Faculty Senate
March 8, 2023

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Professor Emeritus in architecture and the speaker of this august body. We start with a land acknowledgment. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. The meeting is called to order. Our first order of business is the approval of the minutes from the February 15th, 2023, meeting by unanimous consent. This is minutes that have been posted verbatim online. If there are any corrections, I think they would be in the form of typos. Please just bring them to the attention of the dean of faculty, and we will move on to the next order of business, which is an introduction presentation of the Cornell University Library. Elaine Westbrooks is the University librarian. That's five minutes.

>> Elaine Westbrooks: Thank you. As indicated, my name is Elaine Westbrooks, I'm a Carl A. Kroch University librarian. and I have been at Cornell for about eight months. And I'm a boomerang. I used to be here 15 years ago, and I came back for the lovely weather that we have here in Ithaca. Next slide, please. So I want to give you a really quick overview of what the core principles and the things that libraries do. The first thing is that we preserve history and culture for future generations, particularly Cornell University history and culture. Next slide. And this is just the handwriting of Ezra Cornell. You often hear "any person, any study." The reason we know that is because of Cornell archives. And it's our job to preserve what Ezra Cornell actually said. We have lots of wonderful things he said other than "any person, any study." Next slide, please. The second thing we do is we build the collections for future generations of scholars. Not just for scholars today, but scholars for future generations. And this is an important part of our mission. This is what most people expect libraries to do. Next slide. One of the ways it's manifested is our collection of journals and databases that we license for the entire campus. And this is something we're going to talk about in the second part of my presentation. Next slide. There's an example of one of our amazing collections. This is from our Persuasive Maps collection. And I think this is from roughly 1919. And this is a map about women suffrage. And again, just like it sounds, it's a collection designed to persuade the readers. Next slide. The third thing we do is we teach and facilitate scholarship with a variety of services. But we create services that are not available anywhere else in the University. Next slide. This is an example of one of the services that I think is one of our most impressive. We call it Evidence Synthesis. And this is a service that any student, any faculty member, any graduate student can use to better do research. And that means register protocols, that means finding the right articles to do your paper, that means the actual synthesis of the work that you need to write the best possible paper. Next slide, please. Another thing we do is we deliver core literacies. That includes information literacy so students understand good information from bad information from misinformation. We also have literacies about data, about media. We have literacies about making. These are the things that students do. They do the making. They are engaged in social media. They are engaged in information every day of their lives. And we find that when students come to the

library and they learn about these literacies, they learn how to understand information, media, data better, they are better students and better learners. Next slide. We inspire discovery. Next slide. Students come into the library, which I believe are learning centers and student success centers. And I think this is -- I think this is Steven Vider's public history class. But we have dozens and dozens of -- in any semester or a year, we have hundreds of students that come into the library to engage with primary resources, secondary resources. But the key part is that they interact with the experts, librarians, and staff in the library on a day-to-day basis. Next slide. We are the cornerstone of democracy. It is clear that a democratic society works best when information flows freely. And that's why the fact that the library is a place for pluralism, it's a place where we collect all things for all people, all disciplines, all sides, that is what libraries do. And we have a lot of things that offend a lot of people. And that's -- I could find something that offends all of you. That's what libraries do. Next. This is about the information that we provide. That is really key to a democratic society. And this is something that's really being challenged right now. And so I really just want to confirm that libraries really are the stewards of facts. And facts are an important part of dialogue in a democratic society. Next slide. Okay. That was really fast. I went through five things that I think are the most important things that university libraries do, particularly Cornell University Library, which is one of the best libraries on the planet. If you have any questions or comments, please come talk to me, Slack me, email me. I would love to talk to you more. I'm still learning more about the campus. It's changed a lot in 15 years. But the more interaction I have with faculty, students, and staff, the better we are. So I'm going to invite my colleague Max, and we're going to do kind of a tag team on this next presentation. But this is -- do you need to set this up?

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: No. I will remind everyone you have ten minutes, and then there will be ten minutes for Q and A afterward. So go right ahead. [Indiscernible]

>> K. Max Zhang: Thank you for having us. So this committee consists of about, you know, the number has been changing, roughly about 15, 15 members from both the library system side, also on the academic side. So other people [Indiscernible]. So this is a charge we had. So I'm not going to read all of the seven charges. But you can see roughly there's four layers. The number one is the problem with the current model. The current model worked fine. We don't need to change anything. And the number two and number three is what could be new model. [Indiscernible] And four to six is about under a new model, what are the roles of the different part of the campus, right? So the number seven is about I think we had to report to the faculty about you needed a challenge of the [Indiscernible] publication. Go to the next slide. And also, the title of the committee, they're called the Future Scholarly Communication. This [Indiscernible] committee opened access. So that's why we -- the charge here is also we look at broadly not just the open access, per se, but look broadly the scholarly [Indiscernible] system. And the next slide here. I think we'll refer to Elaine to talk about the challenge [Indiscernible]

>> Elaine Westbrooks: Thank you. Thanks, Max. Can we go to the next slide, please? Okay. So when we talk about the real problem that we have, it actually is a wicked problem. And I think when many of us got into our field of study, the world was very different. When journals were prints, before the Internet existed, when scholarly societies and learned societies were strong, robust institutions. And that is just not the case anymore. And so I put this quote here which I think lays out the challenge that we have ahead of us. And we are now dealing largely with five

