FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 11, 2026

SAM NELSON: At this point, I'd like to call the meeting to order. And I'm going to start with something new. I want to acknowledge Jill Short from the Dean of Faculty's Office, who found this great video version of the land acknowledgment, which we are all now going to see.

NARRATORS: Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ'. 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.

SAM NELSON: Great, thank you. And then, I also want to thank Jill. She looked to see if there was quorum for today's meeting, and she noted there was. So, we have quorum at this point. All right. And then the next thing that I want to do is ask is there anybody that would like to move to approve the minutes from this last meeting? Who moved? Okay. And is there anyone that would like to second? All right. Thank you very much. And then, at this point, I'd like to call Laura Weiss, the Director of Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Education Office, to come up and give a presentation.

LAURA WEISS: Good afternoon. Can you hear me? My name is Laura Weiss. I'm the director of the SHARE Office. And you're going to run my slides. I'm sorry. [Indiscernible] I am going to be talking about sexual violence, and I know that has been such a conversation on this campus. It's been absolutely inescapable for the majority of this semester, but I just do want to say the focus of the conversation is sexual violence, and that that can be a lot for folks, so please take care of yourselves if needed. This was the last standard part of my speech when I introduced myself. So, I'm going to very quickly walk you through the SHARE Office and some of the initiatives that we have, as well as some thoughts on how you as faculty may support students or run into this in your classroom. The SHARE Office kind of has two parts. One is our Victim Advocacy Program, which provides direct service to individuals who've been impacted by harm. Oftentimes that is sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, feminist harassment, other forms of bias, hazing, even physical violence. I work with folks, students, staff, and faculty on an individual basis in a non-judgmental way of figuring out what are the needs and goals of this person, and how can we help support them. Oftentimes, it's a conversation around the options that exist, both for formal processes, if someone is interested in making a report to the university or to the police, what that entails, what that looks like, what's involved, how long is that going to take, how many meetings are there going to be, so that people make an informed decision that's right for them. Other times, we're just working through the impacts that their experience is having on their [indiscernible] , whether that's in the workplace, in the classroom, in their housing situation, in the friendship groups. The impacts are really-- It's a ripple in a lot of different directions, and so helping folks to navigate that and figure out what they need and what kind of supports are available, whether you're our office or other spaces at Cornell or any community. I think I kind of said this already, but just wanted to give you a quick grounding in

some of the facts around sexual violence and data that we know about our community here, and then talking about some of the emerging prevention strategies that we're working on in the SHARE office. The other side of our office is really focused on educational and prevention initiatives, trying to find the things that will work, that have demonstrated that they work, and bringing that to the community. So, just a little bit on the background. I think that you're probably familiar with the SARM survey. At this point, there have been six iterations of the Sexual and Related Misconduct survey that we do at Cornell every two years. In 2025, the spring of 2025 was the last collection of that data. We know we had a very low response rate for that particular year of the survey. But in prior years, we've had actually quite a good response rate, between 36% and 38%. So, while there is some question of the credibility of the data from the most recent survey, I think we really do have longstanding, really good data to understand what's happening within our Cornell community. This is a survey where 6,000 students across the university and the different campuses are invited to participate. The questions asked are about behaviors that people have experienced, not have you been sexually assaulted, but has someone ever touched you in a sexual way that was unwanted or non-consensual? So, people are reacting to experiences that they've had. These may or may not be anything that they've ever reported to the university. So, looking at this alongside of data, there are a little bit two different sets of information. So, the first slide up here is just looking at sexual and gender-based harassment and experiences. You can see the 2025, '23, and '21 data in bars across the number of folks who had experienced any form of harassment, as well as the impacts of that harassment. And something that we have seen an increase in in the last two iterations of that survey is folks reporting that they feel they have to tolerate that kind of behavior or some part of their Cornell experiences is in jeopardy, whether it's, you know, participation in an activity, in a sport, in an opportunity, in a lab, a recommendation letter that could be at risk. This idea that they feel like they have to put up with this unacceptable experience that they're having, because otherwise they're gonna lose out on something that's really important to them. The other side is looking at experiences of non-consensual sexual contact. Really broadly defined, this is any form of unwanted touch that's sexual in nature up to and including penetration. 15% of students reported that they had experienced this in the 2025 survey. I think there was a conversation here a couple weeks ago about the 35% of undergraduate women who said that they had experienced non-consensual sexual contact. That data is higher than previous iterations of this that they have shown, but not in a way that I think is really in question. I think that sexual violence is a pervasive experience for too many at Cornell. So, giving you just a little grounding in what's really happening to our community, I think it's important to understand the number of folks who are really dealing with this at any given moment. So, the SHARE office public health approach to sexual violence. You can see from the wheel here all of the different elements that are really necessary to have-- to really address the problem from all angles. We need things like institutional leadership and policies. We need folks who can respond to people who have been harmed. We need folks who are promoting caring community and help seeking and knowledge of what to do if someone does come forward and share that they had something happen to them, and educational initiatives, I think, are a piece of this. So, I wanted to share two evidence-based strategies that the SHARE office is working on that are about engaging students in really practical information. One is called the Enhanced, Assess, Acknowledge, Act Special Assault Resistance Program. This is an evidence-based 12-hour long workshop series that really is focused on the experiences of women, designed for cis and trans women with experiences. This is a program developed in Canada, incredibly well-researched, randomized control trial, follow-up of up to two years post

taking this workshop series. I don't know how well you can see it, but the top right graphic is looking at the reduction in experiences of attempted assault, completed rape, coercion, other forms of sexual assault. There is such an incredible reduction in those experiences for folks who went through the EAAA program. Alongside EAAA, we have another program called the AM/PM Project, Actively Modeling Positive Masculinity. Because the EAAA is focused on the experiences of women, we are not solving the problem by only speaking to women about the experiences that they're having. AM/PM Project is an opportunity to engage men in the issue directly and to work with them to help change attitudes, behaviors, perceptions of masculinity, willingness to intervene. [Indiscernible] . We are evaluating it right now. We have evaluated it in the past, so that second graph that you can see there is looking at some of the changes in acceptance of rape that's pre and post the 12-hour workshop series. We have updated the curriculum significantly since this first pilot was done, so we are actively evaluating it right now. Both of these evidence-based programs are currently being offered as a one-credit class through the Learning Where You Live program because 12 hours is a lot for us to summarize. Even if you can show them that there are really amazing outcomes from these programs, 12 hours is a lot of time. So, partnering with the Learning Where You Live program to offer it for one credit where students self-select into a section either at the AM/PM or at the EAAA. They complete the program. There's some conversation at the beginning, conversation at the end. We are pedaling at this semester for the very first time with the last workshop coming up this weekend. We've had 30 students participate and are evaluating a heck out of every target, but really excited. The feedback from them is really-- They're excited about what they're learning and feeling like this is a way for them to engage on an issue that they often feel hopeless about. The other piece that we've had a lot of interest in is [indiscernible] . There's been a lot of conversation about that. [Indiscernible] as well. Finding ways to infuse curriculum with some of the concepts from sexual citizenship as well as other sexual violence prevention principles, has been really effective in the academic space. Again, students don't wanna come to programs, they don't wanna-- It's hard. So, if you can bring it to them in the classroom, I think they're much more willing to engage in really thoughtful ways with this information and how it applies to their own lived experiences. So, the couple of classes that we're offering that are infused with sexual citizenship principles, you can see them here. Also looking for more ways to bring that and partner with faculty on these things. And because this again is a pilot and we're really interested in understanding, does it do anything, I have multiple sessions of students go through a seven week, one credit class on sexual citizenship. We've been evaluating pre and post-test to see what are they getting from this? Is it doing anything? Because if it's not doing anything productive, then we want to put our efforts elsewhere. So, our next slide. We're really excited. I have a colleague who is an expert in evaluation, maybe not, but she really is, and she created some validating scales that refine sexual empowerment. But looking at things like confidence in communicating their own values, confidence in being able to ask people what they want, and confidence in handling situations that they're uncomfortable with. We saw really big changes on all of these scales, so I think we're really encouraged that these are skills and tools that students need in their lives that show up in lots of different ways. And so, if they're having an opportunity to really think about this in an academic setting, to apply that information to their personal lives, and to have some actual takeaway skills through the activities and discussions in the class, they're coming out with tools to help them have a better time in navigating relationships. Some of the outcomes here, greater self-awareness and values clarification, stronger communication and relationship skills, increased personal agency, greater awareness of what some of those social and environmental

