Faculty Senate
October 12, 2022

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Ok, let's begin. Welcome. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Senate Speaker, professor emeritus from architecture. We start with the land acknowledgment. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫʼ (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫʼ 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 Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫʼ dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫʼ people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So the meeting is called to order. The first order of business approval of the minutes from September 14th, 2022. They have been posted, distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript, so there shouldn't be any corrections, but if there are any, please raise your hand or, whether in person or online. Seeing none, I will assume the minutes are approved through unanimous consent. We are now ready for senate announcements and updates. Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty, and Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean of Faculty, have five minutes, and then there will be question and answers for five minutes after that.

>>Eve De Rosa: Good afternoon, everybody. Can you hear me? Thanks. So we have had some technical issues today, so we will try our best to; hopefully, everybody will join us in time, and I will also try to speak in the mic while looking at slides that are behind me. So I just wanted to make an announcement that there is a new Data Science Minor, and I will move the slides. It's a cross-college minor, and it involves the College of Arts & Sciences, Computing and Information Science, Engineering, and the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, and this is a curriculum that will give recognition to our undergraduates for an expertise in data science. It involves six courses, and it'll be administered by the statistics department, which is also a multi-college entity. Any minor changes to the minor will take place through a curriculum committee that's organized by all of the contributing colleges. Next slide, please. I just wanted to say thank you to those of you who did vote, and for the 33 that did not vote, don't forget that an abstention is still an expression of engagement. So hopefully, we'll minimize that 33 did not vote. If you have any technical issues with the [INDISCERNIBLE], just let our office know, and we will resend it. We are the -- the University is about to engage everybody in a work-life survey, and I just wanted to let you know that our Research Teaching Extension Faculty Task Force -- they have questions that they generated for our faculty. We were able to incorporate those into the survey, and it's going to not just go to RTE faculty but all faculty. The university faculty as well. The work-life survey is for currently employed faculty members at Cornell. So the two larger classes of questions were clear expectations for career investment advancement and the ability to express your opinion and that it's valued. We are going to have a faculty forum looking at the future of academic communication. This is the first one of the year, so in October 26th, we have a remote format only, and it's voluntary. There's no compulsory attendance. You come if you're interested in the topic and you want to contribute to the conversation. And, we're looking at how will archives, trade books, open access publication, et cetera, be valued. Next slide. These are the things that are coming in November. Association president Pollack is coming to the Senate. If there are particular content area that you would like to have discussed, please e-mail the office,

and we will discuss it in the university faculty committee. The university faculty committee will be also looking at the pilot program that is happening right now with student disability services accommodations. So, there is a breadth of classes that have used this centralized testing organization, and we're seeing -- we're going it learn how that's been going and seeing if it does relieve the burden on faculty to really address a multitude of accommodations and styles of accommodation. Then there is also a proposal from SDS to have a faculty advisory committee. So we will learn more about what that might be and what we might want. And, of course, feel free to e-mail us if there are other topics that you would like the university faculty committee to consider. And, for those of you who are on the university faculty committee. If you could just stand or put up your virtual hand on Zoom, that would be wonderful. And so both Chelsea and I are available for questions, as well as the university faculty committee members. And then the last thing that we wanted to update you on is that the nominations and elections committee is meeting monthly, as we mentioned last time, and so, this month, we are trying to address the composition of these committees here so the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty, the AD White Professor-At-Large program, Financial Policies Committee, Committee on Music and the University ROTC Relationships and just trying to get a breadth of disciplines and colleges represented in the committee. And that's all of our updates and announcements. Next slide.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So if you are in zoom land, raise your virtual hand. If you're in person and have a question or comment, just please step up to the microphone, and I will wait a second or two. I don't see any hands, so I think we will move on too the next senate agenda item, which is the AFPSF Academic Freedom and Professional status of the Faculty Committee update. Tracy Stokol, chair, has five minutes, and then there will also be a Q&A for five minutes after that. Is Tracy here or online? so Tracy, if you hear me, you can unmute yourself and start speaking. Ok. Is it possible to move on to the next agenda item? Is public safety here or available? Maybe that is a good idea, and then assuming unanimous consent for this rearrangement of the minutes, let's go to the Public Safety Division, a presentation in any order that you would like, and then 15 minutes for discussion. And you are here. So, welcome.

>>David Honan: Thank you for having me. Joanne DeStefano is finishing up some trustee meetings, so she will join us online when she can. Now that we are early, we may miss her altogether, so. Go head, next slide. I will talk about the new Division of Public Safety and some of the efforts we're putting forth to consolidate all of our public safety functions into one area so that we can provide some seamless transition between different departments. Little bit of background first, though. We have a public safety advisory committee on campus. It's a longstanding committee. It's actually established by New York state law as to what it is and what it's supposed to be doing. Even its composition has to have a third faculty, a third staff, a third students, at least half female, and it's supposed to advise the campus of public safety. So, part of president Pollack's initiatives on racial justice back in 2020 -- she tasked the PSAC to come up with new methods to reimagine public safety here on campus and elevated it to report to executive vice president Joanne DeStefano. Next slide. So, we spent most of the year -- and we -- I'm an adviser to the committee. The committee works independently, but I'm there to answer questions and provide any background or data they may want. They came up with four recommendations which you can find on the Public Safety Advisory Committee's website. The whole report is there. Much of it was about a public statement, commitment for anti-racist policy

and developing and implementing alternative public safety response model, educational campaign for public safety calls, and diversification of public safety workforce. A lot of the time last year was spent on this developing alternative public safety response models. In fact, SCL had already started with a group that we called the Community Response Team, and we got that up and running kind of while we were still doing a lot of the work. So, we did some good things, and we did a couple of things that we were like, ok, that's a good lesson to learn as to how we can improve. So, next slide. So we deployed the Community Response Team, but while that was deployed, the PSAC was doing pretty intense call review of all the calls that come into the dispatch center and we were sending officers out to really try to figure out what calls do we not need police officers on? What do we have Cornell police going to that you don't need a police officer? They were only going because they are the only people here at 9:00 at night, 3:00 in the morning, weekends. What if we had this other group that could take on some of these calls? We also talked about some call diversion. You know, where can we divert calls that just don't need a police officer? So a lot of that has been worked -- has been done over the past year. The PSAC membership was diversified. we had a presentation one of the meetings, we had a lot of different speakers throughout the year, but we had Cornell EMS, which is a student-run organization all volunteer. They are all EMT's if anyone is an EMT or knows one, they know the amount of training they have to go through. They came and did a presentation, and the group decided that we should have them as part of the PSAC, as a member of the public safety neighborhood here at Cornell. In addition to response to medical calls, they are our first responder when you dial 911 and need medical. The group you get might be this student-run group. But they also do standbys at student events, saving student groups a lot of money. They don't charge for their services, and they provide a very good basic life support level of care, so if you don't need an ambulance, usually it's EMS that comes and cares for you, and if you sign off and don't need transport you are on your way. And it's a fantastic group, and if anyone wants more information about that, I would be happy to talk about that. Right now, you know, and I talk about the lessons learned. You know, we learned -- we had a group that didn't have a clinician, and without a clinician, you're limited on what you can do to take people to the hospital and to be engaged, and so a lot of the national hospitals are using clinician and then para-professionals in caseworker roles. So, we are moving into -- we are hiring right now. There's a post open for a clinician to be the director of the Community Response Team. Then the next few weeks, we are going to start advertising for the case workers that will be working for that clinician. And we are hoping to get them up and running as soon as possible, and then in the spring, to put this all together, we announced a new public safety organization. Some of the feedback that we received -- we can go to the next slide -- was that people wouldn't call the 25511 number and use RAVE guardian because they thought they were just calling the police. That's when really put together the data that PSAC was looking at, some of the feedback from the community. We needed to have the dispatch center pulled out of the police department and removed. We needed to bring EMS in, and we needed to put everything together so on the customer side or on the student, staff, or faculty side that's calling for services, it's seamless. They just call for help. The public safety dispatch center, which is all staffed by civilian, they aren't police officers. They are trained up to national standards for 911. In fact, we are the backup 911 center for Tompkins County. If they should go down, all those calls will be handled here. I was -- I stepped down from my role as Chief of Police at that time. We promoted deputy chief Tony Bellamy up to be Chief of Police. Tony is a fantastic partner. He values collaboration with community, and I couldn't think of a better person for us to start these changes with within the police department role. Next slide. So

