

## Faculty Senate

May 10, 2023

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Hello. Welcome to the Faculty Senate. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, emeritus professor of architecture. We start with a land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq', the Cayuga Nation. The Gayogohó:nq' 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 Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. Call to order. We start with the approval of minutes, which is pro forma. The minutes of April 12, 2023 have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. If there are any corrections, just please bring them to the attention of the dean of the faculty. I will invoke unanimous consent to approve the minutes. And we are ready to start. Our first order of business is a Senate Update on Racial Justice and Equitable Futures - An Educational Requirement for Students. Deputy Provost Avery August, I believe, is on Zoom, from microbiology and immunology, and will have five minutes, followed by up to five minutes for faculty discussion. Avery, are you here? Can you hear me? If so--

>>Avery August: Yes, I can hear you. Thank you. Are you all able to hear me there?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Go ahead, Avery.

>>Avery August: Thank you. Are you able to hear me now?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yep.

>>Avery August: Great. Thank you so much. My apologies for not being there in person. I'm not sure, will you be sharing you the slides there? Or should I share my slides here?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have slides here.

>>Avery August: OK. If you can please share the slides. Thanks for the opportunity to provide an update on the work of... updating the Senate on the administrative work on developing [INAUDIBLE] undergraduate education requirement on race and equity. I won't go into too much detail on the history of this work. You know that work from the Faculty Senate proposed a course or material that all students should be exposed to. The president and the provost proposed that this be taken up by colleges who integrate and manage the curriculum for their students. And so, the provost charged several committee members coming from the colleges to develop a plan for implementing such a requirement. The members of the committee you can see there on the screen. They were made up of the associate deans for undergraduate education and for the undergraduate colleges, as well as Professor Durba Ghosh as a Senate representative from the Faculty Senate from the Arts and Sciences College. Next slide, please.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yeah. He seems to be frozen.

>>Avery August: My apologies. I think I just lost the connection there. Can you still hear me in the room?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Avery August: Thank you. The committee was charged with developing some potential learning goals, themes, and best practices, and a review process for the colleges as they develop such a course. And the focus of the committee was on the undergraduate colleges. Next slide. One of the things that we wanted to do as a committee is to, first--If we can go to next slide-- first, get a sense of where the colleges had evolved since the committee's work. That's shown on this slide. Since the Faculty Senate did its work and issued its report to the president and the provost, a number of colleges have moved in this direction. You can see here that the colleges have developed specific courses for their undergraduate students and integrated into their curriculum. College of AAP, the Brooks School, the Nolan School, and ILR School have all developed courses that would cover this material with varying launches starting fall of 2023 or spring of 2023. ILR launched in fall of 2022. A number of the colleges have been moving in this direction and have launched courses outside of the guidance of each other. Next slide. In addition, as you know from the Faculty Senate's report, both CALS and Arts and Sciences have a menu of courses that cover some of this material, either human difference or social difference in Arts and Sciences. And the College of Human Ecology has a number of courses that address race and equity. And they're currently revising their curriculum to develop a core college course. The only colleges that, at this point, did not have courses or did not have plans on the books to do this

were the College of Engineering and the College of Information Science and Computing Designs. Although, they also have requirements to integrate some material based on their--for example, the College of Engineering, on their accrediting agency that are asking them to cover some of this material in their curriculum. They were also starting to consider such material. Next slide. The committee did a lot of work, met with a number of faculty who teach these courses, interviewed them on their experience teaching the course as well as what they cover. We also met with directors of programs that cover and teach many of this material as well as IDP, Center for Teaching Innovation, where we interviewed them and gathered information. And through this process, we developed some learning objectives that you see here on your screen, where there was a learning outcome one. That's sort of the literacy component, to use the language of the Faculty Senate report, that dealt with the history and structure, etc. And learning outcome two, that dealt with sort of the skillset component. These learning objectives were taken back by the associate deans to their respective college curriculum or equivalents for feedback. And this was met with approval. Next slide. Wanted to get to sort of the core proposals for implementing this requirement across the colleges. All the colleges agree, or representatives from all the colleges agree, that each college will have a requirement for such courses. As I said, many of the colleges already have such a course. Each college will determine which course will fulfill its learning objectives as feasible. And the reasoning there is many colleges have specific ideas and ways that they'd like their students to be exposed. An approach that would work in AAP may not work in a Nolan School or ILR School, etc. The colleges have degrees of freedom to do that. Implementing this requirement, some colleges will move forward with experimental courses. Other colleges may modify existing courses or further develop courses where needed. The understanding is that these issues would address the learning objectives in these courses, but

also, the understanding was that one course was not sufficient to cover this material in its full breadth. And so, many of the colleges were also revising and looking at their curriculum to integrate aspects of this throughout their curriculum. Next slide. The timeline for this, I mentioned, the four colleges that have already either launched this--that is ILR--or will be launching this in academic year of 2023/24, in concert with their advised curriculum. CALS will continue to use their current courses to satisfy such a requirement. And as new courses are developed or courses are revised, they will be evaluated for how well they cover the learning objectives. Other colleges have courses that they will be offering starting fall 24/25 as their [INDISCERNIBLE] curating committee finalizes those plans. And so, we expect by the academic year of 2024/25 that all colleges will have a requirement for their undergraduate students within their curriculum. Next slide. With regards to governance of this approach, the colleges, as I said, have primary responsibility for developing and approving the courses that meet the requirements for their majors. They will be consistently reviewing those evaluations to understand the effectiveness of these courses and meeting the learning objectives. And so, this is an ongoing process. We propose a committee composed of representatives in the colleges, or either the dean or a designate that will be convened by the vice provost for undergraduate education, who will share progress and experiences of developing and approving these courses, including materials for incoming orientation for international students, that will be looked at by this committee in collaboration with the vice provost for international engagement. Appropriate approved courses would carry a specific designation that indicated that it meets the requirements. And this would be negotiated with the university registrar. And of course, ongoing evaluation of these courses and curricula would be and is under the purview of the Faculty Committee on Program Review of the Faculty Senate, as well as Middle States Review or other accrediting

bodies, national accrediting bodies of particular programs. Next slide. There are some issues that we thought would need to be explored. And we've made some recommendations on these other matters. In speaking to the faculty who teach these courses, we recognize that they would require robust support either for modifying those courses or, in some cases, managing the conversations that happen in those classes, as well as robust support for teaching assistants who will support those courses. We anticipate that this could be done through Center for Teaching Innovation and the Intergroup Dialogue Project. We've had some conversations with the directors, and they're open to those conversations. We also propose some financial resources such as grants, perhaps managed through the Center for Teaching Innovation, that would incentivize faculty to help them develop or adapt their courses towards these goals. We also did some analyses of the implications for increased enrollment for the courses that will meet those standards. And that analysis was done by Institution Resource and Planning. What we found was that this [INAUDIBLE] largely through Arts and Sciences and CALS, would be able to accommodate the extra students that would be taking those courses without significant changes in enrollment caps. We also recognize that there's a potential increased workload for faculty of color who do and may disproportionately teach those courses. And so, we'll be working with deans and chairs to ensure that faculty who are assigned such courses, that we pay particular attention to the teaching load and the burden that might come with teaching those courses. And as I said, we expect that by the academic year 24/25, that all of the colleges will have such a requirement for their students. Next slide.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a couple of minutes for Q&A. If you're here, just step up to the microphone. If you're on Zoom, raise your digital hand. Maybe one question. We'll start here.