multinational companies that control most scholarships in the world. That's Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, Sage, Taylor & Francis. And some of the STEM areas, they control as much as 80%. So this is a problem that definitely keeps me up at night. Next slide, please. So just to give you a sense, these numbers need to be checked, but this really gives you a sense of how much money these publishers are making off of the free content that we give them. And just notice Elsevier, I believe they're actually more than $10 billion. But the reason why they can make $10 billion is because they get their content, the articles that we all publish, free. And so I want to be clear that I do not believe that publishers are inherently evil or bad. What I really want to bring home is the fact that this is not good for science. It's not good for scholarship. And it's not good for innovation to have a small set of multinational companies that we call an oligopoly control all the academic publishing in the world. Next slide. This is an old set of data, but I think it really does demonstrate the problem that I have alluded to at the beginning, which is there used to be a lot more companies in societies that publish journals. And what we're finding is many of them are selling those journals or working directly with Wiley and Springer and Elsevier largely. And when those societies transfer their journals to these big multinational publishers, the costs go up exponentially. And this shift started in the '70s. And this chart stops at 2013, but it's actually gotten much worse. And this is the national medical sciences. This is also happening in social sciences, and it's happening in humanities. This is not sustainable. Next slide, please. I wanted to share with you these profit margins. At the top is Elsevier, which is approximately 40% profit margin. We have JP Morgan. We have Apple. We have Amazon. Amazon is 2.3%. Right? That's often very surprising. But my whole point is to say that the largest academic publishers are reaping enormous profits from knowledge from which the public largely pays. It's a business model that keeps the knowledge out of the hands of the public. Knowledge is locked behind paying walls. And this is not sustainable for libraries, and it's definitely not sustainable for higher education. The next slide, please. This is another older slide that definitely we need to do research to update this. But just to get you a sense of the inflation that our publishers inflict annually on the library. And so if we keep the same content, our costs go up almost $1 million a year for the exact same content. And these numbers actually have doubled. Our inflation rate currently is closer to 10% now. And it seems there's no evidence that's going to go down. So books inflate, journals inflate, databases inflate, and the library has to manage this year after year. Next slide. So let's just talk about the [Indiscernible]. This is a gift economy. And if you work your way from left to right at the bottom, it shows you the work that has to get done, who pays for it, and who does the work. And if you will follow this from left to right, you will see that most cases, it's either the research and the funder, it's the researcher or the university. There's only one case where the publisher is really doing a lot of the work, and that's the actual publishing. Our faculty and researchers do the quality control called peer review, we produce the content, and we also consume the content. And so this is a gift economy where the taxpayers are funding the National Science Foundation and NIH. And this is one of the reasons why Elsevier can make a 40% profit margin because they do not have to pay for the content they sell. So this is a system that is, I believe, very inequitable. It's unsustainable. It's not -- it's opaque. How they come to the prices for journals is not transparent or clear. And the fact that many of us have been signing nondisclosure agreements when we sign these licenses with publishers, that's been happening for many years. Thank goodness Cornell University Library stopped signing nondisclosure agreements decades ago. But many libraries do. So it's very hard to bargain when we don't know what each other is paying for the different prices of journals and databases. Next slide. So here are the recommendations. I will invite Max back. And if you read the report, we

just want to say that the report attempts to go through that charge that Max showed at the beginning. The charge is kind of impossible. It was very ambitious. And I think the committee, of course, worked through the pandemic, and then there were a lot of transitions in the library. So this committee was actually put together in 2019, and we just now wrapped up the report in 2022, at the end of last year. And so the two key parts in the summary of this report focus on these areas. And I'm committed as the University librarian that the library will do two things. We want to invest in these project initiatives that move scholarly communications in a way that is more sustainable, equitable, and open. And then we are also planning to launch a campaign to build awareness across campus. I would say that the challenges and the issues that go into the economics of scholarly publishing, how it works, who pays for what is very difficult for a lot of people to understand. I actually think about this every day, in the morning and at night. I think about this a lot. But I think we definitely need to do some awareness building across campus. I think graduate students need to understand how this system is working. And more importantly, how it's not working for us as a society. I believe that Cornell should be the place that finds a solution, that we should be the leader. If we can't figure this out at Cornell, I don't know if anybody is going to be able to figure this out. And so one thing I could say is all libraries are talking to each other. We are all part of buying clubs and consortium that we participate in to lower the costs, to get better deals on the cost of journals and databases. We talk about this every day. This is a long-standing problem. And so there is a lot of will and effort within the library community to address this problem. And I think the challenge is that Cornell University Library cannot fix this problem by ourselves. And Cornell University can't fix this problem. So we have to step up. And as the library, I'm committed to disrupting this system, finding a way to build a better system that I think is better for all of us. And so I'm going to hand off the next slide to Max because he's going to talk about what the faculty -- what the report recommends that faculty can do to help.

>> K. Max Zhang: I think on the faculty side, I think this awareness [Indiscernible] and we have to be a part of it. And [Indiscernible] most of the researchers don't care, don't care at least right now. And how we can make this, how can we empower the researcher, understanding the social, economical, and even ethical context of the challenges. Right? And also understand our rights. My goal to sign off on the copyright agreement as soon as possible [Indiscernible]. But at the same time, we have rights on how we can use our rights for the better society. I think that's a part of it. Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Thanks. We have time for some questions. If you're here in person, come down to either of these microphones. If you are online in Zoom, raise your digital hand. And we can do this for the next eight or nine minutes. While we're waiting, if you wanted to have more comments, I know I rushed you a little bit. There's nobody raising their hands that I see. They're not in the chat. They're going to raise their hand.

>> Elaine Westbrooks: I have something to add.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Yeah, go ahead.

>> Elaine Westbrooks: I know many of you might be aware of the mandates that are coming from NIH, the Office of Science and Technology, from the White House. The challenges that I'm

seeing is that there's been a shift where now researchers are being expected to pay article processing fees and charges to make your papers open access. And it's good that information is open. When information is open, it's more likely to be cited. And when it's more likely to be cited, it's more read. I think that's a good thing. The challenge is the economics. I don't know if it makes sense for the library to pay for the subscriptions, the millions of dollars we spend a year. And the research that you also pay thousands of dollars for these APC costs. There are cases where we could split it, but this is the model that's emerging in Europe and the United States. And I think we have to be careful about the unintended consequences of that model.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: We do have a question or comment from Debbie Cherney online. Go ahead. Unmute yourself.

