

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Yeah. I've got five seconds. Hello, I think we're ready to begin. We start with a land acknowledgment. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. That's not the land acknowledgment which is as follows. Cornell University is located in the traditional homelands of the Gayogoho:nq (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogoho:nq are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy predates the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogoho:nq dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogoho:nq people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So the meeting is called to order. The first order of business is the approval of minutes from November 9th, 2022, and as per usual, this takes the form of unanimous consent since the minutes are a verbatim transcript of the meeting, so there ought not be any corrections. If there are, bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty. So our first order of business is faculty resources for student support and advocacy services. Julie Edwards, Director of Skorton Center for Health Initiatives, I believe, is online. If you're there--

>> Julie Edwards: Yes, I am.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: --unmute yourself. Begin.

>> Julie Edwards: Wonderful, thank you very much. I would like to just share with you all some of the trainings that we currently offer as well as a resource that we have online and something that we are considering. So, if you can, go to the next slide, please. First and -- and then the next slide, apologies. First and foremost, if you are not familiar with in the Skorton Center for Health Initiatives, we do focus specifically on offering notice and response, assisting students in distress. And the main outcome that

we really look to achieve with the training is to identify individuals in need of care and so that aligns with our mental health framework. We want to provide a brief overview of Cornell student mental health, so we provide some data at the beginning, and then we review the various levels of distress and what you might notice in a student and then really talk through the ways in which you may engage in conversation with that student and you how you can make a warm hand-off in talking about the various resources that we have here at Cornell. And then lastly, we do highlight not only campus resources but also local and national resources, and so these are currently offered at my request; so we do try to offer at least several during each semester that are open to anyone. And, if that is something that you would be interested in offering within your department or if you would prefer that we offer some open ones for faculty interested, we would be happy to explore that piece. And the second slide, there's something also that -- oh, sorry, next slide. What we call our WISE program or it stands for Wellbeing in Scholarly Environments. And this was something that we piloted last year virtually, and then we actually offered something on CALS back in June, and we also provided in this session an overview of student mental health but then discussed in detail the relationship between well-being and academic success. And then talk through different well-being, promoting practices that could be incorporated into the classroom or just as you set the environment up. And that could be in syllabi. It could be the way in which you introduce yourself or have folks introduce themselves to one another. The students in your classes and then we have small group discussions to really think through what ways might be easy to try and incorporate in the classroom in providing those supports, and then we debrief in a larger group. And we did receive really great feedback from the CALS group this session, and so that is something that we're looking to explore ways in which we may expand upon this and offer this more readily to all of you if you are interested. And then, one last thing I wanted to highlight, if you could just go to the next slide, please. Think the animations are in there, so it just shows how it aligns with our mental health framework. We do have a one-stop shop -- or that's what we've been trying to show this as, and it's our

mental health website. So, if you go to mental health.Cornell.edu at top you will see an area designated specifically for staff and faculty and we have resources that currently exist there including ways that you can support students with emergencies, urgent situations, it has various phone numbers and links and then one new thing that we are exploring -- its been something that was in existence years ago is my understanding but there was a faculty handbook that highlighted a lot of different resources that were available to you all and we are thinking through if it is helpful to revise something like this where we could have it available online as well as hard copy you wanted it in your departments or with in your offices and so I'm working with the vice provosts to identify ways that we would be able to do this but before we revise what we have we really wanted to gather feedback from faculty members themselves and so, I'm working with a vice provost to identify individuals who would be willing to provide feedback to inform the creation or the revision of such a document and how it may be helpful to all of you. And now, what I would like to do is turn it over to Dean Love, who will talk about student support and advocacy specifically. I wanted to highlight some of the existing trainings and resources, and I will now turn it over to her. And I'm not sure if Marla has joined. If she has not, I can just speak to it, so we do not hold up the agenda.

>> Unidentified Speaker: Hello, Julie?

>> Julie Edwards: Yes.

>> Unidentified Speaker: Hi. it would be wonderful -- do you feel comfortable presenting?

>> Julie Edwards: Sure. That's totally fine. I'm happy.

>> Unidentified Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

>> Julie Edwards: The Dean of Students office and Marla Love and her team they've really worked at creating referral forms for students of concern. And, I do know that there were -- I believe some changes that have been made recently, and so this form should be utilized for students experiencing noncrisis concerns, whether it's physical, psychological, or safety concerns. and you may refer them directly to our student support and advocacy services. So this terminology may be new. It was formerly called Care and Crisis Services. They've now rebranded the department in general, and this is the new link that you can use so that you would be able to go in and actually refer a student. You would select student of concern in the report drop-down, and then you would be able to put in information, and it would be received by the student support and advocacy services team with Marla and her team in general. And if you go to the next slide, I can share some of the concerning behavior examples, so if, for instance, there's someone who comes to you and they're having issues adjusting to college or making friends. If you see evidence of self-injurious behavior, if you are noticing intoxication or high-risk substance use

>> Unidentified Speaker: Hello?

>> Julie Edwards: Oh, yes? I'm sorry. I thought someone was speaking. Also, as far as just aggressive speech, if they're suicidal ideations or erratic behavior that you may be seeing in students, whether in the classroom or around campus. If there are significant changes in academic performance and you're a bit concerned just because this is out of character for the student wanting to get them connected or also if a student has a weapon and this is more of an urgent or emergent issues. So these are some of -- just examples of the ways in which you can use the referral form, and then it would go directly to student support and advocacy services so that they would be able to really respond to the incident, try and

navigate and help not only the student in general but then also if there are supports that they can provide to all of you as faculty members. And so I wanted to stop there, [INDISCERNIBLE] and I were just going to be sharing some of the overarching resources that we have available to all of you, and then I know that we were going to also open it up in the event that folks had questions or suggestions or considerations for us to explore.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. We now have time for about ten minutes of questions or comments. If you're in person, step to the front. One of the microphones. If you are online, raise your digital hand, and we'll start with online. Kathryn Caggiano.

