyone is in favor of the proposal in principle, and most of the points that have been brought up have been problems with implementation that apply to one group or another, but may not be dealbreakers for the program as a whole. I think our colleagues in New Haven and Cambridge might think that Cornell already represents a path for entry to the Ivy League for students who couldn't get into those places. The biggest [INAUDIBLE] implementation seems to be that we're not in an urban area. We don't have a population of underserved people right at hand. But that doesn't seem to be something we can't overcome. That's all.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Doug. And then we'll do Eric, Risa, and then Neema.

>>Eric Cheyfitz: Yeah. One of the things that bothered me specifically in the proposal was that the nature of this education is going to be asynchronous, as I understand it. A Cornell education, of course, is based predominantly on being in a classroom with experts in the field. And so, this is going to preclude, for the most part, except some occasional summer meetings, I take it, that kind of classroom experience, not even Zoom, not even a Zoom experience where you can get a certain number of people on screen in small seminars. That is disturbing. The other thing is, of course, the faculty. The Cornell faculty who teaches the students who are admitted here competitively is very rigorously vetted faculty, most of that, but not all of it, through tenure decisions. And so, I don't know how that faculty, which is preoccupied necessarily with research and teaching already, is going to function in this program in any way, shape, or form. So, I say it mostly as an adjunct faculty program. And I think those two things, asynchronicity and the quality--This is not to denigrate adjunct people, but it is to say that it's a totally different vetting system and system of expertise--that those two things will not make this a Cornell education. It will make it something else. I went to Columbia General Studies, by the way, many years ago, and it was night school. David Delchamps has brought this up. People met in a classroom, and there were some Columbia faculty teaching, although I don't know how many. But because of Ithaca's location, as David also stressed, we're in a different situation. Also, the degrees that these institutions do confer, as I understand it, are not the same degree, actually, as the degree that Cornell confers to its competitive student body, the student body that was admitted competitively. So, I actually don't see how this is democratizing education at all. I think what it is doing is creating a second-tier education. And I think that that ought to be taken into consideration because there are ethics involved with that.

>>Eve De Rosa: I'm going to just skip over to Ashley, and then come back to you, Risa and Neema.

>>Ashley Newman: Hi, thanks. I just--I don't know, taking notes and listening, I'm trying to lower it, sorry. There we go. There we go. I guess ideas, I think, that made this difficult was

obviously how people have articulated that it was introduced as the "do we think this is a good idea?" But I think all of us are probably detail-oriented people, and it's impossible to separate the idea of implementation, like how are we going to get this done, rather than the pure philosophical "is it a good idea?" So, I think it was natural for all of our minds to say, "How's it going to get done? Who's going to get it done? How much is this going to cost?" So, I think that that was probably what made the process a little difficult. I would certainly how that during the second phase, where they discuss implementation, that faculty would hopefully be represented on that committee, and not just administrators. I think it would be important to have faculty voices, particularly in the fields of study that were brought up in that initial proposal, that those are the areas that they think they want to focus on. Hopefully those faculty would have a say in some input in that process. And then, in terms of the online process or asynchronous, I guess for me, I look at it as this is not necessarily a democratizing education, but just about increasing access. I think it's a student's choice if they want to pursue a program that is online and not in person. They may know that it's not ideal. They would probably prefer to be in person. Of course they would. But maybe they can't because of their job or where they live or because they have kids and they can't attend an in-person school. I think that we have to give the enrolled students who choose to pursue such a program a choice, that, sure, if they had their druthers, they probably would go to a first-tier-type, in-person, four-year college degree, but life has dictated that maybe that's not in the cards. And so, I don't think we should not offer it just because we don't think it's as superior as another opportunity. I guess student choice, for me, is--While we think online and asynchronous is not ideal, it's less than ideal, but it's still an option, and it does allow us to increase access. In terms of the degree, I think for me, it would be important to have a different name designation. I grew up in Maryland, near University of Maryland College Park, and they had University of Maryland University College. I think they now call it University of Maryland Global Campus. It was a distinguishing--I didn't attend the University of Maryland College Park, but I have a degree from this subsidiary college of the University of Maryland. So, I could kind of envision something similar for Cornell, like Cornell University blah-blah, something else in the name that distinguished it that it was this nontraditional path and not the standard, four-year bachelor's degree. And then, yeah, our location, I think, right? We're not in an urban area like Philadelphia and what have you, so that makes in-person difficult. But again, I think it's the idea that, hey, COVID, some good things maybe did come out of it, and the opportunity to increase

access by online learning and Zoom kind of, probably helped make this idea come out where it normally wouldn't have prior to the pandemic. Those are some of my thoughts on the matter.

