

SAM NELSON: All right. My name is Sam Nelson. I'm the faculty Speaker of the Senate. And it is a great privilege to be here to host today's meeting. I'd like to call the meeting to order at this time. And then, I'd like to read the Land Acknowledgement Statement of Cornell University. 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. And at this point, I would like someone to call for a motion for the approval of the minutes of the last meeting. [Crosstalk]

SAM NELSON: Does someone second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seconded.

SAM NELSON: Thank you very much. That being done, I would like to call the Dean of Faculty, Chris Schaffer, to give a statement concerning the expressive activity.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Chris Schaffer, the Dean of Faculty. I wish to remind all participants with the senate meeting that Cornell values free and [indiscernible] expression and strives to create a community where diverse opinions can be expressed and heard. As provided in university policies, the speaker has the right to speak without intimidation, and the audience has a right to hear what the speaker has to say. Audience members who disagree with the speaker may make their views known so long as they do not interfere with the speaker's ability to be heard or the right of others to listen and see the speaker. Actions that prevent a speaker's ability to be heard or the right of others to listen and see are in violation of university policy and may be referred to appropriate officials. You must fully protect the free expressive rights of speakers and professors alike in this meeting. If there is undue interference with the program, I will issue a warning. If the interference continues, I will ask the responsible individuals to leave the meeting. Before we move next, I wanted to make one brief announcement. If you are a senator, please make sure you sign in. And senators, please collect one of the posters that has your beautiful face on it to stick outside of your office so that your constituents know that you are indeed a senator. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you very much, Chris. At this point, I'd like to introduce President Michael Kotlikoff and Provost Kavita Bala to remark.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Thank you. I think I'll just start. I don't have a lot to say. I'm basically going here to take your questions. Let me just start, however, by saying that we are all extraordinarily upset by the events at Cornell in October of 2024. What I believe is the role of leadership is to try and understand events like this and do everything that we can to prevent them from happening. Over the last few weeks, we can talk about the events that occurred after October '24. I'm glad to answer those questions.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible].

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Mute yourself, please. But what I want to also just refer to is the fact that over the last couple of weeks, I've spent a lot of time talking with individuals, leadership in the student body, particularly, but also staff and faculty, to try and learn more about where we are currently, what we can do to address the suspicion that individuals have, that they're feeling that they're unsafe on our campus, and also some suspicion about Cornell University employees. So, for that reason, we felt that what we need to do is suspend parties in fraternity houses immediately for the remainder of the year. Why did we do that? One of the reasons is that what's become quite clear is fraternity parties have become almost a monopoly of social activity for students. Many, many bars and areas without drinking in college towns shut down post-COVID. And we're now in a situation in which much of the social activity occurs in private houses. We don't have full ability to be confident that what goes on in those houses is safe. And so, for the time being, we will stop that activity, put in place a thorough examination. Part of that is being done by Sally Gates and External View, but we will also bring in expertise to look at our campus culture and try and make improvements. So, the 1st initiative was really to try and increase social safety. The students at the same time-- I've heard a lot from students around don't eliminate all our ability to depressurize and have parties. And so, one of the things we're doing very actively is trying to put together alternative social activities through campus life and working with students to be able to have safe social outlets for students. The second thing that I've heard is that there is a distrust under the suspicion around the ability of Cornell to investigate actions on campus. And I think it would be a tragedy, actually, if a student, a survivor experienced an assault and felt a lack of confidence in going to either our Title IX or our CUPD system. And so, we decided to bring in outside experts, not associated with the university, to be able to be the interviewers and the investigators for survivors should something like this occur. The third thing, as part of that, we also heard that one of the things that Jane Doe experienced was a lack of support from the university in navigating aspects of the university bureaucracy. When a survivor comes forward, we appoint a victim's advocate. That advocate is a confidential source for the victim, is not a required reporter, and really talks with the victim about-- explains the Title IX process, criminal process, learns from the survivor what they wanna do, what they wanna go through, more confidential Title IX process, or go through a criminal process. However, that victim's advocate is not a person who really helps the survivor go through all the issues with bursar, with the health, academic accommodations, et cetera. So, we're adding staff for that. We're also adding staff in COCR, in Cornell Health, for training and trying to increase our efforts with students around training for consent, bystander awareness, et cetera. That first issue of training occurred this year. Every freshman went through that training process. That was part of the-- one of the recommendations, one of the first recommendations of the presidential task force. And then, the third area, which has become clear, is we have to do something together around the culture at Cornell. As I mentioned, the social context of a lot of these social interactions has shifted to private fraternity houses. That's something that we have to consider and think about the social context in which events like this occur. We are going to form the presidential task force again, focusing on prevention. We're also going to bring in outside resources, and we hope to take advantage of faculty expertise who do research in this area. So, those are the three areas that we've pushed forward. They're going to take a lot of effort. I hope we can work together to do that. I understand the anger that many of you feel about the situation. I'd be glad to talk about anything that you'd like to understand about how Cornell handled the Jane Doe situation. So, with that, I'd open to questions.

SAM NELSON: Okay, at this time, you can come forward. And there's several microphones set up. And you'll notice that they have marks on front.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. Thank you for coming to talk with us. I wonder if you can speak to any metrics you plan to run [indiscernible] whether the task force's recommendations are actually working as we move forward?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, great question. We do not have great data on this situation. We have a survey of our students with a very low participation rate. We need better data, and we need exactly, I think, what you suggested, which is data on interventions and what works and what doesn't work, and particularly in the specific social context of Cornell. Cornell is not like Columbia or other institutions. We have a specific social context. So, one of the things I think we have to focus on is research that really determines what the impact of interventions is, as well as what the impact to education. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: I just-- Sorry to interrupt, but I forgot to remind you that we like to keep questions to two minutes or less so we can have more people ask questions.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Is that the answer or the question?

SAM NELSON: I'll let you slide a little bit. But try to keep that answer short as well so we can get as many people as possible asking questions. And so, just be sensitive to that. Also, the questions should, because this is a Senate meeting, should mainly come from Senate. But you're not excluded if you are not. Thank you.

BRYAN SYKES: So, several faculty-- Bryan Sykes, Brooks Public Policy Senator. Several faculty in Brooks have expressed concerns in three areas that they hope that you would comment on. The faculty would like some discussion of keeping all options on the table with respect to institutional reform of Greek life, including review of all available laws of residential life of other universities without a Greek system. They also would like to invite some discussion about updating the curriculum to include a one-credit course for first-year transfer students on sex and sexuality, consent, domestic violence, and what it means to be a sexual citizen in modern times, as there are several courses already being offered on campus, but they aren't required. And then, lastly, the faculty have also suggested moving the SHARE Office into the Ombuds Office to give it more independence so that students could trust it more. And so, the faculty were hoping that you might be able to comment on any or all of these three here.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Thank you. So, I think we need a very careful, open look at Greek life on this campus. No conclusions have been made, no predeterminations. I think we need a careful and open look at that. On the course, I think there is a pilot course that's been run. There is an effort now to think about expanding that. There'll be a lot of conversation with the provost around how do we build that into our curriculum. I think going forward, my own view is one of the things we really have to focus on is both in education around sexual assault and consent, et cetera, but also, you know, the FAU referred to this real necessity for us to talk about judgment and values and instill that in our campus community. So, I fully agree with that. We'll work with

the provost around how we think about education going forward. And your third?

BRYAN SYKES: SHARE office.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: SHARE office. I have to look at that and study that and talk to people about where the best side of that is. We are adding personnel in the SHARE Office for more support. One of the things we learned is when an issue like that-- a survivor like Jane Doe comes forward and reports and is publicized, actually, it empowers more people to come forward. So, we're expecting that might happen.

IRIS PACKMAN: Iris Packman, Faculty Senate ILR. I just wanted to state that this is the first Faculty Senate meeting to open with the reading of the expressed faculty statement. I've been a senator. This is my third year. This has never happened before. Any attempt to stifle faculty speech is a direct threat to our academic freedom. If we're repressed in our own democratic process of shared governance, in our own space for discussion and debate, then what will happen to our syllabi, lectures, research, publications? No answer, because we've seen this administration suppress our academic freedom as well as our students' voices over the past few years. The administration will only allow the speech and expression that it prefers, and the rest will be sanctioned. Thank you.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Could I ask a question? What academic speech has been restricted? And what student speech has been restricted that has been within our expressive activity policy?

IRIS PACKMAN: Since 2023, the administration has punished over 80 students for non-violent speech. Meanwhile, we have the data from Title IX Office that only 12.5% of students who were found to have committed sexual misconduct, the definition of which fits in most people's definition of rape, only 12.5% were expelled, which means the other 87.5% were free to come back to campus. That's the question.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: So, I would just respond that over the last year, we've seen no violations of the expressive activity policies. We've seen no violations of the expressive activity policy. No one has been expelled or suffered that consequence. You're referring to individuals who violated other people's rights, either by entering a career fair and shutting down a career fair, or shutting down other people's speech. So, we have an expressive activity policy. We spent over a year as a consensus as a university developing an expressive activity policy. I believe that it's working and in place. And there is no effort to suppress anyone's voice. I turned to the faculty senate, the dean of the faculty senate, or dean of the faculty to explain why you read the policy. That was not my decision.