>> Debbie Cherney: Okay. How, as individual researchers, I mean, some of these are costing 3 or 4,000 to get the work out. And I know, like you said, some of our societies are going to these big publishing companies. How are we as individual researchers can we help? What do you think we're supposed to do to keep this down?

>> Elaine Westbrooks: Thank you for that question. There are many things you could do. I think the first thing that puts us at a disadvantage is that, as Max indicated, most of us sign away our intellectual property to the publisher. So the first thing is retain your copyright. When you get that form, when you get your article accepted, read the form. And if you want to talk to a librarian about that form, we would love to talk to you more about it. But that form gives you the most restricted license. And what you can say is actually, I want to own the copyright. So no, thank you. Can you give me the other form where I could keep my copyright? And we can help you in that process. Second thing you could do is if you're on your publication's committee of your scholarly or learned society, really try to understand the economics of that journal you're publishing. And understand the motivations. And if you have questions, and I know it's going to sound like every response is talk to a librarian, but I actually think you should talk to a librarian because we have been working on flipping journals to find ways from a journal that's built for profit, to flip the journal so that it's really available to everyone. And so the more you can learn about the economics of the journal of your society, the better off you're going to be. I promise you Wiley is going to come offer you oodles of money, but they're not going to talk about the consequences of when you switched from a learned society to a Wiley or a Springer to publish that journal.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: We have another question or comment from Paul Ginsparg. Unmute yourself.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Thank you. I wanted to bring some historical perspective to this because I was -- paid attention to your comment that if we can't solve this at Cornell, nobody can. I served on the library board from roughly 2002 to 2010, starting under Sarah Thomas. And then she left in 2007. And the next University librarian was Anne Kenney. And we discussed this issue at length, in fact. Sad to say, many of the slides we presented were basically identical. I mean, the same themes. It's sort of remarkable how little has changed. Except, of course, the numbers have scaled up by some factor. But there's still the Elsevier and all the rest. Under the library board, we made a proposal to the Faculty Senate about only submitting to open access journals or not

signing. It passed the Faculty Senate. I believe that was in the 2007 timeframe. At roughly the same time, the European libraries and science societies made proposals that publishers would have to have the hybrid model where they permitted people to pay a little extra to get articles open access. And the publishers, Elsevier included or especially really loves this because they realized they could double the revenues, getting both article fees, as well as the usual subscription revenue. So my question is, and I don't have a -- I don't have any prescriptive actions in mind, but I just want to register my concern that we have given it all that thought, evidently without success. Every other university in the country is doing that. We even had the question of these nondisclosure agreements and the big deal and all of that. And so I would just urge a note of caution that it's going to be very, very difficult because many people have been thinking about this simultaneously and not come up with an alternative. My alternative, of course, was just to bypass the journals entirely. But that's a different system that might not work for everyone.

>> Elaine Westbrooks: Thank you, Paul, I really appreciate those comments. And you're absolutely right. We have not moved the needle as much as I would have liked since 2002. But what I can say is that I believe the library took a much more bold stance in the early 2000s, and then we went away from that. And I would like to bring us back to that bold stance where we are coming up with principles, we are very much focused on changing the way we build collections because of these circumstances of publishing today. What I do think is different now than it was 20 years ago or 15 years ago is we have the University of California system, which has really taken a move to shift who pays for the journals. And that does not necessarily disrupt the system, but that is a new model that we're looking at right now. The other part I like to say is the preprint servers like Archive, which of course Paul Ginsparg was instrumental in making, are another venue that we support that preprint servers are a really important way to speed up science, to preserve knowledge, and to share it more freely. And so once we start talking about open access, preprint servers, [Indiscernible], transformative agreements, there's all of these things that are happening right now, and it's just really complicated and complex. But I would like the opportunity to come back once the library has our task force formed and we start planning for what this looks like. And I also would love to engage in another dialogue. I mean, Paul, you're really putting out a pretty realistic viewpoint that this is really tough. But I'm not --

>> Paul Ginsparg: But also I want to emphasize I would be the first one to be absolutely thrilled if you succeed where the rest of us have failed.

>> Elaine Westbrooks: I appreciate that. I just can't sit back and watch this happening. I have been talking about -- we have been talking about this as a profession for 25 years. And I just cannot sit back and say oh, well, I guess we will just keep giving $2.8 million to Elsevier, we'll just keep spending this money and then engaging in a conversation with you about what we're going to cut, which is not the conversation I want to have with faculty. But that's the reality of our situation. So I would just really want to engage in the dialogue. And if you have some ideas, please contact me if you're interested in sharing some of your perspectives. I think one of the big parts is there's just disciplinary differences. And we know that we cannot treat econ the same as you treat chemistry and literature and English. Disciplinary differences are important. So I don't want to suggest that there's one solution that's going to solve all the disciplinary problems. Or that there's one solution that's going to disrupt the system. Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: I think we need to move on. Thank you very much. We now have Alan Mathios, Presidential Task Force on Admissions. [Indiscernible]

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Let me just say this. Five minutes for your presentation, and then we'll have some ten minutes for Q and A faculty discussion. [Indiscernible]