>> Kathryn Caggiano: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation, Julie. I just had a quick question. I had just clicked through and was looking at the student of concern form, and there's one part of this form where it says involved parties and asks for sort of name and role, et cetera, and -- it's not clear whether we're supposed to be -- for example, identifying ourselves or the student of concern. So I'm wondering, one, just which is it, and two, whether that perhaps can be made a little bit more clear on the form.

>> Julie Edwards: I appreciate that, Kathryn, and it would be individuals. So if it was the student or -- you know, a student might come to you about a fellow student and so, being able to identify that individual, but I think it's helpful to know that more clarity is needed and so I'll make sure I take that back to Dean Love so that she can clarify that in the form itself.

>> Kathryn Caggiano: Okay, so we're supposed to be submitting information about the students

>> Julie Edwards: Well, you can yourself as well, so if you're the one who is noticing the behavior, but

sometimes there will be other students who come forward and so that you can also include their name there as well.

>> Kathryn Caggiano: Okay. All right. Thank you.

>> Julie Edwards: Yes, but I'll make sure to bring that to Dean Love so she can clarify that in the form itself. I appreciate you bringing That up.

>> Kathryn Caggiano: Thanks.

>> Julie Edwards: Sure.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Are there any further questions or comments? I don't see any. [INDISCERNIBLE]

>> Eve De Rosa: Hi, Julie. We get emails into the office of the Dean of Faculty where they are concerned about students, and they feel like the resources are slow to act and. I was wondering you could speak to what improvements have been made for time to treatment or time to see a doctor? If you know.

>> Julie Edwards: Oh, sure. So, meaning slow to act from a Cornell health standpoint? We have just so that everybody knows we've -- we have supplemented our in-person and telehealth within our CAPS department with also a telehealth provider called Mantra Health, and this has really helped reduce the wait times for students. The typical wait time for an initial visit is one to three days, and that's what our data is currently showing. Now it may be adjusted now with the end of the semester, so I haven't looked at it recently, but about a month ago, it was one to three days, and The other piece is that they can -- we

recognize that sometimes students based on their schedule may be offered an appointment that doesn't work for their schedule, and so we look at next available then. And so, we do really try to work with students and offer either a CAPS appointment with our providers or with our Mantra Health. And, originally we had just our after-hours care so that we had a vendor utilized for after-hours services, but this partnership with Mantra has really helped us so that we can mitigate concerns and get students in quicker than we were able to previously. And so I hope that helps answer, but -- it would be helpful if folks are experiencing issues with students being able to get in if you would be able to share that information with us so that we can look at it in real-time and then see if there are ways that we can make adjustments on our end as well.

>> Eve De Rosa: Thank you, Julie. That's perfect.

>> Julie Edwards: Sure. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, I don't see any further hands up here or online, so I think we will move on to the next agenda item. We have a pretty packed agenda, so it won't hurt to save a few minutes here. The next or of business is a faculty update on student conduct and community standards. We have two speakers for ten minutes. Christina Liang and then Karen Vicks, Followed by ten minutes of questions and comments. So, I don't know which of you will start. Christina? Perhaps?

>> Christina Liang: Sure, thank you. Hi everyone. Thank you for -- thank you to Dean La Rosa for inviting us to this afternoon's faculty senate meeting. I'll just introduce myself, and then I'll also pass it to my colleague, Karen. My name is Christina Liang And I serve as the director for the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards Care.

>>Karen Vicks: Hi, good afternoon everyone. I'm Karen Vicks. and I serve as the hearing panel chair in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards.

>> Christina Liang: So we are both here today to provide some updates about the new student conduct process and to talk a little bit about how you all might consider getting involved with the university hearing and review panel. So, we have a brief presentation, and then we'll also, of course, reserve some time for questions so whomever is helping us navigate the PowerPoint if you can advance, thank you, and I apologize in advance. I have a lot of transitions, so if you want to click twice, that will get us through the first couple points. One more time would be great. Thank you. So just a reminder for folks who might not be as familiar with the conduct process. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards is the office that's responsible for resolution of nonacademic and non-Title 9 behavioral concerns. So this would include any type of behaviors, including things like underage drinking, all the way to, you know, drug use, theft, disorderly conduct, and even things like hazing and physical assaults. And our office replaced the office of the Judicial Administrator in July of 2021, and for those of you who have been here for a few years, you may have known that office to be the JA's Office, so what folks from my team like to say now is JA no more. We've moved onto a different office, and Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards are our name. It's a mouthful, so the Student Conduct Office is a nice short version of that. And the new student code of conduct and related procedures went into effect in August of 2021, so, you know, we're in the second academic year of the new code and the new conduct office. Advance to the next slide, please. And then -- two more times. Thank you. One more time. Thank you. A little too far. Thanks. Okay. So, you know, part of reimagining how Cornell addresses and resolves student conduct issues led to our team talking about our vision and our mission, kind of the why in what we do. So, our mission here, if you don't mind clicking one more time -- think it's not

advancing properly. It is okay. You can go back one slide. Thank you. I'll just kind of talk about it. So, our mission really is we want to take proactive prevention steps to help our students make good decisions. An example of that is, you know, we now present incoming first-year students at orientation, and we talk about community expectations in that presentation, talk about the impact of risky decision-making and how that impacts themselves and our larger community. Part of that is also we want to use a transparent, fair, and equitable student conduct process so that our students feel like, you know, the process is not happening to them but rather that they can see the process as an opportunity to grow and learn from their mistakes. Also part of this is, you know, we also consider, envisioned creating an educational and restorative student experience for our students so that they can learn about both community standards and also their personal growth and development. The next slide, please. You've all seen this slide a couple of times at this point, but this is the conduct team, so, very grateful that we've expanded our team, acknowledging that we added a whole bunch of residential spaces, right? On north campus and then also, of course, the student code of conduct now applies to our social fraternities and sororities as well. Next slide, please, thank you, and if you advance a couple, then -- yep. One more. Thank you. Too far. I'm sorry. This is a learning moment for me. Next time I'll just eliminate some of these transitions. So, the new code of conduct, I think, some highlights about changes is that it really creates an opportunity for my team to facilitate some prevention-based workshops and trainings. We like to say, as a team if we're invited to the space to talk about community expectations and help students make better decisions, we're happy to come and present on that. We really departed from this like formal and punitive conduct process. We're trying to use more educational and equitable sanctions that involve the student's input recognizing that when a student is involved in the decision-making process, they tend to have more buy-in, and we're also providing robust training for our university hearing and review panel, and that's a big component of Karen's role, and that's a new role that's part of our team, so we're really excited to be able to do that as well. Next slide, please. I wanted to share a