what does it look like? what am I all bringing together and pulling apart? It's the -- at the top of the AVP there, and them we pull apart the dispatch center out of the police department, and that's our technical operations on the left, which is public safety communications, dispatch, RAVE guardian rings into them. They monitor all of our alarms, burglar, fire, research. There's different research areas that have different alarms that we need to monitor. That's all handled in there. CU Police That is all staying within the police department. Another group that we brought over into public safety was emergency management. They handle all of our emergency preparedness, our business continuity plans, and they play a key role in any major event, but the most important role they play is planning so we are prepared when there is an event that happens. So they are working with us now. Alternative response, CRT. That's what we are working on right now. They came over from SCL. Once we had CRT up and running, and I'm sure I would be happy to come back and talk about that, we get this next piece up and running. We will be developing a campus service officer, and we don't know a name for it yet. That's just the name to kind of hold the place. That's going to be an unarmed, nonsworn person to handle, again, service calls that, you don't need a trained clinician or you don't need a police officer, but you need someone in a -- somewhat authoritative role that can come and keep an eye and advise on safety. One of the main things that I see for this is our walking escorts that we do at night. The blue light escorts. Random patrol, just around campus, looking for lights out, safety hazards. Disturbance calls, disorderly conduct, things that don't need a police officer. We need someone to say we got a call, can you keep the noise down? The biggest thing I want to try to get this group connected with is some of our community events that, because they are late at night they, need some security, and right now, they either get a police officer from Cornell police or they get a contract security person and our contract security folks do a really good job. They're trained, they are up to our standards, but they are just not Cornell. They are not our people. I want people in these positions that know how to treat our community and take care of our community and are accountable to us and the environment that we're creating here, so we'll be working on that next. There's other administrative operations such as Clery Compliance and Access Control, and there's a lot of records, so New York state recently changed a lot of the discovery laws, which require a lot of administrative work to get records done much faster, much quicker. There's a whole unit that handles all of that. Then I was talking about EMS. One thing I didn't mention is they do a lot of educational programming. So, if you want to have CPR training, AED training, Stop the Bleed, the students will come in and do that training, again, free of charge. So, I have been talking to students, you know, they are like, what's different about what you are doing? What's changed? So I'm trying to find different ways to represent, know, what if is that we do. So, this is the common understanding of you had a crisis before. You called CUPD, the officer responded, and there was either an arrest, referral, warning sent to the student conduct office or fraternity or sorority affairs, and that was pretty much it, and then that was the basic understanding for what happened. The new -- the new section is a little bit more complicated, but I want to highlight that when you have a crisis that it goes to the public safety 911 center now. So, they evaluate what the appropriate response is, and once we have CRT up and running, it'll be the mobile crisis team. If it's a nonviolent, noncriminal, especially a mental health call that just doesn't need a police officer. That's where that is going to go. That's going to be, you know, students that are distressed, students that are maybe, you know, not the point of being a missing person, but nobody has seen them in a little while, so instead of sending a police officer to go knock on their door, which absolutely scares them, we are going to send someone that's a clinician that can talk to them and, you know, through the conversation do they need help? Is there something going

on? Then the groups in the middle. Between EMS, police, and CRT, it's going to be fluid between there. If CRT get there's, and it really is something that needs a police officer, police will show up. We want to make sure our police officers are trained that when they get there, just doesn't need a police officer, they can hand that off to the CRT, and there's programs nationwide that are working very well in this area. CAHOOTS is one of them that you'll hear referenced a lot. They've been in place since like 1979, 1980. That's a model That a lot of national crisis response teams are starting to follow. And then from there, any of those groups can then make sure people are connected to the appropriate resources. The hospitals, university services, crisis management, CAPS, Cornell Health, ResLife, you know, there's a variety of different services that we provide students here on campus, or if they are a student or older student or not a student at all. Some of them -- some people we deal with just aren't students, so there's community services, and there's a lot of them here in Ithaca. We aren't going to say you aren't a student, so we aren't going to do nothing. We are going to get you connected to the right community service. If there's police, the police can do student conduct or -- in rare cases a criminal justice system. 911 center will also dispatch to fire and EMS even though they aren't part of -- sorry. Just fire -- they aren't part of public safety, but we still work very closely with the environmental health and safety. The fire department, and off to the left, I want to highlight the crisis hotline. So, we are trying to get word out about -- if you read my weekly message, I did one about 988. So if you are having a mental health crisis, you can -- you can call 988 and speak to a national counselor, or they can actually get you connected here to someone in Tompkins County. They can help connect you with local services, campus services, and they can help walk throughout side of the public safety system. That's a new number and a new resource for people to use to get help. And, you know, they may recommend you go to the hospital, or they may recommend that we get involved at some point and help you get to the hospital. So, that would be a CRT in this case. Hopefully between get this all working in the next year or so. We hope that the community sees just a seamless -- seamless delivery and what the point is we care about our community. We care about delivering the service, not, you know, make arrests or writing tickets or the things that people -- you know, had an image of the police department for -- want this to be handled seamlessly between my groups to make sure we are delivering the right services to the community. So we finished a lot of the data gathering analysis. Chief and I are out making a lot of public appearances, and this is one of them. I meet with a lot of student groups. We did the surveys. We did focus groups. We did a lot of, you know, outreach, you know, during the start of this, but now that we are getting to the point, we have done CRT for a year. We are making some refinements. I want to be connecting with student groups, faculty senate, employee groups. Are we doing it right? Is this what people are looking for? I'm trying to get feedback, so I'm happy to take any questions when we are done here and even after here. If you think anything just drop me an e-mail. You can reply to my weekly message, or you can just drop me an e-mail at Honan@cornell.edu. I would be happy to take any feedback, even outside of here. We're right in the middle of revamping all the position descriptions. I said we had the director that's out there. We're just finishing up the case workers, that should be out very shortly. And we talked about the unarmed campus service and then rebranding. One of the pieces of feedback I'm getting from student is that we associate the 25511 with the police. We want to -- we want to rebrand that, so people understand that number calls our public safety dispatch center now. If you use RAVE guardian, that goes to the public safety center. If you pick up a blue light that goes to the public safety dispatch center. So, if you dial 911 from campus phone, same thing. So, we are going to do a little more work. I'm trying to get some more student feedback on what we could do to

rebrand this appropriately. I really want to get that rebranding out there when we get the CRT up and running. I think that will be good to push those messages out simultaneously. I think that's it. So, happy to take any questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you have questions, please just step up to the microphone. If you are in person and if you are online, please raise your digital hand.