Identify yourself and your department.

>>Ken Birman: Sure, Ken Birman, computer science. I thought this was incredibly interesting, and I want to thank you and the team for putting together a plan. I'm curious to know about metrics of success. How are we going to--This is a new process that we're putting in place. How are we going to evaluate the effectiveness of these different courses and the effectiveness of the responses of the different units of Cornell? [INDISCERNIBLE] kind of an active oversight process to provide continuing feedback.

>>Avery August: Yes, thanks for that question, Ken. Yeah, there are two ways to evaluate the effectiveness. One is, have we deployed it in the way that we said we have? And that's where that governance structure comes in, which will be convened by the vice provost of academic affairs, with representatives from each of the colleges too, to both report on the effectiveness of deploying the courses, but also their experience in developing and deploying the courses. That's the first step. And then, the second step, in terms of the material, because each college is managing the material differently based on their own interests, this would be part of a normal review of curricula that would occur over the--that the university has, the accrediting bodies, the state accreditation, as well as the faculty committee and program review.

>>Ken Birman: I don't see anyone else standing up right now, so let me just ask a quick follow-up.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Quick.

>>Ken Birman: Would there be university-level materials or courses that would be offered to the colleges as resources that they could selectively draw on?

>>Avery August: I'm sorry, my connection was not very good. It was broken up. I heard something about resources?

>>Ken Birman: I was wondering if the university would create university-level courses that could become resources that the individual colleges could selectively draw on?

>>Avery August: That's a good question, Ken. The committee considered the development of single university-level courses, and it was felt that this would be, logistically, very difficult to manage, both in terms of how to engage the material so that it satisfied the interests of the individual colleges who all take a different approach. And so, while we considered that approach, we recognized that that would be very difficult to manage. Now, it's possible that some of these courses might end up in that category where colleges all recognize that course as serving the requirements. I will say, the colleges also agree to accept courses that are taken in other colleges as students transfer between colleges.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK, thank you. I think we have a full agenda, so we're going to move right along to Senate announcements and updates with Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa and Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean of Faculty. Five minutes, and then there will be some time for Q&A afterwards.



>>Eve De Rosa: First slide, please. I wanted to let the Senate know that there is a memorial celebration for the previous dean of faculty and someone who contributed a lot to faculty governance, Peter Stein. He passed away in the fall of 2021. And due to COVID, they were not able to celebrate his life. So, unfortunately, his spouse also just recently passed away. They're going to celebrate both of them on May 13. I just wanted to let his colleagues, who may be in attendance here, know that there's a celebration and how to memorialize him. Thank you. Slide.

And these are the results for the faculty election. We had three different levels of election, the University Faculty Committee, the Nominations and Elections Committee, and then a few senators-at-large. This is the outcome. Next slide, please. I'm trying to be really efficient. I have five minutes. I only gave myself a little bit of time. And then I just wanted to let the Senate know that there are a couple of minors that are coming online for our students. One is actuarial science, and the other is digital agriculture. Both of these minors have been approved by the Committee for Academic Programs and Policies. And they'll move forward to the trustees and to the state.

And we are going to have one more set of votes before the end of the semester. We have to consider three different things. Actually, it's--Yeah, three. The College of Computing and Information Sciences have a proposal to bring in a professor of the practice titles, as well as research professor titles. And Charlie Van Loan is going to give an update on the slight revision to what they presented in March. And then the Brooks School of Public Policy, they are proposing to use a professor of the practice. We will have the presentation today. And then the last one is, we are going to consider the Research, Teaching, and Extension faculty resolution for structural equity and inclusion. They're going to also share feedback that they've received since last month's Senate meeting, and open the floor for discussion. We also had a faculty forum. And

we learned a lot of new things in that space, as well. And so, the recording of the faculty forum was shared with the provost and deputy provost and the chief human resources officer. I tried to share it with as many places as I thought were spaces where the faculty voice should be heard before we consider this resolution. And then, the last thing I want to share with you is a thank-you. I really appreciate--I think there's been such good energy this year on the Faculty Senate and in the Senate committees. And I really appreciate that. And I really appreciate the faculty efforts and helping with shared governance on campus. So, thank you to the senators, to the Senate committee members, and also the university assembly. And with that, we are having a reception at 5:00. Thank you for those of you who braved the slope day to get on campus. Any person on Zoom who's still on campus--And I know you're only about 10 minutes away, probably even if you were in Ithaca, so come on up if you want. We're in the Park Atrium in the Statler. With that, I'm open for questions if anyone has any.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Again, raise your hand, if you're on Zoom, digitally. Or come up to the front if you're here in person. Not seeing any. We will move on to the two professor of practice issues. The first is, Cornell Bowers College of Computing and Information Science, or CIS, resolution to use all ranks of the professor of practice and research professor of titles. Charlie Van Loan has an update for five minutes.

>>Charles Van Loan: Thank you. Next slide, please. Just a recap. These proposals are widely-- the enthusiasm for them in the college, their vote results, they are official now. We just gave you the unofficial results in March. Next slide, please. CAPP has also approved the proposal, basically saying that it squares with all the enabling legislation requirements and so on. So, we're

all set on that regard. There's only one change we'd like to make to the proposal, the PoP proposal. Next slide, please. We did hear back from a few corners that, "Why the 25% cap?" We didn't think a whole lot about it until we put the proposal together. That's the so-called legal limit. But we're very happy to reduce it to 15. The only change that we are proposing here in the PoP proposal is to change 25 to 15. That's all I have to say. There was no other feedback on the website.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. And we're going to move on to the next policy proposal, Cornell Jeb E. Brooks School of Public Policy Proposal for the Academic Title of Professor of Practice. Presentation by Jeff--Is it Niederdeppe?