factors are that have influence on the way that interactions go down. So, our preliminary findings are really encouraging that this is doing something of value for our students. So, we're gonna continue to find ways to, again, create classes and opportunities in academic settings for us. One of the things from the victim advocacy lens that we really see is that when students eventually come and ask to meet with someone for support, it's because the number one reason is it's impacting their academics. That is by far the biggest concern that our students have. And the experiences that they are navigating and trying to figure out, I mean, I think they're really life-changing, huge issues, and their concern is my [indiscernible] . They take their academics so seriously. So, whether it's impacting their work itself, their ability to concentrate on their work, their ability to get out of bed and make it to class, or their feelings of safety in the classroom and ability to participate, these are some of the things that we really see people coming to us about. And since you are the people in the classroom, I think bringing your attention to how this shows up in different academic spaces and what you as faculty members can do to help support students and to create environments where people are finding support in all of these really important spaces at Cornell. There is no one way that people react after a sexual assault. I think oftentimes if you watch a lot of SVU, you think that everyone is hysterical, and crying, and like really is calling it sexual assault. When in fact, oftentimes people are struggling to name an experience that they have, and they can talk about it in [indiscernible] ways, almost nonchalant sometimes in how people might deliver. I've had this experience. So, if you are expecting a certain thing from someone who might be sharing an experience that they've had with you and it's not matching your expectation, that can be confusing for everybody. But it can also lead folks to downplay the experience that a student might be sharing or to think that the impacts are more minimal if they're just talking more casually. So, in the same way that there's no one way for people to act, there's no checklist that I can give you of, like, here are all of the things that you should do. But it can point you in some directions of what is helpful to people. Based on best practices of working with survivors who've experienced harm, if someone does disclose to you about an experience that they've had, using open-ended questions, helping them think about what options exist, what resources exist, rather than telling them what to do or thinking, oh, report, that's the answer, when that's not the answer for everybody. So, if you can help people, help guide people to spaces of support, particularly those that are confidential, like the SHARE office, that gives folks the chance to really figure out, what is it that I need? What are all of those options? And they're not committed to anything that they weren't anticipating in the way that just being routed to the [indiscernible] office and CSCR or the police kind of puts someone into a process, whether or not they're really prepared for what that means. Really, my please avoids are the opposite of everything that I just asked you to do. So, telling people what to do, not effective. Asking people why, you know, "Well, why did you go back with him? You're telling me that you felt really uncomfortable in this group project, so why did you continue working with them?" The why often implies judgment of folks, so if you can avoid that question, that's great. Oftentimes, again, people are struggling to name the experience or aren't sure what to call it. So, if you jump ahead and call it something that they're not ready for, from a clinical perspective, not great. So, just use the language that they're using. If they're saying, "I had this really creepy date last weekend," "Do you want to tell me more about that creepy date?" You don't need to define it if they're not ready to. And then, the other tip, pressuring folks to report or to seek a particular resource. I think what we aim for is helping people know that there are resources, that there are options, maybe helping them narrow down, because there are so many, what are their actual needs? Can you help match and resource to the needs that they're identifying but not making calls on their behalf to

the police if that's something they're looking for. Something that, if you've been at Cornell for a long time, you might have at one point been told that you, as a faculty member, are a designated reporter, and that if you learn anything about someone's experience of sexual violence or dating violence, you must share that information with the Title IX office. That is not true. They have changed the list of designated reporters. I just went through it the other day and pulled out the faculty roles that are designated reporters are deans, past professor deans on West Campus, as well as advisors to student organizations. If you're just operating in your capacity as a faculty member teaching a class, and someone who shares with you, you do not have to report that information to the Title IX. In terms of resources, if you remember nothing else from anything I say, if you can remember share.cornell.edu, everything can be found there. Information about confidential resources, information about reporting, the different offices that do that, how to support a friend, some of those like helpful things, not helpful things, as well as information about the SARM survey. All of that is housed on share.cornell.edu. A few things. I am from the SHARE office, so I am going to promote that as the first resource I want you to think of, but some of the things that I think are helpful to frame the SHARE office as doing or not doing. All the conversations with the SHARE advocates are confidential and they are free. We are located in Cornell Health, but we are not part of the CAS. We're not part of the medical department. There are no co-pays involved. It's just confidential service. There's no pressure to report or to do any particular thing. Again, our goal is just to help people make the decision that's right for them by supplying information and answering questions. They get to stay in control. They get to decide what happens next, if anything. Sometimes we can have a really long conversation, and the person walks away not doing anything. And that's fine. We work with folks on a consultation basis. Sometimes people really can just have a couple questions that they want answers for. It might be a one-time meeting. Other times we're working with people, especially if they're engaged in a process for literally semesters or years. We can work with folks for as long as necessary. And it's up to them. If they want us to, great. If they don't want us to, we can respect that as well. Importantly, I think there's no criteria that people need to meet. There's no Policy 6.4 violation that people have to reach in order to access the [indiscernible] . And so that's provided without people needing to share a lot of information about what can happen. So, just a few quick things for faculty. In terms of the way that you structure your classes, the things that you share in your syllabi, providing agency and predictability to people who've experienced trauma, and trauma broadly, not just sexual ones, but being able to restore a sense of decision making, control, to know, okay, on Thursdays, these are the things that we do in this class. I know that, you know, deadlines are 5 PM on Fridays, that kind of thing. Having that kind of predictability built into your courses so that people know what to expect can be really helpful for them, especially when other things feel [indiscernible] . Providing connection and support. Some of these are really vital things for people who have experienced sexual violence or harm. Looking for that sense of reconnection to people, if trust has been broken, especially if relationships and friendship groups have fractured, which is often an outcome of sexual violence. It happens between people who know each other most of the time. Regaining a sense of connection to peers, as well as to faculty members who care, is really, really important to folks. So, thinking of the ways that you can provide support, it doesn't mean that you have to become that person's therapist, by any means, but helping them identify what resources exist. Helping to normalize helps behavior. If you can say, "You know, a bunch of students that I've worked in the past have found this particular resource really helpful." Helping to normalize this idea of reaching out would be just really important. Sometimes thinking about-- I actually prepared this a while ago

when things were really at the height of sort of the media frenzy on campus. But being able to acknowledge we're going through stuff as a community right now. Saying something is really perceived as helpful versus saying nothing. And for some folks, it's more comfortable to just proceed as normal. And for some students, it's more comfortable to proceed as normal. But just a small acknowledgement, "Hey, there's a lot going on right now, and I know that it can be hitting people up differently." Really don't need to say more than that, but that sends a signal that you're someone who understands, that do cares. So, the last few slides are really taken from the WISE Toolkit, which is something that one of my colleagues has created, Well-being in Scholarly Environments. This is an amazing tool that you can scan it or you can Google it and find it. It's got modules on all kinds of things, of tips for creating environments where people are really centering well-being, figuring out little tips of things that you could do in class. [Indiscernible] different ways of engaging students. There is a new module on trauma-informed teaching practices that goes into some more depth of what I've just been talking about. I'll end here just by saying that, honestly, the times that we have worked with students who are dealing with struggles in the academic realm and a faculty member has done probably to them the smallest thing, like, "Sure, you can have an extension to next week," it makes such a huge, huge difference to students. So, thinking about just those little moments when you can acknowledge someone and the experience that they're having or the struggle that they're dealing with, again, not to be a therapist, not to go into great detail about it, but just to say, like, "I see you're working really hard and I know you're going through some stuff." I cannot tell you, I cannot overstate the value of that for students. They care so deeply about their academics. And I don't know, I hope you understand. I hope you understand how the words in their lives and experiences, and just the smallest thing can be such a difference to them being able to pursue. My last slide is just a thank you. [Indiscernible] any time. I never had a presentation without recommending some books, so if you're interested in learning more, these are some of my favorites that I think really look at sexual violence in some really important ways. I'm sorry for talking so fast.

