

Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2026

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Senate Speaker, now with audio, Emeritus Professor, Architecture. We start with the land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, our first order of business is the approval of minutes from February 11th, 2026. These have been distributed as a verbatim transcript online, and therefore any corrections will simply be typos and such that you can bring to the attention of the Dean of Faculty. So, by unanimous consent, hearing no objections, the minutes are approved. We start with the introduction to Middle States Accreditation and Open Forum. Steve Jackson is here, Information Science and Vice Provost for Academic Innovation, who will talk for five minutes, and there'll be 10 minutes available for faculty Q&A.

STEVE JACKSON: All right, thank you, everyone. Thank you for the time. And I'm doing the presenting, but it's on behalf of myself and my colleague, Maureen Clarkberg, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, and we are the co-chairs for the university reaccreditation process, which is just kicking off. Next slide, please. So, some of you will have been through this before. We are being reaccredited again on our normal schedule through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. That is our long term crediting body. For those unaware, accreditation is technically voluntary, but for many decades now has been tied to the eligibility for federal student loan funds. So, it's not so voluntary, if that's something you care about, which we do. One point to note is that accreditation, our accreditation this time, as in other times, involves all parts of Cornell. So, things happening in Ithaca, things happening at Weil, things happening at Cornell Tech, in Geneva, in fact, in Qatar, the whole shebang. Next slide, please. So, there's a fair bit of detail in the accreditation process. These are the seven standards that the Middle States hold as the items and topics that we need to address through the accreditation process. You'll see that the ones on the right broadly are all about students and how students are experiencing the university, how we're documenting that success and those outcomes. And then, there's a series of things that are a little bit more on the institutional focus, the things on the left item there. So, things around mission and goals; ethics and integrity; planning, resources, and institutional improvement; and governance, leadership, and administration. Next slide, please. Oh, actually, can you go back? Sorry, can you go back one, Jill? The one thing I should have noted on this slide, this is a technical detail, which won't matter to many of you. We are under the 14th edition of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Standards. So, there is a process underway now that they are voting on, basically as we speak, that may amend the accreditation process. But because we started in the fall, we basically, Marin, and Jason Hecht, and I have been involved in this starting in fall 2025. We have checked with Middle States, and we're under the current system. Now, next slide, please. Actually, let's skip over this. This is more detail. This will be circulated with the materials, so you can dive into this more if you

would like. So, this is the timeline. So, it's a pretty long timeline. You can see we're really kicking things off this semester primarily. And then, there's sort of different chunks to this work. So, a lot of the heavy lifting at the working group level, which I'll explain in a minute, is happening over the coming academic year. This is when groups of faculty, staff, and students will sit down in working group and work through each of those seven standards that I mentioned. The academic year 27-28 involves the synthesis of that work. There'll be a lot of reporting back to campus, this body, but lots of other bodies on campus, chances for input, et cetera. And then, the final culminating site visit happens in Fall of 2028. So, it's an extended process. Next slide. These are the different-- The phase that we're in now is the self-study design process, and these are some of the elements of the self-study design. The thing that I want to particularly call your attention to is that the first interaction-- Marin and I have been interacting with Middle States for a little while now, but our first campus visit is in fact tomorrow. Our Middle States liaison person is Kathy Feith, and she is visiting campus to basically kick off the process. She's meeting with a bunch of people. She's taking questions. And there's an opportunity for an open forum for anyone who wants to join tomorrow. I'll get to that in the next slide. I wanted to call-- So, I mentioned that a lot of the process is set by the seven standards of Middle States. It's a very prescribed process that we follow. There's a part of it that we get to choose in design, and that's the institutional priorities. And these are the four institutional priorities that we propose are useful things for us to be spending our time thinking together about, okay? These are things that are very much in the air. They are active conversations. They intersect in some cases with some of the activities of the future of the American University. And so, we propose these four standards-- Sorry, these four institutional priorities as things that we want us as a group to be thinking about together and arriving at some collective thinking around in the next couple of years. The one thing I'll call out is that item three, Research, Resilience, and Renewal. Part of the reason we're calling that out specifically is Middle States is a body that accredits lots of kinds of institutions, some of which don't do a lot of research, which means that research isn't baked in quite as much as the student and the teaching side on Middle State. So, we're calling it out here because we think research is a really important part of what we do. We want to make sure it gets attention. Next slide, please. We have the working group chairs mostly constituted. There's still a couple invites out that will be settled in the coming days and weeks. You can see some of the folks up there. Our goal throughout the process is going to be to ensure as broad coverage as we can to make sure that all groups, colleges, styles of work, different locations that I mentioned across Cornell are represented well in the process. Next slide, please. And then, there's a wider steering committee, which includes a small planning team, which are Marin and I. Barb Hempstead at Weil is the main rep on that. And then as well, Jason Hecht, Victoria White, and Kim Stockton, who is supporting a lot of our work on the administrative side. The working group chairs. And then, we have some at-large members who represent areas that we think are not yet adequately represented by the mix of working group chairs that we've-- limited number of slots. So, in cases where we don't have a college, for example, represented among the working group chairs, we want to make sure there's somebody from that college that's there in the wider group to kind of call us on stuff we're missing, things like that. Next slide, please. All right, so this is the last slide. This is the longer timeline again, and this is the open forum that I mentioned with Kathy Feith, who is our Middle States liaison, and it's happening tomorrow in PSB 401. There's a Zoom option as well, which we can make sure is circulated too. I see we don't have the zoom on the slide, but it might be linked under the slide. We'll find out. Last thing I'll say is we have a website that will be the main home for this stuff as it goes forward, which is just

accreditation.cornell.edu. There's not a ton there right now. There's some descriptions of the process, and you'll see some of our past accreditation reports if you want to see what this looked like the last time we did it. And then, the email here is going to go to the planning team. And this is a good place for you to send any questions you might have or any questions you might be getting. It's also a good place-- if there's a part of this that you want to get involved in, you're really excited about, shoot us an email and say, "Hey, I'm interested in participating in a working group." If you know which one, like you might say, "Hey, I'm really interested in assessing student effectiveness and student outcomes," send us, "I'm really interested in standard four," et cetera. So, reach out to us if you want to get involved. The stage we're at now is we have the working group chairs mostly constituted. By the time we get to the probably June period, we expect to have our working group membership, like each of those seven standards will now have, you know, eight or ten people assigned that represent the breadth of the university. So, we are very much in the moment of taking-- for people to put their hands up and get involved if they would like. And even if you don't put your hand up, we might reach out to query. I think that's it. Questions, discussion?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If you have questions in house, walk up for microphones. If you are online, raise a digital hand. So, David, come up. I don't see any people on Zoom yet. And identify yourself.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. As I recall, it was Middle States who mandated that when we do transfer credit assessment, we do it agnostic with regard to instructional mode, be it online, synchronous, asynchronous, whatever, and it was solely on the basis of syllabus. Is that correct?

STEVE JACKSON: I don't know the answer to that. Marin, do you know the answer?