>>Ken Birman: Sure. Ok. Thank you, David. That was great.

>>Jonathan Ochsorn: State your name.

>>Ken Birman: I really like the CRT idea. My name is Ken Birman. Computer science senator. I have a question that dates back, I think you are in half of the -- there was a gunfight down in town. Someone fled with a weapon into Cayuga Heights. it provoked a town response, and we knew that the town police were following the individual and a lockdown on campus. It concerned me because we have a lot of young people of color on campus, and it seemed to me that it created a high risk of an incident. I'm wondering how your office is engaging with the city to ensure that when there's a response and a situation like that, it's your people responding as opposed to city officers who may not understand the context up here and could make a mistake.

>>David Honan: So, thank you. That was a challenging case because of it not being on campus, but when they started putting out alerts and in the direction that the suspects were running, it was coming toward north campus. Being the fact, there was just a shooting immediately previous to that; we thought that there was a -- a risk to our campus, and that's when we put out the messages. Now, talking about the messages alone. We took some learnings out of that. We learned that not everybody knows what north campus is. We need to use some more -- some more thorough descriptors as to what north campus is. not every building coordinator understands what they should be doing. So we are working between emergency management and building coordinators to understand what you should be doing. It's a large campus. So, a lockdown, you know, as you picture in the like the K -- 12 setting isn't the same thing when we have 280 buildings and, you know, multiple jurisdictions, so north campus is very different than far out east campus say at the vet school. How do we work together so in that particular case -- we were monitoring the radio traffic in advance before any of the alerts came out. We heard that the subjects got out, and they were running through Cayuga Heights. we actually sent officers up there to assist Cayuga Heights, and we placed officers in north campus to respond to any concerns that came into us, so we made sure our officers were responding. You know, what was not put out through the alerts is we had a pretty thorough description. A couple of the officers saw the suspect, so that they had a really good description of who we were looking for. I heard, you know, plenty of concerns from the community, from parents, my son or daughter is black, and I can see that I heard that description come out, which was put out through some local media. And, you know, I talked to them, and I assured them that we know who we are looking for. We see the description. It's much more thorough description than just a black male. That was not something we put out publicly. You know, I worked with the faculty center previously to make sure we aren't putting racial descriptions in our alerts and in our crime alerts that come out. We made sure that officers know who they were looking for, and they were pretty close. We didn't catch them that right and say we, as the larger context of municipal law enforcements in

the campus. They were eventually caught up in Rochester, brought that case to a close. I hope I answered your question.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Well, we had some online questions or comments. Ashleigh Newman, unmute yourself.

>>Ashleigh Newman: Hi, yeah, Ashleigh Newman, at large senator for the vet school. My question was if a student or faculty, staff, anyone were to call 911 from their cell phone on campus, they would likely get directed to the Tompkins County emergency response, not this new community response network with all of the different resources that you outlined. So, is it only that when you use a campus phone, you can reach that network, or how would someone on campus that isn't near a campus phone -- could reach that network and get the help that they need that isn't maybe just directly to the Tompkins County police department?

>>David Honan: So you are exactly right. If you dial 911 from a cell phone, it goes to the county 911 center. We worked very closely with them, and they vet out calls that are directed for Cornell, someone identifies that they are a member of the Cornell community on our campus, they route that call to us. So that would fall into the public safety communications center. How we would like our public to contact us -- if you want to be sure you are getting our communications center, use RAVE guardian. You can text, you can call, you can communicate with our public safety center right off that app. If you want, you can hit a button, and it'll say where you are. If you can't talk and you need help, we also like the blue lights or down the (607)255-1111 number. That goes directly to our center. Work is being done on, you know, is there a way to get calls more efficiently to us? We don't have a solution right now, but it's something we are looking at as to how we might be able to get those cell phone calls on campus to us in a more timely manner.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Ok, we have an in-person question and comment, and then we will go online again.

>>Tom Fox: Hi, Tom Fox from Molecular Biology and Genetics. So, in the review of your calls, I'm just curious what proportion roughly did you decide didn't need to go to sworn officers? And if it was large, do you anticipate shrinking the police force?

>>David Honan: So, right now, there's no plan on shrinking the police force. This is supplement because the police force, as the campus has grown by people and by area over the many years, the police force has never added people in many, many years. In fact, we lost security guards many years ago that we had that just were never -- they weren't replaced with police officers. So, what was -- I think what we have learned out of that was what are we going to send these folks to and not send police officers? It's our check welfares, our minor disturbances, mental health calls that don't involve weapons, don't involve an imminent threat, and what are the numbers? Roughly -- there's -- officers respond to mental health calls on a regular basis. Almost daily during the school year. So, there's, you know good number of calls. I'm sorry I don't have the numbers in front of me. I will be better prepared next time and happy to discuss them then offline, out of here. If we could -- divert a couple calls every day just on mental health, nothing else, you know, we are having those less contacts with police for thing that don't need police.

Then we have various, you know, roommate disturbances, noise complaints are a big one. We get a lot of calls from parents, again it's not that they are missing person but, you know, their son or daughter calls them every hour on the hour on a regular basis and they haven't heard from them in two hours so must be bad. So, this is something that you don't really scares our students to have a police officer show up at their door because they haven't talked to their mom in a couple of hours. So, we can divert it off into this group here. There's also the aftermath. So, you know, we go. Say there's a serious call. It's pretty dynamic when there's a serious medical call or a serious criminal call in a residence hall, in particular. So the police show up, EMS shows up. Maybe the ambulance and everybody is there, and they are managing the situation at hand, but there's a lot of disruptions to that community. So, this is going to be an added level that the police would just leave before, and then people would wonder what's going on. What did I do? You know, there's some people would actually call 911 but then feel like they didn't do the right thing because there was no closure with that. This is going to provide someone in a social worker, clinician context that can sit with that person afterward and say, wow, that was pretty -- that was pretty intense. Are you ok? And then make sure we close that loop with people who are not the victim or the person that needed the medical attention but the bystanders that it disrupts that whole area. I don't see a shortage in many of these programs of work to do. those programs start out a couple people like we are but then they slowly grow. And one learning that we had last year was we limited this group to the residence halls. The students just need care anywhere they are on campus. So, this group will be campus-wide wherever they are needed

 >>Risa Lieberwitz: Thank you. Risa Lieberwitz, faculty senator from ILR. Thanks for the presentation. Regarding alternative public safety models. Could you comment on how that may relate to issues of the relationship between the police and campus protests? Whether those are, you know, large groups, smaller groups, dissenting issues. What happens on campuses which is part of academic freedom and the ability to expression ourselves, whether we're students or faculty, or staff. And those might be on social issues; they may be political issues. So, I wonder if you could comment on that issue of the relationship between the police and campus protests and whether these alternatives are related at all to that.