IRIS PACKMAN: I would say that the policy is working the way the administration writes.

SAM NELSON: Now, I feel the people online need to be speaking. Charlie, would you like to speak? Charlie Van Loan?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, thank you. I have a suggestion, Mike, on how you might improve the social culture within the administration. It involves two positions, the chief financial officer

and the associate vice president for public safety. Currently, the latter reports to the former. Unfortunately, student safety concerns do not always align with financial concerns. That said, why does the administration support this reporting structure? Why should the responsibility for handling of a rape case involve an administrator who is primarily responsible for Cornell's financial well-being? Right or wrong, this connection invites suspicions that prosecutions are coupled to the donor scene. My suggestion is that you elevate Mr. Honan's public safety position to that of vice president with a direct report to you instead of to the financial officer Cowan. And to be clear, before you respond, this is simply an org chart suggestion. I'm not in any way suggesting that the players involved fell down on the job. That is for others to decide.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Thank you, Charlie. It's an excellent suggestion. I'll just say that this was put in place some time ago. I think it's probably over 10 years ago that Joanna Stefano developed this relationship where the Chief of Public Safety reports to the Chief Financial Officer. I think you make an excellent point, Charlie, and it's one of the things that I'm looking at. I don't think that's a fixed relationship, and in some ways, I think it's an awkward relationship, and I appreciate your suggestion.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

ANDREW MOISEY: Hi, I'm Andrew. My name is Andrew Moisey. I'm a senator from Art History and Visual Studies. I think this is the first time I've ever asked a question. I think I'd like to stand at a charged microphone to do so. I have a question I'd like to ask you. First, I'd like to say, I've done a lot of research in the area of fraternity culture. If you're interested in faculty expertise, I might be a person--

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Please email. Please email.

ANDREW MOISEY: Yeah. OK. All right. I have a difficult question I want to ask you after-- as a senator. It feels like, to me, as someone who's researched this problem, that Cornell's in an abusive relationship with fraternities and has been since 1873. When the first fraternity hazing death in America and pull out of off a six-mile creek [indiscernible]. The fraternities pay us to stay together with them and tell task forces that they'll never do it again, but their pirate-like camaraderie spills when they're collectively breaking their own high mountain promises. Every time there's an Antonio Tsialas death or a Jane Doe rape, it is not just a crime between seven men, but an act that by association dishonors all of Cornell. A therapist or a good friend would advise us to say thanks for the memories, but it's time to break up. If we don't, I'm worried, as a recently tenured professor, [indiscernible] will be the next Penn State. My question is, how would your proposal not get people into giving them a year to look good so that we can stay together with them eventually?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I really appreciate the sentiment of a lot of faculty and a lot of leadership of the university that has said to me it's time for Greek life to go. I do think as an academic institution, you should study things, make decisions based on data and fact. I just came-- You know, I'm sure many of you are not alums from Cornell. I just came from a town hall of the alums who made their point that they felt that their sorority experience and fraternity experience was a very important part of their life at Cornell. I just think we have to all take a step

and carefully study this issue. If, at the end of the day, fraternities cannot exist in a safe environment and we can't be convinced that they can be safe, then we should make that decision. But we should make it, it seems to me, based on data and study and expertise, but not on emotion. Okay, thank you.

SAM NELSON: Go ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR Faculty Senator. So, just to add on first to what Iris Packman said about speech is a chilling effect. We use that term under the First Amendment, and we use it more broadly. We talk about the chill on campus when there's repression of speech. And it's not only the students who have been feeling the chilling effect, which would explain why there haven't been any arrests or student contact violations. It's also the faculty who feel it and this town. And so, for example, having two armed policemen [indiscernible] upstairs right now is a chilling effect in a democratic body. Having somebody checking our IDs. I will not get the-- I'm nasty or my attitude was bad about it. This is a chilling effect, and it affects everything we do, including whether women are able to step forward, whether they feel they'll be heard, whether we can speak out the way we wish to here, our syllabi, what's in the syllabi. And this has gotten worse since the last few years ago. So, that's really a statement. My question has to do with the systemic nature of the problem. This is a systemic problem that deserves systemic attention. And thus far, President Kotlikoff, it appears that you have simply reacted to pressure. And the reaction to pressure shows up in the drip, drip, drip of emails that we get saying this is going to happen, this is going to happen, this is going to happen, and including the interview of today's New York Times. It feels that the administration is considering more about how do we respond to pressure rather than the kind of leadership, which should have been doing systemic work and prioritizing these issues all in all. Thank you.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. I just want to be very clear about a few things. The decision to read the expressive activities policy at the start of this meeting was mine. The decision to restrict access to members of the Cornell community verified by Cornell IDs or Zoom login credentials was mine. The decision to invite a couple of members of CUPD to attend our meeting from the bat was also my decision. Thank you.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: So, let me just respond. Let me respond. We're first complaining a couple of things. One is expressive activity, and the other is this sexual assault and how we make our campus safe. I'd just say we've had many, many protests, Risa. Over the last year and a half, we've had-- for a while, we had every week, we had protests outside of my office. Those that were met with understanding that people express their views, have their passions, their time, place, and manner appropriate. They're consistent with the First Amendment. I've been asked to restrict speech of individuals that have come here. Whether it's Hassan Piker or Norman Finkelstein, we've respected the First Amendment. We've had individuals-- I would argue we've had more controversial speakers on this campus than any other campus that I'm aware of. And we've suffered from that in the sense that many people are upset that we're hosting people that they've offended. But I feel that our responsibility is to uphold the First Amendment and the expressive activity policy that many of you participated in, including our Dean of Faculty, and came up with, I thought, a reasonable consensus of how, on the one hand, we protect speech, on the other hand, we protect other people's rights to go to class, to participate, to not be

discriminated against or suffer unlawful discrimination. So, I look forward to a further conversation about that, but I think the chilling part that you're referring to really, to me, is making sure that people respect everybody's rights at this university. [Crosstalk]

SAM NELSON: We only have one at a time.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I'll be very quick. I understand that people feel like this is reactive. I felt, hearing about this, having much of this information come through for the first time, we ought to take some time, think about what we needed to do as a campus, and then take some actions based on that, having spoken to people, and thinking about what the time requires or the moment requires. So, that's why we reacted yesterday and why we're initiating the actions that we have.

SAM NELSON: I'm sorry to cut you off. Noah, I see you're on Zoom.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Thank you. I wanted to ask about or talk about the public data-- and I'm sorry, I'm in a public library-- under the Enough Is Enough Law. Over seven years, Cornell students and staff found responsible for sexual violence were expelled or dismissed from Cornell less than 14% of the time. And so, that means that 86% of students and staff that were found through the Title IX process to have sexually assaulted someone at Cornell were allowed on campus after being found responsible. When perpetrators see that nothing's going to happen to them, they're emboldened. And we've learned that in Jane Doe's case, the Title IX process found two of the men to have raped Jane Doe. But under this process, they received temporary suspensions. And so, like the other 86% of perpetrators, these two men are now back on campus. They're attending classes and freely interacting with other students. And we've heard repeatedly from our students, both undergraduate and graduate, as well as our colleagues and other staff, that they don't feel safe with these men on campus. And so, that's really kind of my question is, can you explain what is going on with this and speak directly to this problem of what a temporary suspension is meant to do if a student is found liable for rape?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, so let me just back up a little bit and talk about the Title IX process. So, the Title IX process allows an individual to choose a confidential process that will be within the university. It has a lower standard of evidence than a criminal process. It also avoids the flaw that you referred to. So, Enough is Enough educational law in New York, it does not matter whether consensually consumed alcohol, drugs, or haven't. If you are not capable of providing active consent, then the individual is found responsible for sexual assault. Now, so in this case, the Title IX case went forward. What that is is a private investigation, a confidential investigation by our Title IX office. In the case of Jane Doe, I have to say this has been confused in the press because a survivor can choose either Title IX process or a criminal process or both. Criminal process is a higher bar, and it's also more public exposure. It can be cross-examined. In this case, Jane Doe chose both. What that meant was they did a single interview because the best practice is to do one interview, not retraumatize the individual. Both the investigators were trauma-informed, trained investigators. Jane Doe's mother was there, and Jane Doe's advocate was there. That process then results, from that point, they go separate. Title IX process goes forward. It does an investigation. It finds people responsible. I have to say, Noah, the two people you've said have been found responsible for rape, that is not the charge and that was not what

they were found responsible for those two. But whatever the Title IX process finds, and they find responsibility, then it goes to a judicial panel. This is our process. That judicial panel is made up of faculty and staff who are trained, hear all the evidence, and then make the decision around punishments. I know Chris has served on those panels for many years. Some of you may have served on those panels. That is a process that's independent of the administration. It's meant to be independent of the administration. It's meant that way so that the president or provost or vice president can't come in and say, "Well, I haven't heard the evidence, et cetera, but I think this is what should happen." And that is due process in the way our process works. The criminal process is a separate process. It goes to a district attorney with a victim's statement that the police reduce to a statement. They don't have to transcript. The transcript and all the evidence of Title IX is confidential, FERPA protected, and can't go to the criminal [indiscernible]. If you disagree - You may disagree with the outcome, I may disagree with the outcome, but that is our process. This is what Sally Yates will look at. If there are recommendations to change that process, we will absolutely go forward with that.