SAM NELSON: We now have scheduled 20 minutes for Q&A. So, are there any questions? And you could come up if you have a question. [Indiscernible] .

BILL KATT: So, you talked about how we have a much smaller list of mandatory reporters or designated reporters than one might imagine. But in the training I completed maybe an hour and a half ago mentioned that if you're managing students, you are expected to report any harassment that you reasonably observed to the Title IX office. Can you explain a little bit about what the difference is between the mandatory reporting and this obligation?

LAURA WEISS: Thank you for mentioning that. So, I think the HR 300 is like the annual refresher that everyone has to take. It does obligate folks who are managers, whether that's a staff or student employees, as a manager, you do have an obligation to report harassments or other forms of harm to COCR. If you are non-employed students that's completely engaging with them through the class or advising or whatever, you don't require that obligation.

SAM NELSON: Great. We'll go up Zoom, and then we'll come around to what's waiting here. So, I can't see the name.

HADAS RITZ: Yeah, this is Hadass Ritz, Duffield RTE Senator. I was also going to ask for

clarification about the designated reporter, for example, for my TAs and core staff, but it sounds like that would fall under that category. The other thing that I wanted to ask is you talked about how the EAAA and AM/PM have kind of been demonstrated effective. And it sounds like that's for people who have opted into those programs. And I'm wondering whether there's any information about whether- You know, I'm kind of imagining that becomes part of the required first-year seminar or something like that. Do we know anything about the efficacy in that context?

LAURA WEISS: Thank you for that question. So, currently, AM/PM and EAAA are opt-in opportunities for students, voluntary. The for-credit piece, I think, is helping people to sign up and want to be engaged with it. These are really intensive programs that have participation in about 20 students. So, they're very small group. It's very discussion heavy, activity heavy. A small group piece of it is I think what helps to make them effective. So, thinking about how to scale those things up is one of the things that we're trying to consider. Right now, we have four EAAA facilitators and three facilitators for AM/PM. Each session has to have two facilitators. So, already you can see the limitations that I have in being able to offer multiple sessions. We will also see the training for each of our facilitators is about $90. For AM/PM, it's a little bit less because we created it. So, I can say it's less. But there's a lot of training and time that goes into helping people prepare to facilitate and deliver the programs, which is just another consideration as we try to figure out how to engage more people in those.

SAM NELSON: Great. Right over here. And please, I should have said, everybody, make sure to state your name and your department.

IRIS PACKMAN: Hi. Iris Packman. I'm in ILR, RTE. Thank you so much for coming to share with us. I have a question trying to understand the process. Could you talk us through a little bit how your office supports students who are going through this Title IX process and what that looks like? The victims come to you first, and then you might help them, or could it be also the other way around? And then, are you also the folks who might sit with them, like as their advocate during that process?

LAURA WEISS: Great question. Our hope is always that we're the first stop, honestly, just so that we can help people prepare for every step of the way. But victim advocates are offered. If folks may get to COCR first, they are told about us as a resource there. So, it can happen at any point in the process. The sooner, the better is sort of our feeling about that, in part just because I think it's important for people to know that the very first time you sit down with someone at COCR, they're recording your conversation. I think that's worth someone knowing in advance so that they're prepared for that. So, helping them to understand what does the process look like, who's going to be involved, how many times are they going to have to meet with someone, depending on what their goals are, it could be a limited process, it could be a shorter process, but we can meet with them in this meeting to accompany people to meetings in COCR. And really, our level of involvement is what the client is looking for.

IRIS PACKMAN: So, folks come to you and they tell you, they disclose that there's been an assault. Do you have to report that there was an assault.

LAURA WEISS: No, so we're confidential, meaning that we don't share information that people give to us, especially when we're recording without permission. So, oftentimes folks are trying to understand, like, what does it mean to report? Who would I report to? There might be a question about jurisdiction, depending on did it happen off campus or on campus? So, we don't share that information unless someone says that they want to.

IRIS PACKMAN: So, do you have data that is available to us about how many assaults you hear about every year?

LAURA WEISS: It's not publicly available. I do track them very closely.

IRIS PACKMAN: Is it shareable?

LAURA WEISS: Yeah. I mean, I can tell you just off the cuff, the numbers have gone up every year that we've been tracking that data. The victim advocacy program has existed since the 90s. I came on board to it in 2015. Prior to 2015, there was one student advocate for the university. In 2018, we got two. Also doing the prevention side of the work as well. And three weeks ago, we hired our third person for the office. So, really, really appreciative that we're able to grow right now. But the demands are also growing, and the need for support comes.

IRIS PACKMAN: So, part of my question is, I don't understand the numbers. There was an article in the USA Today reported they looked at seven years of data from the [indiscernible] reporting, which was-- you know, went through to 2018. So, not the most recent. I don't know what data is available easily, but that's what they looked at. And there were, I believe, 1,216 assaults that were reported there. And I don't know if that means they were, like, through the Title IX official report. Okay. And 1,000 of those never went into any formal process.

LAURA WEISS: Yes.

IRIS PACKMAN: Only 216 went to a process, and then it dropped down to, you know, 50 of them. Can you explain or can you give us an idea of what happened to the first thousand people. Like why did, you know, only one out of six cases even go for that.

LAURA WEISS: Yes. So, I think the easy answer to that is that it's the individual's choice if they would like to pursue things beyond just making the report. Often, these people want Cornell to know that something happened just so Cornell knows something happened, but they don't necessarily want to go through the process of trying to find accountability to the person who harmed them. And sometimes people are just looking for what COCR supported, which is academic consideration, housing, and contact order. Oftentimes, those are the biggest priorities that people have, and making a report is all that's needed to get those accommodations, whereas engaging in the process further is about trying to hold--

SAM NELSON: Sorry to interrupt. We just don't have time for our own exchange dialogue because other people want to speak as well. Sorry to cut you off.

IRIS PACKMAN: I just want to recommend this book.

SAM NELSON: What is the name of the book?

IRIS PACKMAN: It's called "ON THE WRONG SIDE: How Universities Protect Perpetrators and Betray Survivors of Sexual Violence" by Nicole Bedera.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay, Anne Marie Brady.

ANNE MARIE BRADY: Hi. Anne Marie Brady, RTE ILR school. I'm just wondering if I understood you right, you have two staff members. How many cases on average do you have each year? And, yeah, just I'd like to know the case versus staff ratio.

LAURA WEISS: Our numbers for last year-- Again, they come up a little bit every year. Last year, I think we got 128 in cases. We also carried cases over depending on where people are in the process and what's going on for them. So, 128 new cases last year. I can tell you so far this year, we got the 31 new cases. So, I think the increased conversation on campus and increased knowledge of resources is probably why we're seeing such an uptake. But definitely the more people are finding this, which I'm really grateful for, but the need and the staffing are--

ARIANA KIM: I'm Arianna Kim, Senator of the Music. Thank you for that presentation. I think it helps a lot of people understand more about our services. This isn't my question, but just to say that last year I helped in training some leaders for EAAA, and the training was really exceptional. And anything you can do to help make that training part of what everyone does at Cornell would be a massive advantage for the reason we're here today. My question is, what happens when someone comes to you and says, "I want to pursue something criminally?" Do you send it to CPD? Does it go to IPD? What are the steps in that?

LAURA WEISS: Yeah, good question. So, where it goes is really dependent on where the incident happened. If it's something that happened on Cornell property, then the CUPD has jurisdiction. If it's something that happened off-campus, depending on where it happened, it could be Cayuga Heights PD, or it could be IPD, or the state folks. So, helping folks figure out what is the appropriate jurisdiction and the authority to go to is part of what we can help with because there's nothing worse than going to the wrong place and sharing what happened, and then having to repeat it to a different locality.

ARIANA KIM: So, if something has on campus, it automatically goes to CUPD. They don't have a separate option?