 >>David Honan: So the alternatives aren't directly related to that, but as you are speaking, I'm thinking there is a good opportunity here, and police are committed to protecting people's first amendment speech rights. The right to freedom of speech is important. Again, when we only had police for protests that were not disruptive, weren't violent, were just expressive opportunities to use your first amendment rights, all we had was police. If we have these alternative service providers, I don't see CRT as being the key to that, but I think the new alternative response in the unarmed could certainly help with the traffic. We try to -- if students go into a roadway, we don't want to see someone hit. The officers were closing down the road. We can use traffic. We can use -- these unarmed folks to do things like that. I hope I answered your question.

 >>Risa Lieberwitz: Well, just to follow up quickly, having been At various campus protests over the years, here, it's always -- I think for many people it's quite intimidating to see police officers there, armed officers. Both in term of police officers and armed officers, depending on whether they have arms. I wonder if that's what you are saying would lead to not having police officers armed or unarmed at protests.

>>David Honan: Yeah, sometimes the armed officers there because they were the only staff we had to make sure that we can ensure their safety, you know, we worry as much about people trying to disrupt speeches or to use violence to stop these people from speaking, and we are worried about that as well. You know, we have only had police officers to go and kind of get a sense for what's going on. Now we have some alternative responses, and I would be happy to talk further and think about this more. We haven't thought about this in the protest context, but it's a good thing to think about.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I'm waiting for other hands up or for in-person people to come down. Otherwise, could someone find out if Tracy is here to move back to the previous -- ok. So, if there are no more questions or comments, thank you. We are going to move back to the previous agenda item. Assuming unanimous consent. This was the Academic Freedom and Professional status of the Faculty Committee update, and speaking in place of Tracy Stokol will be Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa.

>>Eve De Rosa: I do not look or sound like Tracy, and you do not want me to do an accent, so I attended the AFPSF, their last meeting, so I will try to represent the content that they will be considering over this semester and this academic year. If there are any committee members present in the room or online, just help me out. Throw me a line. It's very possible that Tracy has clinical duties; she represents the vet school. So, one topic that they are considering is how collaborations are valued. So the institution is putting resources behind moon shots and radical collaborations, yet, new PI's are being assessed not based on collaboration, so how do we give value to that? So, some of the guidance that they are using are guidance that the IRL are currently using. How have external letter writers write to your role as a collaborator and NIH has a very delineated way of representing your value to a collaboration. And, so it's not just institutional pressures but also granting agencies like the NIH; really, you are looking for science as a team sport, so how do we allow new PI's to get credit for the work they contribute? There is another item that they wanted to give consideration to. How to map the promotion from associate professor to full professor. Can we have institutional support and guidelines in a meaningful way and mentorship? I forgot to mention that the AFPSF last year, actually before I became the Dean of Faculty, -- there was a resolution presented from the AFPSF under different leadership about making the chair's letter for tenure -- sorry, tenure associate professor. Making that visible to externally and also to the candidate, and so this is not settled on the committee in its new composition. So they are giving, they have withdrawn it, and they want to revise it and bring it back. And they also want to have a college-wide audit of all the other transparency tenure processes that have gone through the Senate and just to be sure that the guidelines and other things that became part of the transparent process are being executed by all colleges on campus. And, the other -- I think large issue that will eventually come to the Senate is that the College of Business, X number of years in, I believe it's about five or six. They have the three schools integrated into this one College of Business, and they have multiple timelines for tenure. Six for two schools out of the three, eight for another, and so, they want to harmonize the ten-year clock across the three schools, and there's a proposal out there -- we are bringing in College of Business faculty as ad hoc members of the AFPSF so they can also consider that along with the College of Business and hopefully inform the ultimate outcome. And so, any questions for Tracy and me as Tracy's proxy?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I see that Richard Bensel has his hand up in Zoomland, so unmute yourself.

>>Richard Bensel: Yes, not really for Tracy though I think she should probably present again when we have a quorum. I think, and I sent messages, but evidently, the chat is disabled, is that true? Because the chat is disabled, members -- Senators, I think, have not noted that I've noted the absence of a quorum three times. I kinda --

>>Eve De Rosa: Richard, there is quorum. There's lots of people in the room, so we make quorum.

>>Richard Bensel: There are -- ok, how many are in the room?

>>Eve De Rosa: 25 to 30.

>>Richard Bensel: Ok, good. I'm glad then we have a quorum. We couldn't see senator's register because the chat had been disabled, Eve. Did you disable the chat?

>>Eve De Rosa: So I just want to let you know, Richard, that was a mistake on our part. That was not intentional.

>>Richard Bensel: Ok, very good. Thanks a lot.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Are you done, Richard? I guess so. We have a in person; just identify yourself and your department.

>>Thomas Bjorkman: Thomas Bjorkman, Horticulture. So, I want to thank you for paying attention to the collaboration aspect. I and many of our colleagues are trying to put together moonshot proposals, and one of the fundamental, from the beginning, questions is how will these people be evaluated if a key feature of the acquisition is its ability to collaborate, and we quickly get mired in if you try to have tenure and promotion procedures done through multiple departments it's going to be a mess, so any clarity we can get will be very, very helpful with doing a good job with these.

>>Eve De Rosa: I can share that the NIH has very – like very delineated procedures for how to reflect contributions of junior or, I shouldn't say junior, but new investigators and the basically what it looks like is the principal investigator would write what their role is in the collaboration, what values they brought to the collaboration and then they would have external – other collaborators on the project but also external to the University if that's the case. Write what the contributions were as well and so – but they do have very delineated, so that is likely where the AFPSF will go; use that as a guidance.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Any other questions or comments? In-person or online? I'm not seeing any hands, so I think we will move to the next agenda item in that case. There's a motion to bring back the research scientist title, and, again, Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty, and senator Ken Birman, computer science, will have 15 minutes to present. We'll discuss that motion and then

have 15 minutes to discuss that motion. Eve?