SAM NELSON: I'm sorry to let everyone know because it seems like there's lots more questions, but we have a hard stop at four because we need to hear from [indiscernible] about the faculty role and implementing a sexual assault task force. And we need to consider an amendment that has been made that this meeting is also included on the agenda. So, I'm going to have to sadly have everybody sit down, and we're going to go on. [Crosstalk]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have a lot of questions that we need to have answered. So, if we could extend Q&A, that would b--

SAM NELSON: So, you're making a motion to extend, and generally you say for how long.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Until the questions are asked.

SAM NELSON: Then, there perhaps wouldn't be time to talk about the amendment that was brought up here. We would use all our time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There are other items on the agenda.

SAM NELSON: There's one other item on the agenda. That's 15 minutes long. It's to talk about--

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Let me just offer. I will be glad to meet with any of you in my office and answer any questions you have.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's important that these questions are asked to be talked about publicly.

SAM NELSON: We can entertain a motion for-- take some time to extend the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Without cutting into the last--

SAM NELSON: It's better to say a specific time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Increase the meeting by ten minutes.

SAM NELSON: Second. Okay, now we have to vote on that. All in favor of that motion say I. Okay, the house carries it. Thank you. We're extending by ten minutes. So, knowing that the meeting has been extended, the question and answer period has been extended by 10 minutes. Please make the questions short [indiscernible] So, can get to as many people as possible.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks.

SAM NELSON: Oh, just one second. Before you go, he's next. So, I'm going to be very brief. Mike Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering. We discussed this extensively in faculty, and we recognize that there's just some very hard problems to be solved if we have to go. We want to walk right back to the time that the suit was first reported and ask the question of why the leadership of the university spent so long before there was any response. Both the faculty and the students and the world at large immediately hear from the university immediately condemning the event, and you have the opportunity to explain what was already going on and where it's going. Since then, we have gone into reactive and responsive mode, and we've lost control of the situation. How much of that was generated by people and communication, and absent your saying this is just wrong, and I need to say something now?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I have go back and remind the timing. And so, as soon as we learned of this, there was a clear response, and there was a statement to the community. Every faculty, staff, and student got a statement that Chi Phi was closed. Multiple individuals were accused of assaulting a Cornell woman, and that was being investigated. Subsequent to that, within, I believe it was a week or ten days, there was an initial interview of Jane Doe. That led to, again, a community-wide statement that said that they abhorred this incident, condemned the incident, and said that seven individuals were temporarily suspended. At that point, the next point was, within weeks, we met to set up a presidential task force to go through that. That was also an announcement to the community and [indiscernible] into the community of a task force to look at this.

MIKE THOMPSON: What was absent was the emotional response.

ARIANA KIM: Hi, my name is Ariana Kim, [indiscernible]. I'm a professor of the Department of Music and a faculty senator. We're gathered here for the Jane Doe at hand, but sadly, her case is not unique. One in three undergraduate women report sexual misconduct. More than one in two women in Greek life report sexual misconduct. Those numbers have only gone up since you've been in positions of leadership. How is that acceptable to you?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I'm sorry, Adriana, when you say those numbers-- Ariana, I'm sorry, when you say those numbers have been going up, what date are we referring to?

ARIANA KIM: Since 2021, those numbers have gone up.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Oh, since 2021, yes. So, we have had a fairly consistent level and unacceptable level of sexual assault on this campus for many, many years. In 2025, those numbers went up dramatically. The participation rate in the survey went down dramatically. It was a 12.5% participation rate. I really believe we don't have good data on this problem. We need better data. But we don't need better data to say that it's too much. And that's why we have to take action to change the culture. I think this is a complicated issue, where there are lots of reasons why the social context of this matters on this campus. And that context has changed since 2020, when we have lots of social options in college now, and now we have almost none.

ARIANA KIM: I don't think it's complicated to even know that a 12% rise and say that 1 in 3 [indiscernible] is too much.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: It is too much.

SAM NELSON: Again, I'm going to go back on Zoom. Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN PANNULIO: Thank you. I put my question in the chat just to make it more efficient. President Kotlikoff, can you name all of the different kinds of assaults, both sexual and otherwise, on men, women, and children that the outside investigators will be examining? And how far will they go back in time in their investigations? Will they include all Cornell University campuses under the supreme control of the Board of Trustees, including the Weill Cornell Medical College unit?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: So, are you referring to this Sally Yates review?

SUSAN PANNULIO: Yes.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yes. So, that is a board review. I don't dictate that review. It's an open review. It does have a very broad mandate. I don't know how far back they're going to go, frankly, but I will say that we're open to anything they ask. This is a completely open-- we are completely cooperating with this review. I see this as a benefit to the campus to be able to say, "If you're doing things wrong, if there are things that you can do better, we ought to do better." And I absolutely agree. Whatever the number is, it's too much.

SUSAN PANNULIO: So, I'm happy to volunteer to participate in any discussions with the Board of Trustees or with the outside investigators on that topic.

SAM NELSON: Thank you, Susan. OK, I'm going to go to the next question.

JULIA CHANG: Thank you. My name is Julia Chang. I'm an associate professor and director of undergraduate studies in the Department of Romance Studies. I am also the Posse 14 mentor for the College of Arts and Sciences. This semester, I work exclusively with first-year, first-semester students who are absolutely terrified. They feel unsafe, and they are shocked that this case happened in 2024 and that there wasn't an urgency when that happened. We need to reckon with the fact that trust is completely eroded on this campus between students and administration. In

2023, I was a mandatory reporter, and so I can tell you firsthand how Title IX re-traumatized and completely botched a case that I was required to report. They ignored my emails. They claimed to not know that I had filed a report. I provided the report number. And then, they said, "We typically don't interview the people who reported if they were not involved in the incident." But I never received any communication from them other than please trust we did everything in accordance with the law. I assumed my case manager was a lawyer, and I looked up their LinkedIn profile and saw that they had worked in fundraising and alumni affairs right before assuming this position as Title IX case manager. I have no trust in the administration, and I can't in good faith refer any of my students to any of the resources that the university has to offer that are non-confidential. And so, my question for you, President Kotlikoff, is aside from these measures we've introduced just now, what are you going to do to rebuild trust on campus? A statement is not trust. A task force is not trust. These reforms don't build trust.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: So, my plan is to work with our community to try and build back that trust and try and understand how we can do better here. You've made a number of accusations about our Title IX office. This will be completely reviewed. We have a-- you know, we've rebuilt that office over the last several years. We brought in a new individual. She's an ex-prosecutor. That office has seen lots of resource addition. I don't know the timing of your concerns, but this will all be open to a review. Title IX, CUPD, our Greek life activities will have a full review of that. And I think that report will provide some transparency around what we can do to do better.

SAM NELSON: Okay, next speaker, and I think this might be the last one unless we have an amendment.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I'd like to make a motion to amend the agenda. We will delay both Dean [indiscernible] and our vice's presentations until October 28th meeting and extend discussions with the president as long as he is stated to stay, and hold remaining time for debate on the resolution. I apologize to the length of--

SAM NELSON: Do I have a second? MULTIPLE: Second.

SAM NELSON: Next, please.

DARLENE EVANS: Yes, my name is Darlene Evans. I'm with the College of Arts and Sciences, senior lecturer, retired. Yesterday, we received a statement, and there was a phrase in it that said, "These steps are-- These are the first steps towards serious systemic change." You've been the provost or president for 11 years. Why are these the first steps towards systemic change? That's one of my questions. And to some of the statistics, the 2025 Cornell survey on sexual assault and related misconduct found that 35% of undergraduate women and 52% of those in Greek life experienced sexual assault at Cornell. This trend has increased steadily since 2021, and yet in two years since Jane Doe's alleged gang rape, and seven years after terminating neurologists at Weill Cornell for sexually assaulting hundreds of male patients, Cornell has invested in one victim advocate physician to cover nearly 30,000 students. In fact, it wasn't until a no-confidence vote was introduced that Cornell's administration announced any real steps to prevent sexual assault on this campus or to seriously support survivors. Why didn't administrators-- And you've been in charge all this time, so saying what we're going to do now kind of rings hollow here.