>> Alan Mathios: Okay. So I'm really pleased to be here to update the Faculty Senate on our Presidential Task Force on Undergraduate Admissions. Next slide. Oh, sorry, go back. The three co-chairs of the task force are Avery August, Kelly Cunningham, who is chief of staff [Indiscernible]. And then Patrizia McBride. And then the faculty that are on this committee, next slide, there's nine faculty. So this is a very faculty- driven approach to trying to help the University think through how we can admit a diverse class that meets our admission. Okay? So the task force charge, next slide, is first, one of the things we should always have an obligation to is look at our missions processes, make sure they are consistent with legal framework that we're operating in. But also always trying to tie our admissions processes, again, to our broader mission. And so that's sort of how we're thinking about what this task force is about. And then the next slide is the actual charge. This was published in the Cornell Chronicle and widely distributed, this charge. So it's a little wordy. And I didn't put the whole charge. This is the preamble charge. And it talks about two major components of what our task force is about. First, coming up with what's called a university-wide admissions policy. And so if you go to that website, at your leisure, here are the major components of what we mean by admissions policy, university-wide admissions policy. First, it embodies Cornell's founding principle and its core values. It responds to the current legal and demographic landscapes. It advances compliance with applicable accreditation standards. And inspires admitting units, colleges, to recruit a class of the appropriate size that is diverse across a range of different categories and that exhibits excellence across an equivalently diverse range of students. Okay? On the principles of practice, which is more like the implementation side of this, it includes examining pipelines and pathways to college and recruitment and retention strategies. Recommend implementation priorities and assessment mechanisms that are tailored for the residential undergraduate experience. And then to provide to admitting units on ways to effectively identify attributes and experiences of applicants that have prepared them to succeed in the university's academically rigorous programs, positively contribute to the campus community, and exhibit the potential to use their Cornell education to address the most challenging problems of society and the world. Okay? So how we're proceeding, next slide, is we formed three subcommittees. And this is important because as we ask for broad faculty input into the process, we like that input to sort of focus on what we're trying to gather data on. And so these are the three subcommittees. And so you can just look at them. And one is about applicant characteristics. So what characteristics or indicators should be prioritized, basically. How do we think about that? How do we formulate that in a systematic way? This notion of given the large, large, large number of applications, they keep going up and up and up and up, can we use modern technology and machine learning to better think about how we can craft our class? And then on the third committee, really think carefully about how we develop pipelines for high schools, where in that pipeline we should be, is it just going after and trying to communicate with juniors? Should we do early [Indiscernible] these types of questions are how do we develop the pipeline issues to get the applicants that we want so we can, at selection time, meet our mission. Okay? Next slide. So here's what we're doing.

We're meeting. We're very early in this process in terms of we're collecting lots of feedback. We're gathering, we're talking to the admissions officials in each of the colleges to try to understand what we're doing currently and to go deep into that. We have external experts, academic experts, faculty in areas of economics, sociology, education to help us learn about the current literature on admission issues and admission policies. And we are really wanting to now broaden the input we get. And so this is one of the purposes of updating the Faculty Senate is around those three subcommittees. If you have ideas and want to provide input to us, the email address is there for you. And it's even best if you direct which subcommittee you would like it to go. We meet as subcommittees, and then we meet as a whole group and report to each other. And again, we're at the very beginning stage of selecting the input. We're not even close to having any recommendations. So this is really our update just to mostly focus on the process at this point. Okay.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. We have about eight or so minutes for questions or comments. Again, if you're online, raise your digital hand. Okay. I see David Lee. Try to keep it to two minutes or so.

>> Thank you, Alan. And good luck in your committee's work. I just -- I had a question, which is how -- as I recall, three or four years ago, there was another committee that looked at many of the same questions, and it was largely sort of a visionary and historical report they issued. I haven't looked at it for a while. But as I recall, it's more big picture, more visionary. I was -- my question is how deep are you going to get into the weeds? There are at least three current issues, very specific questions that are being looked at among our peer universities and nationally. One is legacy, how to treat legacy admissions. The second is how to treat the use of the SAT in admissions. And the third is this whole growing area of AI, using AI, I suppose from the student standpoint, to write their admissions essays. And from the University's standpoint, to evaluate their essays and so forth. Basically, to use that -- use AI in holistic review. And I know there's emerging literature on that. So my question is how deeply are you going to get into those types of specific issues? Thank you.

>> Alan Mathios: Yeah. I think the charge is very broad that we have. And so we are really looking at virtually all aspects of this. And this will include discussions of test scores, legacy, all of those things are up for discussion. And so given how broad it is, how deep we go into any one of them is we're going to do our best to collect the most relevant evidence that's out there. Most of our meetings so far have been outside people coming in to sort of educate us about this current state of what they're doing. We have had people from other universities talk about what they are doing, things like that. So I think everything is on the table at some sense. I think that's the best way to give you the answer to that.

>> So do you anticipate -- a quick follow up, if I can. Do you anticipate that there will be recommendations specifically regarding those three issues? Possibly specific recommendations?

>> Alan Mathios: I think it's too early to tell exactly what our recommendations will -- we haven't even gotten to the point of getting close to recommendations. So I can't say that yes or no. I would not -- I would definitely -- I would say we're definitely, those are not off the table. So we're just -- it's too early to really tell.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Richard Bensel.

>> Richard Bensel: Yeah. Thanks for the report. I have a question that I posed, oh, maybe four or five times in the last decade, which is the relationship between admission of students from abroad and domestic students. My understanding is that students from abroad are given much more -- much less likely to be given full support or scholarship support than domestic students. And that the system has been arranged in such a way that foreign students and foreign admissions have basically subsidized the scholarship grants to domestic students. But I have been unable to get a straight answer from the admissions folks. I posed this question over and over again. So I would like to add it to David Lee's list of things that should go into the report. Thanks.

>> Alan Mathios: Yeah. So it actually would be great of you to send that, send any comments you have about that. This is not related to the task force. So I will just give you my personal knowledge when I was dean about -- dean of human ecology, again, this is not -- we haven't talked about this in the task force. But I do recall that needs blind admission policies were changed slightly for international students where we set a budget for how much financial aid that we provided. That was my understanding. We had not focused -- diversity -- international students as part of diversity is one of the many, many, many factors that will enter our compensation. Okay?

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Any last comments? We have a few minutes only. Okay. Seeing none, I think we'll just move on to the next agenda item. Thank you. Senate announcements and updates. We have Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa, Chair of the University Faculty Committee, and member of the Psychology Cohort.