>>Eve De Rosa: And the provost will involve faculty in the search for the new dean of the School for Continuing Education if the idea of implementation, and then bring it back to the Senate. So, the Senate and the faculty will be involved in the decisions.

>>Ashley Newman: OK, great.

>>Eve De Rosa: Risa.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yeah, thanks. I wanted to build on some of the things that have come out in terms of identifying certain things that seem to me to be key. One is the question of the process thus far, and in particular, the fact that Provost Kotlikoff did say in his March 3, and I guess March 19 memos, he did say that--He said, "I will begin a search for the next dean of the school whose primary responsibility will be the establishment of a part-time bachelor's degree program within the school, consistent with the cautions articulated by your committees." It was only after saying that very definitive, "There will be established a program, and will consider the cautions from the committees" when he was called on it, that he then said, "Oh, I'm sorry if you"-- Basically, he said, "I'm sorry if you thought I meant what I said, but what I actually meant was, it really hasn't been a decision yet." And I think that we have to be very, very concerned about making sure to hold the provost to what he said after he was asked about it, to say, "This is not yet a decision made." And I think there are various ways to make sure that we're not actually looking at a fait accompli that's now just simply stated in different words from the provost. And one is not to simply wait for something to come back to the Senate that we can then consider further, but in the Senate, for us to have votes on certain things, like what should the process look like, how should the Senate be involved in the development of a proposal to do this at all, and any implementation aspects. Have the Senate vote on things like making sure that faculty experts in all different areas are consulted. If the Faculty Senate can discuss and vote on what David Lee called dealbreakers, and that what I called basic conditions, the parameters that I think Neema was pointing to, that we should do that now, not wait for things to come back to us. And

then, also, I think that one of the committees asked for this, I haven't seen anything about evaluations of other part-time programs that are in place. I would really like to see that if there is something, so we can at least use that in our assessment. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Neema and then Richard.

>>Neema Kudva: I think some of us--When I listen to our conversations, I think they're really important conversations because we bring different views to the table, we think through them, and they're important. So, I hear democratization. I also hear expanding access. They're two different things. They work in different ways. I hear deal-breaking or conditions, and then the question of process. It seems to me that, as a faculty, wanting to involved in running a complex institution like Cornell is something we want to be able to do. Yet, at the same time, to put our--I worry about wanting us to be in the middle of every implementation decision. It's not possible. I would just say that in thinking through how we want to design this program, we think carefully about the levels at which we want to be able to engage and how we do engage. The one question then is the ways in which we think about resolutions, and not do resolutions that would stymie the work of this university. We are 80 departments, more than 80 departments. We work in so many different ways. I run a program in India with young people from indigenous communities that I have never gone to AIISP about. And we run it in India with partners in India, and those kids get a kind of certificate of sorts. And so, it's--We can't stymieing everything. We have to have some sort of--I don't know--first order, second order, third order sets of priorities in terms of how we engage. So, I really want us to think very carefully. Look at this conversation today. This program, if it moves ahead, is going to be such a boon to CPEP, such a boon. I don't know, Mary, you can tell us, how many million people do we have incarcerated in this country unfairly? A horrible penal system. Right? And we have--And it's also going to be hugely difficult for farmworker kids or farmworkers. And so, we can't stymie the damn thing based on "I want to be able to vote on every damn implementation decision." I just think that's a big problem. We need to somehow figure out, what are the orders of conditionalities that we want to put into place? What I would love the Senate to be able to do is to put a resolution together, a sense of the Senate resolution, which says, "One, we support this resolution. For purposes of vote, we disagree, Eric and I, democratization and expansion." And Eric, my son goes to GS. He gets the

same degree as Columbia at a much lower price. So, the thing is, things change in the world. We work to make things happen. And I really--And it's possible for us to say, "Here are two or three conditionalities that are really important, critical, central. But we push this forward." The expansion and democratization part of it, to me, it's absolutely not a debate. I cannot even believe that we're debating it from my perspective. I do think we have to put certain protections in place. That I agree with. And I'm not speaking as associate dean of faculty. I am speaking as a faculty member in this university.

>>Eve De Rosa: We want to be mindful of time. And so, let's limit the final three comments to two minutes each, just in case somebody else wants to pop in. Richard.