Why haven't you taken these things more seriously until now, when there's a far stronger press looking at Cornell? The night before the alleged assault at Chi Phi, the CPD made an arrest at that same fraternity for ketamine. The next day, the university administration allowed a party at the same house. Where were the monitors? Where are all those safeguards that were put in place in 2024? The alleged gang rape might have been prevented if someone in the administration had taken proactive steps to protect the students. [Indiscernible].

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, thank you. That's a lot. And I see the only thing I can say is that immediately when we learned of this incident-- This has been an issue on our campus and every college campus. It's something I know people would like a president or a provost be able to immediately eliminate. It's something that we all have to work very hard to try and address. We immediately, after this event, appointed a presidential task force that-- I'm sorry, this is calling our community to try and look at ourselves, to try and say, "What can we do to try and reduce or eliminate these activities?" If the expectation of leadership is that they are able to prevent anything like this from happening, we're going to have lots of cycles of leadership here, because we need to be able to work together to be able to change the culture, educate our students, and try and address this problem. I want Cornell to be a leader in this area, and we have plans to really invest in this area. But the idea that you can somehow, because an event has occurred, eliminate it immediately, it is just unrealistic.

DARLENE EVANS: If I might, my question was, why now? When you've been--

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, not just now. So, it is not just now. We started on this problem immediately after we found out.

DARLENE EVANS: [Indiscernible].

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: So, on this case, the reality is the press-- So, as I said, Title nine is a confidential process. It's confidential from leadership. Much of what we've learned, much of what you've learned about Jane Doe, I've learned about Jane Doe.

DARLENE EVANS: Why is that?

SAM NELSON: I'm sorry. I can't relay the timelines of dialogue. Thank you very much. Up there, Anne Marie Brady, please.

ANNE MARIE BRADY: Thank you. This is Anne Marie Brady, faculty senator for Outreach ILR School. Nearly 70,000 alumni have signed a petition pledging to withhold donations until administrators are withheld account.

SAM NELSON: I think we lost you, Anne Marie. Can you hear us? Do you want to respond to that, President Kotlikoff?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, I think I heard that there was a 70,000 alumni that have signed a petition to, I assume, remove leadership from Cornell. I have to say, again, I just came from an alumni town hall of volunteers, some of the people most committed to Cornell. I was asked the

same question about is their confidence-- What can we do to restore confidence? I do think that what leadership-- what is the mandate of leadership is effective action to try and improve the situation, to address the issues, the core issues here that are not simplistic, they're not easy, they can't be brushed aside with a wave of a hand. That needs all of us working together. It needs experienced leadership here. I also think that if this university feels that they will solve this problem by replacing a president, that itself is not good for Cornell's reputation because I don't think it's the right way to address situations like this.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Anne Marie, we lost you for a second. We heard the part about the 70,000 alumni. Is there anything else you would like to add? I think we lost her again. All right, thank you. Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please.

RICHARD BENSEL: So.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Name and--

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Benschel, Department of the Government. Several times, we've had references to the New York Times interview. We've had references to Title IX process. In the interview yesterday, you stated that you learned shortly after the Jane Doe event that a student had reported being gang raped at a fraternity party. But you also said you did not have a full picture of Jane Doe's allegations and the subsequent investigation took earlier this month, October 2026. You also seem to use the Title IX investigation as an explanation for not reading the text for the police investigation, a text in which, for one thing, Jane Doe reported that she had been raped. However, this explanation doesn't seem to matter because there was a two-month interval between that investigation and the initiation of Title IX proceedings in January. Your reported lack of interest in the Jane Doe event is, in fact, very surprising, since as president of Cornell University, you have been extraordinarily active in the disciplining of student behavior. For example, the [indiscernible], the arrest of students at a protest on March 10, 2025. Given the horrific nature of the Jane Doe event, we might ask, did you in fact not read the police report in the two-month period between the investigation in November and the initiation of Title IX proceedings the following January?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Richard, I have to correct the-- Is this on? I have to correct a couple of your points. The police investigation and the Title IX investigation began at the same time. Our process is that those are confidential investigations. That investigation, the Title IX investigation, is confidential. It goes to an independent judicial board, and then a decision is made to appeal. There's an appeals panel, and that stays as a confidential protective record. Our process-- Now, this may not be the right process, and maybe that Sally Yates says that should be made that the president should be made aware of that information, but that is not our process. I did not see the transcript, I was not privy to the transcript, et cetera. Similarly, the police, the criminal investigation, is a confidential investigation that's shared with a district attorney. It's not shared with the president. There is a reason for that. I think that the policies that Cornell has established,

which I didn't establish, are that you don't involve senior administration in adjudicating a case without having all the information, et cetera. I do think, however, there is a legitimate question. I absolutely agree. It was a legitimate question that the president, the upper administration, the provost, the vice president for student campus life should be privy to the results of that to be able to understand the overall implications for the university. But I have to be honest, that information was not available to me. But I do reject and I really reject the idea that I have had no interest in it or was not concerned enough. That was my message to the community as soon as we learned about it, as soon as it was reported to the Title IX office, and that was the reason that we established this task.

RICHARD BENSEL: You've had some years to look at the police investigation. You don't really look at it last month.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: That investigation is held confidential. It's not something that's made available to the president.

SAM NELSON: Next speaker, please.

SHAOLING MA: I'm Shaoling Ma, associate professor of Asian studies. And I'd like to continue Ann Marie's question since she was cut off. She began by alerting us that nearly 70,000 alumni have signed petitions, pledging to withhold donations until [indiscernible]. And this administration's failures impact Cornell students and patients as well. Now, when sexual violence has known itself to be far-reaching trauma, it was the damage to long-term financial stability of our institution. Costing not only \$1 billion in legal settlement fees, but potential billions of dollars lost in [indiscernible]. This will negatively impact our working conditions, with certain parts of the school bearing more austerity measures, as it already is. How do you plan to resolve that? And this is really Anne Marie's point. I would also want to ask a somewhat naive question. Maybe I'm dumb, but I really want an answer to this. Is rape a less disruptive expressive activity than protesting against genocide?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I recognize the passion around this issue and around the issue with Gaza, but these are two separate areas here. Title IX is a federally mandated process to try and deal with the problem of victimization of women. It is a process. You can criticize it. It has been criticized. It does give women an option that is confidential to gain some accountability on the part of the individual. Now, the most the university can do, the strongest remedies that we have within Title IX, is to expel someone or eliminate an activity. That we did in this case. We had expulsions, we had suspensions, but this is an evidentiary process where people hear the evidence and make decisions based on the evidence they heard. I think due process is really important here. Now, due process is important in protests as well, but I just really object to this constant conflation of free speech and disrupting a career fair or disrupting other people's speech. It's just not intellectually honest to be able to talk about that. And I frankly think it's insulting to talk about that in the context of Jane Doe.

SHAOLING MA: I'm sorry you're insulted, but we were just read the Expressive Activity Act. And I think disruption-- I mean, I think protecting speech, what about protecting a woman's body and her whole life?

SAM NELSON: Would you like to respond?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: I think I have responded.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. OK, Betsy on Zoom.

BETSY BIHN: Hi, there. Betsy Bihn, Good Science. This goes back to the New York Times article, and this is a yes or no question. We've all been interviewed and misquoted, so I just want to make sure. In that article, as one of the faculty mentioned, it stated you learned the student had been-- had reported being gang raped at a fraternity party on campus shortly after she first came forward in November 2024. It also stated that you did not follow with her or seek to learn whether any of the accused men had been punished. You did not know the woman had dropped out of Cornell until she filed a lawsuit last month. Is that accurate?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: It is not accurate that I didn't know that any of the men were punished. I didn't know any of the details of the case in terms of the Snapchats or any of that additional evidence that came out during the investigation. It is true that I was not aware that Jane Doe had dropped out of the university.

BETSY BIHN: Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Okay.

DAVID DAMON: David Damon. I'm sorry. Initially, I got a comment and a question. A comment is that it's something that a colleague of mine has told me and that has been floating around my head. And that is how we communicate something communicates a lot about how much we care. I don't mean to you by you, because I think it's not about an individual care, it's about structure. We know a lot about your [indiscernible].

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: My what?