>>Jeff Niederdeppe: Niederdeppe, yeah.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Niederdeppe, Senior Associate Dean of Faculty Development, Communication, for five minutes. And we'll have an opportunity to have Q&A for 10 after that.

>>Jeff Niederdeppe: Well, thanks. It's a pleasure to have the opportunity to be here. I was a senator back in 2014 when the enabling legislation was debated and passed. So, it's fun to have the opportunity to come full circle and share with you our proposal today for the Brooks School. Next slide. I know you've debated other professor of practice Charlie presented about Bowers just a couple of sessions ago. So, I thought I'd spend, actually, the first minute or two saying a little bit more about the Brooks School since we are less than two years old. And I want to emphasize a couple things. I won't read a quote from our Inaugural Dean Colleen Barry, but we

are fundamentally a multidisciplinary school. We focus on policy challenges facing both the United States and globally. And our mission is positive change in the world. Policy engagement in the real world is central to what we want to equip our students to be able to do. Next slide.

And so, I'll say a little bit about our curricular offerings to degree programs. We offer undergraduate, professional master's, and PhD degrees. We have a BS in Public Policy, which technically is policy analysis and management until August, but we'll shift to public policy in August. We offer a BS in Health Policy. We have two professional master's programs, the Sloan Master of Health Administration and the Master of Public Administration, which used to be CIPA and is now the Brooks MPA Program. And we offer a PhD in Public Policy. In addition, we're the home to many programs, centers, and institutes that serve undergraduates, faculty, and staff from across the university, including Cornell and Washington Program, which is housed in Brooks, Capital Semester in Albany. We're the home to the Institute of Politics and Global Affairs, which is focused on--It's a nonpartisan group focused on dialog about complex policy challenges facing the globe. And we are the home to several academic centers, as well. Oh, wow. Sorry. Normally, that's not a problem for me, volume of speaking. Apologies for that. Do I need to repeat anything, or should I just move forward? OK, thanks, Eve. Next slide, please. Oh, I must have set up animations here. I'm not going to go through the nuances of our proposal, so we can skip through these really quickly. All of this to say you have access to it. We modeled it after the many successful examples from other colleges and schools that have been debated by this organization, by the Faculty Senate. Next slide, please. I will say a little bit about justification for the position. Maybe you can click through a bunch of times. Sorry about that. One more. Perfect. Part of our goal in doing this is we want to be able to attract distinguished policy professionals and administrative leaders to support our educational mission. We're looking to recruit people

who have a distinguished record of professional achievement, who have had major impact on policies in their design, in their practice, in their advancement out in the world. And the philosophy here is that our students, particularly our undergraduate and professional master students, benefit and find that this experience complements the academic training that they receive from our professorial faculty that are trained in a variety of disciplines. Finally, I'll just note that virtually all of our peers have a similar title that they make use of, Harvard, Duke, Michigan, Princeton, Chicago, Syracuse. So, in the competitive landscape for policy schools, it's quite important to have the opportunity to make use of this title. Next slide. I'll just say a few things about the basic parameters of our proposal. We are restricting the use of this title to folks who have 15 or more years of policy-related or administrative leadership experience outside of academia. And this limits our desire to use this for only the sort of professor of practice level. There will be no assistant or associate professors of practice based on our proposal. Next. We're looking for nearly full-time faculty here. We're not looking to use this title for part-time lecturers who teach a course here and there. We're looking for folks who are dedicated to the educational experience of our students. These are primarily intended for teaching appointments, but we may also make use of the title for executive directorships, for instance, of some of our publicly-facing programs or institutes. We want to be able to use this for both external recruitments and, in limited cases, for internal title changes that will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. And we set our cap to 20% of our tenured and tenure-track faculty. Right now, we have 44 faculty who are on the tenure track or tenured in the Brooks School. We have many offers out, I think five active lines. We're looking at 9 or 10 at the start. We're looking to grow over the years, but around 10 in the short term is the cap that we'd be looking at. Last slide. Finally, we have universal approval for use of this title among our tenured and tenure-track faculty. And among our benefits-eligible

RTE faculty, we had a high response rate. Not 100%, but no "no" votes and no abstentions among the two polities. I will stop there and answer any questions you may have about this proposal or the Brooks School more broadly. Thanks.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Raise your digital hand or come up to the front if you're in person. You could take a minute to elaborate on anything while we're waiting if you would like. You're pretty concise. OK, I don't see any digital or actual hands. Once again, we will move on. We have a Proposed Resolution on Graded Academic Course Work During Scheduled Breaks, presentation by Lisa Nishii, who I assume is--

>>[INDISCERNIBLE]

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK, online and not here. Should we move to the next item while we wait? The next item deals with structural equity and inclusion for research teaching and extension, or RTE faculty, a presentation from Senators John Callister, in mechanical and aerospace engineering, and Kim Kopko, Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research. 5 minutes and then 10 minutes for Q&A. Go ahead. Let's make sure this is about right for both of you.

>>John Callister: I'd like to thank everyone who participated in the faculty forum on April 26. We had over 50 participants. And in that meeting, we learned a lot about issues that were important. And what major thing that we've received in feedback from our initial presentation is that they would like to see a non-exhaustive list of some of the issues, just as examples, of what

we mean in terms of structural equity. We have some up here. Again, I think they're the same as my text in front of me. As you can see, some examples of those are RTE are not allowed at faculty meetings. For example, one department just has tenured-track and tenured faculty for department business, and then just has a lunch where RTE and staff are invited. Secondly, RTE faculty are listed separately on the website, or, in fact, not at all. Three, there's no opportunity, as we've discussed, about something beyond a senior title. And it's felt that with just two levels, we are at a disadvantage, again, compared to our peer institutions, who often have three levels in the non-tenured-track, or RTE, area. Another one brought up was inconsistent search and hiring. Some RTE go through a search, have a vote, are hired as lecturers. And then, after several years, have a formal review with a vote to advance to senior lecturer. That's just one example, again, of the many titles that are in RTE. But sometimes we find that some RTE faculty are directly hired to a senior lecturer position, for example, without a search or vote. Fifthly, we're often not included. Sounds trivial maybe, but it does result in problems when you're not on the faculty list serve and you don't learn of things going on. And sometimes they have to add your name and send it out. Sometimes they forget. I'd like to add another one here. Just number six, job security and academic freedom were also issues. Now, I understand--You say, "Well, you're not tenure-tracked, so there is no job security. Well, that's not entirely in line with our peer institutions. And it also might dissuade some folks who are choosing to work at Cornell. So, we're, again, proposing a discussion of some alternative vesting procedure for RTE faculty.