>>Richard Bensel: Yeah, I can be two minutes. When the notice of this meeting was sent around, we were asked to submit questions. And the question I submitted was, will the Faculty Senate be permitted to vote on this program before it goes forward?

>>Eve De Rosa: The answer is yes.

>>Richard Bensel: And reflecting on Neema's comments, I think David Lee's questions about primary concerns raised by the committees, those should be addressed by the provost. [INAUDIBLE] does not have to have exact answers, but I think they're very serious questions, and not to have any answer at all, we shouldn't go forward until they do. That's it.

>>Eve De Rosa: OK, Kurt, then Mary Jo, then David.

>>Kurt Jordan: I've sat in rooms where there have been faculty and staff who are going to be directly impacted by this, should it come about, and I will say that nobody is enthused about it. I will say that it seems that in order for us to undertake an expansion of this magnitude, everything should be just hunky-dory in the Cornell campus in Ithaca that we should be doing things adequately that--And I would say, at this particular time, in this particular point in the pandemic, it seems insane to try and think about this sort of expansion, given what everybody is undergoing right now, especially with all the ethical and implementation issues that we're talking about. If

we'd had a chance to define our financial priorities and our expansion priorities, would this be it? And I'm guessing very strongly for a lot of people on this campus, the answer would be no. It would be for me. Thank you.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you very much, Kurt. Mary Jo.

>>Mary Jo Dudley: I just want to respond briefly to what Neema said. And I think, Neema, I agree with what you're saying. Not everybody needs to be involved in every decision. We're not able to do that. However, a proposal that pretends to meet the needs of these specific historically marginalized, vulnerable populations might benefit from including the involvement of a program like ours, which is the primary entity through which farmworkers interact with Cornell University. So, the question is, OK, Mary's saying, "We've run this in prisons, and it goes well, and it could benefit a large number of people." It's not a debate. It is about, is there a possibility of designing this effort, which seems to be going to move forward anyway, to actually meet the needs of those who are identified as the primary beneficiaries? That's my question. I'm not looking for more meetings to go to. But my work is deeply involved in building trust with the farmworker community, so that's who they come to when you say Cornell University. My work depends on an ongoing, positive communication with that population. Or is it just lip service? You just put farmworkers in there because it looks good, and some funder might want to fund it. So, there is a value to having participation in these discussions before it's a done deal. And I don't think you would disagree with that, Neema. But I think we need to be clear about the goals of this proposal and who will be targeted as the funders of this effort. And we want to strengthen the relationship, in my case, that farmworkers already have with Cornell.

>>Eve De Rosa: Before, David, you give the final comment of the forum, I just wanted to say, Mary Jo, that it's meant to be a self-sustaining program, according to this proposal, based on tuition. Just wanted to share that. David.

>>David Lee: Yeah, thanks. Yeah, just two quick observations. One, regarding Richard's points, when I used the word "dealbreaker," maybe I shouldn't have used that word. That was just sort of what I was thinking. It was to identify a small number of potential issues that, were they so

important, any one of them, really, that this just wouldn't work out? And to me, the finances, that's pretty fundamental. And I mentioned three others or so. But I didn't expect that they're going to be worked out now. I think the whole point of having an implementation phase is to answer, try to answer those questions. So, I'm not going to expect the provost to have answered all of these questions before sending a--before appointing a new dean or whatnot. I think these are part of the implementation process. But if they don't turn out to be positive, and we have to, I would think, as a university, really look very honestly at each of those, faculty role, the financial aid question, the type of degree, some of these really major questions that, if they don't fall out the right way. It's hard for me to imagine the program going on if it's going to lose money, for example. I just can't imagine that. In terms of Neema's point, I guess my last observation is, that's exactly what I was thinking, as well, Neema. And I really hope that we can--Whatever the Senate does, I hope we can put together a short resolution that expresses what we think overall of this idea, and let it move into the next phase, and let whatever happens happen. And if it turns out to be a bad idea, I think that will be answered. But to prejudge these really important questions, to me, just doesn't seem like the right way to do it. So, I think we should go ahead with something fairly short and sweet. And I agree with Risa on process, that we have to continue to be involved in a fundamental way as faculty, absolutely. Thanks.

>>Eve De Rosa: And that's a good note to end on. I think we're all in agreement on that. And I thank you all for coming today and giving voice for the faculty. And I will share this with the provost. And I will also share it on our website, so that all of us have access to the recording and the notes. Thank you for coming to the forum, and thank you for contributing from the chat. We'll make sure the chat's there, as well, for everyone to see. Thank you all. Have a good evening. Bye.