DAVID DAMON: Your car. Your [indiscernible]. We know a lot about the career fair. There was a strong communication of language through language of emotion. I was really struck. I didn't catch your name. I was really struck by what you said long before. And I was really struck by this, that there was a real sense of importance, importance and significance. And I really believe that that was important and significant. I totally think that I was sincere. I think it's-- also really believe that what happened with Jane Doe was extremely important and significant. And yet the communication of language and tone communicates others. You went to the New York Times to talk about pathways to peace. You didn't go to the New York Times to talk about paying rent when it happened. And I understand why you're doing it. I wouldn't want to either if I were the university president and that happened. I would find it heart-wrenching to do so. You know, one who chose to do, and one who didn't choose. And that is where I was concerned about communication. I do believe, and again, I'm not trying to use the language of you so much as the broader structure. And that goes to the question. I don't think anyone in this room believes that sexual violence on campus can solve these. I think that's misleading. Nobody believes that. I

don't think anybody in this room thinks that changing leadership would immediately then lead to the things that make sexual violence happen on campus. I think that's misleading. The question is, is it possible that something so horrific on campus could happen? But even if the university checked all these legal boxes, and even if all the process, even if Sally Yates comes back and said that process is a good process. But because of such horrific nature, the only way to move forward in rebuilding trust, and rebuilding confidence, would be for the people accountable to say, "Something has to change, and we are the persons who are accountable, and so we must change." Now, I don't think changing individuals would solve anything. And so, I would rather hear about structural change, liberation, responsiveness, and control that matter. But I want to know the answer to that question.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, I think it's a great question, David. I think you can point your finger on what has to happen, and that is leadership has to lead that change. I think deeply that that has to happen at this university, and it has to happen through community. It has to happen from all of us. There's a lot of people that have been pointing fingers throughout this process, whether it's Title IX, the CUPD, or the DA, or the president. That's not the issue. I feel I've been at this university for 26 years. I know this university, I know many of you in this room. We have the support of the trustees. We're going to invest in this issue, and we're going to lead in this issue. And that is the important thing that I think comes out and does justice to Jane Doe. If we don't do that, we just compounded the injury.

DAVID DAMON: So, I hear everything you say, and I understand that. My concern is when you just said we have the support of the trustees.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, that is just--

DAVID DAMON: Yeah, I know why that's important for them. I want to know why-- what you're going to do to make it happen for the rest of us, people who, unlike the trustees, make this university all great.

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, that is exactly the point. We need to invest resources, focus, attention, concentration, bring to bear the expertise of our faculty on this issue. I think what I'm hearing is a lot of anger at administration. I understand it. I understand the passion. Some of it is being conflated with some other issues. But I do think the real importance here is that we focus on this issue and make progress on that issue. And that's what I'm committed to doing.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Our last question, and then we need to discuss the motion.

CORINNA LOECKENHOFF: Corinna Loeckenhoff, Human Ecology. My question is how can we have any confidence in your leadership if you allow one of the students implicated in the Jane Doe case to back into shared campus housing this fall semester? This was a student who was suspended for more than a year, and Cornell's own records show that, at the very least, they admitted to taking drugs and having sex with an intoxicated person. Why did you place this person in a shared room, in a coed dorm, on the mixed-gender floor, with a gender-neutral [indiscernible] bathroom? And why did you randomly assign them to a roommate, who had no warning about his past? Why was Housing Services not aware of this? They had no clue until the

shocked roommate contacted them and asked them for a room change. Why did you leave the alleged perpetrator in his original room for more than two weeks, even though there were messages on Sidechat revealing his name and dorm room location? This was a clear security risk, but Housing did not take action until the day after Jane Doe was [indiscernible]. To be clear, I'm disclosing confidential information. Personally identifying details about the situation have been shared among students at our Sidechat for weeks. Your interference as president allowed for dangerous disconnect between disciplinary processes and the housing system. This needs to be fixed, but given the lack of action over the past two years, how can we have confidence that you can fix it?

MICHEL KOTLIKOFF: Well, you've got a number of points. One, I have to say is that the process that we have in Title IX weeded out certain punishments to individuals. Once those were satisfied, that was the decision of the judicial panel. Again, something you may disagree with, I may disagree with. We didn't hear the evidence. We weren't part of that panel. We weren't trained to be part of that panel and apply accountability to those individuals. So, I'm not going to stand here and say they made a wrong decision or these individuals should never have been allowed to come back. I do think there is some legitimate question about that judicial body, whether that's the right way to adjudicate these cases. But I will say that having come back, I fully agree that we need to be responsive in terms of responding to the actual-- If people are identifying concerns, we need to respond quickly. If we didn't do that, I pledge to look into what happened there. I don't-- some of your information hasn't been verified to me, and I'd like to do that.

SAM NELSON: Thank you very much. Professor Paul on Teams, please come forward and discuss. This is to discuss-- We skipped the other item because we were running out of time on the agenda. And I'd like to thank everybody for participating in that question and answer period. Now, we are going to discuss the proposed resolution. Professor of Labor History, Paul Ortiz, will follow.

PAUL ORTIZ: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask your permission to ask the co-sponsors of the resolution to come up.

SAM NELSON: Absolutely.

PAUL ORTIZ: I want to emphasize the collaborative nature of the resolution.

SAM NELSON: Absolutely.

PAUL ORTIZ: Okay, thank you. So, if you're a co-sponsor of the resolution, if you feel comfortable, please join me. And I'll begin reading. I understand that we need to expedite this. So, dear colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to present this resolution. Hundreds of students, staff, faculty, and alumni approached the sponsors of this resolution to emphasize to us that the Jane Doe case is but the tip of the iceberg. According to Cornell's own data, 35% of undergraduate women at Cornell reported being the victims of non-consensual sexual contact in 2025. Students, staff, and alumni have shared their nightmarish ordeals of being assaulted and raped at Cornell. The earliest stories that I received personally from alumni date back to 1971. This is not a new problem in Cornell, and we heard President Kotlikoff emphasizing it. Now, I've

served my country in multiple combat zones. I've seen people die after being shot at point-blank range. But I was not prepared for the anguish, shock, and grief that current and former Cornell students and staff have communicated with me and my colleagues up here about their ordeals of being raped and sexually assaulted at Cornell. Most of the current and former students who have approached faculty to share their stories of being sexually assaulted at Cornell have told us they were afraid to report these assaults because they felt that Cornell had often treated rape as "a PR problem" rather than a heinous crime. This administration and previous administrations have created a climate or culture of fear that prevents many victims of sexual assault from coming forward to testify about being assaulted. As one student survivor of sexual assault told us, "Cornell will quash any incident that they feel tarnishes its brand." Faculty sponsors of this resolution have been told the same culture of fear exists at the Weil Cornell Medical Center. Many students do not come forward because they understand that their ordeals will not be treated seriously by Cornell. The culture of fear undermines the ability of our communities to stand united against all forms of violence at Cornell. This administration has chronically failed to address these core issues at the bottom of the Jane Doe case, as well as hundreds of other untold stories of sexual assault and trauma at our university. This is the primary rationale for this resolution. While I applaud the fact that Cornell's administration responded yesterday to the crisis of sexual assault on our campus, I mourn that it took so much trauma, so much student organizing, and especially the suffering of Jane Doe to bring this about. This is why the vote of no confidence resolution is more important than ever. Cornell will not do the right thing, colleagues, unless we, the faculty, demand that it do so. For years, faculty who have had expertise in the issues at hand, ranging from student disciplinary procedures to mental health, have begged this administration to let us help with these issues. Instead, we've been stonewalled by Cornell's increasingly top-down leadership that the administration waited to make their announcement the day before they might be held accountable in the Faculty Senate meeting today was appalling. 79% of undergraduate women at Cornell in 2025 reported sexual or gender-based harassment. My first semester at Cornell the year prior, I sent out a message via Canvas to schedule office hours from 5 to 6 PM in mid-November. Three women students immediately messaged me. "Please, professor, do not schedule your office hours during dusk or dark." Many women feel unsafe walking alone at night at Cornell. Other students tell us that they feel unsafe walking to the library after dark. It took the courage of Jane Doe, the meticulous student journalism at the Cornell Daily Sun, and student protests to do what the administration should have been doing all along: prioritizing the safety, health, and well-being of our entire campus above concerns over image or brand. In response to those who wanted us to amend this resolution to call for the resignation of specific individuals, and believe me, many students and faculty have done just that, we responded that switching one or two people out of leadership positions will do nothing to change the culture unless students feel the freedom to speak out on this or any issue. A distinguished Cornell alumna, who is currently an advisory board member at one of our colleges, wrote me this morning, "If you're looking for alumni backing for today's vote, you have from thousands of us. Our ire toward the administration is beyond measure." Colleagues, please support this resolution. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: [Indiscernible]. You'll notice the signs. Please arrange yourselves accordingly. Okay, I'm going to start over here, and then I'll go to the Zoom. And then I'll--

ITZIAR RODRIGUEZ DE RIVERA: Itziar Rodriguez de Rivera, RTE faculty of Romance

Studies and senator. I'll be very brief. Vote your conscience. Vote your confidence.

SAM NELSON: I still remind everybody, we have limited time. Try to keep your comments to at most two minutes.