>>Kim Kopko: Next slide, please. Good afternoon, everyone. And thank you again for the opportunity to present to you in this space. Is that better? Thank you. How's that? As John said, we did have a faculty forum to discuss this issue. It was very well attended, and the conversation

was very robust and, in my estimation, in a very positive way. There were a lot of issues that were raised. And one point of feedback that was consistent that came back to us, and we did debate this. In our last presentation at the Faculty Senate, we explained the reasons for not providing specifics because that was based on feedback that we received. And also, with RTE faculty, there are a number of issues. They might not be as narrow or as confined as issues with tenured or tenure-track faculty because you have research, teaching, and extension faculty. So, a lecturer may have very different points of concern than, say, a research faculty member. And when we attempted this exercise, our list was like this. And we really did not want to present a laundry list that looked like it was too much or too many complaints. But there are many, many concerns out there. And then the process was to list, maybe, the top three. One is job security. The other was academic freedom. And the third was... It was more just around the culture and the climate, very specific issues around equity, was the word that came up. And so, when we present the resolution for vote, we're going to attach the list of concerns that we received as background information just so folks can see some of the specifics and that we're being responsive to that request. It's not in any way intended to be a long list of issues or concerns. It's really just as descriptive background information for some data that we've collected. Our faculty resolution is that our RTE faculty experience an inequitable workplace with regards to performance reviews, promotions, and employment duties. Further, there are wide disparities between RTE and other faculty with regards to human resource infrastructure and other institutional support, as well as eligibility for some university-wide awards. This deeply affects RTE faculty, lowering morale, discouraging full participation in the academic life of the university, and hampering work performance. These issues are longstanding and serious.



>>John Callister: Whereas the Research, Teaching, and Extension Task Force has examined the rights and responsibilities of RTE faculty with respect to job duties, resources, performance reviews and promotions, service, advising, governance, and other academic and administrative duties; Whereas RTE faculty have recently gained three key rights, those of university voting rights, the right to emeritus status, and the right to serve on the Faculty Senate; Whereas RTE faculty play a vital role at Cornell University by significantly contributing to research, teaching, extension, and service; Whereas egalitarian treatment and respect for all faculty is necessary to the health and vitality of the academic environment, sense of community, and reputation of the university.

>>Kim Kopko: Be it resolved that RTE faculty have comparable structural equity and inclusion to the tenure-track and tenured faculty, except for those rights and responsibilities specific to tenure-track faculty arising from the hiring of tenure-track faculty and service on tenure and promotion committees for tenure-track faculty; Be it further resolved that the vice provost of academic affairs represent the RTE faculty in the university administration, with the responsibility of determining and implementing structural equity and inclusion of the RTE faculty in collaboration with the deans of the schools and colleges.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Time for Q&A. Again, waiting for digital hands on Zoom and actual bodies up here in the front of the room if you're in person. Please identify yourself and your department.

>>David Delchamps: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Who is the vice

provost for academic affairs? I tried to find that online. [INAUDIBLE] [LAUGHTER]

>>Eve De Rosa: Maybe you should say that for the audience on Zoom.

>>Kim Kopko: The question of "who is the vice provost for academic affairs?" It is Avery August.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK. Thank you. Did you say Lisa is online? Great, OK. We're going to move back to the proposed resolution on graded academic coursework during scheduled breaks. Lisa Nishii, vice provost for undergraduate education, human resource studies. You'll have 10 minutes, after which there will be 10 minutes for faculty discussion. Go ahead.

>>Lisa Nishii: Great. Thank you, everybody. Good afternoon. The purpose of the resolution in front of you today is to formalize, strengthen, and provide more specificity to a 2011 Sense of the Senate resolution. There was a faculty Sense of the Senate that was passed in 2011 in recognition of the fact that while students are always expected to be prepared for class, they should be given sufficient time to carry out assignments and prepare for classes without being required to devote their breaks to such preparation. The resolution, which was passed, strongly discourages faculty from framing assignments in such a way that necessitates academic work over Fall Break, Thanksgiving Break, February Break, or Spring Break. However, the 2011 Sense of the Senate resolution lacks authority in both form and content. It lacks binding authority because it is not legislation. It communicates the Senate's sentiment. And it also lacks authority by virtue of its content because it does not contain a prohibition, but rather it discourages faculty.

And it also leaves ambiguity about what kind of academic coursework may or may not be assigned over breaks. Next, please. Despite regular reminders to faculty about the Sense of the Senate, students have in different forms continued to express concerns and complaints about work that's scheduled over break, so that requires them to do work over break. I'll give you a couple examples here. In 2016, the Student Assembly passed a Reducing Academic Work Assigned Over Break resolution, seeking to put teeth [INDISCERNIBLE] into this 2011 faculty resolution, but the Faculty Senate did not pick up the essay resolution. As part of this resolution, the Student Assembly surveyed students, and they found credible examples of 45 different courses across 6 of the then 7 undergraduate colleges in which students reported having academic work assigned over break. On March 1, 2022, there was a Cornell *Daily Sun* article titled "First-Years Question if Workloads Allowed for a February Break at All." Several students interviewed said that they had work to do, or even work that was due, during break, causing them stress and negating the point of a break. And then, in 2019--I know the order is a little bit mixed here--but in 2019, as all of you, I think, know, we had a big mental health review. And in the final report, the authors of the report expressed concerns about the continued unproductively high levels of stress and student mental health strain. And in that report, they recommended immediate adherence to the 2011 resolution. Next, please. Now, to the wording of the resolution. It begins with the general limitation with some specific exceptions. Be it therefore resolved that subject only to the three exceptions set forth, which I will talk about in a second, faculty may not assign graded academic coursework during scheduled breaks. It explicitly prohibits the assignment of graded academic coursework. And here, we refer throughout the resolution to graded academic coursework to clarify the nature of the work that is at issue. I want to point out here, there's an asterisk. And you'll see some gray font below. Based on a recommendation we

received from the EPC, we recommend a slight revision to the wording that was initially part of the resolution. And that revised wording is in the bottom bullet here. And it's graded academic coursework that requires students' devotion of time during scheduled breaks. It's just meant to clarify that faculty can't assign graded academic coursework that requires students to work during break. I think the point is to differentiate it from prohibiting faculty from actually giving assignments out over the break period. We just want to make sure there's no ambiguity here.