couple of excerpts from student reflective exercises, and so there will be three examples on this page, and I'll just kind of share them briefly as these are examples of things that students have shared as part of their, you know, reflection papers or the things that they have said in the conduct process. So they've talked about how this experience has really taught them to always consider the reasons for why they're making decisions and then to really weigh the risks and rewards and the compromises that they're making for their goals and why they're not -- why they're making them. And students have said, you know, in the future, I will put my opportunity for success first and weigh any decisions that I make with informed ideas about my own motivations and consequences, so, really, an example of a person applying what they learned in this process to future decision making. Thank you. Other students have also said by hearing the interpersonal effects of my poor decision as opposed to just the minimal financial dent that it has caused. I come away with a greater sense of responsibility for how I can support my community. So emphasizing the personal growth but also how it impacts the broader community. And finally, this is very important, and I want to make sure I'm making a positive impact on my community and make up for the decisions that I did in the past. So, it's -- it's great to see that students are reflecting on moving forward, how their behavior might change for the positive. Next slide, please. So, couple of themes I'll just share from our first year under the new conduct process is we are seeing reports involving behaviors that are kind of consistent with what you would see in a college environment. Some risky drinking, poor decision-making that's closely connected to that, things of that nature. We are seeing riskier behavior compared to precovid-19, and so I think there's a sense of students wanting to make up for lost time, right? Engage in riskier behaviors, not necessarily having role models from the previous two years to kind of use as a model for them. There has been a rise in reports of cyberbullying harassment behavior, and so that's definitely a trend that we're seeing as well, and there should be one more on this slide. Thank you. There's just been more reports in our newer residential communities, right? These are beautiful, shiny new buildings, and so, lots of opportunities for

students to engage in those spaces, and so we're seeing a rise in those reports as well. And with that, I'm actually going to turn it over to Karen, who is going to talk to you all a little bit about how faculty should consider joining our university hearing and review panel. It is a great opportunity, so I'll kick it over to you.

>> Karen Vicks: Thank you, Christina. So, if what you've heard so far sounds like something you might be interested in being a part of, and you share some of those values of an educational and restorative student experience, then I invite you to consider joining the university hearing and review panel. Next slide. So you may be wondering what exactly is the university hearing review panel? So, there are 55 -- 55 people who are a part of the university hearing review panel. There's 15 staff, 15 faculty, and 25 students. We resolve formal complaints that are reported to the Student Conduct and Community Standards Office. Participants and members of the university hearing review panel participate in paid approved monthly trainings so, the President's Advisory Committee on Diversity and Equity and, just an example of some of the -- some of the trainings that would include, you know, some introductory, so you don't need to have any experience or any background in this type of work. So this is certainly an introductory Training for those who have never done it. We've done trainings on identity and implicit bias and how you may show up as a decision-maker, work with group behavior sanctions and remedies, and of course, some practical applications in there as well. The term for participants and members is two years. It is staggered, so we had a group that joined last year and -- a fresh group that joined this year, so it's about half and half. Some will -- on their term will be up in May, and then we have some who have a two-year term, so we're consistently looking for new members. And then, one faculty member is selected to seven as a review panel chair for appeals. That is -- that person would be overseeing a three-person panel for appeals on some of the decisions that the original panel makes. So, this -- the appeals panel chair would basically oversee one faculty, one student, and one staff in making

those decisions. Next slide. So, if -- if you know we're looking for some folks who share some of the same values -- the educational and restorative values. There are -- I think there's a couple more if you could just keep clicking. Yep. So, I want to -- I want to let you know that I as the hearing panel chair. I manage the administrative process part of it. We have processes and procedures that we have to follow according to the student code of conduct procedures, so as chair, I manage those administrative pieces. but I want to let you know this is a great opportunity to -- to work with students and staff outside of the classroom, to be a part of just this brand new approach that we're using to address student behavior. If - the valuable insight that you get working with students -- not just the ones on the panel with you but also the students that are involved in the process too and really getting a different perspective outside of the classroom which is really just wonderful to be able to participate and engage with them as well. So I invite you to be on the lookout. We'll be doing a reach out, so if you're interested in that, you know, I would certainly be open to hearing, you know, you can certainly reach out and contact me. I do want to acknowledge that we do have -- on our meeting today, we do have some people who served as chair and who have served on the hearing panel in the past. If you have done that, you are still welcome to join and be a part of it this year too. There's my plug, but I invite you to, you know, to continue the work and to join us, so I think we're ready for some questions? Oh, there's our contact information if you are interested in reaching out.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have some time for questions or comments. I'm looking for digital hands. If you are in person, just step to the front of the room. I see Thomas Overton online.

>> Thomas Overton: Hi Christina, hi Karen. So, for the rest of the group, I spent several years as a hearing board chair in the former previous procedures. I was just curious if you could comment on how the tenor of the proceedings is changed. You know, cause certainly used to be quite contentious at

times and pretty difficult to work through in a number cases. I was just curious how you proceed with the new procedures are going relative to, again, the tenor of them.

>> Christina Liang: Yeah, thank you for that question, Tom. I can -- I almost slipped and said Chair Overton because I've said that so many times, so -- first, thank you so much for your service for all those years. You know, I think one of the things that our community explored in the process of revising the code of conduct is acknowledgment that there were a lot of adversarial components, and, you know, while, you know, for us, I think that new student code of conduct focuses on an opportunity to educate students and not focus heavily on pointing fingers and saying, you know, you did something wrong, right? For us, it's about moving forward and acknowledging that humans are not perfect. Students are not perfect, but so long as we can be open to learning and growing from this opportunity, then there is benefit and growth from that. I'll kind of turn it over to Karen to talk a little bit more about the hearing process for sure, but I would say one of the really unique components about the new code is the explicit use of restorative justice in a lot of our resolution methods, and so we don't utilize the hearing process and the formal complaint process often. There are sometimes when it does happen, but we utilize things like meditation, direct referrals to encourage students to think about taking a decision-making class that is generally just a good practical skill, right? Outside of what happened in this particular situation, we use a lot of reflective exercises, we encourage students to engage in conflict resolution, and de-escalating conflict that -- and all that can happen outside of the hearing process, and that's been a great change of pace and change of tone for us.