MARIN CLARKBERG: I don't think that's Middle States. It might be Department of Education, and Middle States does-- So, the US Department of Education Middle States does require us to certify that we are in compliance with those rules.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Okay. I thought it was Middle States, but I stand corrected. So, did Chris. Chris Schaffer.

STEVE JACKSON: We can check that. Lisa Nishi's been very involved in that. We can check. I take it that that's a concern around that, David?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Well, I mean, comma, after what I said earlier. As you may recall-- Or a semicolon. As you may recall, there were some, especially in the STEM side, who objected to that, who thought that was not a good thing to do. And therefore, I'm wondering whether there's any kind of wiggle room for pushing back on middle states, whether when they do this, perhaps, revision that you were talking about, we could contribute our opinion about that rule, et cetera. That's all.

STEVE JACKSON: Yeah, if you want to-- if you don't mind shooting me an email, David, I can loop Lisa Nishian on this too, I know who is more knowledgeable about this than I am certainly.

And we can check that question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead. Identify yourself.

DAVID LEE: David Lee, Dyson School College of Business and Faculty Trustee. I haven't followed this closely, I admit, but my recollection is when a lot of the new regs came down from the federal government, there were two matters that were going to change significantly with the new accreditation process. And I think they were, certainly DEI was one, and I think the other one was workforce development. So, my question is, are the old-- We're still gonna be under the old standards, but will our response to the old standards be phrased or convoluted in a way that reflects the realities of the new standards?

STEVE JACKSON: Yeah, so we're under the old standards. Middle States has issued a note to those who are under our standard, standard 14, that a previous principle that they had required institutions, or encouraged institutions to respond on regarding their DEI activities under that language, they are saying they are suspending that requirement pursuant to the executive order that they are under. So, we are no longer required by Middle States to do what we used to have to do in terms of reporting by DEI categories as specified under that process. As part of our general principles and values at the university, we remain committed to any person, any study. So, we may not use the categories that are required, that were required under the old standard. We are following the Middle States rules, but we will continue to offer, I believe, an analysis that recognizes the importance of all students landing and succeeding at Cornell to the fullest extent possible. Do you know the workforce development piece?

MARIN CLARKBERG: I do not. And I'm feeling like you guys have little bits of detail here that I'm not sufficiently attuned to. What I do know is that Middle States is, you know, an independent, private entity, but it is itself essentially accredited by the Department of Education. The Department of Education, they just recently got recertified in their thing with the conditional sort of they have to go back with the revised edition that doesn't have DEI in it, that I do have some recollection of workforce motion in middle states about developing more about, for example, experiential credits and so forth. So, I think that stuff is afoot. And so, I think it may be informing the next edition more than it's impacting us right now.

STEVE JACKSON: The one addition I'll add, David, is that there's a negotiated rulemaking process underway that's been initiated at the Department of Ed with all the accreditors. We have representatives who are attending that process to track what's happening in those conversations, and they will be keeping us updated on things coming down the pipe. So, we are watching for changes in the accrediting environment. We have known for a while that accreditation was likely to be a point of interest under the federal government. We knew, actually, even before the election, that this could be the case. So, we're watching it really closely. We are under the existing standard. We're under the same standard as before with the modulo of the exception of the suspension that I just mentioned of the old DEI reporting requirement. And we'll continue to track, and it may evolve somewhat as we go along.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other questions or comments? Eve?

EVE DE ROSA: Just want to let everyone know in the Monday message, the Zoom link is there. And tomorrow's an opportunity to actually speak to someone directly associated with Middle States.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, thank you very much. We're going to move on. This is a proposed resolution to revise academic integrity code. It's been brought to the Senate previously. This time, it's coming as a resolution for your discussion, and eventually voting, I guess, later this week via Qualtrics. So, Liz Karnes and/or Michael Ryan Clarkson will present for five minutes. After which, there'll be 10 minutes for discussion. Go ahead.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Thank you. Yes, we've briefed the Senate on this quite a few times before over the last year or two. So, my remarks today will be relatively brief. Can we go to the next slide, please? So, now there are materials available on the Senate website. They weren't there last month when I came to you. We have the proposed resolution itself. For full details, we have a red line edit of the current academic integrity code. So, you can see every single word change that we are proposing there. If you don't feel like reading the entire thing in detail, there is a one-page summary of it for the busy reader that you're welcome to look at instead. The proposal, the proposed resolution, and the red line edits were reviewed by three different committees, the academic integrity--

[Inaudible]

Test one, two. Thank you so much. Sorry that we went off there. I'll back up again. So, three different committees have reviewed this, the Academic Integrity Hearing Board Chairs and Recorders. We've briefed them at least the last two academic years in a row in January about this, and they had a chance to see the red line edits and give us feedback on that. The EPC, the Educational Policy Committee, has seen this, and so has the University Faculty Committee. All of those have given us feedback. You can find a detailed document. If you happen to be on one of those committees and want to see what we did with your feedback, there's a response to every piece of feedback that we got there, and everyone else is welcome to look at that as well. Next slide, please. So, I want to reaffirm, as always, that our core practices aren't changing. This is not some sweeping revision to the code. Faculty are still in control of the academic integrity policies for their courses, and students are still responsible for submitting work that is their own work, that reflects their own intellectual efforts, and appropriately acknowledges the influences and contributions of others to it. The core academic integrity process itself is not changing either. It's still primary hearings and appeals as you already know them. But we are making some other updates. So, next slide please. The biggest update we're making to the code is to include the process that's come to be known as accepting responsibility as a first-class part of the code. I'll say more a little bit about that on the next slide, but before I get to that, let me finish this one. The second is to create a centralized record-keeping for academic integrity across the university. So, this would be housed in one office instead of distributed across all of the colleges. The third is to clarify details regarding graduate students because the code of legislation of the graduate faculty has evolved, and we need to update some details based on that. The fourth is to modernize some of the examples of academic integrity violations that are currently in the code to include things like unauthorized use of artificial intelligence, and unauthorized is an important word there, as well as unauthorized use of materials and devices, which could range from

unauthorized cheat sheets up to smart glasses that display answers to students in the frames. It's coming if you haven't thought about it yet. And finally, to update the language to be inclusive and gender neutral. Okay, next slide please. I won't go into all the details about accepting responsibility, given the number of times we've briefed the Senate on it before. I'll just remind you, this is an educational intervention in which students agree to a limited penalty, they accept responsibility for their actions, and as a result, it does not become a technical finding of violation of the Code of Academic Integrity, and students and instructors are spared the burden of a primary hearing process as well. Next slide, please. And this is the last. So, I thought today to add some new words to things I've said many times before. I talk about why, to me, it's important to support this resolution. And I'm going to begin by quoting our Dean of Students, Marla Love. She gave a seminar once in which she talked about having accountability and grace for students. And I think what this proposal does is it adds grace to the accountability that's already in the code to provide an option in which we can lean into our educational mission to give students an opportunity to learn from their mistakes without being overly harsh. Beyond that, we get to turn cheating into a structured learning opportunity. There was always a learning opportunity of talking to the faculty member involved as part of the primary hearing, but now there's a workshop on ethics and values that relates not just to the cheating a student may have done, but to decisions they're gonna make in their future work as scholars and in the workforce. We've definitely seen that it reduces burden and stress on both students and faculty as a result of not having to go through what can be an onerous hearing and appeals process. It also still preserves faculty authority. You have the choice as a faculty member whether to use this or not. We hope it also increases consistency of faculty across the university being willing to engage in a process that sometimes can feel burdensome, or harsh, or even combative. This is a nice, gentler way of doing it. And so as a result, I hope it strengthens academic integrity overall at Cornell. Thank you so much. We'll take questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Again, if you have questions in-house, come to the microphones. If you're online, raise your digital hand and identify yourself.