LAURA WEISS: So, that has recently changed. Cornell did an annual review with the state police [indiscernible] . So, students can choose to work with CUPD or the state police if something happened.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. And then, the last one, Tracy McNulty.

TRACY MCNULTY: Thank you very much for the presentation. I have two questions. I mean, first about the survey you presented at the beginning. I'm curious as to why only 6,000 students

were interviewed, just a section of the students, and not the whole population. And then second, given that you're saying that many more people have reported some form of sexual assault than eventually pursue a Title IX case. I'm wondering, what is the nature of your communications with the administration, or kind of where your office sits within the university flow chart, as it were. Like, are you under student and campus life? Are you in health? Do you report the kind of numbers that you're seeing to the administration?

LAURA WEISS: Great questions. So, structurally, we are within Student and Campus Life within Cornell Health within the Skorton Center for Health Initiatives. There lies the SHARE office. So, we're a couple of layers down from senior registration. I do write an annual report that is shared up through the channels there. How far up it makes, I couldn't say. And your first question was about the 6000 person for the SARM survey. Well, I'm sorry, in 2015, we entered into an AAU survey on sexual violence on campus because it was a survey with 17 different universities. Everyone decided to do a sample of 6,000 students. In 2017, Cornell did its thing. It created its own survey that we have used since then, but we've kept the 6,000-person sample just for consistency's sake. There is conversation this year about either expanding that sample because the population of Cornell has grown since 2015, or doing a [indiscernible] sample. We don't do that [indiscernible] yet, but those conversations are made.

SAM NELSON: Thank you very much. Now I'm going to go on to the next level on the next issue on the agenda, which is a proposed resolution. I'd like to call Adam Smith, Suzanne Charles, and Dan Buckley up to make the presentation.

ADAM SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are back with you today to formally introduce this resolution on behalf of the University Faculty Committee, which both voted for this resolution unanimously, 11-0. As we've just learned, the problem of sexual violence pervasive on campus is complex. And there's no single solution that can bring it to an end. The change we need will require everyone, faculty, students, staff, and our administration working together. We believe that Cornell faculty have a moral obligation to lead this effort. And so, the resolution before you represents the next step in our path to addressing sexual violence in our community. The UFC is introducing the resolution today to begin the consultative discussion. We wanted to invite substantive ideas and suggestions in order to sharpen the proposals that are outlined here and to take advantage of the deliberative wisdom of this body. Please post suggested amendments, or concerns, or new ideas as comments on the pending address page, or you can also feel free to send your ideas directly to the Dean of Faculty. We will gather everything together and bring the revised text forward at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate. Now, framing this resolution, we'd like to provide you with a brief overview of the overall design, and then briefly sketch the three individual parts that compose the resolution. So, let me introduce my colleagues as well.

DAN BUCKLEY: Thanks. Dan Buckley from UFC. This resolution asks the faculty to commit your expertise, skills, and knowledge to finding and implementing new approaches for addressing ongoing crisis of sexual assault in our community. The resolution seeks to use the power of this body, the faculty senate, in a positive way to seek policies and practices that will reduce rates of sexual assault and improve outcomes for victims of sexual assault in our community. The resolution proposes three mechanisms for working towards a safer campus. The

first is deep research to find approaches that work. The second is community engagement so that those approaches can be understood, shaped, shared, and implemented across our campus community. The third is independent faculty assessment of our administrative procedures to determine whether our efforts are working and to hold ourselves accountable for progress. The resolution proposes these three structures to do the ongoing work of reducing the burden of sexual assault in our community. The final resolved clause asks the three bodies to work together so that research informs engagement and both inform our judgment. The resolution is only a first step. Should the Senate pass this resolution, the OSD will follow the chartering resolutions for each of these initiatives to guide their establishment and govern their operation. Development of the chartering resolutions will allow for substantive contributions from the faculty and our broader expertise in the community. We don't claim these are the only three ways you can contribute. If you have other approaches or see better ways, we can build these. We want to hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: CM. Can you come here?

SUZANNE CHARLES Susanne Charles, UFC. The first resolved clause recommends a standing faculty-led center on sexual violence and its prevention, beginning work by fall 2027 and funded for at least five years. We envision this to be ambitious and long-lasting. Grounded locally, the Center would study and act here in our own setting. Its first question should be Cornell-based, and its findings should reach our programs and policies quickly. At the same time, the Center should be national in reach, emerging as a clearinghouse for data and research so that we can identify ideas that work wherever they may arise and disseminate strategies to help in other locations. The Center will identify practices that reduce sexual assault and serve as a hub to communicate these ideas broadly. To be truly impactful, the Center needs to be built to last. That means resources and staff who support the research of both new and existing faculty. Lastly, the Center should be truly independent, free to publish what it finds, and report regularly to the Senate and the community. The goal is to develop a durable research center with the mission of identifying interventions grounded in evidence that will produce a sustained reduction in the burden of sexual assault in our community. This resolution speaks only to the will of the Senate to establish such a research center. If approved, then the next step would be to engage with the administration and the service of shared governance to provide faculty input into the establishment of such a center. Pillar two, a joint commission. The second clause invites the student assembly, GPSA, employee assembly, and the university assembly to co-convene a joint commission on sexual violence with members appointed by each body. It will take us time to heal from this crisis and to move forward. Healing requires that we rebuild trust in each other. And to rebuild trust, we need to listen and engage in a thoughtful way. The formation of the Joint Commission will foster deep engagement across our community to promote healing and to allow us to discuss and implement approaches that will reduce rates of sexual violence on campus. The Sexual Assault Task Force, created in response to the shocking events that occurred in 2024, worked for 13 months in their effort to produce thoughtful initiatives that are already being implemented. These initiatives should help address the crisis of sexual violence on campus. Still, since sexual assault is a cultural problem, it is important that our entire community work collectively in the process of finding solutions. The commission is designed to engage faculty, students, staff, and administration to allow diverse voices to be heard, to evaluate competing ideas, to socialize new approaches, and to adopt changes designed to reduce rates in sexual

violence and improve support for victims. It builds on the task force's work rather than replacing it. It focuses on authentic, sustained engagement across our entire community. It provides a path for implementing novel approaches through joint resolutions passed in the spirit of shared governance. This resolution speaks only to the will of the Senate to establish a joint commission. If approved, the next step would be to establish a resolution charter. Other assemblies, including the UA and EA, are already moving on resolutions in support of the Joint Committee. In fact, the EA passed its supporting resolution just last week, so we anticipate that this initiative would move ahead quickly. The charge to the committee will need to think about its relationship to a relaunched task force. There is significant scope for the two initiatives to work in consultation with one another, as dictated in the resolution of the Charter. The goal of the Joint Commission is to seek broad representation from our community in our effort to reduce rates of sexual violence.

ADAM SMITH: The third resolution creates a standing Senate Committee for Institutional Administration, appointed by the Nominations and Elections Committee with the Senate's concurrence. The Committee for Institutional Administration will be charged with assessing our administrative policies, procedures, and practices, and offer independent judgment and constructive recommendations in the service of shared governance. The Committee would advise the Senate on pending matters, but it would also be charged with proactive and ongoing review of policies to engage in a process of continual improvement in university practices. The Committee would be focused taking on investigations in response to issues and concerns emerging from the Senate or its committees. Its work would be advisory to the Senate and constructive with faculty participation and governance. The first focus of this committee must be the university's responses to campus sexual violence, including the measures announced for the 15th, responses to the task force, to the commission, and to Sally Yates' review, the Greek life review as well, staffing and budgets for prevention and survivor support, the one we just heard about, and investments in healthy students. The committee would report to the Senate and formulate resolutions for action by the Senate. Like the other resolutions, this resolution speaks only to the will of the Senate to establish such a committee. If approved, then the next step would be to establish a resolution of charter for the committee to be debated, revised, and subjected to a vote of the Senate in a future session. Now, taken together, these resolutions seek to establish a durable set of campus structures for faculty engagement. They propose a faculty-led research effort to find approaches to work, a framework for campus-wide engagement to empower the voices of our local community and put initiatives into practice, and a location for ongoing faculty-led assessment to inform the campus whether these approaches are helping our community. Let me briefly now put up the text of the resolution so that everyone can take a look. I read this in the record of the Senate last meeting and don't see that I need to do so again. You can find it on the Pending Matters section of the Dean of Faculty web page, so I'll spare you reading it then. But I do want to end by saying that we look forward to your questions and to your suggestions, both today if there's time, and online. We are very grateful for the comments that we've already received on the website, through conversations on campus, and through emails to the Dean of Faculty. We will take the time between this meeting and the Senate meeting coming up in December in order to collate all of this feedback we provide in order to provide the strength to adopt the set of resolutions. Thank you for your time.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. We have now time for any questions. Are there any questions? Please come on up. Also, if there are any on Zoom-- Tracy, I see you have your hand up. Go

ahead.