>> Thomas Overton: Okay. That's great. Thank you.

>> Karen Vick: And I would add to, we have to acknowledge the human component of all of this, right?

There is -- you know, with -- with our students, I spend a lot of time working with the parties involved. I spend a lot of time working with the hearing panel and building that community and wanting to -- you know, be representative of our community and -- and want to honor that too, so, I -- I think that's something that has been an additional feature with this new program as well.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an in-person speaker, then we'll go to Paul Ginsparg after that and identify yourself, please.

>> Ashleigh Newman: Yeah. Ashleigh Newman. College of Veterinary Medicine at large. My question was brief and just a point of clarification of if this office applies to not only undergraduate students but also graduate students, professional students, as well and if faculty at all levels would also be eligible to serve? Thanks.

>> Christina Liang: Yes, and yes.

>> Karen Vick: And I will add we have some great representation from the school of Veterinary Medicine. We have some staff members that are involved. We have some students that are involved and have been wonderful wonderful participants, so I encourage -- I encourage faculty as well. It's amazing.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Paul Ginsparg, online.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Thanks. I was curious about one thing that was on your slide. I apologize if I -- if you elaborated on it and I missed. You had something about risky behavior having increased since pre-

pandemic and risky behavior may be some code word for something that you're familiar with, but I'm curious to know what it refers to and, you know, you said students were trying to catch up for lost time and what that means as well.

>> Christina Liang: Sure. Absolutely. Happy to comment on that. I think, you know, thinking about our college students and the college-age students in their developmental phases. They are looking to the collegiate experience to explore and try new things, right? And especially for the two years where students were largely being extra careful about, you know, things like socializing and partying and engaging in those types of behaviors. There's a component of wanting to kind of catch up, and so, what I mean by that is we might see higher bac levels, right? Blood alcohol content levels when students are evaluated and needing to be transported to the hospital because they're -- not knowing how to engage with alcohol in a way that is safe, and so that's what I meant by that. I hope that's helpful.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Yeah. I -- ordinarily, going to parties wouldn't necessarily constitute risky behavior, but is there more than just alcohol that's being abused?

>> Christina Liang: I think with everybody institution, there is potential drug use as well, but I would say largely our -- my office experiences the reports are coming to us largely stem from alcohol use and how it might affect decision making.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Okay. Thank you.

>> Christina Liang: Yeah.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Are there any other questions or comments? We have a few more minutes. If you have one, raise your hand or step up. Otherwise, not seeing any, we'll go to the next agenda item. This is the S.C. Johnson College of Business Tenure Clock Harmonization, academic freedom, and professional status of the faculty committee update, and we'll have two speakers initially. Suzanne Shu for ten minutes, who I believe is here in person, and then Tracy Stokol for five minutes, followed by 15 minutes for questions and answers. So, Suzanne, why don't you start?

>>Suzanne Shu: Thank you. Is it working? Okay. My thanks to the senate for having us here today. I am here serving as the Dean of Faculty and Research for the SC Johnson College. I'm also a professor in the marketing area at the Dyson school affiliated with [INDISCERNIBLE] the Dyson school. so here to talk about the tenure clock harmonization. Thank you. so, a little bit of background. In 2012, the Johnson School graduate school, which at that time was not yet part of the new College of Business, came and requested in front of the senate an extension of their tenure clock from six years to eight years, and that was driven by competitive pressure as well as some other reasons and they did successfully get that change. It was changed with approval of the trustees as well, and so, for the last ten years, the Johnson school has been under an eight-year clock for our faculty. At the same time, once the College of Business was founded and brought together the three schools of Johnson, Nolan, and Dyson, Nolan and Dyson were still under a six-year clock for their faculty. So we have this discrepancy within the college right now that some faculty are on an eight-year clock or so, and some faculty are on six-year clock, and that was a little bit of the concern that was prompting this. So why are we bringing this to you now? The college has been around for a few years now at this point. Why is it suddenly an issue that we're asking for this consideration of an eight-year clock for all of our faculty? We go to the next slide. In 2021, Dean Andrew Karolyi, when he took over as the new Dean for the College of Business, was the leader of a task force co-led with the provost to look at the structure and a lot of the processes within the college and at

that time there were about 40 recommendations that were put forward including some restructuring of how the faculty sat within the college and one of the recommendations endorsed by the provost was to look at this question of tenure clock harmonization and so that's part of why it's coming forward. But the other big thing that came out of that task force and the restructuring was a shift in how faculty sit within our college, and so, if we could go to the next slide, the way to think about it right now is that our faculty now under our new structure that just took over on July 1st sit within seven or eight disciplinary areas and so, for example, we have faculty in things like accounting or finance or marketing or strategy that sit within that disciplinary area and teach across our three schools. So faculty are still affiliated with a school which is where the majority of their teaching happens, and yet we have faculty that teach in multiple schools at the same time. What is the implication of this for the tenure clock issue? Well, if you think about one of our disciplinary areas like finance. You can think of this as similar to a department in other parts of campus. When we are hiring new faculty into finance, let's say that we go out onto the market like we are this year, hiring some new faculty from a pool of rookies who have just completed Ph.D.'s in other business colleges, and we hire one finance faculty member as assistant professor to affiliate with the Johnson school and another faculty to affiliate, with the Dyson school they're effectively teaching the same courses, they come from the same pool of candidates, they're doing the same research and have the same expectations and the tenured vote will be of the other faculty in their area which would be the other finance faculty and, yet, the one affiliated with the Johnson school has an eight-year clock and the one affiliated with the Dyson school would have a six-year clock. And that's the piece that concerns us is that there's sort of an inequity and an -- inability to compare those two faculty members when they're coming up for tenure because they're living under different expectations in terms of the time that they have, even though everything else they're doing is essentially the same. And that's part of what is motivating us to come forward now and ask for this to be reconsidered. We would like all of our faculty to be following the same basic tenured clock for evaluation. So, if we go to the next