TARA HOLM: Thanks. I'm Tara Holm. I'm the Senator in Mathematics, and I have a question from one of my colleagues. So, thank you. I think this is a great-- I appreciate the motivation and the implementation of this. I think it's a really good program. One of my colleagues asks though, I think one of the advantages of this program or one thing that we're trying to achieve is to give students grace, as you say, and to allow students-- There are certain professional schools that students may be applying to, and when they have had an academic integrity code violation, that can be reported to the school in the application process. And so, I think this is a way of allowing students the grace to recognize the boundaries of their work. And I understand that this is being done, that if they participate in accepting responsibility, they would not then be reported to medical schools, or law schools, or so forth for ethical violations. But my colleague's concern is, suppose a medical school or a law school changes their policy to say that the student has to waive confidentiality to ask their undergraduate institution to release all records indicating that the student did not adhere to the institution's code of academic integrity, including, and I think this is becoming a common way to change policies and to give students grace. But what the concern is that if medical schools, or law schools, or other graduate schools start asking for further information, not just guilty findings of the Academic Integrity Hearing Code, but any indication that a student did not abide by the rules. He's just concerned that students will be

participating in accepting responsibility, thinking that it will not further be reported to medical schools or law schools, but then, in fact, Cornell will be required to report it. So, I don't-- Is that clear?

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Thanks for the question, Tara. I get it, yeah. As a pointer to this, actually, at the end of our response document to the committees, there's a long question. Perhaps it came from your colleague. I don't know. And we wrote a detailed answer to it there. So, I hope you'll send your colleague there as well. But as a response to this body, what I want to say is, I, you, we cannot control what external entities will ever ask of our students. What we can say is that you are either guilty of a finding or we have a finding against you or not. And if other entities want to ask other questions about your academic record, we're going to have to answer that. We've talked to counsel about this. If they come with legal compilations from the FBI, we have to answer it. There's nothing we can do about that. So, there's no way we can perfectly protect students when they've messed up this way. But don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good is what my PhD advisor would have said to me.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. I apologize in advance if I am misremembering stuff. I just learned some of this stuff about a week ago. But I'm pretty sure the vet school students are basically exempted from the academic code because they have their own, we like to believe, more robust honor code that they feel is important. Would they be able to opt into this alternate disciplinary/grace system without fully ditching their own honor code and returning to the standard academic integrity code?

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Thanks for the question. So, as part of the code of academic integrity, buried in it, there is a statement that some of the schools in the university and some of the colleges maintain their own honor codes to do things differently. You're right, vet is like that, so is law. Graduate school is another interesting case on this. Okay. So, the vet school has its own honor code. That's what the vet students are bound to. And if the vet school ever wanted to update its honor code to include something like this, that would be up to them to do. However, it is my understanding that since your faculty would have to opt into it to offer it and they're bound by their own code, this is not directly applicable to them at this time. However, we have started using this for some professional masters that are in the MPH program, I believe. And Liz, if you're online, you might be able to speak to that.

LIZ KARNS: Yeah, we have been using accepting responsibility with-- I think we have 14 MPH classes that are included. And we've seen some students from that so far. They are included because I guess the way the grad school addresses professional programs, they are under the academic integrity code. So, it's been pretty smooth so far. Good response. Faculty love it. Same response that we get from undergrads.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Eve?

EVE DE ROSA: I just wanted to say that the honor code is tied to the professional degree, and that's why we have that difference.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any further questions? Seeing none, I think we will move on to our

next agenda item. Thank you very much. This is the introduction to Dean of Faculty candidates. Each of the three candidates will have five minutes to present their case. This is an election, not just of the faculty senate, of course, but of the whole university faculty. And it will be taken online between April 15 and April 29. That will be the window for voting. But even though it's a university election, the candidates will present their case to you, five minutes each. After which, we'll have 20 minutes for Q&A. But I want to clarify that the intention of the Q&A is not to advocate for or talk against particular candidates, but rather to ask questions that all three candidates can answer. That being said, we'll start with Kelly Musick. Five minutes.

KELLY MUSICK: Okay, thanks everyone for joining here and online. I'm really honored to have been nominated for this role, and happy to introduce myself to you, and get to hear from Chelsea and Chris, and to get to hear your questions. I'm going to take this time to talk briefly about my background, the current moment, and the experiences and approach that I would bring to the Dean of Faculty role. So, a bit on my background. Do you want to pull up this side? Oh, you got it. Thank you. Perfect. I'm in the Brooks School of Public Policy in the Department of Sociology. My training is interdisciplinary in sociology, policy, and population, and my research focuses on families in social inequality and comparative perspective. I've spent much of my career here at Cornell. I bring experience leading through change over many years as a faculty member, as a department chair, and most recently as the inaugural Senior Associate Dean of Research in the Brooks School. This was a unique opportunity. As part of the leadership team, I helped to create the academic and operating structures, shape faculty governance, and set strategic priorities for the school. In my role overseeing research, I supported faculty in doing impactful research across disciplines, and methodological approaches, and on a wide range of topics that are crucial for pressing issues around the globe. I was chair of the Department of Policy Analysis and Management through the major restructuring of the social sciences that led to the Brooks School. I advocated for protections for early career faculty in this transition, worked with colleagues across colleges on new policies and practices for the school and super departments, and I saw powerful examples of faculty governance that influenced the setup of the Brooks School. I led the Department of Policy Analysis and Management, PAM, during COVID, did my best to take care of faculty, staff, and students during those really uncertain times, strengthened mentoring structures, and developed new initiatives for belonging that included mechanisms for data collection and accountability. So, I'm just going to say a few words about how my background and experiences intersect and I think would be useful in this current moment. We're facing significant challenges to the way we teach, do our research, engage with the public, including new questions about higher education's partnership with the federal government, funding cuts, directives on what faculty can study and teach, and heightened public scrutiny. I have felt these pressures and pushed against them in my role as associate dean, for example, navigating colleagues' stop work orders on funded research, and mapping out next steps on belonging initiatives in this shifting landscape. As a sociologist studying various and overlapping structures of inequality, I've also pushed against these pressures in my own research and teaching. For example, I've worked to keep a pipeline program and population going in the wake of the Supreme Court decision on admissions and funding cuts for training the next generation. I've also continued to push students in my large undergraduate class on social problems in the US to think deeply about multiple dimensions of inequality while acknowledging contention around concepts that have long been used in sociology to try to make sense of the world around us. And just the last slide. Finally, I just want to say a bit about the

approach I bring to the Dean of Faculty role. The challenges and changes in the last couple years have brought a lot of uncertainty around what comes next. And I think in this moment, it's especially important to hold really fast to core values, any person, any study, academic freedom, and the shared governance structures that uphold those. I'd prioritize approaches to leadership that have worked for me in past roles, listening and learning, building connections to solve problems, and promoting transparency and engagement in decision-making. Eve and Adam have worked to democratize the faculty summit and expand faculty voice, and I'm committed to continuing that effort and to amplifying faculty perspectives. I noted that I've spent much of my career at Cornell. I will also have two kids here in the fall, and so just a little more to underscore a very deep commitment to this institution. And I thank you for considering my candidacy.