>> Eve De Rosa: Hi, everyone. Just this is a reminder for everyone online and everyone in the audience, please sign in. And I will get started. I will move this so I can see the slides at the same time. So we had three votes, and all of them were approved. So I'm just going to take you through quickly. I have a little highlight to remember to state that we only had 19 do not votes. Last year, there was over 40. So thank you, thank you, thank you. Let's half it again. I love this level of engagement. And thank you very much. The other note to self, and I am now embodying Chelsea. She was frustrated because people weren't really sharing with their constituents. And so please, when we take -- when we have these discussions, take my Senate Summary, if you want, and share it with your department if you don't get the opportunity to share it in your faculty meetings. There's other ways and other means by which you can share what we're talking about. And hopefully, people will see the relevance and importance of what we do here. And of course, please take these votes back after the fact. So we have three resolutions. So Resolution 184, this is to ensure academic freedom in the global hubs. And you can see it passed with a 64 -- that's okay -- yeses, 25 no's, and 21 abstains. And then we have now Resolution 185. Now we can go. That is our College of Business. They wanted to harmonize their tenure clocks across the different schools. And the choice was to harmonize to the master's program and Ph.D. program, so the graduate program. So now it's eight years for all of the colleges -- all the schools inside the

College of Business. And that was approved 84 to 15 to 12. And then the last one, 186. And that was to bring a medical gynecologist to the health services at Cornell. And that one received 98 votes for yes, 9, and then 4. So that's all of our votes. Please take them back to your constituents. That would be great. And talking about constituents, our RTE faculty have been formally part of the Faculty Senate for the past year, as far as I can appreciate. And so one of the things we did is to make sure they now know who their constituents are. And so everyone's received that. So means the RTE faculty get to also reach out to whomever they're representing, get their feedback before voting. So very pleased to be able to say that. As I've mentioned before, RTE faculty were included, except for the librarians, which we're going to address the next work life survey. But RTE faculty as a larger group were included in the faculty cohort for the work life survey. And those data will be coming to me so I can sort of parse it by the different types of faculty we have here at Cornell. And then I wanted to say that for the first time, RTE faculty will be included in the faculty SIP, including librarians. So this is also something that I think is another accomplishment as we fully integrate RTE faculty into the Faculty Senate and the University in that way. And I wanted to represent Chelsea again in terms of updating the Senate on nominations and elections. We're getting ready for the spring ballot. And so we are doing really great. So nominations selections month by month since September has been going by college, and excuse me, by committee, by Senate committee. We have about 13 of them. And looking at the distribution of the different disciplines and also the different colleges and schools. And so we're really trying to have more representation and more diversity and not the same people serving all the time. So you see my pleas in the Monday Message every once in a while for people to really contribute outside of their unit. And so the more we do that, I think the more representative we will be, and the more engaged people will be. Yes, next slide. I just wanted to share that the Provost is having an academic update. We have an opportunity to ask them questions ahead of time and also questions live. So in response to what was shared, but also if in anticipation you have things that you want them to address or think about, this is our opportunity. And so I just wanted to remind everyone that we have that available to us and that, again, in a more intimate setting, not a webinar and fully remote, the President will be in the Senate with us next month. So again, if there are topics that you want to see the President address in this space, if it's exclusively important to us, then please email that to the Dean of Faculty. And I think that's it. Yeah. So I'm open for questions, comments. If you're in person, just come to one of the mics because the people on Zoom cannot hear.

>> Risa Lieberwitz, the ILR: Thank you. I wanted to note that the Cornell Daily Sun reported on President Pollack's response to the Student Assembly's support for having a gynecologist hired in the health services and that according to The Sun, President Pollack's response was no, that she didn't support doing that and she thought that there were plenty of non-MDs who could do the work and that people could go into town to have other treatment. And this really contrasts with the overwhelming support that came through the vote that we just saw. So I have a specific question, which is about what can be done when we have a very particular situation like this with this gap between the Senate support, Student Assembly support, and then the administration's response, what can we do collectively to actually not just say well, let's move on, but to actually push back? And that's certainly a more general question, well, what can we do collectively to actually move our agenda forward as we have votes?.

>> Eve De Rosa: So I can say that obviously, all of our feedback will go to the President. And

thank you, Risa, for reminding everyone that this is a resolution, much like the natatorium, which was added to everyone's vocabulary last year, that it went to all of the assemblies and it was approved by all of the assemblies. Yet, there isn't necessarily the response that we would hope. And so I do know for the natatorium, there are negotiations and in particular with the college until they find the funds to do so. But for the gynecologist, I have already started speaking with Jada Hamilton, who is the director of the health services. She's wonderful, she's informed. I have invited her to come to the Senate so that we can learn more and be educated about what it is that sort of is the barrier to this being acted upon. And so I think that's one way for us to engage in that way with the director of the medical, the health services.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Shall we move on?

>> Eve De Rosa: Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: We have one more order of business. Cornell Bowers College of Computing and Information Sciences, CIS, resolution to use all ranks of the Professor of the Practice and Research Professor titles. The presentation of this resolution will be provided enthusiastically by Charlie Van Loan, Emeritus, Computer Science, CIS. Ten minutes. And then there will be time for faculty discussion.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Thanks an awful lot. And hi to everybody in the Senate. It's great to see so many old friends. Okay. So we're going to try to get both of these titles on the books. And this presentation is to give you the background information for that. Next slide. So just for your information, many years ago, the Senate created what's called the enabling legislation. If the department, for example, wants to use the Professor of Practice title, they have to write a proposal. And the enabling legislation gives you a framework for writing that proposal covering all the important topics. Next slide, please. So we have done this many times before, and for both the PoP and the Research Professor proposals. Just to say up front, we're very interested in feedback for this. And I know that many RTE senators, if you have insight about these particular titles, please send them. You can click on those links and see how your college went about proposing and getting their titles approved. Next slide, please. So let's talk first about the research proposal -- the Research Professor. There are sort of two main reasons why we're interested in this. First of all, if we manage it properly, we're creating a research-related career path. Okay? And again, if we do that right, we'll enhance the stature of the title holder, their department, and the college. Okay? And second, and you see this in all the RP proposals out there, we're behind, and we would like to compete with our peers in this arena. And many of our peer schools have quite attractive research opportunities off the tenure track. So this is the step toward advancing that. Next slide. So as required, we do internal votes to make sure that the unit in question is on board. These are tentative. It took us a while to get the electorate's rate because CIS has lots of joint appointments and 0% appointments and so on. The vote actually closes on Friday, but nevertheless, I think you can see the pattern there that there's almost universal support for this particular title. Next slide. PoPs. Okay? So the idea behind PoP is to bring somebody in who has experience on the outside and can share that experience and teach for us being informed by that experience. So traditionally, you might think of maybe someone who has worked in industry for many years, but also someone who has worked for a nonprofit and so on. It's quite a flexible sort of position. But the key thing is if that individual brings in outside