slide, the proposal to move forward. Dean Karolyi appointed a committee led by one of our faculty, Sachin Gupta, and with representation from all three of the schools. So faculty who had been tenured under either six-year or eight-year clock who had been experiencing those different tenure clocks and, so, equal representation across our three schools. That committee looked at all of the options. They spent a lot of time considering the pros and cons of a six-year clock versus an eight-year clock. They included information from peer schools, and I'll mention some of that in just a moment. They also did a lot of town halls with our existing faculty and surveys to try to understand the different tradeoffs that our faculty saw on what was preferable. They also looked at some historical data on tenured cases and delivered a very comprehensive report to us in April, which I think was provided as [INDISCERNIBLE]. It was then a vote of faculty, an official vote in faculty held in September. Dean Karolyi and I have also gone and presented to the provost council, to the academic dean's meeting, and to the AFPSF, which you'll hear Tracy present in a moment, that report, and the UFC. So we sort of have been going around and getting feedback all over campus on this particular proposal. So, just to take you through a few of the things that are part of our consideration and also what happened to that faculty vote. We can go to the next slide. For background, part of the original recommendation ten years ago, why the Johnson school wanted to go to an eight-year clock was very much driven by competitive nature of our peer business schools. And, you see right here, this is an updated set of data for the peer business schools that was put together for this report, and you'll see that a lot of those other top schools have more than six years as a tenure clock for their business school faculty. The reasons for that are varied but for our purposes, what we're concerned about is that we are hiring against those schools, and our faculty are being drawn away by some of those other schools, and so, it's a competitive matter for us that to get good faculty and to keep good faculty and to retain them we need to be competitive in terms of our tenure clock. And in the business school environment, as we talked to any junior faculty member whose assistant professor on the tenure track, they had told you longer is better. That's what they want is a

longer tenure clock, so it's very difficult for us to compete against these other schools that have longer clocks. And you see that the other thing that we highlighted on this is other universities, sometimes the business school or the business college is out of sync with the rest of the university by having that longer clock. So, just to let you know, that is sort of a typical thing that happens. We go to the next slide. The recommendations that came out of the committee report, the first recommendation was the really big one which was to convert everybody over to an eight-year clock, and I'll show you some of the pros and cons for that in just a moment. What the report was less clear on was the midterm review timing. Should it be a after four years or after five years? Again with the peer schools, there's a little bit of difference on which pattern those schools choose. The other recommendation that came out of the report was that whatever the timing of this midterm review was, for our assistant professors, it should be very comprehensive and thoughtful and not just be sort of an automatic pass-through to continue with the appointment but to really think about where does this faculty member stand? If they are not on track for tenure, we'll need to be honest about that at that point in time because eight years is a long time to have someone who is perhaps not being productive. On the other hand, if we have a faculty member who is really a superstar and doing fantastic, and we have some risk of them being poached away from another university, then we need to consider options like promotion to associate professor [INDISCERNIBLE] tenure at that midterm review, so that was part of the set of recommendation that came out of the report. something that we're still trying to figure out what the best option there is, what, you know, for example, what is the split of faculty that would get the associate without tenure verse just assistant and so forth. So we realize that there's some tradeoffs there, but really the big one is that eight-year tenure clock. If we go to the next slide, the list of pros and cons for that eight-year tenure clock -- I don't want to read all of these. They're documented very well in the report from the committee, but just to highlight a few of them. Numbers 2 and 3 are all about retention, and that's something that we take very seriously. When we go back and look at the numbers, especially for women

faculty, which have a difficult time, to be honest, in business schools and business colleges in terms of -- getting tenure and staying in the pipeline. This longer clock really helps them out. We get a lot of feedback from them. This is something that's very important to them and becomes a real retention issue that if we don't have a longer clock, they will leave us for other top business schools that do have longer clocks. The midterm review, as you see, shows up in there in a few spots. The other aspect, number five, hiring rookie faculty. We are doing a lot of hiring right now. As I meet with those rookie faculty to talk about coming to Cornell, the question of tenure clock comes up in almost every conversation, and they are pretty unanimous about the fact that they all prefer a longer clock, and that is something that they are really paying attention to when we're trying to recruit them. And then number seven is another one that I think is really important here. Since we are in this college with the three schools, and we have one school with an eight-year clock and two schools with six-year clocks, and those faculty are all doing very similar work publishing in similar outlets in same discipline, doing similar teaching, and we -- we feel the need to harmonize, the question is which direction do we harmonize? We are very concerned if we ask the Johnson school to convert to a six-year clock, it sends a really negative signal to our competitive set, compared to -- I showed you all those peer schools, versus if we move the Nolan and Dyson schools up to an eight-year clock that sends a positive signal of who Cornell wants to be as a business and who our competition is. and so the last slides we put up. If you can, switch. Just the results of the faculty vote. I wanted to show you those. This was the official vote -- faculty vote that we took in September. We have 149 tenured or tenure-track faculty in our college. About 70% of them responded. Pretty representative in terms of area and school. The vote on the eight-year clock very positive. About 80% were in favor of that eight-year clock. If we break that down by school, you'll see that Johnson is overwhelmingly positive. 93%. Of course, they've had that eight-year clock for ten years now. They really like it. Dyson also positive. Nolan still majority support but not quite as strong as Johnson. The timing of the midterm review I mentioned is something that still is sort of unsure to us. We see pretty equal split between

faculty who like it after four years versus after five years, and so, that's something we're still sort of thinking about, but the eight-year clock is certainly the big piece that we're looking for feedback on. So I'll stop there. Thank you very much.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, and is Tracy online? Somewhere if can you unmute yourself?