[Applause]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Next we have Chris Schaffer.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Chris Schaffer. I'm a faculty member in the Biomedical Engineering Department. My lab study's neurodegenerative disease, like Alzheimer's disease, using optical tools that we develop. I've been at Cornell 20 years this year. And I've long been interested in faculty governance. I don't know if this is a bragging point or not, but I have been in the Senate almost continuously. Only during years that I've been on sabbatical have I not been a member of this body. I've served on the Nominations and Elections Committee, I've served on the University Faculty Committee, and for three years as the Associate Dean of the Faculty. During that time, I worked closely with then Dean of the Faculty Charlie Van Loan on increasing representation and voice of research, teaching, and extension faculty in the Senate and in shared governance broadly. I worked quite a bit on student misconduct policy, primarily around Title IX issues, where, at the time, there was a lot of upheaval in Title IX processes, and the university needed to respond with adjusting our procedures. I served on those panels for 10 years, where you hear a lot of stories that are just difficult. After my time as Associate Dean of Faculty, I was actually the Senate nominated representative to a couple of committees that had a lot of impact for all of us. In 2020, I served on one of the COVID committees that was focused on reopening research operations, where those of you who run research labs and had to write some thing about how you were gonna do it safely. That's my fault. I drafted that process. I also, two years ago, spent a year serving on the expressive activities committee that was put forward to revise processes around how protests and things like that go on campus. A little bit more relevant experience. About 10 years ago, I spent a year in Washington DC under a AAAS fellowship working as a science policy advisor in the United States Senate in Ed Markey's office. So, just to take away from this, I've represented the faculty in decision-making around both challenging issues and at times of great institutional stress in the past. And these experiences have really shaped how I think about the Dean of Faculty. I'm not going to claim all of those things went well. Some went well, some went less well. And those experiences have deeply shaped how I think about the Dean of Faculty role, which I really see as centered on facilitating effective shared governance. That's what I would like to see us do better. Honestly, right now, with as much controversy as we have had in the Senate over the last few years around some issues, I really do think that our biggest challenges emerge not from strong disagreements on issues, but rather from the timing and the depth of Senate and faculty engagement with topics as they come up. And that's where I'd really like to see things change. I think too often our input, it

comes late and in the form of comments of often then not even substantive, but procedural objection type comments that are about policies that are largely already formed. And in addition, I feel often sometimes it feels like we're doing consultation over here in the Senate, and yet there's this other place over there, I'm pointing toward Day Hall, where decisions get made, and that disconnection, I think, that sense of disconnection between consultation and where decisions are really made erodes trust. So, I would like to see us do better. My focus would be on trying to make this shared governance interface work better by making it more timely, substantive, and transparent so that it can be more effective in shaping institutional policies. So, for example, I would like us to be-- I would like major issues to be brought to the Senate and its committees at an earlier stage, where faculty can help frame the problem, not just comment on it. I'd like to strengthen our Senate committees by turning it into standard process to have them review administration and Senate initiated ideas and provide their perspective to the broad Senate as we take action. And I'd like to work with the administration to try to standardize the consultative process and make it more transparent so that we all kind of have a sense of how things are going to go. For example, utilizing the Senate and the nominations elections committee as a key role for staffing ad hoc committees that the administration sets up, as opposed to having them cherry pick folks that they're interested in. So, these are just a few examples of things I think we could do to make the shared governance process work better. We have extraordinary faculty here. I think when we engage early, thoughtfully, and substantively on issues, we can work through difficult challenges. And my goal as Dean of Faculty would be to strengthen those processes so that we can continue to do that and do it better. Thank you.

[Applause]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Next, we have Chelsea Specht.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Hi. Good afternoon, Dean DeRosa, Associate Dean Smith, esteemed senators online and in person, fellow faculty, visitors. I'm Chelsea Specht. I'm the Barbara McClintock Professor of Plant Biology, and I'm honored to stand before you as candidate for your next Dean of Faculty. I want to start with a bit of a story, two stories actually. The first comes from the slogan, "Happy cows make better milk." It was an ad campaign in the early 2000s of the California Milk Advisory Board. The slogan implies that cows treated well with access to resources and care that reflects a positive environment produce higher quality milk. This implication is actually supported by research that shows that cows with low stress, good welfare, opportunities for socializing, access to resources, and freedom of movement produce higher quality milk. Excellent. We all know that environment matters, yet as we work to improve our teaching, our research, or the metrics of productivity that we use daily, we are encouraged to focus on what we can do better for ourselves without always being prompted to consider how our environment might work for or with us as a partner. I believe that the Dean of Faculty Office is here to make sure that your environment and the environment for all faculty is one in which unnecessary stresses are limited and in which you are provided access to resources, opportunities for collaboration, and freedom to do the work for which you are most passionate, knowledgeable, and dedicated. Next slide. My second story comes from a friend and colleague, Vicky Sork, former Dean of the Division of Life Sciences at UCLA. As Dean, Vicki was universally loved by her faculty, so I asked her, what's your secret? She said, "You know, when I first started as Dean, I made a promise to myself that every single day, no matter how hard I