BRYAN SYKES: Bryan Sykes, Public Policy Center. A number of our colleagues have expressed some concern about the resolution, given that it did not contain any whereases. And they also were concerned about the notion that you would have a no confidence vote, given that it's unclear exactly what the malfeasance or negligence is that should be articulated to the faculty for support of the no confidence vote. And I was wondering if the authors of the resolution could speak to those faculty members who share that perspective because they're open to having their minds changed, but they would like to hear some sort of explanation for why this type of motion, given that there's very little information or more of it's being dripped out into the public sphere, that they would like to know about the specific malfeasance and negligence.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

PAUL ORTIZ: So, I've been a university professor for 25 years, and I've never been involved in such an amazing process that led to such a concise statement. The feeling in all this seriousness that was that we needed conciseness. The feeling was that I just cannot overemphasize how many alumni, how many staff, how many students approached us, and they said the Jane Doe case is the tip of the iceberg. Now, how we deal with the culture of fear here is more difficult in some ways than how we deal with the specific bureaucratic administrator proceeding. And so, that's part of what we're trying to get. If women or victims or any victims of sexual assault do not feel comfortable and confident coming forward, you say, what's happened to them? That's the main problem that we're trying to address. But again, at the same time-- You know, I just had-- My email today, literally in the last 30 minutes, has blown up. Many alumni want certain administrators to step down. We just have not done that because we feel that unless we address the culture of fear that makes some students feel uncomfortable walking through the library at 7 PM at night. But I don't know how a whereas addresses that.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. OK, we can go to Zoom. Noah?

NOAH TAMARKIN: Yeah, thank you. And I forgot to say this before when I spoke. I'm the faculty senator from anthropology, and I'm also in the STS department. I actually want to just say something really quick and simple, which is that we have students who are telling us that they are needing change here, that they're needing our support, and they're asking us to do something. And so, for me, a vote of no confidence is the very least that we can do to support our students. As Paul has said, it doesn't have whereas clauses to say specific actions to take, in part because I think this is a starting point, not an endpoint. This is the very first bar of how we start to stand with our students. And for me, that's the most important thing. And I can't imagine voting no, because voting no is to say I stand against our students. I stand against Jane Doe, and I cannot do that. So, that's why I'm a co-sponsor.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Yuval Grossman, senator from Physics. I'm speaking today on behalf of the physics department. We contacted the department members for the start of the resolution, and about half of the department responded. All those who responded expressed deep concern about the events and wanted us to make clear that we support Jane Doe. As for the resolution before us, among those who responded, approximately 70% did not support it, while approximately [indiscernible]. On both sides, there was a request to clarify what is meant by central administration. Those who support the resolution argue that, given the current situation at Cornell, only a few leadership can successfully resolve it. The majority of those who oppose the resolution consider it premature. They do not believe that we have enough information to make an informed judgment and would prefer to postpone the vote of no confidence. Given the physics department's position that we should not vote on the resolution until the independent review is concluded, we hope that the US team will introduce a motion to postpone the vote until the results of the independent review are made public. If they do not, we will introduce the motion ourselves at the next meeting. If we cannot postpone the vote until more information becomes available, we will vote against the current resolution.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

JENNIFER COLT: Jennifer Colt, Senator to the Library. If there's one thing we've learned over the course of the last year or so is that we cannot trust this administration in collaboration with CUPD to tell the story. We can't trust them to tell the story of the president backing his power over students accurately. Instead, we watched him change the story when video came out. We can't trust them to tell the story of protesters and the disruption they may have caused because, again, the story changed when video showed exaggerations by CUPD. And we certainly cannot trust them to convey or handle the details of a complicated sexual assault investigation accurately. Jane Doe could not trust CUPD to tell the story, and she could not count on the administration to care about her story. As the administration pushed for criminal charges against protesters, they let criminal charges against rapists fall through the cracks. The administration wanted to know how many protesters were arrested at an event, but as we read in the New York Times today, they did not follow up or even ask about arrests or the results of an investigation for this horrific sexual assault. We cannot trust the administration to be transparent and honest as we proceed in the culture change necessary to stop sexual assault on this campus. Relationships require trust, and we have none. Trust cannot be mandated from the top down by a task force. Trust is built in relationships, and in an institution, it's built in democratic processes with independence and transparency. We need a reset of trust and democracy on this campus, but I do not believe this administration and facility.

SAM NELSON: Seth.

SETH SANDERS: Is that me?

SAM NELSON: That's you.

SETH SANDERS: Thank you. I'm sorry. A little trouble hearing. So, thank you. I'm Seth Sanders. I'm the senator from economics. And I'm speaking on behalf of the economics department. We canvassed department members for their thoughts in the resolution. 20 faculty

members responded. Among those who responded, 80% did not support it, while 20% do. Those who support the resolution argued that the vote was a necessary signal that faculty will hold university leadership accountable for institutional failures, weak enforcement, and perceived inability to produce meaningful reform. Opponents wanted a clear account of what the administration knew, what decisions it made, what rules applied, and whether those decisions were defensible at the time. Most favored postponing judgment until the independent review process provides an account. Given the economics department's position, we support the position of the physics department, hoping that the UFC will bring a motion to postpone the vote until after the independent review. If this doesn't happen, we will support the physics department's motion offered at next meeting for this delay. And if this doesn't happen, we'll vote against the current resolution. We are concerned that a vote now that fails will send the wrong signal of support to the central administration. A vote now that passes will have little impact without the independent review, especially if the motion passes with marginal support. We believe that the best way to build a consensus is to wait for the promised review. We ask all senate members to support the physics department's proposal. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. Ten years ago, acting Dean of Faculty Michael Fontaine sent me an email to express that there was going to be a motion for [indiscernible] , and he did this because it was unprecedented. That was not how the Faculty Senate had ever communicated with the administration before. It's no longer unprecedented. MPR said this was unprecedented this morning. There's not an investment of this. We see two or three times a year people bring up these motions to attack the administration. Two years ago, I got an email saying that there had been an act of sexual violence committed to the Chi Phi fraternity house, followed by emails saying the Chi Phi didn't shut down. About a month ago, I got an email from the campus police showing crime statistics. I kept on it for the first time in my life last week and saw that over half of all crimes reported on this campus are sexual assaults. On a campus where we have to beg students to please not leave their laptops and their cell phones unattended down the hall from where they're sitting, over half of all crimes reported are sexual assaults. And, you know, the administration committed the ultimate sin. They decided to unilaterally not act unilaterally. They unilaterally decided to follow the Cornell policy. We write Cornell policy. I saw something come up on Zoom. Where did this policy come from? It came from us, the faculty senate. We are leaders. We have power to review, edit, and adapt Cornell policy to improve this campus. And we have done nothing. We heard that the presidential task force on sexual assault wasn't enough. It's more than we've ever done. The of no confidence should be on this body for refusing to do the hard work of actually fixing problems. Dr. Lieberwitz said that the president was just issuing these statements in response to pressure. This is just in response to pressure. This is the same garbage you see over and over again, attack the administration rather than accept our own responsibility. My constituents, when I hold them, in that school, mostly stand against this. They send me here to do real things, not pick stupid fights with the administration. So, when your turn to vote comes up, I ask you to think about why did your constituents send you to this chamber? Was it to tell the administrators that we don't like them? Or was it to improve policy? Because we really can't be both. This destroys our credibility.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

RAYNA KALAS: Rayna Kalas, Department of Literature [indiscernible]. I expect that there are a lot of senators who are disturbed by sexual assaults that have taken place [indiscernible], but who are uncertain that a vote of no confidence in the central administration is the appropriate response. I also was initially ambivalent about whether a no confidence vote was the right action to take. I'd like to explain how I made the decision, co-sponsored the resolution, and why I continue to stand by it. Before signing on, I went back to read months of publicly available statements to the community about fraternity misconduct. I reread the student code of conduct and community standards documents, and I reread the reports on the task forces on sexual assault and on the future of the American University, especially the sections on academic civics, the Board of Trustees, and shared governance. I am grateful for the hard work and expertise my colleagues put into those reports, through the research, review, and recommendations they brought forward. These documents reflect the community standards of the university whose central mission is research and education. I do not doubt the commitment of our administrators and trustees to Cornell as an institution, but I have lost confidence in their ability to connect the management of the institution with the mission of the university, their ability to identify and correct patterns of concern preemptively, to work collaboratively with various constituencies, and to lead our community in a way that prioritizes knowledge, teaching, and learning, as well as safety and dignity for everyone involved. Though these ethical and educational priorities should be ends in themselves, the fiscal and organizational health of the institution depends on it as well. And I need to add something to the last comment that was made, which is that I think there are probably many people in this room who have been on endless university committees and have not had a place to serve. And we are doing that, and it's a very [indiscernible].

SAM NELSON: It's 4:58. The meeting is set to adjourn at five o'clock. We have a number of people left on Zoom and in line. [Crosstalk]

SAM NELSON: We have what?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have till 5:10 because we added ten minutes.