TRACY MCNULTY: Yeah, thank you for this, and thanks for the time that went into preparing this. My first response, and I hope you could address this, is that it sounds a little ivory tower. You know, I mean, of course, I like the idea of faculty expertise being central to the solutions that we come up with. But the research center makes it sound almost like this is a new problem that we have no sense of when, in fact, in some ways, the causes of sexual assault are as old as human society itself or the treatment of women first as chattel and then eventually as sexual objects. So, I mean, there's quite a deep dive that one can do in terms of research. But there's a lot of research, a lot of data that we could act upon now, including the idea that men in fraternities are much more likely to commit sexual assault than men not in fraternities, that women living in sororities are much more likely to be victims of sexual assault. And yet I haven't heard any willingness on the part of the administration to consider putting that knowledge into action. I'd also be interested to hear from the members of the committee why you phrase this as building on the task force rather than replacing it. Because it seems to me that the task force was both very, very heavy on administrators and really not on faculty expertise, for example, that while undergraduate students were included, I've heard from some of them personally that they were very much marginal members to the community. Their input was not taken very seriously. And then, most of the recommendations seem to touch upon messaging and communication, but in ways that have not even been carried out. So, we heard two weeks ago at our last faculty senate meeting that one of the recommendations was to regularly update the fraternity scorecard, but that even today, if you look at the scorecard for Chi Phi, the major points are about awards it's received for community service, right? And there's no information about these sexual assaults. So, you know, is this a model that we can build upon, or do we need something fundamentally different?

ADAM SMITH: Thank you, Tracy, for your comments. To your first point, I think that embodying the general faculty information that our research is always better would be one response. I think that there's certainly a lot of research that's been done. There is expertise on campus that we have not sufficiently recognized. And I think that's one thing that we could actually use as a forum that would actually elevate and involve making that research not just ivory tower, as you put it, but also translational into the way the work of the campus so that the campuses also have been added to and approved by the research that's ongoing. To your question about the relation of the second resolution to the existing task force, I think the goal here was indeed to address the administration heavy population on that and to take a different, what I would describe as more participatory path. Here, I think we're taking a model from the Future of the American University Committee's process of extensive engagements with the community and actually locating the community as the source of information and solutions itself. And so, having a forum for a sustained, deep, reflective conversation seems like it's useful. The employee assembly has already endorsed this collaborative effort. The other assemblies are looking forward to addressing it as well. It seems likely, I think, given the developments in the conversation since we first put this together, that the university assembly is likely the most natural for this group. We will have to consider in a conversation with our collaborators as well.

CSABA CSAKI: Hello. My name is Csaba Csaki, and I’m a senator representing the physics department. We actually canvased the department, and I’m reporting on the feedback we have

received so far. Everyone recognizes the good intentions of the UFC and back these resolutions, the feedback overall is lukewarm. Most importantly, my colleagues do not support the faculty-led research center. Almost no one replies appropriately. Their concerns were that the problem here is not a lack of research, that the relevant data are largely confidential, it will be a significant service burden, and that its costs and governance are unclear. We recommend removing the center from this resolution. Second, the Joint Commission do moderate support. Some appreciate it involving all the assemblies, others worry it would be vulnerable to produce little and suggest debating for the outcomes of the ongoing reviews. Third, there is broad support for the Faculty Committee on Institutional Administration. Colleagues see real value in standing faculty body that checks value of the administration policy on its commitments, and several do not have an even broader mandate on administrative background to do with it. Several colleagues also felt that the language on fraternities and sororities is too tentatively, asking only that their suspended activities would resume, frame the review too narrowly. The full range of options should be on the table of [indiscernible] campus and converting the houses to four residences. More broadly, there was concern about any bureaucracy without concrete measurable goals. Whatever we adapt should say clearly what success will look like. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. There's no one in the back. Go ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR Senator. Thank you to the UFC for putting this forward and for your openness about having discussions. I appreciate the discussions we've already had. So, I wanted to follow up on some of the comments that have been made already. One has to do with the research center. I think that adding deep research to the description was simply not adequate. Of course, we always want deep research. But I think what we're hearing is a comment, which I agree with, which is to step-- I agree with this, to step back a bit and say, do we need another center? Do we need a research center? Would it be more productive at this moment to say, "Let's figure out where all the work is being done already on the campus, the resident campus and the extension areas, both in terms of here in Ithaca and in New York and in Buffalo and other cities to say what work is being done on this, both in terms of research and in terms of the applied research that's done through practice." This is being done all over. I have a personal connection, a personal professional connection with the Worker Institute, which is part of the IMR school. It's located in New York City, and it has been, for decades, doing research and practice, bringing theory and practice together on issues of gender-based violence in the workplace, in organizations. We have people who are doing work, tenure track faculty, tenure faculty, RTE faculty, all over Cornell working on these issues and who could use a lot more resources to work on these issues that could be done tomorrow without a new research center. And part of that would also be resources for these different existing groups of faculty to join together and say, "What could we do in connecting with each other more?" And perhaps a research center would come out of that, perhaps not. So, I think that the leadership UFC could provide is perhaps guiding through that kind of process. And then, I just want to add another couple of things on the second piece about bringing the Senate together with the other studies. I would suggest that we also bring other governance bodies into this. The CPSU is extremely important in governance and UAW to the staff and the AAUP on campus the Cornell chapter, which I'll talk about very briefly in a little while is also very much a governance kind of body. And so, I think we could expand that. I think that's what I have. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: All right.

ADAM SMITH: Sam, can I just--

SAM NELSON: Oh, yes.

ADAM SMITH: Thank you very much. And I couldn't agree with you more about the expanding conversations. We met with UAW yesterday, which was part of that effort to make sure that those conversations are ongoing and insightful. I want to also provide the challenge that we talked about yesterday around the question of research institute center or whatever. And there, we're trying to balance, and I would love for some suggested language, where we want it to be open enough, and I agree, we want to let expertise lead the way and the way in which the form that that research body should take. At the same time, we want to send a message to administration, to the provost's office, in particular, as to the scale of resources that we anticipate moving forward. So, when we're invoking words like institute or center, we're trying to get a sense of the scope. We're not trying to dictate. So, this is a writing problem that we're still trying to work through. And I hope that by the time we get to the next iteration, we'll have found a better way to balance those concerns.

SAM NELSON: Up on Zoom.

HADAS RITZ: Yes, Hadas Ritz, Duffield RTE Senator. I want us all to keep in mind that the important thing is outcomes, that we want to actually make an improvement for the student experience at Cornell. So, the most important thing isn't that we should be seen to be doing something, but that we should actually be accomplishing something. And so, for all of these, the three pillars of this joint set of resolutions, I hope they're all written in such a way that really emphasizes that. And in particular, I'm interested-- It should be very clear about the presence or absence of teeth. What I mean by that is I don't want a lot of people to expend a lot of effort and for committees to make suggestions and then for none of them to be implemented. And so, I guess if someone could speak about, you know, of these pillars, which can actually-- which are guaranteed to have outcomes, like if the committee that's reviewing the kind of institutional policies says that there's something that's to be changed, is that just advisory, or is there any expectation that those changes will actually be made? I would like that to be very clear in the resolution language.