>>Eve De Rosa: Hello again. I'm no longer Tracy. I'm Eve. So, what I would like to say is, today really is a premotion. We fully intend for everyone to contribute and think through this with us and contribute also to the ultimate drafting of the resolution. Ken is going to present his draft thus far, but if others want to contribute, and also endorse this motion, please let us know so that it can come back in the next senate meeting. And basically, my job today is to provide some institutional context for the title. When Ken brought the draft proposal and slide show, and research to the office of the Dean of Faculty, then I took it to the University Faculty Committee and tried to incorporate their feedback and essentially, they wanted an institutional perspective, and so after receiving that mandate from the university faculty committee I met with Academic HR and we made sure that we have clarity and it is a very nuanced, you'll see, perspective on the titles and how they're used, so I just want to give my best overview of the research scientist title. How it's been historically involved in the University. Next slide. So Research Teaching Extension Faculty, and we're specifically thinking about research titles today. These are faculty who are here on contract and not tenured track faculty. And I just also want to make clear that there is no promotion between these different titles. So you have the two tiers of the research, the associate title, two tiers of Research Scientist title but only specifically in research division, and I'll provide context for that and then three tires of the Research Professor and very delineated for all of them. Delineated process for promotion or advancement. Next slide, please. So we'll start historically with Resolution 42, and I'm going to slide my mic around so that I get this correct. And so, in 2004, there was an approved resolution from the Faculty Senate establishing the Research Scientist and the Principal Research Scientist as titles for researchers here, professional researchers, and academics. Basically, the resolution there, as you can see, is they created these two new titles in 2004, and I think Ken might even be able to provide more context for why it came to the faculty senate when he presents. Next slide, please. In 2015, the Senate enabled the research professor title and, at that time, and this is all three ranks, at that time they relegated the Research Scientist title to research divisions only, and any new appointment outside of that had to use Research Professor or Research Associate. So, even though Research Scientist is on the books as an available title, at this point, it's at the discretion of the Dean and, or you have to be inside a research division and not have any tenure track lines available. And I think that's all I'll say about that. Next slide, please. And then, I just wanted to give a description of the Research Scientist title as it's considered that this is a Principal Research Scientist. They can initiate new research activities. They can manage a lab and also submit proposals – funding for external funding. And, ok, next slide. Here are all of the titles available, and so you can see for the academic titles, principal Research Scientist and Research Scientist are available. They weren't taken out o fuse completely, but they've been used specifically for research divisions. But deans can actually, at their discretion, bring this title back but is this a time for the title to come back and be used University-wide as for long-term researchers at the University? Next slide. And then I think the last resolution that I want to bring as a reminder for those of you that were here at the time and those of you that were new I just wanted to provide these three resolutions so you can understand the context of this proposal and the last one is that the research teaching and extensions academics were part of the employee assembly up until 2019. So in the spring of 2019, research teaching extension faculty were brought in the faculty senate with university voting rights. So, at the time that the Senate in 2015 made the decision to bring in the research professor and no longer use the research scientist, RTU were not voting members, so that's the

third resolution I want to bring to you today. And, Ken, come on up.

>>Ken Birman. Well, thank you very, very much, Eve. And thank you, everybody, for more discussions about this endless questions about the endless number of titles we have at Cornell. I want to return to 2004, when it actually me who introduced the resolution to create Research Scientist titles. At that time, we were finding that Cornell was having some difficulty competing against peer institution and that the difficulty centered on a perceived issue of prestige with the senior research associate title. Research Associate, which is often used right after Post Doc, is common, but Senior Research Associate fell into disfavor at our peers, and Cornell was finding it difficult to hire people at that level and felt that the promotion sequence to Research Associate was awkward. So College of Engineering, at that time, I was on the engineering policy committee, brought to the Senate a proposal that we start to use Research Scientist titles. Our peers were doing that that and, in fact, still use those titles. With the senior version being called Principal Research Scientist and the initial version called Research Scientist but with a dossier review, even at that initial level. So we operated that way until 2015. Next slide, please. In 2015, when the professorial titles were introduced, there was an assumption that the majority of people in the research titles would probably try to move over to these professorial titles, and that was stated in the debate. If you go into the record, you see a discussion around that. Juan Salgado presented this. The Senate didn't really pursue that much. The dialogue at the time had to do mostly with the Senate toughening the standard for obtaining the research professor titles. And the tougher standard that was advocated and adopted that a research professor was somebody that often would be a leader on bringing in research brands. That they would have a tenure-like evaluation for appointment to those proposals. We write to prestigious faculty at other institutions. There was actually a comment I found that because this is a group of people who only do research and don't teach, that the research expectations should actually be higher than for Cornell's expectations around tenure for – tenure-track researchers who have a balance of teaching and research. So there was a real feeling that these should have a touch standard associated with them and the Senate imposed that. With that, it was adopted. So you would see your research professor as a person who could obtain a tenured faculty position at a peer institution in fact but was choosing to bring in soft money, their own soft money often, run a research group or perhaps a laboratory. Some kind of a large presenter, and it would be highly prestigious track. Now, at that time, if you think about it, effectively, two types of titles have been frozen because, as Dean De Rosa was explaining, we had agreed to stop using Senior Research Associate and start using Research Scientist. In fact, in 2004, we asked that units consider moving any existing senior Research Associates directly to Research Scientist without a further review. And, now, at 2015, we ceased to use Research Scientist except in the research division, which means not available in general without a special request from any other unit. There are still people who hold this title, still on the books, but we can't make new appointments. So, for example, in College of Engineering and Computing Information Science, the [INDISCERNIBLE], we are unable to make new appointments on these research scientist titles. We are only able, in fact, to go back to senior Research Associate. A decision was apparently made to honor the more recent decision, the 2015 one, and reverse the 2004 one, but the Senate was not consulted at that moment, and, certainly, the RTE faculty didn't have a voice at that stage either, so they simply happened. And now, so let's move forward. The impact essentially is that you have a group of people who potentially can't qualify as research professors under the senate standard and are now being pushed back onto what we in the Senate perceived as a less

prestigious title, that of Senior Research Associate, which is not really used at our peers. They favor Research Scientist for individuals who would not get 12 very, very strong tenure-like letters and who don't have huge publication records, and who don't, perhaps, supervisor Ph.D. students directly. So let's go to the next slide. And, [INDISCERNIBLE] have the -- yep. So, as you can see, I highlighted them in pink. In College of Engineering in and in the [INDISCERNIBLE], we are seeing renewed use of senior Research Associate for individuals who aren't -- don't have the profile of the research professors, which are also being used on the white lines. There's quite a few. As far as we can tell, there are about ten people in this category by now. Can we have the next slide? Our peers have not frozen the use of Research Scientist, and that's what brings me here today, and I'm hoping with your support, we will simply reiterate our preference that our RTR colleagues have available to them the Research Scientist track. With that, the University would reauthorize use of titles in unit that wish to do so. We would still have the research professor track as well with the tough standard the Senate imposed. And as you can see, that would make this more competitive with CMU, MIT, University of Washington and Seattle, and so forth. Our peers are using this additional title, just as the Senate found in 2004. And, so, with that, the next slide, please. My proposal today is that we discuss a motion that we would actually vote on after the next meeting. So, this is still a motion in preparation, and in fact, I would need some support from other faculty senators and other faculty to bring this forward. With your support, to simply reiterate our preference and reauthorize the use of the Research Scientist titles. So, the next slide is a bill because it's a long motion. It just says the same things. So, first -- so first, whereas the Cornell Faculty Senate determined the Senior Research Associate title, the senior being significant because I don't think there's a concern about the initial use of Research Associate to be unsuitable for our professional researchers, citing concerns about RTE professional stature and competitiveness. And whereas the UFC draft of the more recently enacted research professor title assumed that Research Scientists would shift to this new rank (and therefore recommended freezing use of the research scientist title), but the Senate subsequently strengthened the criteria for appointment to the research professor titles, limiting their use to Cornell's most prestigious RTE research appointments, And whereas the senior research associate title has consequently been revived without Senate consultation, which is – I don't want to go into that by the way, recreating precisely the problems that the Senate tried to address in 2004. And whereas, for the people for whom a research professor is inappropriate, our peer institutions favor the research scientist title. In fact, in 2004, we asked that units consider moving any existing senior Research Associates directly to Research Scientist without a further review. And, now, at 2015, we ceased to use Research Scientist except in the research division, which means not available in general without a special request from any other unit. There are still people who hold this title, still on the books, but we can't make new appointments. So, for example, in College of Engineering and Computing Information Science, the [INDISCERNIBLE], we are unable to make new appointments on these research scientist titles. We are only able, in fact, to go back to senior Research Associate. A decision was apparently made to honor the more recent decision, the 2015 one, and reverse the 2004 one, but the Senate was not consulted at that moment, and, certainly, the RTE faculty didn't have a voice at that stage either, so they simply happened. And now, so let's move forward. The impact essentially is that you have a group of people who potentially can't qualify as research professors under the senate standard and are now being pushed back onto what we in the Senate perceived as a less prestigious title, that of Senior Research Associate, which is not really used at our peers. They favor Research Scientist for individuals who would not get 12 very, very strong tenure-like