Next, please. Here's the first exception. Students are expected to be prepared for and participate in class sessions that meet immediately after scheduled breaks, for example, by keeping up with reading assignments during scheduled breaks and participating in class discussion and active learning activities in the same manner as they would normally be expected. Next, please. The second exception, students who have been granted extensions through scheduled breaks for graded academic coursework or assessments may find it necessary to complete such graded academic coursework or prepare for such assessments over break. For example, make-up exams or assignment extensions, we added this as an exception because sponsors thought that we should provide flexibility for students who really would benefit from the extra time that breaks can provide. And it also provides faculty with more flexibility when they're trying to determine due dates for such extensions and also for make-up exams. Next, please. The third exception, courses that have a travel or field component or a clinical component may expect students to conduct such academic coursework during scheduled breaks. This exception here is to recognize that sometimes school breaks, like Spring Break, are the only opportunity that might be available for a course to incorporate a travel or field component. And we wouldn't want to inadvertently prohibit that kind of coursework. OK, next, please. There's greater specificity in this clause. Be it further resolved that with the exception of graded academic coursework and assessments for

which students have received extensions, including make-up exams, faculty may not hold a graded exam or quiz, conduct an in-class graded assignment, or have due a graded assignment the day following the last day of a scheduled break, thereby reducing the need for students to devote time during their break to such endeavors. To be clear, in such instances, faculty need not wait until their next class session for an assignment to be due. Rather, they may have a graded assignment due a day other than their class meeting date. It's just worth emphasizing here that the limitation is one day, not one class meeting day. And the faculty can have an assignment due on a day other than a class meeting day. I'll give maybe what's an extreme example. But let's imagine a class that meets only on Mondays. And the faculty teaching that class would not need to wait until the following Monday to have something due. That can really disrupt the tempo of a class. They could have an assignment due on Tuesday or some other day during the week following the break, even if the class doesn't meet on those days. Next, please. Be it further resolved that any of Cornell's professional degree programs that have scheduled breaks that differ from the established breaks set by the university at large for the main Ithaca campus and the Cornell Tech campus shall implement this policy based on their own calendars and understandings of scheduled breaks. We put this in here because we received valuable feedback from professional graduate schools on the resolution, specifically about the confusion that the resolution could create if we didn't explicitly call out the fact that not all students share the same scheduled breaks. Indeed, there are different academic calendars associated with different programs. Next, please. And this here is text to ensure that an element of the 2011 resolution remains in effect, which is for it to be further resolved that as set forth in the 2011 resolution, at the beginning of each semester, the Dean of Faculty shall remind the faculty of the resolution requirements. How are we doing on time? I can address a couple other issues, one more question

that the EPC posed, and one also from the UFC. But I want to be mindful of time.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have time. Go ahead.

>>Lisa Nishii: OK. Then, next, please. OK. When I introduced the first part of the resolution that put forth the general [INAUDIBLE]. I just lost you. Can you hear me?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: OK, my screen went blank. OK. The edit that we made to the general limitation with the wording, in addition to that, we also received another suggestion and one question, which I'll address here on this slide. The suggestion in the first bullet was specifically, the wording was, in courses with weekly assignments, the length of or effect required for assignments due after a break should maybe be reduced to account for the fact that students would not have the same number of days to work on an assignment. I think the spirit of this is to clarify any ambiguity about the limitation on graded academic coursework by including a specific example for how faculty could reduce the graded academic coursework, especially for weekly assignments. However, we did not have adequate time to discuss this with the faculty sponsors. And we are a little bit reticent to be overly prescriptive in the resolution. We do hope, though, that faculty will share ideas like this with their colleagues about other ways to maybe help reduce some of the stress that students experience so that they can indeed rest over their breaks. A question we received was, will the resolution affect the way that the Registrar's Office schedules midterms? And the simple answer to that would be no, because prelims are on

Tuesdays and Thursdays. And if I have this correct, we don't have breaks that end on Mondays and Wednesdays. And this resolution is just to prohibit exams for one day, exams and graded assignments. Except Labor Day, but that's so early in the semester that it doesn't really seem that it really plays here. And then I'll just say one--I'll share one last thing. Thank you for forwarding. This is a suggestion from the UFC. I will read it. No in-class exams can be scheduled on the Monday or Tuesday after Spring Break. Graded assignments made within the week before Spring Break also cannot be due on those days. However, graded projects or other assignments that were assigned at least two weeks before the start of the Spring Break can be due on any day after Spring Break, including the Monday and Tuesday. I think there are really two parts to this suggestion. One is to give a two-day pause following the break for exams, but allow assignments to be due immediately after a break as long as they were assigned at least two weeks prior to the start of the break. In this slide, I'll focus on the first part. This is the notion of extending from one day to two days after a break. I think some students may really appreciate this notion. We did discuss this with our sponsors. This was previously, though, not in response to the UFC suggestion. And they did express some concerns about the feasibility of extending to two days in all courses, and also the concern about the extent to which this might exacerbate the compression that will happen when we take those two days away in terms of when assignments can be due. The bottom line, though, is we have not yet had a time to discuss this with the sponsors, and so, have not made this change to the resolution in this short period. And then, next, please. I'll address the second part of the suggestion from the UFC, which was to allow graded assignments and projects to be due immediately after break, but not exams, as long as they were assigned at least two weeks before the start of the break. And the sponsors of the resolution had also previously discussed whether to connect these restrictions on what could or could not be due

after break to when it was assigned. That is, if students had lots and lots of time to prepare their work, that would it be OK to have things due? And ultimately, the group decided that we did not think it was right to couple it with the timing of the assignment, that it doesn't really help that students had ample time. If they're working at a good pace throughout the semester, they would still have to work over break. And we're just trying to avoid that. And the other thing--last thing--is that this then makes this distinction between exams and assignments. And the different treatment for exams, not allowed for two days, but OK for graded projects or assignments, might not always make sense in that in some classes, a project or other kind of assignment might be worth more and require a lot more effort than an exam. And so, we're not quite comfortable with differentiating so explicitly in this resolution. That's kind of where we landed. But I'd like to open it up for discussion now. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK, come on up. I see we have someone in-house. And then, if you are on Zoom and have a question, just raise your hand, and we'll get to you.

>>[INDISCERNIBLE]

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Is Rebecca here or online? You're invited to say something. Rebecca is the chair of the EPC. And if there's any further introduction that you need to make about yourself, feel free.

>>Rebecca Nelson: I appreciated the input from the committee. Am I commenting now?



>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yeah. And stay close to the mic.