ADAM SMITH: I think it's that concern that is the reason for the third pillar of the resolution. That is, it's not enough just to have the research arm to things or the community conversation. You need to follow up. And that third portion, that third pillar, is supposed to be focused on that follow up to provide the Senate with an ongoing understanding of what's been accomplished and what hasn't been accomplished, so that the teeth come in the form of visibility and legibility of the accomplishments, or lack thereof, of the initiatives that have been undertaken. And I want to note that that third pillar can be utilized in relationship to an array of campus-wide initiatives. It doesn't have to-- It might start on questions of sexual violence, but it would not necessarily have to end there.

SAM NELSON: We have time for one more comment or question.

IRIS PACKMAN: Yeah, so I guess my initial reaction is that this feels like an academic response to a very concrete real problem. And the concern about well now we're going to need an institute to study this that starts in a year to look at this problem while we know that hundreds of people are going to experience some kind of assault in that time period isn't really going to address that issue. And you know we had a vote on whether to delay our vote on it with no confidence based on the waiting for the Yates report. We're like, "No, we don't want to wait. We want to move now." And so, I feel like this feels a little-- This feels like you're sort of intellectualizing something that's very much a physical somatic issue. And so, I'm wondering if when creating these recommendations, you were sort of asking the practitioners, like Laura Rice and others who work on this exact issue on campus, about where they see the greatest, because my concern is that at the university you will say there's limited resources. And so, we're saying we're going to hire new people and staff at this office. But meanwhile, Laura had to wait, you know, a year and a half after the task force was convened to get one more person in her office. Well, I would much rather send the resources there. [Indiscernible] . So, those are my reactions.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay, we're going to move on. The next proposal. Please come on up. We have-- Let me check if this name's right. This is the proposal for add/drop deadline changing. And is it Ishan and--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jillian Goldfarb.

SAM NELSON: Okay. Nevermind. Sorry.

JILLIAN GOLDFARB: Hi. Good afternoon, friends and colleagues. For those of you [indiscernible] , I'm Jillian Goldfarb. I'm an associate professor in chemical and bi-molecular engineering, and also chair of the university's Educational Policy Committee. I would like to present this on behalf of the committee. This represents about a year of work in coordination with the registrar's office and the vice provost for undergraduate education office, in which we want to propose an idea where we translate students' add/drop that they have now in their period away from being a great decision mechanism and into one that really teaches them learning strategies, earlier decision-making, and simplifies course expectations, which does have a burden on us as faculty as well as the students. So, next slide. The problem is that our drop date right now is nine weeks into the semester. This is abnormally long, as I will show you some data, and it complicates student learning. This basically creates months of enrollment churn after the semester starts. What we propose is to align the add and drop dates until week two. And this would stabilize our enrollment earlier. It would make it easier to have group work assigned and to get picked off right off the bat, enable us as faculty to focus on those people that remain in our courses to help our students adapt learning strategies rather than using the drop date as a creation mechanism. And finally, it reduces significant risk in certifying equivalents for federal and local departments. So, this is the distribution of drops that currently occur between weeks one and two, and then often through week nine for the past few years. We plotted this as undergraduates versus all the students, and you can see that the percentages of drops before week two and after week two are approximately the same. Undergraduates account for at least three-quarters of the drops, which relates to their population here. So, you can see that moving the drop date right now would change about a third of what's happening. It would push that if students didn't want to take

a W into Week 2. Next slide, please. Now, as you can read the full text in the resolution we put forward on the website, here are kind of the main points. First, students start overextended. We spoke to over 100 students last year, and many of them across colleges that have a bit more flexibility in their majors take at least one extra course that they enroll in and start the semester in. And is their intention, they told us, to remain in all if they're doing well, or to drop the one that they're doing the worst in. Now, that doesn't make sense for a grade management strategy. However, in digging deeper with many of these students, we found that they think they're actually adding stress to their life because they have a higher workload than what they actually see through. So, there are positives and negatives to this. It also, in terms of helping them develop adult decision-making skills, delays a commitment into something, which as we all know, sometimes you do have to make a decision and a commitment sooner. Students in some majors, more than others, are able to use late drops to manage grades and GPA. Whereas students in other majors, such as those that have a more rigid curriculum, such as our pre-med students, our vet students, our engineering students, have a much more inflexible curriculum, and they can't drop a class. Then they might be a year behind in their degree, and you can imagine the financial impact of that. So, there's an equity issue here, that some students in the university have this ability to essentially have a higher GPA just because their course structure is less rigid and they have more flexibility to be able to drop. Projects and group work, for those of you who assign a lot of group work, you may assign a group throughout the semester, you know the trouble that happens when at week six and week seven, someone drops out of the group, two people drop out of the group of five, and then you're struggling with your range, and it puts the students that are in the class still at a disadvantage compared to a group that remains full throughout the semester. Another one is really something that I know a lot of us care about in terms of efficient resource utilization on campus. You know, we are teachers, we are researchers, we are service members of this community, and we want to make sure we use these resources wisely. There are classes on campus, you can imagine, that are high enroll, and Thinking Wise is one of them, where it's hard to find a seat in that class. Now, if someone drops before the week two deadline now, before the add period happens, someone can take that empty seat. But right now, when someone drops in a 20-person seminar class at week seven, that seat goes unused that someone else would have liked to have potentially had, especially in our smaller courses. And actually, how this all started was we asked the question, "Why can't final exams be scheduled earlier in the semester?" And the answer we found through our investigations here was that we need enrollment stability to happen. And if that doesn't happen right now in week six or seven, when the majority of the drops happen, we can't set a final exam schedule until that time. So, the parents that have actually called me and looked up the [indiscernible] on the website asked me, "Why [indiscernible] to travel?" This would help alleviate some of that problem. And then, of course, from the faculty perspective, if we're spending time in classes on students who aren't committed to being there, we're not spending time then to students who really need to be there and need our help. Our resources are spread thin. If we were to have a little bit more early stability with our roster, we'd know where we were in terms of our teaching modes and things that need to be beefed up for the future. Finally, there are significant financial implications for both students and the university at the late drop date. Right now, the registrar cannot certify our enrollments. [Indiscernible] ? And you might say, "Okay, well, this has implications for students who are on you." For example, our veterans who are receiving benefits, over 500 of them on campus, at least, their pay is based on how many classes they are actually stably enrolled in to complete the semester. Some of our students' financial aid is based on not only the classes they

stay in and they complete, but not having an SU grade and having a forced grade in that. Every time we miss an enrollment cycle and the registrar has to go back by hand to update something, that introduces risk into this system. If we get audited, as we have in the past, we can potentially be on the hook as the university for this. In fact, it seems we just lost about a half a million dollars over the past few years by not being able to certify our veterans' benefits. And students themselves who need to have their enrollment certified could be potentially at risk for their own financial aid benefits by not keeping a high enrollment. So, those are some of the basic problems that we encountered and the reasons for this proposal.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

JILLIAN GOLDFARB: Our recommended policy is to retain the current add date. This is common, and I will show you data in a second, to have a week two add date throughout the semester and to move the drop date to align with that, to meet the next day. Over time, we have full confidence that with the new software coming in with the registrar that we will be able to align these systems and actually create spaces in classes where someone has dropped, but we could put someone in to use it. Past semester module courses would be, you know, paraded accordingly. In order to do this, there is some work on our part as faculty. One of the things we've heard from the students, as well as from the campus-wide mental health survey that happened in 2022, is that students need clarity per year. They need to see, not just a syllabus of oh, here's a great distribution of [indiscernible] . They need to see the workbook. They need to understand when things are going to happen, how much their work, what reading lists comply so they can gauge their workload across campus. We need to align college and major level advising to help students understand that having one W on a transcript is not the end of the world. In fact, many people across this country do. We need to actually coordinate exceptions for extenuating circumstances. When we have students that face a housing insecurity this semester or a major health issue or family emergency, there needs to be an exception for extenuating circumstances, and we need to coordinate that as we are one Cornell in this, not different colleges, different exceptions. And finally, recommended that we actually follow up with assessments. So, a quick review of the data that informed this. Next slide, please. As you can see, we did a survey. I pulled the top 20 US News colleges, our peers. The majority of them have a much shorter drop date. We are one standard deviation above the average. Nine of our peers actually align the add/drop date to allow for a true shopping period. Shopping means you look at a class, you decide to take it, and then you change it with another class. Right now, we have a really long return period, but it's not shopping. Next slide, please. To those who are concerned that we might lose the liberal arts nature of the fact that we are this amazingly large community where you can have a liberal arts experience, the evidence shows that most of our top liberal arts colleges in this country actually have a two-week add/drop date, and those align for the same reason. So, we would not be losing that experience by aligning with this. Finally, at the end of October, we fielded a survey of all 24,607 students, asking them, "Hey, what do you feel? You are stakeholders in this." We had a little less than 10% response rate. For the most recent course that students dropped after the second week, we asked why. What were the top three motivating factors? The first was workload. They couldn't manage the workload that they had signed up for. Next, the class wasn't that they were respecting. And third, the grade. So, those top two things are, you know, faculty, we can do a better job of that by just being a little more clear. Also in this survey, we asked students, before you decide whether or not you want to remain in a course, what information