SAM NELSON: Okay, excellent. Okay. Thanks for straightening me out. So, even though we have an extra 10 minutes, I doubt we cover everybody. So, I just want to make everybody aware of that. Obviously, I'd like to keep on going. But at some point, it has to-- Unless someone has a better idea. Okay. Who's the last person to speak? Trevor, thank you. Actually, yeah, Trevor, go ahead. No, actually, it's Suman. Suman, you're next. Sorry.

SUMAN SETH: You're right. Thank you. So, I just want to say, having listened to the president, that I was deeply disturbed by the refusal to take any personal responsibility for the situation that we're in. President Kotlikoff has been provost or president for more than a decade. And over and over again, in his comments, what he did was tell us about Cornell policy as if he has not had a decade in which to change said Cornell policy. Instead, what we have is the day before a no confidence vote, we finally get a series of measures that our president has now decided to put forward. So, I have very, very, very little confidence that this administration will do the right thing unless it is forced to do the right thing. And I don't think we can constantly force them to. So, I would suggest, given that we've had a decade of this president as president and provost, that

we say that a decade is enough to improve issues around sexual assault on Cornell's campus, and that it is time for us to declare a vote of no confidence.

TOM FOX: Tom Fox, Genetics Senator. I think it's meaningful and useful, obviously, to criticize leadership when we object to something they've done and we have a better idea what should have been done and suggest that. I don't see that in this resolution. So, I'm basically reiterating the point made by the first speaker that the resolution is not telling us what to do. I do appreciate this credit.

ARIANA KIM: Ariana Kim, professor in the music department and faculty senator. With regard to the actions or inactions of a university administration at many levels and to those who hold positions of power over others, what does it feel like when those who are meant to protect you do not? What does it feel like when systems break down and protocols are breached? What does it feel like when accountability vanishes? What does it feel like to be so steeped in fear culture that speaking up feels paralyzing? What does it feel like to be gaslit into the reading that harassment, bullying, and violence are your fault? What does it feel like to be broken by another human being? I can answer those questions. If you in this room can answer those questions or know a staff, faculty member, or student who can do the same, I strongly urge you to consider voting in favor of this resolution.

SAM NELSON: And now onto Trevor.

TREVOR DOLAN: Yeah, thank you. I want to speak briefly to the desire for more information that some folks are expressing, which I think is laudable in principle. But this resolution is focused specifically on the administration's ability to effectively address the ongoing crisis of sexual assault on Cornell's campus, not focused on the way that they handled Jane Doe's assault or any of their actions in response to assaults in the last several years, nothing that needs to be turned up by an investigation. We don't need more information to understand how they're addressing the crisis of sexual assault because we know that they knew that the 2025 Cornell survey on sexual assault and related misconduct showed that 35% of undergraduate women on Cornell's campus and 52% of those in Greek life experienced sexual assault at Cornell. We also know that they're acting now in response to media scrutiny and New York Times coverage, not as a consequence of observing any of these data points in the last several years. So, it leaves me with some questions, like how can we be confident that they will continue to act when they're out of the spotlight, as Suman raised? How can we be confident that their commitments are genuine when they're only being made under duress? How can we be confident in their ability to address this crisis when this whole moment, the reason we are all here having this conversation right now, is the end result of their failure to do so over the last decade?

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: Inna Zakharevich. I'm a Senator from the math department, and I'm speaking on behalf of the math department. I have canvassed the department. I have not heard responses from [indiscernible]. They were still coming in as they were coming in before I got here. So, this is not complete information, but over 80% are against this resolution, largely because we are currently acting with no information. The external investigation has not happened. We have not been told things that we can do to improve things. And generally, we feel that this resolution is another way of doing nothing while pretending to do something. And so, I

support the physics and mathematics department in postponing the vote until after we have more information.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Maria.

MARÍA GONZÁLEZ PENDÁS: Thank you very much. My name is María González Pendás. I'm an architect-- I'm a senator for architecture. I'm speaking on behalf of myself. I have not yet polled my constituents about this. I was waiting to have this discussion and do so before the vote on October 28th. I will say I really welcome the resolution, and I thank the co-sponsors. My reaction to this, if not now, when? So, I'd like to address this question of like why more information? I think that the fact that we don't have more information, and even after President Kotlikoff's Q&A today, we still have not information. In fact, his knowledge that he didn't have the information. The fact that we don't have more information is precisely the reason why we need to put this resolution forward. I will say I have talked to some of my constituents, and I see some concerns for the resolution, specifically in a spelling out or laying out the difference between the details, information about the details of the case, and the resolution having to do with the details of administering a crisis, this particular crisis of sexual violence that is ongoing and the most recent crisis on questions of trust. So, I'm wondering, I'm asking the co-sponsors, is there room or space, or do you foresee the possibility of laying this out in the resolution, like making it very explicitly that this is about, you know, not personal accountability or not flattening leaders' responsibility in sexual violence, but about administering the crisis on sexual violence. And is there room to perhaps introduce or address these questions of trust that have built up in the last month and that Julia so very importantly put forward? I think that would make some of us, you know, discussing this with us constituents, you know, clarify those points. That's what the resolution is about. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. I want to apologize. I went out of order. I meant to go to this next. Go ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: But first, I would like to move to extend the meeting again by another 10 minutes until 5:20 because we have lots of people who want to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

SAM NELSON: All in favor, say aye. The house has it.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. We have today to talk about this resolution. We also have a special meeting on the 28th of this month to discuss this resolution, and we are learning a lot as we discuss it. We have a lot of information. This is designed to be a robust discussion, and we're hearing a lot from constituents as well as others who are speaking. And one of the things that I want to repeat that I said before, which is that this is a systemic problem. It's a systemic problem which requires systemic solutions and systemic actions. We have not seen that. What we have seen to a great extent from the administration, the central administration, is once again a top-down line of governance in which they put together a task force, mostly of administrators, of course, handpicked by the administration. And I am not saying anything in particular about those people. It's structural that systematically what we see over and over again are task forces that are

put together by the central administration. And at the same time, we heard today from President Kotlikoff, after the pressure he's been feeling and after reading what some of us have been saying to the press, he said, "Oh, we need to do this as a community. We need to bring everybody into this." The faculty senate has been running after the administration for years, saying you need to include us in decision-making. When I've tried to get the Faculty Senate involved in Title IX policy, because I'm an expert on that issue, we've been excluded from that. So, this is a problem of systemic inequality on this campus in many ways in terms of gender inequality, sexual violence, sexual misconduct, and it's also a systemic problem of the lack of real democratic governance by our governing bodies. And so this, if Kotlikoff says, "Oh, I want the community," well, what we see is that he does not, including on the expressive activity policy, that was not-- we wouldn't even have had that made put together unless we had pushed back. So, every time we push back, sometimes we will get a drip of reaction. And what we don't need is reaction. What we need is real leadership that believes in democratic governance. Thank you.

STIJN VAN OSSELAER: Stijn van Osselaer, Johnson School and Senator. It seems premature to call for the resignation of Cornell leadership, as I believe we have seen no evidence yet of a fireable offense committed by anybody in Cornell leadership in their response to the Jane Doe case. I think we should postpone the notion for the investigation.

JULIA CHANG: To clarify, it's not a resignation.

SAM NELSON: I'm sorry, what?

JULIA CHANG: The resolution does not call for a resolution.

SAM NELSON: Okay. I need to adjourn the meeting. [Crosstalk] Oh, 5:20. Great. Go ahead.

JULIA CHANG: Julia Chang, Department of Romance Studies. What I have learned in this past two and a half weeks at Cornell is to get this administration's ear, apparently you have to talk to them via the press. That's unacceptable. The urgency with which the administration is acting now, sending us resources, hosting town halls, putting forth new measures, we needed that urgency two years ago. Justice deferred is justice denied. And I want to support what the former faculty senator said, if not now, then when? What reason has this administration given us to have confidence that they can navigate issues of sexual assault on campus? I can't think of any, and that's why I support the resolution.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. So, Aaron, go ahead.

AARON POSNER: Hey, thank you. I wanted to take a second to address a few folks who spoke in opposition, suggesting that we delay this vote. And I want to say that, I think, to the point that we have plenty of information to express that we have no confidence in this administration, delaying this vote is, I don't know what else to call it, but defeatist, and it accomplishes nothing. We have an opportunity as the faculty to act now, right now. And this is one of the only venues we have to act. And it's incumbent upon us to do that. One of our central missions of the school is educational. And in order to do that, we must provide a safe environment for students to learn in. The administration, the current administration of this school has failed to do that. We as

faculty cannot fail in the same way. And that is why I urge you, urge you to vote yes on this resolution of no confidence. And I just want to take a second to say folks who have expressed, in good faith, I think, some concerns about the wording or the exact content of the resolution, you know, whether there are changes in good faith to clarify some of those things, although I wholeheartedly support the resolution, I would urge you to vote yes, nonetheless, because I think this is a really, really crucial moment to act, and folks will look back and see whether the faculty said anything. We must do something. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. [Indiscernible].