knowledge. And that leads to number two there by a -- by having this title, we're sending a signal. And what is that signal? The signal is that we respect knowledge that is acquired outside of academics. And next slide, please. So we also voted for this. And again, you can see quite overwhelming support for this. But I do want to mention the two people who disapproved of that sent us comment. We do our ballots in CIS. We also give faculty the chance to comment. And I just want to say that their issues for lecturers, the lecture track is also a teaching track, obviously. And the question here is that, first of all, the track only has two ranks. And it does not have the word "professor" in the title. And we have over 300 lecturers on campus. Some of them have given their whole lives to teaching and doing fantastic jobs. And it was sort of -- I sort of knew this all along that there are issues there with that track. But it sort of surfaced here when we talked about the PoP. And I'm really glad that in, I believe, one or two months, there's going to be a faculty forum where various RP issues are going to be discussed. And I'm going to show up there as a private citizen, at least, and argue for creating a third track there in the lecturer, in that track. And that it should be titled something like Instructional Professor. Well, this is a side topic. It's tangential. I'm saying when you put these proposals together, there are often teaching moments that come up along the way. And for me, this was one of them. Next slide, please. As you have seen over a dozen of the presentations of this variety, and I don't want to bore you with the stuff that you have seen before. So let's talk about four things that are a little bit different about our proposals. Okay? Just to be honest about the things we're trying to do. Next slide. So first of all, as you know, the percent limitation computation that goes into all of these proposals, and the enabling legislation puts the limit at 25 and 10 for both of them. And for us, we have quite an operation down at Cornell Tech. And I just want to be clear that the computation involves the sum of faculty here and there. Okay? And that all appointments, again, are approved by the CIS dean, Dean Kavita Bala, who I hope is in the audience to answer questions. And also the Cornell Tech team. So just about how we do that sort of calculation. And just a note there on the percents, the colleges vary in this. First of all, for the RPs, all the colleges go for the 10%. But if you look at the PoP percent, engineering, JDSM, I'm not sure how the business college handles this, are at 25%. Human Ecology and AAP, 20. CAL, IRL, and Arts is 10. So there's variation there. And again, under the heading of feedback, we have had some concern about the 25%. We're very flexible. We want to hear from people if they think that is out of line or whatever. Next slide. And we also have text in there about statements of contributions to DEI. If you have seen the OFDD has guidelines about that. Those guidelines apply to tenure track hiring only. Okay? And we felt that they should also apply to both PoP and RP hiring. And there's a quote from the recommendation from OFDD, which is to say that applicants are invited to comment on that part of their resume. Next slide, please. In fact, the next two slides deal with ranks within these two tracks. Because it also brings up very important things. So in particular, the majority of PoP appointments on campus and at other universities that we have studied have always been at the full level. When you think about it, you can sort of understand it. We want people who have extensive external experience. And so you come in the door here, it's kind of hard to reason about what would be in assistant PoP, and how would that person be promoted? We don't slam the door on having assistant and associate PoPs. We just feel that most of the time, they're going to be appointed at the full level. However, if there is to be an appointment here on campus, there has to be a heightening of that individual's relevant external professional experience. This is a feature that's not explicitly mentioned in any of the PoP proposals that we have seen. So this I want, again, to be up front about that. I think it's very important to state this from the standpoint of how does this track relate to the lecture track, and it's in our proposal.

Next slide. There's also a rank issue. Not issue, feature about the RP track. Again, it's the three-rank track, just like tenure track. Okay? And I think the view sort of out there is hey, this is the track where we hire superstars. And great if you can, and it certainly has happened. However, it does make sense when you hire an assistant RP to really put a lot of value on potential. That's just what we do in the tenure track. So we come out and say that explicitly. Because I don't think enough attention has been paid to the fact that, again, it's a three-rank track. We want to have people come and have research careers here. And just a little note there about assistant RPs that, just like in the tenure track, we value -- potential is very important. We do know from the fall, there's discussion about the Principal Scientist title and perhaps bringing it back, and we're very supportive of that. It does not affect this proposal directly. Okay? This is like all the previous college RP proposals. Yeah. So that's that. Next slide, which is the Q and A. And Dean Bala, I believe, is in the room in case you have larger dean-level questions that need to be answered.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: If you're in the room and have any comments or questions, please step up to the microphone. I see a couple of hands. We'll start with Harold Hodes.

>> Harold Hodes, Philosophy: One thing that's puzzled me for quite a while is the very concept of a Research Professor, what's the point of hiring Research Professors rather than tenure track professors? It seems that it only increases the amount of teaching that's being done -- I shouldn't say teaching. The amount of intellectual activity on campus that's being done outside of the tenure track. And I'm inclined to think that it's bad to be increasing that. So can you explain to me why it's good?

>> Charlie Van Loan: Sure. Okay. First of all, in the proper environment, there's interaction between RPs and tenure track faculty. There's research project, research activity. It's not like it's a silo. And the presence of a great Research Professor would be to enhance the overall research production in a department, make possible new collaborations, and so on. Here is an example. And to the other part of your question, here's an example we give of someone who might switch from tenure track to RP. Suppose you're an assistant professor, you come in here, you're all enthusiastic. You discover that you're actually not that interested in teaching. You're not that interested in going through a tenure review. But you have a tremendous research reputation, you are able to bring in external funding, and you decide that that is how I would like to spend my research life here at Cornell, at least for the next couple of years. So it's whole greater than the sum of the parts if it goes together correctly. And in no way does it undermine the research activity of the tenure track faculty.