should you have? And I'd like to point out that three of the top four things are actually things that we put forward in this resolution as well. We think that you need to understand your cross-course workload. You need a good syllabus. You need two weeks of instruction to know if this is the right place. If you'll notice, the student assembly put together a proposal that they asked us to consider a week five drop date. And we did think about this. It does complicate the [indiscernible] and increases risk to students. But there is a thing about knowing more about what you're saying against this drastic change. However, what will happen is this. If you want an exam graded and information by week five to stay in the class about your grade, we will all give you exams in week four. We may or may not have them graded, and now you're going to have to compress 20%, 30% of your semester grade into the first four weeks of class. We know from the pedagogical literature that that's going to lead to even more stress by having a cycle semester compression. So, finally, sort of a summary of what we think the educational benefits here would be helping the students gain early learning momentum into a class. Once you've made that decision, we want to help you commit to that decision and stay in these classes and make sure that you're going to be successful. Second, we want to focus course choice over award selection. Instead of enrolling in that extra class to drop, the idea is that you make a decision and you put the effort into the classes where you are. [Crosstalk] Second, fair and timely access to seats in high enroll and high demand courses. Then, enhancing instructional support, allowing us to spend our time and invest our time in the students that remain in our courses and committed to what they're doing. Strengthening group-based learning, predictable planning for students and their families looking to book travel out of Ithaca in the winter. And potential other benefits here would include potentially addressing grade inflation and equity across majors, as well as enhancing our federal compliance reporting and reducing financial risks to students. So, with that, I just want to mention that these are our new EPC members who didn't have a chance to discuss it. This proposal was put forth in March of 2026 last year, and it was supported [indiscernible] .

SAM NELSON: Thank you. I am seeing that we're running a little late on the time. We may have to extend. Yes. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [indiscernible] .

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right, time.

SAM NELSON: Go ahead.

EESHAAN CHAUDHURI: Hi, everyone. My name's Eeshaan. I'm a senior at the Brooks School. I'm currently the president of the Student Assembly. First and foremost, I'd like to thank Dean Schaffer, as well as all of you for inviting the student assembly to come and share our perspective about this proposal. I think a really good place to start with just me always saying that I think we're all on the same page here, where we want to have the best of students. We want students to learn how to prepare well. We want students to take good classes. We want students to be prepared for life post-graduation. Now, when it comes to this specific proposal, the student perspective here has two main components that I'd love all the senators to consider before you guys go and vote. First is just this general idea of exploration. I think a liberal arts education depends on students taking risks outside their nature. Two weeks isn't enough to judge a course,

especially with what's the current system right now. Students on these call on a lot of the things, like putting a syllabus and naming that it's there ahead of time so that they can actually view what the course is gonna be about. We've heard back from the university registrar that they're gonna go and have this new system that they may consider this to be a possibility, but we've seen no fundamental concrete ability for the university registrar to say, "Hey, this absolutely will be a thing." And without taking into those considerations of understanding that what the future of taking classes and adding classes is gonna look like and how much information students should have. It could be judgmental to go and put it in a policy like this, where students may not have as much choice as they'd like. I'd also like to consider that when a wrong guess means a W that employers and graduate programs receive, that oftentimes, these students will be scared of the course they saw exploring outside those comfort zones. We just talked a little bit about how that's a bad mentality for students to have right now, but I think it's also important to acknowledge that that's what the general consensus of the student body is like, and changing that idea of the student body will take years upon years. So, in the meantime, in the short term, those 10 years are going to be sacrificing student head storage. Second, and most importantly, is the context around this decision as well. I think that putting the window to two weeks on top and everything like that means that students will be stuck in classes that, let's say, they're struggling inside. That means every single professor will have a larger chunk of students who are going to be struggling in their classes, which means, number one, that students are going to be looking for more academic support. That means that when it comes to our advisors here on campus, they're going to be getting more meetings. They're going to be getting more stress from students asking for help, asking for clarification on different policies, things of that nature. And given everything that's happening on campus, resilient Cornell, things like that, we've already heard immense stress from the employee side of things in terms of trying to keep up with the day-to-day workload, putting on top of that, more and more students in every single class are going to be struggling with their coursework as well, which is leading to immense strain on the system. Secondarily as well, we're also looking at how students are going to be going and helping each other out. We look at two resources here on campus. A lot of them have especially fallen off in the past couple years. One program I specifically like to point to is [indiscernible] . In 2021, they had probably 200% more tutors than they do currently have enrolled today would have been supported student athletes. So, putting that all into consideration, there's different student population groups that would be substantially hurt by this. Lastly, the final point I'd like to bring up is just the idea of risk around [indiscernible] . I completely understand this idea of putting prelims within that first five may be hard to do and I think we're flexible around what that policy may end up going and looking like, but I would like to point out to figure two to that report. It shows that five weeks right now is the average across all the other institutions that are currently taking on. From a student perspective, we don't actually think that's that much of a risk because all of our other peer institutions that's average across the board. So, with that, we can say we'd really like for the faculty to consider alternate proposals for [indiscernible] . Thank you so much.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Are there any questions, quick questions? I am noticing that we're-- Come on up. I am noticing that we're about ready to run out of time.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seconded.

SAM NELSON: All those in favor, say aye.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.

SAM NELSON: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [indiscernible] . And then next week, are we going to discuss this or no?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: This will come back, probably in February for a vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We are not going to vote next week?

SAM NELSON: This particular--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe we move it to the next agenda. [indiscernible] . The last two weeks, [indiscernible] .

SAM NELSON: Yeah, yeah.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: We keep extending every Senate meeting.

SAM NELSON: Yeah.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: I think I'm not the only one. [indiscernible] , so I'm against it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I understand we just had a motion approved to extend the Senate meeting by ten minutes.

SAM NELSON: All those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

SAM NELSON: All those against, say nay.

MULTIPLE: Nay.

SAM NELSON: The voice vote counters is by far more than the those against. I will say that in the future, I'll try to be much stricter and try to finish early in the future by cutting people off. Okay, questions?

CSABA CSAKI: I am Csaba Csaki, a senator from the physics department. We did a lot of work this week, so we also asked our colleagues for their view on this resolution. And the response was a strong and almost unanimous rejection to moving the drop date to the 11th day of classes. The main objection is that students need time to figure out if their course is right for them. After

11 days, students in most courses hadn't taken a [indiscernible] , and in some they hadn't heard a single problem. I often post my first problem set in the second, so the drop date would come before it was even agreed. Second, exploration. If a wrong guess costs a W or a bad grade, students will play it safe and pick the course they think are easiest. That works against what Cornell education should be. Third, student well-being. We spend a lot of time saying how seriously we take it, but when it comes to actual decisions, it often takes a back seat. An 11th day deadline removes the safety bar for the students that need it most, first years who can't yet judge their workload and ambitious student balancing hard courses with research. We understand there's a real problem in some courses, their space is tight and wait lists are long. In physics, that's mostly our labs and large introductory courses. Those need targeted solutions, not a new drop date for every course. For example, instructors could choose from a few drop date options for their course just as already they took among options for the final exam. So, our department's message is we strongly oppose the 11th day drop deadline. At the minimum, students should see a first major assessment before they have to decide. The student assembly strictly compromised the step in the right direction, but in many courses, even that comes before the first period. We hope for a more nuanced proposal.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. They're just making comments. Okay, up on Zoom. Go ahead.