letters and who don't have huge publication records, and who don't, perhaps, supervisor Ph.D. students directly. So let's go to the next slide. And, [INDISCERNIBLE] have the -- yep. So, as you can see, I highlighted them in pink. In College of Engineering and in the [INDISCERNIBLE], we are seeing renewed use of senior Research Associate for individuals who aren't -- don't have the profile of the research professors, which are also being used on the white lines. There's quite a few. As far as we can tell, there are about ten people in this category by now. Can we have the next slide? Our peers have not frozen the use of Research Scientist, and that's what brings me here today, and I'm hoping with your support, we will simply reiterate our preference that our RTR colleagues have available to them the Research Scientist track. With that, the University would reauthorize use of titles in unit that wish to do so. We would still have the research professor track as well with the tough standard the Senate imposed. And as you can see, that would make this more competitive with CMU, MIT, University of Washington and Seattle, and so forth. Our peers are using this additional title, just as the Senate found in 2004. And, so, with that, the next slide, please. My proposal today is that we discuss a motion that we would actually vote on after the next meeting. So, this is still a motion in preparation, and in fact, I would need some support from other faculty senators and other faculty to bring this forward. With your support, to simply reiterate our preference and reauthorize the use of the Research Scientist titles. So, the next slide is a bill because it's a long motion. It just says the same things. So, first -- so first, whereas in 2004, the Cornell faculty senate determined that the senior associate research title. The senior being significant because I don't think there's a concern about the initial use of Research Associate to be unsuitable for a professional researcher. Therefore we authorize the use of Research Scientist, so I'm going to stop with that, and we open the floor. The only request being that we shouldn't engage in -- too much of a witch hunt of how this situation came about. Even I have talked about that. It'll be more constructive to go forward and just to ask what is the proper way to honor the accomplishments of our RTR, RTE colleagues. Those who can become research professors. I'm very strongly in favor of that. Those who are on a slightly different track don't publish quite as much and may not have quite the degree of international visibility. Do we really intend that they have to go back to using senior Research Associate as it's occurring now, or could we reauthorize the use of Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So if anyone has comments in person, walk up to the front. Get your on -- online, raise your hand virtually. And I'll give you a -- we have -- is it Weijia Song? online?

>>Weijia Song: Yes. Hi. Can you hear me?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Weijia Song: Yes, ok. Great. Thank you, senator members, the member of the senator, to bring this up. I'm a Research Associate in CALS since 2017. So, it's already been more than five years, and my main focus is on building a system and in doing research on cloud computing. I feel that without this title, my career path is kind of like a sealed at Cornell. So, if the -- if we can revive the Research Scientist, I think that would be a perfect title that can go to for the next step. I just want to comment that thank you for bringing this up and thank you for thinking about this. This is -- this is something very important to people like me at Cornell. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an in-person comment, and then we will go back online.

>>Elizabeth Lamb: Hi, Elizabeth Lamb, And I'm an RTE representative for CALS, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, with knowing that this might open a hornet's nest, is there a reason for doing this just for research and not including the extension titles which are relatively equivalent at same time? Because I think some of the same problems occur. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Go ahead, Eve.

>>Eve De Rosa: Can I ask what those titles might look like?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Wait, come to the microphone.

>>Elizabeth Lamb: Extension Associate, Senior Extension Associate, those are the two primary ones that I'm thinking of. Can you hear me?

>>Eve De Rosa: so, is the -- so -- I guess what's happening here is they have the associate and senior associate, and then they have the three-tiered research professor. Are you --

>>Elizabeth Lamb: We don't have extension professors.

>>Eve De Rosa: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to get. Is it--

>>Elizabeth Lamb: [INDISCERNIBLE]

>>Eve De Rosa: Is it the Research Scientist step or --

>>Elizabeth Lamb: Yeah, so the Extension Scientist --

>>Eve De Rosa: Or is it the -- ok.

>>Elizabeth Lamb: I think. Because I think the Extension Scientist is what Ken's recommending, and I think that has more utility perhaps in this situation than Extension Professor position.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you.

>>Elizabeth Lamb: But I may be -- there may be people who disagree with me.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you for the clarification.

>>Ken Birman: You know, I'm very sympathetic to your point, and I think that the RTE community has a number of issues that need to be addressed one by one by the Senate and by the community. This is a step, and it's not going to be the final step. We have to think about the prestige and the career track of our colleagues at every level. And Cornell has gone through a period where the RTE researchers, perhaps, weren't treated exactly on a par with faculty. We are

trying to change that, which is why now, RTE faculty do have a vote here in the Senate. A significant number of faculty senators are RTE researchers. This particular step I'm advocating is intended to sort of reverse a choice that was made that I -- that I think the Senate needs to think about, and I'm hoping will agree with me isn't the preference the Senate would have expressed had we been consulted. But, you are raising a different question, I would say and I think it's an important one, and I would hope that there would be further discussion and debate and hopefully that something could be done for the extension group as well.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an in-person question or comment. Identity yourself, David.

>>David Delchamps David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. It's a question. ok. I'm trying to put two presentations together. Am I correct in understanding this is my first question, that the Research Scientist title still exists but requires special permission from somebody to give to a person?

>>Ken Birman: Oddly enough, there's some confusion in the University itself about the whole question. There's no question that a Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist are still on the books. The trustees never removed them after they were put there. In the Computing Information Science and in College of Engineering, our understanding has been that we are not permitted to use them without a petition process that has to be initiated by the Dean, and, in effect, that they are not available to us.

>>David Delchamps: so, wait, the Dean can say yes, or the Dean has to petition someone higher up?

>>Ken Birman: The Dean seemingly has to petition someone higher up.

>>David Delchamps: Ok. Yeah.

>>Ken Birman: But that process has not been pursued.

>>David Delchamps: Right.

>>Ken Birman: And in fact, the first I learned of it was Eve, learned of it today. When Dean Bala -- KB -- Dean Bala inquired about it, she actually had the impression that CIS at least does not have access to this title anymore.

>>David Delchamps: Ok. The second question I have -- ok. This is -- so, right.

>>Eve De Rosa: So, according to Academic HR, this title is available so you will see in the resolution when the research professor was brought, they did freeze new appointments except for in the research division, but, according to Academic HR is at the dean's discretion to bring this title in, so I have to give that nuance. So, the resolution says that it's frozen for anyone outside of the research division, but from the perspective of the Academic HR, deans have the discretion, so it's messy.

>>David Delchamps: Ok. What is the research division? That's the other question I had.

>>Eve De Rosa: Divisions on campus that are exclusively research and do not have any tenure track lines.

>>David Delchamps: Ok. Can you give me an example?

>>Eve De Rosa: Yeah, I was going to say CISER or someplace like that.

>>David Delchamps: Just curious. I heard that appellation and had no idea to whom or what it applied. Thank you.