>>Rebecca Nelson: We appreciated the spirit of the resolution and the idea that we should know and be reminded and have means by which we value and not [INDISCERNIBLE] the breaks that students have expressed that they need. But we feel that the resolution is kind of small in what it gives the students. It's that one day. We would maybe appreciate it a little bit more in the way of examples such as the one we suggested, maybe just as an example, or a couple more, or the one that Lisa also mentioned, just to give people a feel for what constitutes respecting the spirit of the resolution. We did note that it might be tougher for students if the result is that people put the big exams and papers all right before the break, so then you're really hit with more stress ultimately. I, personally, am one of those slackers who really appreciates the break for a chance to catch up. And I don't think that should be completely... There's an implication that any catch-up is not-- You're a bad person if you're catching up. And I'm perpetually catching up, so I sort of appreciate a little more space for the catch-up possibility. And we did appreciate the addressing of the ambiguity. Thank you, Lisa. The gauging of the workload for short weeks should be maybe in that example category. Those were our thoughts. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: OK. We'll start in-house with a question. And identify yourself.

>>Walker White: Hi, I'm Walker White, computer science. I just wanted to make a comment on this. First off, I appreciate the spirit in which this is given. And I've always been very supportive of making sure that students don't work over breaks. But I do a lot of project-based instruction, and I'm concerned that we're thinking about these things as assignments that are turned in

separate from the class that's actually being run. I do a lot of in-class critiques where students are doing presentations. And so, it's not just the students that are turning in, it's the students that are involved in the critique itself. I've always made sure that people aren't going to work over Spring Break. They have the stuff done before Spring Break. But I do have to have presentations after this. This requirement would require me to completely cancel the class, and I would have to have a make-up class. And I'm not sure that that's the right solution here.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Go to Harold Hodes online.

>>Harold Hodes: Am I audible?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I hear you.

>>Harold Hodes: Well, a number of worries here. First of all, this resolution does constrain how instructors can run their classes. And it sounds to me as if the vast majority of classes either do not give any work over break or don't give excessive work over break. If it's only 45 offending classes out of all the university's classes that pose a problem, it seems that this is attacking a small problem with a sledgehammer. More specifically about the details of the proposal, a good number of classes have students, the day before class, posting to some sort of discussion board, which involves doing a certain amount of thinking and writing that is posted the day before class meets, say on a Monday, when Sunday is part of the break. And it sounds as if this proposal would prohibit this sort of thing. Maybe that wasn't part of the intent of the proposal, but I'd like to see a revision in the wording that would make it explicit that discussion posting is allowed on

the last day of the break. OK, my two points.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. We have a question or a comment from in-house. Go ahead. Identify yourself.

>>Stephan Schmidt: Hi. Stephan Schmidt, city and regional planning. I guess more just a clarification question. My class is largely project-based. And in terms of final projects, so semester-long projects, where the expectation and assumption is that students are working over the breaks, including Thanksgiving and Spring Break, as well as a series of intermediary deadlines, if you will, sort of progress deadlines towards the final project, I'm just wondering how this policy would affect that. I think the last slide tried to address that, but I couldn't really follow the logic. So, just more a clarification for semester-long final projects. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Lisa, do you have any comments on that?

>>Lisa Nishii: Sure. I think I'll say two things. The first, the point about, well, if the numbers are really small, then is this necessary? I guess, to that, I would say, if the number's small, then not many would be impacted by the proposed resolution. But if the number is large, then it feels there's even greater need for this. We don't have an accurate count. The 45, I don't know exactly how many courses or students the SA surveyed when they came up with the 45. 45 classes could impact a lot of students depending on the classes and the class sizes. So, I just want to say that. To the second point about discussion boards or projects that are ongoing, our intent was to have addressed that with the exception type one, which was to say that students are expected to be

prepared for and participate in class sessions, including things like active learning, things that are part of the normal course of the class. It's just not this punctuated, graded assignment that would require an intense amount of work on the part of students. And if it's just a reasonable progress through the course of the semester, the idea would be that they could probably complete something like that before leaving for break or as they come back to campus. We are aware. It's also just one day. And so, we're trying to strike this balance, because we hear you, between providing this relief for students without it being so disruptive to the way that faculty teach and structure their courses.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And the faculty has something to say.

>>Lisa Nishii: I think in response to the two in-house questions, both of those are reasonable. It is in the sense that these are things that students--this is an expectation that's set at the beginning of the semester in terms of work and efforts that are towards either an ongoing project or the discussion board or online. All of those things are very reasonable and don't push back or conflict with what's being proposed. And I kind of want to remember--everybody remember that this is a Sense of the Senate. This has been on the books since 2011. There's nothing new here. And if anything, by formalizing it, this is just giving--sort of formalizing it and actually limiting the scope by saying, "Only one day is needed," it kind of actually gives the faculty a little bit more space than they had already. So, I just wanted to remind everyone that this has been on the books as an informal Sense of the Senate since 2011. Yeah, Rebecca, come on up.

>>Rebecca Nelson: Eve and Lisa, would it be possible to note those cases, or similar, some

generic version thereof, under that first exception? Because I found that exception, frankly, a little obscure and sort of seemed to annihilate the whole thing to a certain extent. I wasn't--Yes, I could see that you can't have a giant exam or a giant due date. But you obviously don't feel comfortable as to knowing whether you're excepted or not, so just to make it really, really clear. Because our one example--I don't like one as a number anyway. I like an [INDISCERNIBLE]--but three that really cover what each group of people--maybe this [INDISCERNIBLE] cases that are really itchy to us as to whether it's OK or not OK. Because I think the spirit is good, but if you don't know if you're in line with the letter or the spirit, it's really almost counterproductive.

>>Lisa Nishii: What I can do is I can post those examples. I'll take them right from the transcript and post them with the resolution and make clear that, if people should look at those things, comments that came from the Senate meeting.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a comment online. And then we can go in-house again. Denise Ramzy.