work or how late I need to stay up, I would do one thing every day that I wished my dean had done for me when I was a faculty member.” So, as Dean of Faculty, I believe that I would be able to do at least one thing every day that I wish a dean had done for me as a faculty member. But perhaps more importantly, I will work with your deans and university leadership to encourage them to share the same mindset and conviction. And it's not overly optimistic. In 2022, David Figlio, incoming provost at the University of Rochester, framed the provost position as having a front row seat to the university's excellence and is playing a key role in acting as a facilitator for faculty pursuits. Faculty and administration will always work best as a community, as a village, as partners putting together the brilliant and complex puzzle that is Cornell University. Next slide. So, how do we do this? What are our rights and our responsibilities? As former Associate Dean of Faculty, I know that the Dean of Faculty Office is responsible for overseeing university affairs, creating policies, and fostering communication between the faculty and the university community. So, let's take these one at a time. Next slide. The Dean of Faculty is the faculty's representative in university's affairs. Being a representative means acting or speaking on behalf of another person, group, or entity. It involves serving as an agent and an advocate, acting first, foremost, and finally in your constituents' best interests. This also means taking the time to understand the motivations driving the trustees, the president, and the provost in their decision-making processes, building partnerships such that faculty can do their best work while supporting the university's vision and mission, and creating a healthy ecosystem that we know leads us to be happier and more productive and proficient. Next, we are a body that creates policy. This gives us extraordinary power and responsibility. I'm committed to working with faculty to build policies that make our lives better, our decisions easier, our aspirations realized, that help us to do the greater good, and to ensure that our community fosters any person, any study. I believe that policies are meant to instill best practices to support faculty in aligning our mission with that of the university and to facilitate a progressive culture of opportunity. As Dean of Faculty, I will work with all of you to ensure that our policies strengthen shared governance, strengthen the academic mission of our university for us and the students and stakeholders we serve, and strengthen the ability of our community to build, create, generate, learn, grow, in short, to thrive. Next. And finally, fostering communication. Ian Balcom, former provost of UVA, referred to faculty and administration as sharers and shapers of the institution. The sharing and shaping can only be done with constant communication and awareness. The faculty senate is a torch lit by another, meaning enlightenment is rarely self-generated but is sparked by guidance, shared knowledge, and the continuation of ideas through congregation and conversation. From Monday messages to ensuring faculty voices are heard, consulted, and elevated in the visioning of resilient Cornell, I will foster a communication such that all faculty know what needs to be done and how we need to do it. Together, we can create a vibrant academic community that pushes boundaries and sets new standards. I look forward to embarking on this journey together and shaping the future of Cornell. Thank you.

[Applause]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, maybe all three can sit in the front row. And then, are there any questions that should be addressed so that all three candidates can answer them? If you have such a question, please come up to the front. And if you're online, raise your digital hand.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government. Thank you very much for the three

presentations in policy experience and university service, and those are important things. So, is character. I would like each of the candidates to describe that occasion in which you took a principled stand that was personally costly. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Maybe we can answer in the order that we presented.

KELLY MUSICK: Okay, principled stand that was personally costly. I don't know. I guess I'll bring up one from my time as Chair of Policy Analysis and Management. And actually, it was collaborating on the social justice initiative. And there was wide consensus for a candidate, and yet a few vocal voices and opposition that, at the time, you know, I was a relatively new chair, felt kind of scary to stand against. And yet it was a stand worth taking on behalf of excellence at the university. And so, I think I learned a few things from that. One is that it's really important to find ways to encourage the voices of all so that the few loud voices don't give the impression of consensus, where it's actually a minority view. And then to just persevere when you feel like you're standing on the right side.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thanks for the question. I've been fortunate not to have too many situations where taking a principled stand led to significant personal negatives. I'd say one case has to do with Title IX cases. I don't serve on those panels anymore because I resigned in protest from continuing to serve on them over a particular case where I strongly disagreed with conclusions that were being made. I was one member on a panel. And ultimately, the Title IX office at the time moved forward without my agreement, with my name on a document that I hadn't agreed to and things like that. So, I blew the entire process up, where they had to launch an entire new investigation around this because it was not being handled appropriately and my concerns were not being addressed. I can't say I enjoyed the Title IX work because it's a terrible story that you're hearing about people in their worst moments, but it was rewarding work in the sense that I felt it was something important for the university to work hard on. As ineffective as that felt, it felt like it was something, and I walked away from that because I was unhappy with how this particular case was being handled, procedurally, not just the particular substance I disagreed with, but the substance I disagree with wasn't being taken into account in the process, either as written or as what I thought should do. So, I stepped back from that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Chelsea.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Thank you for the question and for giving us this opportunity to sort of sweat through how we can answer this question without revealing something sometimes. Anyway, I'm going to talk about a story that I think was really important to me because it involved a graduate student, and I was a graduate student. So, I arrived at Cornell in 2017. There was actually a situation that kind of was the straw that broke the camel's back, and what made Cornell so enticing for me to come was part of the story. So, I had a graduate student that I was really excited to admit at my former institution. This individual had the backing of all the faculty, my backing personally, the department, the entire department, actually a couple departments in the graduate programs were very excited about this candidate to the point where we were going to nominate them for a particular award that would give them additional finances to be able to

come to this institution and be a graduate student there. And the person who was the head of the graduate school at that time decided to override our decision, saying that this individual student didn't have the academic background to succeed at this university. And I was like, "That can't be true. You must not be seeing the full picture." So, I laid out the full picture and they were very-- they were in particularly upset that we offered this fellowship without-- We didn't really offer the fellowship, but we had put this person up to offer as a fellowship without their permission. And so, they dug in, and they ultimately did refuse to admit the student. So, I packed my bags and I came to Cornell, and the student was admitted, graduated in five years from a very rigorous program, and is now at Stanford University. Anyway, it's a good story, but it did take a little bit of-- it was very stressful at the time, but it was worth it to see this individual excel.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have an online question, so we'll go online to Anne-Marie Brady.

ANNE MARIE BRADY: Yeah. Hi, sorry, I hope you can hear me, I'm in a train station. I'm Anne Marie Brady. I'm a new faculty Senate member and from the ILR school, representing outreach. I'm just wondering for the three candidates, thank you very much for your presentations, how you will maintain independence from administrative, from Day Hall, if you will, and ensure that you're representing our interests and not necessarily the interests of administration.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Kelly? Reverse order.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Give her a chance to think this time. Thank you very much. I really appreciate, Anne Marie, that question. I just will say that I-- As representative of the faculty, that independence is inherently part of this position and part of who we represent with the faculty. There has to be a partnership, but you can't have a partnership without having partners, right? They have to be independent to create a partnership. I think a lot about the way policies are created. And I see policies as negotiations, and every policy, for the good that it does, will have consequences, intended and unintended, that might be negative or felt negative by a group of stakeholders. So, any policy that's set has to engage in negotiation, and you can only have negotiation if you are independent parties. And that would be the mindset that I would instill.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I guess Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yeah. Hi, Chris Schaeffer. So, yeah, as Chelsea said, this is an elected position. So, you're fundamentally independent in the sense that you don't lose the position unless the faculty initiates a recall vote, or perhaps the Senate can do it. I'd have to go back and look. So, certainly not beholden to someone in the administration for the position or the ability to have a seat at the table or be in the room. That said, I don't think I would choose to use this independence in a reflexively combative way. I think it's very important to build trust with the administration, of course, bidirectional trust, but that means they need to trust us. I have been in meetings with members of the university administration talking around an issue that certainly pertains to faculty. And I can remember bringing up like, "Hey, we should run this through the Faculty Senate. We should, you know, go through our normal consultative process." And the response there was, "Well, do we have to for this? Are you sure? Like, isn't that going to make it

more complicated? Isn't that going to make it harder?" And I think we can change that perspective at Day Hall by building trust in the way that the Senate responds in timely and substantive fashion. And that would be how I would choose to use the independence of this position to try to build trust that makes us a more effective partner with the administration.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Kelly.