>>Ken Birman: And let me just add one more thing. We consulted with John Siciliano, the world expert on these things, and his e-mail back said that it was -- the title was not available to us anymore. So--

>>John Ochshorn: We do have another online question or comment from Kathryn Caggiano. Oh, I see a different color. Mark Lewis, then and then Kathryn.

>>Mark Lewis: different color, yeah. Kathryn can go first. I can wait. Go head, KC.

>>Kathryn Caggiano: Ok, sure, thanks, Mark. I just wanted to make a comment in that it does look like, based on the way the title descriptions are currently written, that the Research Scientist and principal Research Scientist title are not permitted to teach without special approval by the dean, and the senior Research Associate, while that is not a title that is intended to teach, that they may teach courses that are consistent, it says with the terms of the funding of the position. So I just wanted to point out that is -- that is a distinction that whichever way we want to take this may require some sort of clarification.

>>Ken Birman: If I could, that is, in fact, the case. It also extends to research professors. The wording was that they would teach rarely. And it has been permitted. I know of cases, but it's considered -- it's considered to be rare. So it should not be the primary way that these individuals receive their compensation and the argument for that, at the time that the Senate discussed this, was that you don't want to see a breakdown of traditional tenure, piece by piece, into people who do research but don't have tenure. People who teach who don't have tenure. And where teaching revenue would support the research professors. So, there was a concern about that, and at the time, the Senate expressed this -- and it was applied both to Research Scientist and principal scientist research and then the research professors. Senior Research Associate is a much older title, and the Senate never discussed this issue relative to that title.

>>Kathryn Caggiano: I guess I'm just suggesting that it might bear discussion, right? Given that there is -- given that the wording makes it such that they are not permitted, right? It's a difference -- different type of flexibility -- level of flexibility than the research -- senior Research Associate title currently has. I guess I'm just suggesting that.

>>Ken Birman: And it's -- that would want to continue using senior Research Associate for that

reason. I'll agree.

>>John Orcshorn: Mark Lewis?

>>Mark Lewis: My hand was down, but I didn't -- turn my mute off. Just to clarify, it can be a part of your regular appointment. That's how it's written. So if you write that appointment letter for research professor, it can teach on occasion, but it's not supposed to be a part of their regular appointment. That was my -- that's the comment to respond to Cathryn's point. So I just wanted to say that when we -- in the College of Engineering, because, Ken, you mentioned it several times when we did this research professor/research assistant, associate to full professor, it was done with the understanding that there are only a few Research Scientists and they were asked and polled if they would be willing to switch from what their titles were to what the new titles. So, it was only three of them at the time. I think two of them switched, and the other one became a full professor in the CS. So, it wasn't that they were just switched. It was that they were actually asked, and then they confirmed that was what they wanted to do. This is supposed to be, I think, parallel appointments, so Research Scientist went to either Assistant Associate depending on their tenure at Cornell and their seniority. Senior Research Scientist, I think, went to -- would go to full research professor, again, depending on that seniority. I think that was the idea. I'm not quite sure what we are gaining here except maybe we are having -- instead of from Research Associate, Senior Research Associate, three more levels in between. But I don't think they were meant to be in between. I think they are meant to be parallel appointments, with the professor title being something that helps people gain more notoriety because they are now called professor as opposed to being scientists. Ok. I look forward to your response, Ken; thanks.

>>Ken Birman: Yeah, thank you, Mark. Sorry, I agree with that. In fact, the same thing occurred in [INDISCERNIBLE] CIS. We had one individual who was a Principal Research Scientist, and it was moved over to be a full research professor without additional dossier review. The intention was that for new promotions to these positions that there would be a dossier review and that -- as the Senate expressed in 2015, that the review for research professor would be considerably more stringent than what was being used as the review criteria for Research Scientist and Principal Research Scientist. So, that -- the research professor titles would not be easily available.

>>John Ochshorn: Okay. Risa Lieberwitz.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yeah, thanks. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. So, what I want to suggest is that we have an RTE ad hoc committee that Eve noted as it [INDISCERNIBLE], and it sounds like we have the update about the survey questions. I think it would be generally useful to know, you know, what the RTE ad hoc committee is doing, but more specifically to this discussion -- this would seem to be an appropriate kind of question to give to a committee that is looking at the status of RTE faculty. Rather than doing things piecemeal but to, look at things as a whole, and the other thing I just wanted to mention is that titles matter, and I'm not saying they don't. I think titles do matter. But, what I would also like to, you know, put out there in the discussion generally, and this is part of the reason for giving it to a committee that's working on more than one issue with regard to RTE faculty, is that we should think about the content of people's employment conditions. And, so, you know, the kind of thing that Ken pointed to in terms of concern of maintaining tenure track and not undermining tenure had to do with the ways in

which people need job security and need those kinds of employment conditions so that they can actually fully engage in the academic freedom, whether it's research or teaching or both. That people need that kind of protection, so it seems to me that it's the content of our colleagues jobs that are the most important and that it's not simply about titles, but it's about making sure that we respect our colleagues by making sure that they can exercise the same sorts of rights and privileges -- not privileges really but rights and employment conditions that all of us should be able to exercise so that we can actually fulfill the academic freedom that we should all be able to practice and exercise in the -- toward the goal of the public mission of the University. So, I would really like us to keep our focus on that kind of discussion as well. Thanks.

 >>Walker White: I'm Walker White. Computer Science. I'm also the RTE representative for CIS. While I'm in a teaching position when I actually first started in computer science, I was actually in the type of position that Ken was talking about, and I just wanted to bring up something. Ken keeps mentioning about the stringency of the research professor position, but there's another perspective. I wanted to take a look at it because this is something that, at one point, could have been my career track. In computer science, a lot of -- research projects are often working on software, and the impact of these research projects are not necessarily determined by the papers that are published but the -- you know, the adoption and the use of this software out in the community and you need long term senior personnel who are not necessarily the people that are writing the papers working on these types of things to make those research projects viable and, indeed, at an industry and at a company they would have a scientist role. So. [INDISCERNIBLE]

 >>Jonathan Ochshorn: Weijia Song?

 >>Weijia Song: I'm just - - agreeing with -- with Walker. Yeah. I see we have extra question from Mark.

 >>Mark Lewis: Sorry. I just want to respond to that one point that Ken made at the end there about the dossier review. There's supposed to be stringent dossier reviews for each one of those promotions. I think what was happening -- I'm conjecturing -- not complete conjecture -- they weren't happening in a stringent way, but every one of the promotions, in fact, the reappointments are supposed to be subject to stringent dossier reviews. Just turns out that each one of those titles we talked about are -- the dossier review ends at the dean's level. So, the deans can decide if they don't need to -- stringent dossier review. If they want to, they don't go to the provost because they are dean's levels appointments. It's possible that those things are supposed to have those reviews, and they just weren't happening. Thank you.