MICHELLE CROW: Hi, I'm Michelle Crow, RTE Senator for Arts and Sciences. I think this would be really difficult for us, those of us who teach the half semester courses. And so, in a half semester course, students will only have met once or twice before the add period comes up. This is simply not enough time for students to make a good decision about whether they can stay in those courses.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Next speaker.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. I oppose the change for not only all the reasons my colleague in physics does, but I have spoken to students on the [indiscernible] side. I spoke with one student the other day, one of the TAs in my course, undergrad TAs. He took a massive blow last fall, anticipating he was going to drop something, but he didn't. He ended up finishing all the courses successfully, and he was really happy he did, and now he's into round four of a $90,000 per 10 weeks under internship interviews because he took all those courses, basically. Okay, so bottom line is students do want to explore. They can't tell whether they like the course even until week five or six. That's one thing. The workload mis-estimation, it's not on us. I have great syllabi for my courses, but a student might sign up for five courses and say, "Okay, the one I hate is the one I'm going to drop." And then they got the one they hate, not the one-- You know what I mean? Okay. Now, Jillian, I admire you for chairing the EPC. It's a job I did for about 10, 15 years. Okay. However, when I read this proposal, this is how it came across to me. It came across to me as something from our compliance obsessed registrar's office that's going to make life easier for a small number of registrar types and financial aid officers that's dressed up in all this motherhood talk about learning outcomes and student decision making and all that stuff to make it palatable to the Senate. And I just don't like the way it reads.

JILLIAN GOLDFARB: So, I can assure you that the EPC looked at this before we consulted the

registrar. You know, just to let you know that that was our process. Happy to share our minutes with you. I think one thing we need to differentiate, though, is whether we want the drop deadline to be based on performance or educational decision making and interests. And at week nine, we're saying we want you to drop the thing that you're doing the worst in. We don't want you to necessarily work at it. We want you to drop it because you're not doing well. And if we believe that our colleagues at the top-level arts institutions around the country, as well as many of our top peers who have two- and three-week drop deadlines, are also allowing for their students to explore and giving them really great educational outcomes, then why do we have to be so different from so much of a later date?

SAM NELSON: Okay, thank you. I'm going to go back up to Zoom. Go ahead.

DREW MARGOLIN: Is it me?

SAM NELSON: Yes.

DREW MARGOLIN: Okay. Yeah, so I don't know the exact place to draw the line. I do appreciate this proposal. I wrote here, I think there's a deeper question, which is do we think that if a student takes a course and gets a bad assessment, they should drop the class? That seems to me like it's like what we're really talking about. And many students think, yes, like if I'm not going to do well in this class, I should drop. But I think no. You shouldn't be able to drop because you should work your way through it. You could actually do better, or you can just live with not doing as well on something as you had anticipated, which is just a part of the learning outcome of life. I took some classes that I did poorly in because that just happened to me. And so, on the other hand, if we do think that students should be able to-- If that's not how we feel, then it's a different policy. So, I feel like the question of like what should the students do if they're not doing poorly, we should have some sort of sense of how we feel about that because that's sort of what we're actually debating.

SAM NELSON: Okay, thank you.

PAUL GINSPARG: I've got a comment and then a question. My comment is [indiscernible] representing information science. I brought this up at our faculty lunch on Monday. And unlike my colleagues in physics, the response was overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal for a number of reasons, mentioned it's a department where, of course, we've been always subscribed, and there are group projects and all that management. And so, that's one difference. One of the points made though is a point that was just made by Drew, which you also made, which is, and if you uh faculty members said this. Why do we just take it for granted that students should be able to manage their GPAs rather than taking courses that they're passionate about? That you know should be the decision criterion. That was the decision I used for however little is relevant 50 years ago. So, it's just the question mentality, and at least one department was incredibly in favor of it. The question I have is I did not understand the logic you employed about the add versus drop date. You made an argument that would make sense either to synchronize them or even to have the add date the day after the drop date. So, why is it fixed the day before, if it makes sense according to you?

JILLIAN GOLDFARB: So, the transition to the new registrar system, in theory, will allow it that if we, for example, have everyone add the class they want to add, the add date and the drop date coincides the next day with that. The following day, anyone on a wait list who wants into a class would be put into the class that they want, and then they would also designate a class to be able to drop in that place they need to. So, it was more the cascade of it. And this is obviously a discussion, and if people want to make amendments to that, they can, but there will apparently be a system in place to allow essentially.

SAM NELSON: Okay. I'm going to have to cut it off there because there's a couple other issues. Risa, do you want to come up and talk about the AAUP?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: One question I have is, we have three minutes?

SAM NELSON: Yeah.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: So, shall I just do it because you got other things here too?

SAM NELSON: Yeah, we got a couple.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: All right. Okay. Do I need another mic, or should I use one of these? Should I use this?

SAM NELSON: Yes.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Let's use this. All right. Hello, everybody. I'm Risa Lieberwitz, ILR Senator, and I'm also very active in our AAUP chapter here at Cornell. And so, on this first slide, what we want to do is to make sure that everybody on campus knows about the AAUP, the American Association of University Professors, which was initially founded nationally in 1915. So, it's been around for quite a while. These are the people who brought you academic freedom and tenure. But there doesn't seem to be enough information that people feel that they have about how the AAUP welcomes all faculty and actually beyond faculty. So, this is to really introduce you if you don't know about the AAUP or to give you more information if you do know about the AAUP. It's open to everyone with a teaching and/or research position or somebody who's in an academic staff position. And I've listed this here, tenure track, tenured, RTE faculty, librarians, adjunct faculty, postdocs, academic staff, could be like counselors, graduate students can all be part of the AAUP. And so, that's kind of a point that we wanted to make really, really clear. It's a very open, welcoming, organization. Can I have the next slide, please? And then, the mission, as you'll see, aligns very much with what the Faculty Senate does, which we also think is important for everybody to know, that the AAUP, as founded, was designed to defend the rights of everybody who's in those positions in higher ed that I just went through, and that's for your academic freedom, which is very broadly defined. Teaching, research, public speech, whether it's in your discipline or not, institutional governance, the shared governance, that's another separate goal that is part of your academic freedom, economic security, which is where tenure job security came from, to protect our academic freedom and to protect our ability to have this kind of independence and autonomy that faculty need in academic freedom. Also, we stand for protecting higher education as a public good more generally. So, there are many issues that we

talk about in the AAUP that aligns with what we're talking about in the Faculty Senate, but are also broader or different from what happens in the Faculty Senate. So, we see what we do in the AAUP as supporting shared governance and as allied with having a strong Faculty Senate and the kinds of issues that we were talking about earlier with regard to strengthening governance on campus generally. And then we also, because we're in Ithaca and Tompkins County, where our interests are also to strengthen the interests of the broader community. Next and last slide. This is the fun slide. So, once again, the AAUP is open to all faculty. And we have this question here. Do you support academic freedom? Well, a well-known academic, Albert Einstein, supported academic freedom. And he was a member of the AAUP from 1935 to his death in 1955. And here you have a very familiar picture of Albert Einstein and maybe not as familiar a picture, which is his AAUP membership card that the AAUP still has on file. So, as we say, you don't have to be a genius to realize that universities need-- There shouldn't be an and there. It should be universities-- Universities and academic freedom need support. So, it should be there. So, you too can join the AAUP if you'd like. We're happy to talk with you more. If you'd like to learn more about it, aaup.org. You can join. You would be automatically a member of the local AAUP chapter. And I forgot to put it up here, but if you just go to aaup-cornell.org, you can learn more about our chapter. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you, Risa, for going so quickly. Richard, would you like to do the final good of the order?

RICHARD BENSEL: Sam, I'd love to put it off.

SAM NELSON: Okay, thanks for understanding. All right, the meeting is now-- I move to officially close the meeting, and it's adjourned. Thank you.