KELLY MUSICK: Yes, thank you for that question. So, I really see this role as in service to faculty and the institution, and I think those are not at all in conflict. I think it really benefits the administration and the institution as a whole to have a robust faculty perspective on issues. And so, you know, it's possible the president and provost may not want to hear it in the moment, but we have this incredible faculty, and we have the power to raise issues that make Cornell better. So, I see that as a really important job on behalf of the faculty, but also on behalf of the institution.

PEIDONG SUN: I'm Peidong Sun, Faculty Senator-- Oh, no. Faculty and the Senator from the History Department. I'm always very nervous when I stand here. You might remember the first time, I was trembling. That's why I don't have a script today. And so, first I'd like to thank our three candidates because they were courage enough to take on this challenge in this moment while we need the most clear voice, and good judgment, and a strong commitment to Cornell's academic mission. So, I would like you to join us-- join me giving them a round of applause.

[Applause]

Thank you. Thank you. And I have several questions. After being senator for three years, I have a few questions I haven't found good answers to yet, but I want to hear your thoughts. Number one, for university faculty and RTE faculty, what would you do to bring them attention to the key issues and the resolutions we are doing here in this senator? For example, would you ask a department to elect their senator in a more democratic way? In our department, all senators, we elect them, we vote, then we choose. So, they take our representative very seriously. They share the notes, share the old agenda, timely fashion. Okay. Another question, how would you look at today-- I don't know online participants, but in person, how would you bring people more, I mean senators, more actively participant in this agenda we are doing here? Number two question, for the untenured faculty, the junior faculty, what would you do to make sure that their voice are heard and they can receive support they need most at this moment? We all know, understand why junior faculty and tenured ones, they do not speak in public here. We know their concerns, but we all-- we were there. We know we want support, not only from the Senator, but also the broader University. How would you do to give them-- to get their voice heard and give them the support they need most at this stage? Number three, last Senate meeting, we all witnessed the relatively tension related to a quotation of the AAUP Cornell chapter. What would you do to improve the communication between the senator and the AAUP Cornell chapter? Because we know some of our faculty members or senator, they are the members of that chapter. So, how would you say to those senators and the faculties, when we have some debatable issues, what would you say to those people? Last one.

[Laughter]

I'm sorry. Finally, finally, last one. In terms of Daily Sun, whenever the senator faces a debatable issue, would you accept an interview with the Daily Sun by your official capacity or your personal capacity, and why? Thank you. I'm Peidong Sun from History Department, and I believe a clear voice for shared responsibility.

[Applause]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Maybe Chris goes first this time.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi, Chris Schaffer. I'm gonna have trouble keeping track of all four of those. I'm always willing to be interviewed by the Sun. In the last two weeks, I've been quoted two or three times there, once when I misspoke and described our president as being capricious in his decision-making activity. So, I would be always willing to talk to the Sun and to other outlets in either a personal or official capacity. Regarding the first issue you raised, I really think it comes down to strengthening the role of being a faculty senator, where it's something that's more desirable so maybe there are competitive elections to do it and something where it's more respected from the administration. And I think that will come through building increased trust, by having more timely, deeply substantive engagement on issues that emerge. And I see the Dean of Faculty role is critical in facilitating that by being in the room in meetings in Day Hall to identify things early that need to come through the Senate, either because it's something of broad interest to the faculty or it's something that our procedures require it, and to try to lower the perceived pain threshold in the administration from engaging the faculty on issues. So, that was four and one. What were two and three? Yeah, supporting junior faculty. Thank you so much. I think that's a fantastic challenge in the context of the Senate. One thing, I'm actually not sure if Eve already does this, but if not, she'll probably be doing it soon. We should have the non-tenure track faculty meet independently with maybe the University Faculty Committee and the Dean of the Faculty to try to bring issues up in a forum that isn't so dominated by folks that are tenured and otherwise. And point two? Oh, AAUP. Yeah. So, I don't see fundamental conflict between AAUP and the Faculty Senate there. They can coexist and collaborate on issues and be on different sides of issues as those arise. That seems okay to me.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Maybe--

[Laughter]

CHELSEA SPECHT: Yeah, Peidong. Wow, yeah, that energy. We need to harness that. That's first and foremost. So, I'm gonna go kind of in the same order that Chris did. So, yes, on the Daily Sun, always happy to talk to them as both in official capacity and working with others too and with the Senate too, especially when there's position statements that need to be made. I've thought a lot about faculty attention to key issues and just faculty attention more broadly. The number of times people are like, "What does the Dean of Faculty office do?" And one of the things, actually, Eve and her team have been amazing at the new website, and just even encouraging people to go onto that website. It's actually so easily navigatable and readable right now. But I've thought about things, as Peidong mentioned, elections within departments so that you know who your senator is and you've actually voted for that senator, also having senators

then stand for the broader elections and get them engaged in different committees. Chris had mentioned having the committees be really tied to particular activities, and motions, and movements, and needs within the community, and then bringing people into those communities through sort of associated membership, an ad hoc membership on those committees to make sure that they're really functioning and doing their work. I've also thought we need to have-- Like, the Monday messages, everybody needs to read those, so we have to have the tricks, right? So, let's do faculty quotes in the Monday messages, and then everybody's reading that faculty quote and being like, "Hey, did you see what so-and-so said this week?" And I know these are just, like, silly kind of little tricks, but if there's a community feeling that you're missing out by not having opened that email or by not participating in a committee, that's where we start to build community. So, giving people a little FOMO when they're not involved in this group is not such a bad thing. And then, also I was thinking about short essays on the nature of things by our senators, talking about on the nature of the things that we're discussing, what are their opinions, how are these brought together, and creating short essays that can go out and foster discussion, conversations, and communication within our community. These are just some ideas, but also addressing sort of the junior faculty issue. I'm currently Associate Director of Faculty Development in the School of Integrative Plant Sciences, and I meet monthly with our assistant professors. And I would love to do this at a broader scale across the university. Of course, it cannot be at a time that everyone can make it, but if you're doing something monthly, then you start to build that community and say, "Oh, I have this thing to do on the last Wednesday of every month," or whatever. And also bring in people that are important for them to meet so they're not meeting the provost or the deputy provost when they're already past tenure, but they're actually meeting these people as assistant professors and seeing how the university operates so that they then become part of the machine that drives the university forward very early on. I think just monthly meetings are ways to sort of work through that. I think I got through most things. I want to give Kelly time, but just saying I'm going to go with what Chris said with the AAUP. I think that it's great to have that dialogue and opportunities to see how we can dialogue across those differences to do more and do better.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Kelly.