 >>Ken Birman: If I could just make two fast -- so first of all, what Mark said is absolutely true. In [INDISCERNIBLE] CIS, there would be six external letters for -- it would have been Research Scientist. Now it's become senior Research Associate. There would be 12 external letters for the research professor track. So, they are both dossier reviews and both quite stringent, but the degree of outreach is different. Also, speaking to something that Risa suggested, I actually think it would be a wonderful idea to get input from the Professional Careers Committee. The RT committee, but I also think it's important to recognize that the Senate offers an actual vote, a genuine voice to all of us, and we include representation of the RT faculty. The

RT faculty were not consulted on an action which had an environmental impact for them. This motion offers an opportunity for them to express a voice as well. They can vote it down, but the original 2004 view was that there was a question of professional prestige involved, and because senior Research Associate is not used by our peers in this way, that people felt awkward at conferences when they would encounter friends who had titles recognized and used at other universities and they would be wearing a name tag that had a title which is not commonly used this way at other universities.

>>Jonahtan Ochshorn: Risa.

>>Yeah. Thanks. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I was surprised to hear that Ken said that there seems to have been some unilateral decision to freeze this title. I mean, if it's available, it's available. So, you know, I don't actually have any problem with voting that it should be made available for use. But, I do think that it makes a lot of sense to think about a senate ad hoc committee that is going to be reporting to the Senate and perhaps vote, you know, have things to vote on. That if we are talking about titles for people on the faculty and here in the RTE area, that we should be also thinking about how the employment conditions and substance are determined and that this should be seen as a whole. So, I would suggest that since we have a senate ad hoc committee in place that it discusses the issue that Ken raised and these other substantive issues, which I hope they are discussing.

>>John Ochshorn: Any other comments or questions in-house or online? I don't see any hands. I'm assuming there is no so-called good of the order today? That correct? Eve?

>>Eve De Rosa: Risa, I just also wanted to say that I think that's a fabulous idea to bring it to the task force.

>>John Ochshorn: So, we are about to adjourn. I would just make a plug for good of the order. I miss it. So, send your ideas that are not necessarily ideas that are about a motion but other things of concern at Cornell to the Dean of Faculty's office so that we can get you on the agenda for the next meeting.

>>Eve De Rosa: I'm happy for people to -- ok. We have Harold Hodes, but I just want to put a plug in for the good of the order as well. Anyone who plays an instrument, you want to come up and play music? We are happy to have that. So, I just want to put a plug-in.

>>John Ochshorn: So before adjournment, we have a few minutes. Harold? Identity yourself.

>>Hi. I'm Harold Hodes, from philosophy. I want to talk about giving the faculty a pay raise. The -- during the covid epidemic, we had contributions to our retirement frozen. The covid epidemic was followed by a remarkable period of inflation that has not ended. We have not had a significant across-the-board pay raise, so in effect, we have had a pay decrease. So, I think that the salary improvement program should recommend an across-the-board pay raise for the faculty of at least 10%. I'm not the only one in my department who is thinking this way. Most of my colleagues agree with this. So, I hope that there's some way to get the SIP on board with this idea.

>>Eve De Rosa: Harold, you are not alone. I actually am trying to get the financial policies committee to come to the Senate in November. I think this will be a perfect topic for them to discuss. So, thank you.

>>John Ochshorn: We have a few more minutes, so I see Allison online. Identity yourself.

>>Allison Chartchyan: Sorry for that. I did have a question about the makeup of the RTE ad hoc task force, and that was posted in the chat. The second issue that was discussed at -- one of the earlier meetings that I attended was having RTE faculty participate on all the faculty senate committees and have a voting -- have a vote on those committees. Has there been any movement to consider that?

>>Eve De Rosa: So, Allison, the RTE committee has really good representation, so are there colleges or discipline that you don't think are well represented? So that's one thing. Then, we have RTE on many of the senate committees and so are you asking to just formalize that? Because in the guidebook, I don't think its formalized because RTE faculty did not -- they weren't -- they weren't part of the faculty senate at that time, but, for example, the Education Policy Committee is chaired by an RTE faculty member. Mark Milstein. So, is -- so I guess I just wanted to get a sense of what exactly is it -- what are we missing? Terms of representation for discipline of college on the task force, and are you asking for the handbook or the guidelines to be updated because RTE are on senate committees except for FACTA.

>>Allison: Ok. And do they have a vote on all those committees? That was something--

>>Eve De Rosa: Yes.

>>Allison: Ok. I'm confused.

>>Eve De Rosa: And they chair some of these committees as well.

>>Allison: I will have to go back and look.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Tara Holm?

>>Tara Holm: Thanks. I'm sorry. I hope this hasn't been said. I was late because we have a faculty meeting earlier in the afternoon on Wednesdays. I'm Tara Holm from the math department. I have been hearing some of my staff -- actually, this comment begins with our last senate meeting when Paul Ginsberg was expressing frustration about the change in the calendar and the lack of communication from the registrar's office about that change and the reasons for that change and the fact that change had taken place, which really did affect the fall semester. I have heard from staff and my department about some other planned changes coming at the suggestion of the registrar and I -- so those include, for example, shortening our add-drop period. It seems to me that is the type of thing that ought to be -- the EPC ought to be consulted about, and I just wondered if that is happening or has happened and to what degree the Senate is aware of such things.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Tara. As we mentioned last time, the EPC over saw -- so the registrar made a proposal for this year's academic calendar. It went to the EPC. It got feedback from the entire committee, and they said ok. And it was to meet the state regulations, and so we needed exactly -- I believe it was 75 or 73 days, and so --

>>Tara Holm: I understand why the changes happened, but I just wanted to make sure --

>>Eve De Rosa: And then the second thing was the anticipated changes -- those have not come to the office of the Dean of Faculty yet, so I will reach out to the registrar and try to get that through EPC. So, whatever I receive from the registrar will go to EPC for sure.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And we have maybe the final in-person comment. Identify yourself, please.

>>Andy Horbal: Andy Horbal, RTE faculty at large senator. To go back to Allison's comment, by way of clarification at the August 31st -- I believe 31st, orientation for the Senate, the clarification that RTE faculty are not eligible to serve on committees was an answer given in response to a question. And, so, I know you have communicated with me about putting together a list serve that RTE at large can use to communicate with constituency. To respond to your question from my per accountive, I think what would be helpful is to clarify that RTE faculty are eligible to serve on committees so that we can use that list serve to recruit RTE faculty to volunteer to serve on those committees. So whatever form that clarification takes, possibly, clarifying in the handbook so that anyone who looks up if they are eligible can see that. I would be in support of that.

>>Eve De Rosa: I think those are wonderful suggestions, and that is the work of -- so Risa, you had asked about the work of the RTE task force. One of the things that the RTE task force -- so working on this -- the constituency -- who are the people that they are representing because at that moment it's not clear. We are working on building community, so if you are the college representative for RTE, then you will get all of the RTE -- so we are giving IRP, Institutional Research and Planning office space to finish the survey and execute and then we are going to get together as an RT task force to get all of the people that RTE are representing at the college level and at large. So, that's one thing, and we also are reaching out to find out how exactly to spell out that both RTE and university faculty are available or can volunteer to serve on our 12 senate -- 11 senate committees -- so they cannot serve on FACTA, which is the tenure review committee. I did find that out. Thank you. Thank you, everybody, also. Especially seeing 30 people here, yes! Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If there is a -- two-minute comment, we actually have room. Otherwise, I don't see any hands. I will wait a second. Ok. I think we should just then -- in that case, adjourn and thank you. Meeting is adjourned.

>>Eve De Rosa: And everybody here, please remember to sign in. Thank you.