>>Tracy Stokol: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Tracy Stokol: Great. Thank you. So, I represent the Committee of Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty, and we reviewed the original document provided to us from the College of Business, and then we met with Dean Shu, and we had a great discussion, and Dean Shu provided us with additional information which we incorporated in our final report. So, essentially, we evaluated the proposal, and we think it is really important to standardize and harmonize the clock in the College of Business for the reasons that Dean Shu articulated in that faculty pretty much performing the same job are now evaluated on difficult clocks. Although the eight-year clock is much longer than the rest of the university, it is in line with a lot of the College of Businesses which are seven to eight years in those that were surveyed by Dean Shu, and that -- that would fit within the expectations of a College of Business and as Dean Shu indicated most of the new faculty that are hired into the College of Business are hired into the college and don't fit within the classic school structure but may actually span multiple departments or, sorry, multiple colleges -- schools within the College of Business. So, we thought that there were several pros to the proposal in that they do want to harmonize it and that the majority of the faculty were surveyed in a more recent survey which, was 79%, as indicated by Dean Shu, preferred the

eight-year to the six-year clock and that the pretend year assistant professors would be given the option to stay on their current clock under the current proposal so they could choose to go to a six -- stay on their six-year clock or go to an eight-year clock if they're currently in the Dyson or the Nolan school. So, what were some of the issues that we raised? We felt that the issue that the tenure vote would be more informed because there is then eight years or at least a seven-year time for evaluation for that faculty where the faculty member may have accumulated more citations, and that would be inform better faculty vote for tenure was not unique to the College of Business and actually affects a lot of other colleges and units at the university. And so, we didn't think that was the strongest argument; however, again, we understand that is part of the culture of the College of Business and that the majority of faculty, including many of the assistant professors who were most impacted by the change, preferred an eight-year versus a six-year clock. We were concerned about the female faculty partly female faculty had more of an inclination because of family concerns or family desires to request extensions on an already extended clock compared to the rest of the university. Dean Shu provided Us with information showing that both male and female faculty can request parental leave and tenure clock extensions, and interestingly more male and female faculty have actually requested these tenure clock extensions, and that may be because many of the female faculty haven't had families. So, and -- data provided by Dean Shu indicates that the extension of the clock may actually facilitate tenure because the percentage of women getting tenure within the College of Business -- so the different units in the College of Business were quite low, concerningly low and since the Dyson -- no, the Johnson graduate school has changed to an eight-year clock that promotion has increased from around -- I think 20% to closer to 60% for women receiving favorable promotions and tenure. The effect of the extension of the clock on minorities was not addressed, and that's because minorities represent a fairly low promotion of the college and are primarily Asian. Our committee was most concerned about the voting results from the Nolan school, where only 61% of the faculty voted in favor of it, and when discussed with Dean Shu, she indicated that

comparative peer schools actually mostly have a six-year clock but data provided by Dean Shu showing that when faculty have left Cornell to go to other schools, they're not going to comparative schools to the Nolan school of hotel management but are really going to the College of Businesses -- actually going to a more extended clock anyway. So, the last point I wanted to make is that we felt that even though -- if faculty are not given the option of early promotion to associate professor without tenure that it may send a negative signal to faculty that are still performing acceptably but that because most of the peer schools seem to offer that option, we felt that should be a consideration at the College of Business if they adopt the eight-year clock

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We can't hear you.

>>Tracy Stokol: You can't hear me?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, you're back.

>>Tracy Stokol: Okay. Great. Sorry. sometimes I lose Internet here. And we felt that may place Cornell at a disadvantage if early promotion to an associate professor without tenure was offered. So to summarize everything, we felt that it is important to provide uniform expectations for tenure regardless of whether it's a six or eight-year clock, and we acknowledge that the vast majority of faculty prefer the eight-year clock, and that's it for me and hopefully, I didn't go overtime.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: It is okay. We have some slack time. Are we ready for questions and comments? If you're in person -- step up to one of the two microphones. If you're online, raise your digital hand. And I'll wait a few minutes, seconds, not minutes. We have someone in person, I think. So, just identify

yourself and --

>>Tom Fox: Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics. Appointed in CALS. So, if I understand this correctly, there will be faculty members with CALS appointments in Dyson who will who are on a different tenure clock from the rest of the faculty members in CALS, which, personally, I don't see as a problem at all. The reason I'm asking the question is folks in my department years ago talked about how it would be better to have a longer tenure clock, and we were essentially told well, you just didn't do it. It has to be uniform in the college, so does this actually open the door for other units to make similar extension requests? Is my question.

>>Suzanne Shu: It's a wonderful question, and as a faculty member in Dyson, I'm very appreciative of the fact that [INDISCERNIBLE] we welcome the fact that we have that history. But you're right; a faculty member coming into Dyson would now have an eight-year clock under this arrangement. Whether this is something that other units should consider, I think that's outside of my realm of expertise. I think it's a fair question but not one that I can answer today.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Tracy, do you have any responses to that question?

>>Tracy Stokol: Yes, so I will say that we didn't discuss that in the committee, and I think largely because we felt that this would not be something that most of the colleges would go for or other units in the university, but, if we're wrong on that aspect and this is creating precedent for a vast move by colleges they would have to justify pretty well by showing that peer schools do the same thing so that Cornell would remain competitive and I know for my college at any rate that would make us very uncompetitive, and we have a hard time competing anyway, so I think that there's a lot of colleges, I

know, that would not want to move to eight clock so don't foresee this becoming a wave of requests to the provost to change the clock. It would have to be a -- adopted by the board of trustees, so, at this stage, it is fairly unique to the College of Business and the business school initially.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I'm not seeing any other hands raised, so, at this point, I think we will move on to the next agenda item, which is announcements, updates from the Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa and Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean of Faculty. So you have lots of time. Talk slowly. Dropped things. That helps.