>>Denise Ramzy: Thanks. Hi. I just was thinking, as I was kind of thinking about this, I absolutely support the spirit of the resolution. I just wonder, shouldn't there be a discussion about the calendar as part of this? There's sort of a bigger issue. In fall semester, when we come back from Thanksgiving Break, often, there's just one week left of classes. And so, by sort of definition, there have to be things that are due that week. And so, I guess I'm trying to figure out, it's one thing to say, "We're going to say the day after we get back from break, we can't do this," that's all fine and good. But we're not actually addressing the real issue, which is that we're

giving students so little time when we get back from certain breaks because of the nature of our calendar. We're sort of missing--The spirit of it isn't pervasive across all of the ways we can think about it. [CROSSTALK]

>>Lisa Nishii: Do you want me to respond?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: OK. I know. And I just remember from during the pandemic, when we were constantly looking at the calendar to see what different permutations were possible, that we actually have very few degrees of freedom, is what I learned with the academic calendar. And that we have our summer session, and then orientation starts right away, and the fall semester. And then we need a certain number of weeks of academic instruction, period. This is regulated. We need that. And so, to give students--So, we'd go more into the break. And we already end pretty late in December. But then we can't push--There are a lot of problems with then having exams, for example, after a shorter Winter Break. You solve one problem, you create another problem, is essentially what we learned. And then, also, we have winter session. And academic terms cannot overlap. This is another thing that I learned. I've tried the math in many different ways, and I haven't been able to come up with a better solution. And I think people will be very upset if we took away--Faculty would be upset if we took away more of their Winter Break. Denise, thanks for the spirit, but I just don't know how we can solve that one.

>>Eve De Rosa: I'm going to add to Lisa's comment. There are multiple offices working on the

academic calendar. We have scientists modeling in every permutation of classroom space, schedule, everything you can think of. We have admissions, we have undergraduate education, the dean of faculty, the registrar, having frequent meetings about the academic calendar. It is no small feat.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a comment or question in-house.

>>Hadas Ritz: Hadas Ritz, mechanical and aerospace engineering. A comment you made earlier about whether or not exams should be prohibited on the first two days after a break, I believe the registrar does not schedule evening exams the Tuesday after Spring Break, which I think is entirely appropriate. I think that that would not be nice to the students. But I think there should be some acknowledgement of whether that is or isn't a prohibited day of in-class exams, as well. It's prohibited for evening exams, and maybe it should be clarified whether we think that that's just not a reasonable day to have exams for students, or maybe it should be a reasonable day, and the registrar should schedule evening exams that day, also.

>>Lisa Nishii: If there is an amendment that any senator would like to propose to this, then I think that's the way we would have to go to change it from one to two days and to formalize that.

>>David Delchamps: David Delchamps, electrical and computer engineering. And I like this. I like what you've come up with. And I think it's good that we're turning this into actual legislation instead of a Sense of the Senate. And it reminds me of many years of frustration I've had when talking to students, as a member of EPC--And Rebecca and I served together for a while--that we

just have strong recommendations all over the place, and we don't have a lot of rules. For example, one of the strong recommendations is that if the student has 3 exams in a 24-hour period, somebody budes. But it's still just advice. It's not a rule. Students think it's a rule. But it's not. And I'm curious, Lisa, are there any thoughts--I'm looking at the screen to see you. Are there any thoughts about making that into a rule?

>>Lisa Nishii: Yes.

>>David Delchamps: OK, I was just curious.

>>Lisa Nishii: That also came up. And we've been working through the nuts and bolts of that. Our term is over, but you're going to see a lot of me in the fall.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have one more comment in-house. Identify yourself.

>>Ken Birman: Yeah, Ken Birman in computer science. I was thinking back to Peter Stein, the remark about the memorial. Something Peter Stein did as dean of the faculty might be useful here. Although, perhaps it's too late for the suggestion. In situations like this, when he was proposing legislation--And in his case, it was conflict of interest--Peter preferred to have a general statement of the principle, and that was the policy, and then a little booklet illustrating exceptions and explaining why they were legitimate exceptions given the spirit of the policy. I think that this is stumbling over a similar issue, a tendency to sort of legislate, and then people ask, "Well, what about this case? What about that case?" Rather than a firm statement of the



principle, which I very strongly support, and then you could go through Walker White's example and explain why that's actually OK because the structure of the course necessitates that. And you could give a different example and say, "This is not OK because it attempts to violate the spirit of the principle." Again, it's perhaps too late to change this, but that's what I would have done.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I think we're going to now go back to Dean of Faculty Eve De Rosa. And then we'll have a Good of the Order section.

>>Eve De Rosa: Ken, I love that suggestion. And we are revising and revamping our website. I think it's very reasonable to give case studies, basically, maybe sitting next to the resolution on the website. Thank you for that suggestion. Since we're so efficient, I thought I would come back up and entertain you guys with some other things that I wouldn't have included since I only gave myself five minutes to speak--I mean, I would have included if I had more than five minutes. One thing is a plea. We have out there right now a request to deans, directors, and chairs to submit a Qualtrics--It's a very brief survey, asking how units across campus value collaborative and community-engaged work, scholarship. And what we're trying to understand is, at a system-wide level, across all the different disciplines, how this is valued. And we want to know if we need to set up specific guidelines for new faculty, tenure-track faculty, and also for RTE faculty who would like to be promoted. And so, we just want to understand, across the different disciplines, how is this appreciated? And part of this is because our newer scholars are--if they're going for federal funding, federal funding is usually tied to collaborative science. And, for example, NIH has guidelines for how that gets valued by NIH. And so, we just want to understand, system-wide, how Cornell values that and so that we can provide guidance. In order

for us to understand and appreciate what's happening across the university, we need numbers. And so, that's one plea. Another plea, huge one, again, teaching awards. We know there is excellent teaching going on in this campus. We have the Provost Award, we have the Weiss Awards. And I'm going to share with you that the same colleges, maybe plural or not, same units within that same space, are repeated nominations coming from the same space. And I would like to be able to give to President Pollack a real spectrum of disciplines and colleges and schools across our university, where we know excellent educators are. This is another plea for people to submit nominations for their colleagues that they know are excellent at their instruction. Next year--I thought I'd give you a little preview. Next year, we'll be thinking about the swim test. The swim test was implemented here in the Faculty Senate. And in the pandemic, it was suspended. It's now back. But that allowed a space for us to look at data for who's not passing the swim test and who's taking the introduction to swimming test and course. And what we found, primarily, it was women and people of color and the intersection of both. And there are two sides to this. Is this a barrier, or is this teaching somebody a life skill? We've had this conversation in the Senate. We have a draft resolution that's been pending. We put it up there so everybody can see it. We are now going to shop this across different student groups. We're going to have it also be considered by the Office of Student and Campus Life, and the dean of students is going to take this around. We're going to just try to do our due diligence and get student feedback on this. We're going to absorb all of that and bring it back to the Senate. I just wanted to let you know. That's a fun topic for next year. Another cool thing that we're doing is we're working with registrar, financial aid, admissions, and student campus life to potentially build a concierge service for financial aid. Many of our low-income, first-generation students are having difficulty with financial aid, and they need someone to help them navigate it. And we have an