>> Kavita Bala: And I am just going to jump in. This is Kavita Bala. Thanks, Charlie, for doing that. Sorry I missed the beginning. I think it started a bit earlier than 4:30. In our profession, if you look at a place like MIT and [Indiscernible] is a peer to us, we have nearly half of their faculty or tenure track and half of research professors. CMU has approximately the same amount. So it is very common among our peers in our business to have a very heavy research professor track. We don't actually have that at Cornell. It's something that would be great to have. And actually, our location isolates us a little bit, and that has prevented us from having many of them. But it's a vibrant way for people who want to be involved in academia without -- who don't want to do the teaching. And that's something that we should encourage. And certainly puts us at a disadvantage [Indiscernible].

>> Who calls on the people? Richard?

>> This is Mark Lewis: My question is I'm pretty sure the Professor of Practice title does not have clear ranks in other colleges. And just seeing, I think I heard you say that there's potential [Indiscernible]. It seems odd to me -- this is a question and a statement --that we would have a college that has an assistant Professor of Practice [Indiscernible] and other colleges not allowing that at all. Do you want to address why it's different in different places?

>> Charlie Van Loan: Again, we are not -- that was a little hard. I hope I get it right. I think you're saying, Mark, that we're not entertaining assistant and associate PoPs, whereas some colleges might, and that's a disconnect we don't want to have. We're not slamming the door --

>> Kavita Bala: It's the opposite actually. Charlie, the question was why are we having an associate and assistant when colleges only have one.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Again, we find it very hard to imagine that such an appointment at an assistant or associate level, but you never know. So we don't do without. But we state pretty hard that we anticipate most of the departments that the whole level -- at CMU, we looked at a number of other schools, they actually have just the single rank. Anyway, that's -- we would love more feedback on that particular issue if possible.

>> Mark Lewis: What I'm trying to say is there's no such rank on the College of Engineering.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Okay. Yeah. But there are in the University. They do exist across the University. Yeah.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay. Let's -- I have a couple of people online and also in person. Let me go first to David Delchamps. And then back here to Risa Lieberwitz. And then back online to Doug Antczak. And I'm putting Richard last because he already spoke. But you're also in the queue.

>> My question is very simple. David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Charlie, you quoted the stats percentage of tenure track at the various other positions. And you had this number less than or equal to 25% in the College of Engineering for Professors of Practice versus tenure track. And in my department where we have about 40 faculty members, we only have one Professor of Practice. Is there any department in Engineering that's anywhere near 25%? That seems awfully high to me.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Operations Research, to my knowledge, has the biggest PoP component on campus. And Mark can speak to that. Well, if he wants.

>> I guess he's sitting down. Anyway.

>> Kavita Bala: Mark says he has six of them. Five. Five.

>> David Delchamps: Okay. I had no idea there were that many in either department. Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Introduce yourself and your department.

>> Risa Leiberwitz, ILR. I find it curious when one of the arguments put forward for having these different titles, professor of fill in the blank is that it will make us more competitive to have more nontenure track positions with a title that has "professor" in it. It seems to me that if we were actually considering competitiveness, we would have more tenure track lines. Because the job security would be far more attractive to candidates than a position without job security. So I really find that a very odd kind of thing. I would like you hear something about it. And if I could kind of pause and then do the follow up? Would that be okay?

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: I think it's okay.

>> Kavita Bala: I can comment on that. In our business, actually, there are people who don't want to teach, but they really want to do research. And the job security is not a big deal because there's just immense amounts of jobs available in the industry. So we actually don't have that issue where people feel -- right now, getting people to come into academia at all is really hard the Computing and Information space. And they just can retire when they're 40 if they go off and work for 15, 20 years. So they don't think of job security the way people traditionally do when they're thinking about [Indiscernible]

>> I don't think they're a professor, then. And I think that -- and this relates to my follow up. If we -- this isn't just a College of Information Sciences, but generally, this discussion around these issues, we forget what the reason is for having tenure track and tenured lines, which is that the job security is there to protect academic freedom. And so there may be some people say well, I don't really care about that, I'm just fine. But the point is that if we're in this profession, we think in terms of teaching, research, and the service that we do and the kind of public speech that we do, all of which require us to have academic freedom. And that means that we need the freedom to say things that are pushing against the status quo, to say things that are not welcome in the profession and the discipline, but to try to actually raise questions. And that's what the job security of tenure is for. And simply because people say I don't want to teach, I just want to do research or I only want to teach, I don't want to do research, that doesn't take away from the foundational principles of why we have job security and why we should increase that so that everybody has academic freedom. And I don't think it's adequate for people to say it's not a problem here, don't worry about it.

>> Kavita Bala: I think that's absolutely critical. I totally believe that we should have that job security. These Research Professor lines, which is the ones I think this really matters in, are people who are not funded through -- it doesn't affect the tenure lines, if that's actually the proposal. It will not change the total number of tenure lines to the extent that you can have more tenure lines, that is my job, I will continue to provide more tenure lines. These are separate. They sit on soft money, and they apply for funding separately. So they will not encroach on the growth of the tenure population, which we will continue to grow.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Doug in Zoom land.

>> Doug Antczak, Microbiology and Immunology. Good to hear your voice again, Charlie, and to see you on screen. Just I think my question might have already been answered. So these research professors would be required to pay their entire salaries from grants, is that correct?

>> Charlie Van Loan: Yes. Or it could be they are part of a center where the umbrella sort of thing. But basically, yeah. These are soft money positions.

>> Doug Antczak: That's a pretty high bar to set. Most individuals who could pay their own salaries from grants would probably be in a tenure track at most places.