>>Eve De Rosa: Hello, everybody. Thank you for attending. So, first thing that I would want to announce is we have sad news that Cynthia Robinson, who has been supporting the Cornell academics and professors emeriti committee, executive committee, and the work of all the retirees and the faculty, and the RTE is retiring after 40 years at Cornell which is phenomenal. Kate -- the committee is actually one that existed 40 years, so she's been here from the very beginning, not in that role, but the longevity is fairly amazing, and also the work that Cynthia did. She just gave all parts of herself to this job. It is been an honor to work with her. She is amazing. So, it is really sad news for the office of the Dean of Faculty. She's been there for 13 years, and so we will miss her. We will miss her vivacious energy, and this is a picture I think Cindy will probably cringe at this, but we thought it was pretty funny to include a picture of when the day that she received the president's award for employee excellence. She is considered a game changer by the university, by the president, and she really is. supported the emeriti and the retirees through the pandemic she was a person who, at a time, that was really difficult to get vaccinations, and she was really looking all across the state, getting people to vaccinations. Still makes me emotional. So, we will miss you, Cindy, and thank you. Next slide, please. And I have to say, Dean Shu, this is probably the least contentious presentation for the business school, so thank you for

efficient presentation; very thorough. As Dean Shu was presenting to the AFPFC, the UFC, some phenomenal questions from both of those committees and the business school would go back and collect the data and really has been able to put forward a compelling proposal. So, I would now want to -- mind or -- those of you who did not see this article. The president has a new task force on undergraduate admissions, and, we had a -- under Charlie Van Loan when he was the Dean of Faculty, he created an advisory committee on undergraduate admissions at the university as senate committee, advisory committee. And, so, once the president made this choice to have her own task force on admissions, we wanted to make sure we had faculty representation on that, and it is very good representation. There was an article in the Chronicle. You can see who is on it, and it is a growing committee but only by one or two more, so essentially, it is the full committee, and we have nine faculty members, and one of the faculty members is a senator representative on the university faculty committee, one is a nonsenator representative on the university faculty committee, and Alan Mathios is the nonsenator role, but also he was the chair of the faculty senate's committee advisory committee on admissions. That group, if you looked at their annual report, said Charlie convened this group just before he stepped down from Dean of Faculty, and that group met three or four times. You can look at their annual report, and every time they met with vice president of admissions and enrollment John Burdick, and so they are extremely well versed on all of the complexities and nuances that are involved in the decisions about admissions, and so our committee and our senate is sending great representatives, and I think very valuable representatives to the conversation at the university level. And so, I also wanted to mention that we have good representation across the colleges, and so you can see that six of our colleagues that admit undergraduates are present in the committee and the task force. Next slide, please. So, actually, we're using -- we have ample time so we can actually even open the discussion up even more, but we have in the good of the order, Carl Franck today is going to present a pending resolution that came to the UFC and will be on our first senate meeting in the new year. And, so, that's

the academic freedom and Cornell programs in China and other parts of the global Hubs system, so they'll present today, and it's an opportunity for more faculty to become a part and sponsor, co-sponsor this resolution. Another resolution that's coming to the senate in the very first meeting is the need for gynecologist medical doctor in Cornell health. They do not have one, and this is a resolution that has passed the student assembly. The graduate and professional student assembly has been under consideration and may even, at this point, have passed in the university assembly. So we're the only assembly that has not considered it, and so we'll bring it to the senate in the new year. Other resolutions that I anticipate, and I know there will be more, but at moment we will be looking at --and we brought this topic already, the reactivation of the Research Scientist title for researchers that are contract-based researchers at Cornell. So part of our RTE faculty. And the complexity with this and why it hasn't come is that we have to create a new description of Research Scientist and also think through the implications of if we do this, this is a title that was taken away from faculty in the departments and units where you can get tenure. If we do this outside of the research divisions, then we have to first consider the people who currently have the title and how they -- either meet or don't meet the new description of this title, and also the implications for our RTE that would like to have the title. And, I think there's a good energy behind it, and it'll happen. So the current proposal will have Research Associate and Senior Research Associate, Research Scientist and Senior Research Scientist, and then research professor at the three stages. So that looks like where we're going with that. Another anticipated resolution, so the physical education committee has been meeting. They have been meeting with all elements, their Dean of Athletics, which is -- we have a new Dean of Athletics, the provost you'll sort -- responsibility of athletics and then of source the committee itself, the senate committee. And it's been a very contentious and complicated conversation about whether we should eliminate the swim test, and so, I believe they've come to resolution, and it'll be writing it over the winter, and we should expect it in the early spring. And the RTE task force that Charlie convened in his final year as Dean of

Faculty is still going strong, and in fact, we're meeting on Friday, and we're still working through sort of issues of representation, equity, and inclusion, and we'll formalize that in some way also for this spring, and I think that is it. Chelsea, I don't know if you want to speak to what you're doing at the -- so we are having a cocktail party afterward, so those of you who are on Zoom land, please feel free to come down and physically be in person, have a drink and some food with us, and I don't know, Chelsea if you want to speak to -- so we're really trying to increase our faculty engagement, and so, Chelsea has come up with an innovative sort of way to get our senators to think of themselves as serving some of our senate committees.

>>Chelsea Specht: Innovative bribe? Yeah, so, again, if anyone from Zoom land is on campus and can come here and then obviously everybody here -- we're going to have a room outside of here to have a celebration, cocktail hour after the senate meeting is over. And, you will be able to -- one of the things that I have noticed is that we just met with the chairs of all of the senate committees today, had a really nice lunch, and one of the things that was so amazing is to hear the chairs talk about their committee work and each one of them said I'm on the best committee because we get to do this. Like, well, I'm on the best committee because we get to do this. Well, I'm on the best committee, and they -- were so inspirational the way they talked about the work that they have accomplished. And they're not all faculty senate members, right? They're just members that are parts of these committees, but you all, as members of the faculty senate, can also serve on these senate committees, and it can really increase your understanding of the breadth of work that is done and also enable you to be on one of these best committees, to be on this -- this includes A.D. White -- selecting who our A.D. White visitors and includes selecting what music choices we get to listen to through our amazing concert series, as well as impacting some of the most important work that we do with our -- with fellow faculty, with research, with graduate students, and undergraduate students. So, this is an opportunity for you to sign up for

one of these committees. There's information about each of the committees and what they do, and you will get the opportunity to take a piece of paper, put your name on it, let us know which committee you would like to be part of, and then put your name into a little bag. Is it a bag, Jill? It's a basket. Into a basket. After we get a number of names in that basket, we will then start pulling those names, and we have some beautiful Cornell swag that you will then get to win, but you can only win if you put your name in the basket and you can only put your name in the basket if you want to be on one of the committees which are all the best committees to be on so yes. [INDISCERNIBLE] well, that is a very good point. My sense is what you should do is let us know what committee you're already on and then let us know if there's any other committee that you might also want to be part of or -- cause we want you to be happy where you are or if you want to re-up to be on this committee just let us know now. you can also say -- actually, you know, I'm kind of done, but I am on this committee, so you get to put your name. I think you should get to put your name if you are already on a committee. So thank you very much.