ARIANNA SCHINDLE: Hi, y'all. Arianna Schindle here at the Worker Institute. And we at the Worker Institute, we're ILR Extension, we work with the public. And our credibility doing work around gender-based violence and harassment in the workplace is being questioned. Our community partners see the work with Cornell as a liability, even if they know that we have been experts for decades in addressing these issues on an institutional level. They do not trust that our institution will take the proper steps towards systemic change after these issues have been buried for decades. The vote of no confidence is an essential signal to our community partners that we will uphold our public mission and the values of our work. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Justine.

JUSTINE MODICA: Thank you. I didn't want to speak today because I am one of those who, as Arianna mentioned, feel absolutely paralyzed by fear. I've had multiple contingent colleagues lose jobs for criticizing this administration, students who've been issued persona non gratas for speaking their consciences, undergraduates even terminated for their campus positions as residential advisors. And we watch these things happen, and we learn lessons from them. Lessons to be afraid, to be quiet, not to speak. And I speak today because I am so afraid to speak that I'm shaking. And that culture of fear stifles speech for so many of us. And I ask you to think about your junior colleagues here and how we're feeling. That doesn't have to be the case. President Kotlikoff said that he doesn't see the connection between this issue and freedom of speech. But how can we rebuild a democratic community of real shared governance as long as this administration and its culture of fear continues? Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Seema.

SEEMA GOLESTANEH: Apologies, thank you. I also, like Justine, was not planning on speaking today, but I've been compelled by some of the comments and concerns. In particular, I would like to speak to the faculty senators who have relayed the concern that the motion-- the resolution rather-- is just sort of negative and is not productive. I have personally worked hundreds of hours with the administration, with faculty and staff across the entire university to try to reform disciplinary measures. And I'm not exaggerating. I have worked with the Expressive Activity Committee, with the Faculty Senate, and also in quiet private meetings with various administrative officials, also with students as a representative. So, I can know it seems that, oh, there it goes again, a bunch of arts and science colleagues who are getting mad and want to take this opportunity to punish the administration. I am coming in good faith and saying, as someone who has worked literally many, many hours, ask yourself if you have actually done

resolution work, if you have done any of the committee work, especially about disciplinary reform. We have brought up this issue before. Last spring, it was the senate passed a resolution criticizing the temporary emergency suspensions, and it passed 80%. What happened was we had the temporary suspensions. The university changed the policy to emergency suspensions, which were temporary suspensions all in name. We have acted in good faith, and I will continue to act in good faith with everyone. But at this point, after all the work we have put forth, we owe it to our students to send a message that this is not okay. This is not geared towards the president or any other specific individuals. But the system is broken as faculty. This is the faculty senate. We have tried in good faith to work with people. This is why I wanted to speak up to people who say, "Oh, they're just doing this. It's not productive." This is productive because it's communication to the students. It's also communication to media, which unfortunately, as other faculty have said, this clearly is a way to get results. I don't particularly like it. I don't even like speaking like this right now. I wasn't planning on it. I've got to leave very shortly. So, again, please relate this to your constituents that there are people who have worked very hard in good faith to reform and have sort of been so exacerbated after the last two years, we have been left with very little choice. And I'm doing this for our students who are very devastated and want to see real change happen and not just platitudes. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: [Indiscernible].

IRIS PACKMAN: Iris Packman, faculty senator from ILR RTE. I am one of the contingent faculty. I would say, among the many supporters, over 150 faculty who have signed on to this petition, nearly half do not have tenure. And a large portion do not have the potential to have tenure. We are sticking our necks out. We are doing this because we care more about the safety of our students and our colleagues and the integrity of our work than the chance that one of us could be retaliated against. It's terrifying, as Justine said. And I think that the faculty senators in the room who have tenure should take note. And those who don't, your vote is confidential. You can vote your conscience. I do want to highlight just a couple of quick things. There was a comment, you know, opposition, saying that it's our power to write these policies and it's our power to make the changes, and shame on us for not doing so. And I would remind everyone that last year we overwhelmingly passed a resolution saying that the administration was overusing temporary suspension. And this was heading up to the revisions to the student code. The administration released the revisions in August, and none of our suggestions were taken into account. None of the student assembly's suggestions were taken into account. This is not true democracy. And in fact, under the new August version of the student code, if you rape someone, you can still mitigate your stations by writing an essay. That is what this administration has done two years out from the gang rape. And it is not just about Jane Doe, obviously. We can get into the details of who knew what, when, and who gave someone their information. That's not what this resolution is saying. We're saying they cannot manage this crisis. This is a crisis. This is not a single incident. This is 35% of undergraduate women. And President Kotlikoff said, "Well, that's not an accurate survey sample. We don't really know the numbers." Okay, so let's look at the numbers from 2023 survey. It was 23%, and the 2021 survey was 21%. So, is that an acceptable number of sexual assault? Would you say that more than one in five, nearly one in four women being raped on campus is acceptable? Is that not a crisis? Because those were larger survey responses. So, I think we need to look at this more holistically. The administration wants us to focus very narrowly on the minutiae of this case. And that is what happened in other

resolutions as well. It will distract us with facts of a small portion of the issue when what we're seeing is systemic change needs to happen. And I will close with this. During this meeting and right before, I had received, I would say, about 100 emails from alumni asking us to please pass this resolution. I don't know who's organizing it, but it's pretty amazing. And I would just ask that-- This one alumni of CALS 94 asked me to share a few sentences from her. She said, "I love Cornell, but right now I don't like it very much. And I'm ashamed to wear red. The future Cornell case study or PhD thesis will be entitled "Too Little Too Late". Cornell's continuing narrative from the top is almost as appalling as the allegations. Nothing impactful was done with very concerning data that preceded 2024. Communication continues to lack empathy, direction, and speed. This could have been the moment to have an impact bigger than Cornell, with the ethos that drives thinking, innovation, and diversity that has defined us since 1865. Past and current actions show that current leadership is not fit to do so." Carol Berman. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. [Indiscernible].

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, faculty member from the Biomedical Engineering Department. I want to be clear, speaking in personal capacity. I'd like to start by thanking the members of the Senate and the faculty for what I thought was very respectful and very considerate debate of a critically important decision. Thank you. In standing for election, in my work as the dean of faculty, I focus on trying to increase the [indiscernible] the Senate considers and the care of which we match our recommendations to the problems that we identify. I believe this resolution falls short of the scope. It does not articulate specific failures underlying this judgment or what consequences should follow. It leaves each of us to supply our own reasons and imagine our own remedies. There is not a substantive basis of action nor a considered response. The anger in our community is justified, that I share. I believe you should use this anger to sustain a renewed faculty commitment to addressing sexual violence. That means actively participating in the things we already know we can do now to help. It means learning from students and existing research to develop further ideas and evaluate the extent to which those efforts work. And it means investing in the scholarship necessary to develop a deep understanding that can underlie effective lasting change. That is why I invite you, your colleagues, leading sexual assault task force, and folks from the SHARE office today to come talk with us, to help us understand as faculty what our role in implementing changes that are already identified is, and to help us better understand how we can support students who are victims or otherwise suffering in this time. I will bring those folks to our senate meeting in October, and I hope senators can take the work that they learned from these presentations back to their faculty colleagues and charge all of our faculty to be part of the solution going forward. Yesterday's announced measures to support survivors and reduce immediate harm creates the beginnings of our path forward. We as faculty should do our part as well as contribute our expertise to developing ideas for longer term change. And we should certainly also scrutinize the commitment to and the results of these and all future additions. I oppose this resolution because I want our collective judgment in this body to be explicit and our demands clear. I want us to commit to the sustained work of making Cornell safe for our students, and I think we do that by working as a faculty to address the issue.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that the Dean of Faculty was not speaking in his personal capacity since he shifted into being a faculty. It seems to me that it's inappropriate to put a thumb on scales as the Dean of Faculty.

SAM NELSON: Okay. Thank you for expressing that. Richard, you have one minute. Go ahead.

RICHARD BENSEL: It's an important resolution. It's a beginning. It's not an end. We passed resolutions described by the dean of faculty. They then detailed, they then anonymized, they then ignored. This is a time in which, obviously, we had the attention of the central administration. We had the attention of the country. We had the attention of the alumni, and we should use it, not to authorize the president to appoint yet another handpicked committee, ostensibly for reform, but to claim that realm and that right for ourselves. And the only way to do that is to clear the brush. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: I now will move to adjourn the meeting. Do I have a second? Thank you.

HADAS RITZ: I was still waiting with the question on Zoom. Am I not allowed to do that?

SAM NELSON: Well, we're out of time. The meeting has been adjourned. I'm sorry.

HADAS RITZ: Okay.

SAM NELSON: Do I have a motion? We had a motion, and it was seconded. All in favor, say aye. Thank you.