KELLY MUSICK: Thank you. I'm just going to start by thanking Chelsea and Chris because there are a lot of good ideas, and I, going last, can just piggyback on those. So, you know, I agree, the AAUP is another resource. Some of us have affiliations, some of us don't. We sometimes agree with the AAUP, we sometimes don't. I think the mission of academic freedom is one we're on board with. That's like a founding principle that we share. I'm also happy to talk to the Sun and other outlets. The ideas about broadening engagement, deepening engagement in the Senate, I think were great. I'd just like to reiterate the importance of committee work, rolling up your sleeves, working side by side with colleagues on issues that you find important and meaningful. I think, you know, that's one very clear way of getting buy-in from people. And, you know, maybe thinking of ways to strengthen channels between senators and their home departments. I think there's great variation in how much information gets passed along and how much discussion there is around what happens in the Senate in home departments. Junior faculty. It's really critical that our junior colleagues feel safe in speaking their perspectives. I'm also a real advocate of limiting service roles and being judicious in what we put on the plates of our junior colleagues. And so, I think there's a balancing act there. More broadly, in terms of thinking about

supporting junior faculty, OFDD has done a lot of work in formalizing mentoring structures. Those are critically important. And there still is quite a bit of variation across units in what those look like and how well they operate. And so, I think there's more work to be done there. And then, there are just going to be new questions about how we evaluate our junior faculty, ongoing questions about how we value public engagement, and I think some new questions about how we evaluate grant getting among our colleagues in this new environment. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think you should go first. You've already had a question. Okay, ask candidates.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. I'll try to keep this quick. As we think about leadership, and faculty governance, and representation, and strengthening roles, and as we think about the future of the American University, I would ask if you can think forward, you know, three to six years as you're exiting your role, could you see yourself supporting the serious consideration and possible nomination or election of an RTE faculty member to the next dean position?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Maybe we should revert back to the original order at this point. Kelly, Chris, and then Chelsea.

KELLY MUSICK: I think that's a great question. So, you know, fast forward five years or so, I would have more information and knowledge of my colleagues, but I've, you know, long worked with RTE faculty in my own department, and am frankly blown away by their teaching and engagement with our students. We have-- We're in a policy school, and so our RTE faculty fulfill an absolutely critical role in direct policy engagement and applied work that many of our professorial university faculty, we don't have the same experience. And so, really critical skills and experience that come from the RTE faculty and our students just benefit enormously from having that, having access to that knowledge and expertise.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi, Chris Schaffer, played an assistive role with Charlie Van Loan in increasing the current representation that RTE faculty have in the Faculty Senate. And I, at least in my own department in college, seen that elevation as being something that has carried over into other contexts around governance and decision making. I think an RTE faculty member being elected as Dean of Faculty would require a change in the university bylaws, and that's a process that I would want to go very slow, and considerate, and thoughtful about with lots of input, lots of buy-in so that that was-- So, if it did go forward, it went forward with broad support so that if someone with an RTE appointment were elected to faculty, they would have-- people weren't like, "Oh, how did that suddenly happen?" I would rather that be a broad, consultative process to make a change like that. I would certainly be willing to-- I'm not at all opposed to it and certainly would be willing to consider it.

CHELSEA SPECHT: So, I think Bill wants to be the next Dean of Faculty. Is that what I'm getting from this? As Chris was saying, I'm so honored to have been part of this body of senators during the process of the elevation of RTE faculty into some major leadership positions. And I think that this has come not only by the will of the people for this to happen, but there also has to be some policies and best practices in place that allow these things to happen. And so, if this were five years from now, there'd have to be some of those policies in place. And some of those

things would be really logistic. So, one of our senators had questioned about independence, right? And with RTE faculty, one thing right now is that the Dean of Faculty needs to be tenured. And that tenure is important to maintaining their independence from the administration. That would have to be applied to any position, any person in the position of Dean of Faculty so that they were able to retain that independence. I also think that there's a time allotment issue, and I think-- So, the RTE faculty, it's such a diverse series of funding streams that are coming to generate the RTE faculty, and so you'd have to think about what kind of allotment of time can be contributed, given some of the challenges or the demands of the position of that RTE position. So, whether they're teaching, whether they're research, whether they're extension. So, there would have to be policies and practices in place to allow for those critical needs of the Dean of Faculty role to be met by an RTE faculty. That being said, the love of Cornell, the talent, the intellect, everything that it takes to be a Dean of Faculty, I see absolutely reflected in our RTE faculty, and the question would be, can the position handle the policies that wouldn't need to be in place for them to be an effective Dean of Faculty?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Final question, and ask that the responses maybe be 30 to 60 seconds each.

GILLY LESHED: Gilly Leshed, Information Science. So, I'm gonna back off of Bill's question about RTE faculty. I'm gonna ask you to tell me-- I heard about your opinions about the implicit but highly felt power structure in the university faculty between RTE faculty and tenure track faculty. I want to hear about some of your activities that you've done in the past, not involvement in the RTE faculty part of the Senate, to change some of the policies in favor of empowering RTE faculty. And beyond, I highly appreciate their work.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, Chelsea, then Chris, and then Kelly.

CHELSEA SPECHT: So, can I clarify the question just a second? So, work that we've done specifically towards policies that support RTE faculty broadly on campus. Okay. So, my work started, I was Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion in the College of Ag and Life Sciences, and then Associate Dean of Faculty with Dean DeRosa when the RTE committee, faculty committee was generated. And I met with that committee regularly. Starting within CALS, we have research, but teaching and extension, especially the large ones in CALS and particularly extension. And so, I've worked with the Cornell Cooperative Extension and some of the extension faculty to build an understanding among our faculty about the role that those individuals play and how those roles are inherently based in their extension has a leadership element to it, a teaching element to it, and sort of a, well, and the kind of guidance through community building element, and just kind of creating a sense within the department-- I'm well beyond my 30 seconds. A sense within the departments that how important these roles are, so that when it comes to the point of saying should RTE individuals have representation on the Senate, the answer was of course. Look at the leadership roles that they're playing. Look at the emphasis in our classrooms, in our extension programs, in our research institutions, and how important those roles are. And if they are missing on the Faculty Senate, then we are missing a huge part of our community. So, I'll end it there to give other people time, but just saying, generating the environment for that hierarchy to dissolve.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi, thank you for that question. Outside of the work in the Senate, most of my work involving RTE faculty has been within my department, where I've been PI on a series of education and outreach focused graduate student training grants. And one thing I've done is I've brought our RTE faculty in as co-PIs, and co-investigators, and as a part of that intellectual activity because it aligns with the teaching mission and the involvement of graduate students in that teaching mission that's core to their job. So, I feel like that's an example of elevating their elevating status or however you want to say that in terms of integrating them and with other activities that are important at the university. In this case, graduate student training and pedagogical innovation that's beyond just the delivering of classes.

KELLY MUSICK: Great. Thanks for that question. My experience has also been mostly within the Brooks School of Public Policy, and I would say there is a real shared understanding that our RTE faculty bring expertise and experience that our university faculty don't have. And so, a real respect for that policy engagement and a real recognition that that is a critical part of a policy school. So, I've worked alongside as chair prior to the founding of the Brooks School, alongside RTE faculty as director of undergraduate studies in the belonging initiatives that I led in PAM, and then in Brooks, my co-partner in these initiatives was RTE faculty. So, I feel like there have just been opportunities, like Chris said and Chelsea alluded to, that to work alongside as colleagues and partners in the important work that we do.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're going to go on to announcements.