army of retired and emeriti faculty who have put their hands up to say, "We will help and be concierge service." We're going to work through this and understand what that might look like, but I just wanted to let you know that. It's really wonderful to have the faculty volunteer for something like this to support our students. And the last thing I wanted to say is, another thing that will come back to us is we're looking with the vice provost of undergraduate education at academic integrity across the colleges and schools. I've mentioned this in our Senate meetings. And so, we're going to be working together over the summer to see if we can simplify the process and unify how it's--maybe not how it's interpreted, but also just how it's worded, so we can start to get data. It's actually very difficult to understand this space. And so, we are thinking about things like, what is academic integrity at Cornell? What does that look like? What does it feel like? And how is it defined? And we're going to create an onboarding video for new faculty so that--we're going to start to set a standard. What we're learning is that faculty are stepping away from pushing on students who are violating academic integrity because it's such a burdensome process. Is there a way to streamline it? Is there a way to make it systemically even and equitable? And also, is there an easy way to report students who violate outside their college? We're also finding that there are repeat offenders who go outside their college, and it doesn't necessarily go on their record and come back to home to their home college. And so, I just wanted to share some of the things, important things, that we'll be working on next year. And thank you. And then we're going to have our Good of the Order.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Actually, we have about seven or eight minutes. And there are some people that wanted to make some comments. So, without objection, I'm going to just open it up to comments on other agenda items that have already been closed. I see Alison is online. If you

unmute yourself, you can take a couple of minutes.

>>Alison: OK, I'll just make a quick comment. I wish we could reopen the Q&A on the RTE discussion because I think there are several of us that had comments on that. I really appreciate the RTE resolution. I think the first "whereas" statement is missing some of the key components of concerns that our two speakers today mentioned, including hiring, appointments, review, academic freedom. And then, I'd like to point out, I think this is clear that the "be it resolved," the two statements don't clearly address how those concerns are going to be addressed. There needs to be a stronger "be it resolved" statement on addressing those concerned. I think the first "be it resolved" statement is too vague. I'd also like to--I understand that the RTE taskforce is going to continue its work, so I think that should be a "be it resolved" statement, as well. Thank you very much.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If there are other comments--I don't see any other hands on the Zoom. OK, not seeing any. We'll move on then to the last order of business, which is Good of the Order, for five minutes. We have Michael Ryan Clarkson from computer science. And the mic is yours.

>>Michael Clarkson: I had some slides for that. Could those be pulled up, please? [AUDIENCE CHATTER]

>>There we go. There we go. Thank you. There we go.

>>Michael Clarkson: OK, thank you. I'm Michael Clarkson. I'm a senior lecturer in the

Department of Computer Science and a Stephen H. Weiss Provost Teaching Fellow. I've been on the lecturer track here at Cornell since 2014. And in that almost decade of teaching experience, I have taught over 6,000 students, recently about 1,000 students a year, so the correct unit of measurement is the kilostudent. Most of them call me Professor Clarkson. Last month, I won the Professor of the Year Award for the second time in the Engineering College. Yet, professor is not my job title. Do titles matter? At some level, they should not. The intellectual work we do as faculty, the impact we have on the world, the training of the next generation of scholars, is far more important than what we put on slides or sign in our emails. But the words we use for one another do matter. They speak to the worth that we ascribe to the members of our community. The Senate has had conversations here, including today, about the community of RTE faculty. So, I offer the following remarks in the hope of continuing that conversation, not just today but into the next academic year. The fundamental problem with the title "lecturer," I believe, is that it does not reflect the many intellectual contributions made by many teaching-track faculty here at Cornell, contributions to their unit, to the university, and to the world. These faculty develop innovative course content, often at the foundational levels of the discipline. Faculty are on the frontlines of identifying and improving pedagogy, not only in their own courses but throughout a curriculum. These faculty make internationally visible contributions through textbooks, publicly released teaching materials, and leadership in teaching societies. But despite these intellectual contributions and many more by our teaching-track faculty, we continue to use the historical title of lecturer for them. Unfortunately, in our US academic culture, that has negative effects, hinders recruitment. If an outstanding teaching, focused candidate can take a job with the title professor, why would they not? Indeed, this is a real, not hypothetical, problem in my own discipline. Another negative effect is that the lecturer title increasingly creates disparity with the titles in use

at Cornell. A faculty member who devotes their career primarily to research can now be titled research professor. A faculty member who devotes a substantial part of their career to industry or policy, then pivots to teaching, can be titled professor of the practice. A faculty member who devotes their entire career to teaching is not titled professor. As an aside, I wonder the extent to which this relates to teachers being undervalued in our society as a whole. A third negative effect is that lecturer as a title can suggest to students, parents, donors, that courses are not being taught by "real faculty." And that's a shame because teaching-track faculty have the freedom and responsibility to devote their full efforts to the best possible educational experience for their students. Response to these negative effects of lecturer as a title, and no doubt others, there is another title in use at other universities. The typical form of this title is teaching professor in the standard ranks of assistant, associate, and full. To be clear, a teaching professor title should not be a substitute for, nor an erosion of, the standard tenure-track professor title. Cornell will always need tenure-track professors who engage in world-class research. That is one of our core values. Introducing research professor and professor of the practice titles is not going to change those values, nor should a teaching professor title. Rather, teaching professor should honor the intellectual contributions made by teaching-track faculty. Teaching professor conveys a commitment to undergraduate education, since that's the curriculum level at which most of these faculty serve. Teaching professor demonstrates respect for these faculty who devote their entire careers to teaching. Teaching professor encourages collegiality within departments by reducing the othering of teaching-track faculty with respect to tenure-track faculty. It also encourages protection by the administration by exposing the parallel nature that these policies for various classes of faculty ought to exhibit. And last but not least, the move to create teaching professor titles is part of a national trend. Next slide, please. Here's a representative sample of universities

like Cornell. 9 out of the 20 have a teaching professor title. But peer pressure should not be the driving force behind our conversations. Rather, what I want to ask is that you, as senators, listen to faculty within your own units and reflect together on whether the current state of teaching track titles at Cornell best meets our values as a faculty and our intentions of remaining a world-class university. Meanwhile, I'm working with Charlie Van Loan to advance these ideas. And we look forward together to continuing the discussion next year with the RTE taskforce, with appropriate Senate committees, the dean of faculty, the colleges. And we hope that there will develop interest to draft a Senate resolution, recommending the introduction of a three-tier track titled teaching professor. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Do you want to remind everyone that we're going to the Park Atrium immediately after the gavel right outside here? Having no more business, the meeting is adjourned.