>> Kavita Bala: I can comment -- go on, Charlie.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Well, I mean, again I think there's a whole range of -- people approach academics in many different ways. Some people don't want to go through a tenure route, some people don't want to write papers. Instead, they have a lot of knowledge to share from the outside and so on. And we value that kind of knowledge in the Po P setting. So I just think that it's, not to be corny, but whole greater than sum of the parts. We have a tremendous teaching research engine here, and we need different types of people. We have retention problems, we have dual career problems. The overall strength of the place depends on being flexible. And with moderation, at least for [Indiscernible]. And the respect for all the positions. But also, we just have to be more flexible and more different -- make possible different kinds of academic career. Yep.

>> Doug Antczak: Okay. Thank you.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Richard Bensel.

>> Charlie Van Loan: You're muted.

>> Richard Bensel: Oh. Well, I said happy to see you. You should come back more. It's good. Several years ago, you presented a big report on tenure track and nontenure track and RTE and so forth, the numbers. And we haven't seen one since then. But my suspicion is that in these changes, there's been an increase in nontenure track appointments at Cornell. This one looks particularly dramatic. I mean, looking at your votes, 80% or so of the votes were tenure track. And this looks like the increase in nontenure track would be doubled or tripled by this change. But regardless, this is a worry that we are basically taking and watering down tenured, protected faculty as the core of Cornell University. We have heard over and over again from various departments that they need these nontenure track appointments for competitive -- for competition with their peers. That may very well be true and may very well be true that in elite universities generally, there's been a decrease in tenure track and that basically that the cost incentives and so forth create these things for a deterioration in the academy. But it is a worry. And so yeah, I would like to see -- this isn't really addressed to you. I would really like to see Cornell make another report, see what the changes have looked like since the last one. Thanks.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Yeah. I want to -- Institutional Planning have all these dashboards, and

you can actually go back and look in time at the stats. Ever since I started paying attention to this, the number of University faculty, the tenured track faculty, more or less has been in the mid-1500s. That has not changed in 20 years. I don't have a stat on the number of RPs and Clinical Professors and whatever. But I think it might total about 100, I think.

>> Eve De Rosa: I can give those numbers. So I did share with the Senate last May the composition of every college and school. And I gave the percentage of University faculty, research, teaching, and extension faculty for every single college school campus that is inside of the Senate. And computer science, so the Bowers School of Computing and Information Science, has 80% of their faculty are tenure or tenure track. So they have 3% for research and 16.5 for teaching and no extension. So I think it might be a misunderstanding of what was presented. Those were just how many approved the resolution, Richard.

>> Charlie Van Loan: Yeah. And I also want to say, again, that those are just upper bounds. And we get to mention that maybe OR is close to that. But yeah, the fraction -- I'm not alarmed by the fraction or the trends I see here.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a question or comment from Abby Cohn.

>> Abby Cohn: Hi. So I think it's important to put this in context in terms of what we're really comparing this against, which is not the size of the tenure track faculty, but the hiring of adjuncts and other people in very, very marginal employment categories. And in the case of the research professorship, it is really a title. We used to have the titles of Senior Research Associate, Research Associate, and it was just deemed that those titles were not seen to be attractive. At the risk of dating myself, I served on the committee that wrote the enabling legislation. And the logic of it was that these were decisions best made at the college level, that each college could understand and think about what range of titles was important to them. And I have been very pleased over the years to see each and every one of these proposals come forward with a lot of real engagement, thought, and specificity to the specific college that is putting it forward. And I would just like to say I see this proposal as consistent with all of those others. And whether we like these pressures or we don't like the pressures, these are the realities. And to Cornell's credit, we have continued to have a way, way lower percentage of people in these nontenure track positions that are truly on very marginal part-time bases. And I think that these titles have helped us maintain that position.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay. I think we can move on to the next order of business, which is probably adjournment. But I just want to check with the Dean of Faculty if there are any good of the order scheduled.

>> Eve De Rosa: We do. Risa, do you want to come up with your good of the order? And thank you, Charlie, for mentioning, I think we're going to use our faculty forum for April to discuss RTE faculty. So that was what Charlie was referring to. So at the end of April, after our Senate meeting, we'll have a faculty forum.

>> Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. So I'm coming to tell you about a really exciting event that's going to take place next Wednesday. And it's here on the slide for March 15th. And this is an event that's

part of an annual series of events that ILR has. And the events are generally called Union Days. We have been doing it for about 35 or so years. And each year, we have a theme. And that theme is part of celebrating the labor movement and providing various kinds of events, including panels like this one, keynote speakers, sometimes we have films and directors come, all around a theme that we choose for that year related to the labor movement. And this year, our theme, which isn't on the slide, but the theme is Talking Union, with, of course, an exclamation point at the end of it. And as you all know, there's been a real uptick in interest, generally in the United States, in approval ratings for unionization. And we have seen that as well on university campuses where there's been a lot of organizing of different kinds, collective action, unionizing and collective bargaining all across the country at different stages. And one of the things that's so interesting about that is that it has affected faculty and graduate student employees, as well as undergraduate student employees. And we have also seen this in the public sector, universities, in public universities as well as in private universities. So given the interesting organized activity and activism that's taken place recently, one of the events, in fact, the kickoff event in Union Days this year is this event of unionizing on university campuses. So it's a panel. We hope you all come and bring your friends. Encourage your students to come. The panel is really interesting: We have speakers who will be speaking about faculty unionizing, about unionizing among graduate student employees from Columbia, as well as Northwestern. And undergraduate students unionizing there at Dartmouth. And we have the executive director from the American Association of University Professors who has had experience in working in all of those areas. So it should be very interesting. And we also have a Zoom option. So it's in 105 [Indiscernible]. And we also have a Zoom option. And I guess that's it. Let me see if I missed anything. But y'all come. Okay. Thanks.

>> Eve De Rosa: Actually, Risa, that reminds me I forgot to mention there was a really robust discussion about the global hubs. And so for those of you who want to know more, the Vice Provost of International Affairs has scheduled a town hall on Monday the 13th at 11:30. And it's the faculty leads. And they're just discussing what they do. So I just wanted to put that out there too.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Having no more orders of business, we are now adjourned.