>>Eve De Rosa: So we have a number of members of the university faculty committee who are here and online, so we have a few minutes for questions if needed or wanted, and then I think we'll move on. Okay. Great. So, we will then have Carl come on up. We'll start the good of the order, and Carl will present this new resolution, and then we have time for discussion, and then maybe we'll end early today and start our holidays soon.

>>Carl Franck: Thanks very much. I'm Carl Franck from Physics. Jill is [INDISCERNIBLE] resolution. So, we'll be showing you, and I'm going to ask you to just take a look at it and read it. We'll have a -- brief resolution, but it's posted on [INDISCERNIBLE] explain is on the pending website. So, the border is here. What I mean by that is the international border is right where we stand here. And flawed people can do

the right thing. I'm exhibit A of that. This week was a crazy time. I was engaged in promoting This resolution and did some pretty dumb things. I want to thank Eve for classy reactions that gave me a chance to talk to you about this. Also, I want to explain I'm not an originator of this resolution, but as soon as I heard about it, I knew it was something that we really needed, and I really -- it's an honor to say something about it. Also, I'm -- as we speak, more people are joining on as sponsors, so, as I show here, resolution has words about Cornell's programs in various places -- international programs with a special emphasis on China. Can I have the next slide, please? Jump to the next slide? Thanks. Sorry. The second [INDISCERNIBLE] okay. So, the point is here is the question of how a concern has come up in this -- and it's a question of how Cornell looks upon itself in the world. We have some fantastic arrangements with around the world and -- in the sense that we bring people here. We have a global reach. We get educated, we learn from them, and they go back out. [INDISCERNIBLE], but I'm reminds of something that my wife and I learned about last week. We went to the lecture by Melissa Moore, who is one of the chiefs of Moderna. and she had explained to us that d in a sense, we can thank our lives -- a lot of us can thank our lives to the fact that very, very quickly the Wuhan virus got sequenced and the China -- and the data was posted by Chinese scientists that allowed the -- the Moderna and Pfizer vaccines to immediately get to work on doing something that would absolutely wonderful and historically life-saving so in that sense, she might as well have been in Wuhan when you got that sequence. What I mean is that the data was presented instantly around the world, life-saving help that allows us to get a vaccine. At the same time, there's a lot of things that are going on that are very disturbing in the world. The war in Ukraine, the behavior of Saudi Arabia, at the same time, there's optimism in Iran and -- the heroic efforts in favor of human rights. These are tremendous developments, but the United States doesn't always do the right thing, and that's my point about doing the flawed things. I just mentioned -- I just remember hearing about a wonderful couple that fled from Russia. Husband and wife. They were physicians. They showed up on our southern border, and they were

thrown into despicable camps under despicable conditions, and this is the kind of thing that a lot of people who are less attractive couples than this freedom-loving couple from Russia get thrown into. Folks from Central America, for example. So what is our reaction to all this? As you know, in many cases, it is not our -- my problem, you just go about doing what we need to do and carry on. But there's been a tradition at Cornell of doing -- of looking beyond what's -- our immediate interest in the future. I want to circle back to something that happened lots of years ago that had a lot to do -- that -- that connected to Cornell to China. It was a time when I was walking decades ago past Bartels Hall, and there was a fantastic array of satellite dishes. The way you get the news out in those days. It was there because Frank Rhodes, our president, had gotten ahead of the U.S. State Department in a matter of foreign policy. Just like the Joe Biden got ahead of Barack Obama in gay marriage. it was because the former president of Taiwan was giving a keynote address at his alumni union, and that happened to be here at Cornell. So [INDISCERNIBLE] said to me, Cornell -- Frank got a big donation out of that, but I don't think that's what's happening there. I think this is a matter of principle. We began our meeting with -- you're reading -- of a -- a statement of principle regarding a Native Americans here, and what I'm offering to you today is this -- what I think is a beautifully succinct resolution. It really gets right to the heart of the matter. A couple of springs ago, when we tied ourselves here in the senate in knots trying to address this issue of international relations of China with regards to a shared program, we now have a chance to do it again. Now the important point I want to make is that when you're dealing with an autocracy, any institution worth a darn is going to be an arm of that autocracy, so we're working with the Chinese government, so what this resolution is about is very simple, and you can read it and if I can get to the next slide, please? These are the co-sponsors, and growing as we go along and if. I can have the next slide one more time? You can find out what's going on about this, and we hope very much that you'll take a look at this resolution that -- hope you'll debate it. We're having fierce debates in my department, but importantly I hope you'll support it because I think that it's really needs to get done. So the

[INDISCERNIBLE] I try to offer examples of how we move along clumsily. My case in point but at the end of it all -- despite our foibles, we can get to a better place and without being pretentious about it and make this wonderful -- and make this wonderful solution -- institution that I'm so lucky to belong to better together. Thank you for your time.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So, Eve, do we want to take questions and comments or -- okay.

>>Eve De Rosa: Sure, since we have time, we can take any questions or comments and I did forget to say sorry, Carl; we will send this resolution to the committee for academic policies and procedures. The chair of that committee sits on the international council, so we can also do what we did like we did with Tracy, giving a review, a committee review of the proposal along with the co-sponsors in the next senate meeting. So I just want -- I meant to mention that. But, please, anyone online or in person.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I think we are done and ready to adjourn. See you next semester. Or -- in the adjacent room for a party if you're here.

[End of transcript]