[Applause]

Senate, dean of faculty.

EVE DE ROSA: And I have less time, which I happily gave over to our wonderful slate of candidates. I hope you guys appreciate how excellent all three of them are and that you'll engage in voting between April 15th and the 29th. So, thank you, all three of you. Okay, so first slide is just-- Oh, yes. So, both of our two resolutions, so we now have 211 and 212 have been approved, excuse me, have been approved by the Senate, and they're currently in the Office of the President. And we'll find out his response to both of these. Next slide, please. Yes. So, we're still doing the pop-up faculty lunches. The next one's going to be on the Agritech campus, and hopefully it's a gorgeous day like today. And so, I just wanted to let people know that we will actually take you to the Agritech campus if you don't want to drive yourself, but it's a free lunch, it's a beautiful campus, and so please join us and just let us know if you need a ride. And I would like to hold our next faculty forum on April 22nd. I'm going to cover the proposal to have basically an equity-based proposal to put forward extension professor titles. And so, I have a working group. That working group has representation from Cornell Cooperative Extension, from the Bronfenbrenner Translational Research Center, and also from the ILR and the vet school. And so, those represent Cal, CHE, and basically the contract colleges where most extension faculty live. And so, I would love it if you join me on that, and we'll discuss the proposal and hopefully bring it to the Senate in May. And then lastly, I think-- Oh, I thought there was one more. Maybe not. Okay.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: What's the date of the pop-up?

EVE DE ROSA: Oh, it's April 15th is when we're doing the Agritech pop-up lunch. So, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And we do have time for a question or two, if there are any.

EVE DE ROSA: Happy to give it over also to the good of the orders.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If not, then we will move to the next agenda item, which is a dual, not dueling, a dual good of the order, starting with Richard Bense, Government. And I would say we have four minutes each.

RICHARD BENSEL: Well, I'll be briefer than that. This is just an update on the resolution that I circulated. We now have 11 faculty senator sponsors. We have 17 faculty. It was submitted to the university faculty committee last week. We have heard nothing, had no response from the university faculty committee. We hope that-- hope and expect that we will be able to present the resolution at the May meeting. Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: And I just want to say, Richard, you will be hearing from-- It was holiday for everyone, and it was actually after we had set our agenda for April, but we absolutely will respond.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Our next good of the order is David Lee, Faculty Trustee.

DAVID LEE: David Lee, Dyson School, JCB, and Faculty Trustee. Some of the things I'll say will reinforce, perhaps in different ways, some of the things we've heard from our three candidates. For the last eight years, I've served in several capacities as Senator at large, and on the UFC, and for the past four years as Faculty Elected Trustee. The past few Senate meetings have been among the most refreshing I've participated in in my time here. Why? Because we've been focusing on doing the business of the faculty, and notably our meetings have been largely devoid of the type of elevated rhetoric so often directed toward the administration that have characterized many of the meetings that I've participated in the past. Our Faculty Senate website states that we represent a voice of the faculty and that we provide an effective channel for faculty members to express their views. But the faculty comprise, my numbers may be a little off, about 2,800 of us, between around 1,600 tenure track and around 1,200 RTE faculty. Notwithstanding our size, we found on many occasions, including the fate of some proposed resolutions, that many of the opinions registered, often volubly in our meetings here, do not represent the actual breadth of the voices of our faculty. I believe that many of us do make good faith attempts to canvas a cross-section of our colleagues on given issues, but that takes time. We have many pressing demands on our time, and I suspect that consultation is frequently not done. And the rhetoric that historically characterized many of our meetings has frequently been counterproductive to the collective best interests, our collective best interests in accomplishing our work, again, particularly vis-a-vis the administration. Our VOD and transcripts are readily available. The Cornell Sun and sometimes other publications report what we say. I can't emphasize enough how the words of just one professor, not a senator, uttered off campus several years ago have led many outside observers to generalize, albeit unfairly, about the faculty as a

whole, and our reputation has suffered for that. Words matter. Beyond rhetoric, another thing to keep in mind is that we are very much part timers, perhaps except Eve, but I think even Eve, you're a part timer, right? It is the members of the administration who do the full-time work, and in most cases far beyond full-time, on our behalves. Think about the challenges that have arisen just in the past half-dozen years or so, COVID, the post-COVID response, the encampment, the defunding of research, other threats emanating from Washington, and so on. Do they sometimes get it wrong? Yes. I'm not for a minute suggesting that the faculty in the Senate should roll over in the face of poor administrative decisions. Far from it. I'm simply saying that we will continue to be the most effective if we work collaboratively with the administration and if we use constructive language. Why am I mentioning this now? It's to remind ourselves of the sheer number and scale of the challenges yet before us. Provost Bala's committee on the future of the American University is examining many of these in detail, the long anticipated demographic cliff we finally reached, the demonstrable reduction in public trust facing higher education institutions, the funding cuts and related threats emanating from Washington, which may be with us for at least another two and a half years, the plummeting numbers of international students studying in the US, although fortunately, we have not experienced that here, although it's down somewhat, and most immediately, the severe cost revenue squeeze that is facing most higher education institutions, including ours. All we have to do is look an hour up Route 81 to Syracuse and see the impacts of these forces, the 93 academic programs that SU announced last week it is eliminating disproportionately in the arts and humanities. So, what do we do? The most effective way we have to mitigate the effects of these forces is to work collaboratively, not adversarially, with the administration, and of course, amongst ourselves. I know it sounds trite, but we are all in this together. Where have we heard that before, right? I only have a couple of moments left, so let me just cite without any elaboration several of the measures we might continue to undertake. And again, I'm not implying we don't already do these things, just that we might do so even more intensively and purposefully. First, make a concerted effort to excise the sometimes reflexively negative rhetoric that has frequently characterized our past meetings and deliberations. Second, as we cycle off our terms, encourage our faculty colleagues to elect as senators those who are genuinely interested in working positively and collaboratively with each other in the administration. Third, encourage our colleagues to elect leaders of this body, the Dean, UFC members, senators at large, faculty trustees, who are similarly interested in genuine collaboration and problem solving. Fourth, improve communication between this body and the administration. And I think this was an element of some of the earlier comments. For example, as Eve has done this year, continue to invite high-level members of the administration consistently to report on their work, issues they're encountering, and solutions they're looking at. The relationships we build when times are good will pay off when times get tough. Finally, improve our own communications with our colleagues, whether through emails, faculty meetings, personal contacts, and other mechanisms, recognizing this indeed does take time, but will ultimately improve the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate. I'm sure there are other measures worth considering as well, and we've heard some examples from our candidates. Thanks for your attention.

[Applause]

EVE DE ROSA: Hi, everyone. I just wanted to remind David of one important constituent population, our retired and emeriti faculty, 800 strong, and also part of our faculty electorates. I

just wanted to make sure that everyone's aware that, you know, I engage with them monthly. They're just a wealth of wisdom, and a big part of our body, and have representation on the Senate. Thank you. Okay, bye everyone.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're adjourned.