

Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2026

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Senate Speaker, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. We start with a land acknowledgment. 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, the meeting is in session. We, without objection, by unanimous consent, approve the minutes of the February 11th, 2026, meeting. These, as you know, are verbatim transcripts, so the only errors might be typos, misspellings, similar things. If you encounter such things, let the dean of faculty know, and they will be corrected. We're starting today with remarks from President Michael Kotlikoff and Provost Kavita Bala. They will have 10 minutes, and that will be followed by 15 minutes of Q&A.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Thank you, Jonathan. So, I'll just spend a few minutes on two topics and then turn it to KB. I'll talk a little bit about the Student Code of Conduct and the draft revisions that have now been released on Policy 6.4 procedures, the upcoming resolution from the Faculty Senate, and then I'll turn it to KB to talk a little bit about Resilient Cornell. So, the draft revisions for the Student Code of Conduct have been released. They largely address issues of clarifying emergency measures and providing some appeal process for suspension and shortening the process to an ultimate adjudication of the issues. Both of these issues are things we've heard from the community. We're looking forward now to Senate input, input from the senators, input from the entire community. It's been sent directly to the Senate and all the shared governance bodies. So, we're looking forward to that feedback, thoughtful feedback on these proposed revisions. Secondly, I'm very pleased to see that the Senate is establishing a task force on Policy 6.4 procedures. My sense is that we don't need to change Policy 6.4. The policy itself on bias and harassment is robust, but we need to make the procedures consistent with our Title VI legal responsibilities, we need to make the standards consistent across that process, and we need to streamline procedures as much as possible. So, I very much thank the Senate for undertaking this and creating the kind of broad task force to look at it. We also need to, as part of that process, harmonize all the descriptions in the faculty handbook or faculty guidelines with 6.4 procedures, harmonize those so that they are consistent with our understanding of our legal obligations under Title VI. So, the language itself needs to be clear, and it's not always consistent. That's one of the things I hope that this task force will undertake. So, I'll turn it over to KB to talk about Resilient Cornell, and then we're both happy to answer questions.

KAVITA BALA: Thanks, Mike. Does that work? Good. Actually, a couple of updates. One is also on the Future of the American University. That's a short update. They, as you may know, in October started a very intense listening phase, talking to lots of people on campus and also beyond from outside, supporters and critics alike. They're now moving into a phase where they'll start coming up with their recommendations. And I just want to give a "heads up" to everybody.

They are going to be doing town halls towards the end of the semester, trying to catch everybody before the summer hits. So, I hope all of you will robustly engage with them then. They'll spend the summer then working on finalizing their report and releasing it at the end of the summer or beginning of the fall semester. So, that's one quick update. I wanted to give a little more detail on Resilient Cornell. We've had some discussions now. As you know, it's been-- So, I just want to clarify first. Resilient Cornell is really a big umbrella term that we're using for us looking at all parts of our budget to achieve financial resilience in the face of the very unpredictable times we find ourselves in. So, it's really a multi-pronged approach. Just to give you a sense of the various things we're doing, we're looking at procurement. We now have a new chief procurement officer who's looking at how we decrease our external spend. So, this looks at getting us better contracts, better prices on things we buy, et cetera. So, that's already going on, and we don't send a lot of email about that kind of stuff, but that's one part of the multi-pronged approach. Another, which maybe some of you have heard about, some of you may have not, we had established about a year ago, actually eight months ago, a position control committee to look at all the positions that we are hiring into. And the reason we're doing this is we were growing very, very rapidly, and we just could not sustain the level of growth we had in terms of new hiring that we were doing. This committee has been very disciplined about controlling the amount of growth that we are seeing in our headcount, and that is actually a major component of how we're going to achieve our budget resilience. Now, when you don't grow that way, we have to relook at the work that we are doing and restructure the work that we are doing, and that is part of an ongoing process that all the units will be undertaking and doing already. Next major component-- So, that's the biggest component probably of our budget savings, which is just not hiring new headcount. The next is a new program that is going to be announced for staff, a voluntary retirement program that's going to be announced in the next couple of weeks. The details will be released in those two weeks, but that's gonna be one of the major components, too, of our budget savings. And the last piece, which is the one maybe that most people have heard about, but it's probably the smaller of all of the components I've discussed up until now, is looking at all of our functions. So, the functions include things like the Alumni Affairs and Development, that's AAD, information technology, IT, communications and budget. We've all been doing work. These are called functional groups. These functional groups have been doing work to think about how they should restructure their work. I won't get into the details of how they're doing it. Both the development people already have already done their work, and they're actually moving forward with ways that they think will improve their structure, and they're functioning better. IT and communications are going to post soon on the Resilient Cornell website their proposed conceptual models of how they're thinking about restructuring those two functions across the university. You'll all have an opportunity to give us comments on that. Please feel free to do so. And once incorporating all of that, we'll then move to actually figuring out the actual implementation of those conceptual designs. But it will give you a sense of how they're thinking of those two functions and going forward. Budget is also going to be posted shortly. The main thing I want to say is there's been a lot of simmering going on in the background as they've been wrapping their brains around new models. We're now ready to actually start thinking about the execution and get feedback from the community. So, we're looking forward to engaging with all of you and happy to take any questions about any of you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, we typically take questions online if there are any, but if there are people inside.

LINDA CANINA: I have a question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Well...

LINDA CANINA: Oh, I'll raise my hand, sorry.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Just identify yourself.

LINDA CANINA: I'm Linda Canina at Nolan.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

LINDA CANINA: Just a quick question. I'm wondering in terms of headcount, are we talking about reducing the number of administrators or not increasing the number of administrators versus faculty? Because I feel at least we're all pretty stretched in terms of teaching. We're all being asked to teach in overload. And at the same time, we have great candidates applying that we're not allowed to hire when a lot of faculty have left, and we're not even replacing them.

KAVITA BALA: Thank you, Linda, for the question. Everything I talked about in the Resilient Cornell is all on the staff and administration side, so everything I talked about sits on this side. In a previous Resilient Cornell, one of the town halls, I mentioned this, but I'm happy to repeat it here, the academic functions are not part of this purview that we've been doing over the past year. That's been happening with each dean within their college to look at their finances, look at the changing landscape, and achieve the resilience that they need. As you may know, there are many pressures on our budget, apart from if you're a grant-based kind of a college, then you would see hits on those. We've seen significant decrease in funding. If you have international students, we've seen significant loss of funding through revenue because international students might not have come on campus. All of those budget pressures are being felt in different ways. Each college is responding based on the specific pressures on its college, but this is coordinated across the functions and the administrative units, not on the academic side.

LINDA CANINA: Okay, thank you.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Just add to that, Linda, you know, to me, the one of the principal things that we need to achieve out of Resilient Cornell is the finite financial flexibility to make greater investments in our core missions. And those core missions are, of course, academic missions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

LINDA CANINA: Thank you.

ITAI COHEN: Itai Cohen.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Is that on?

ITAI COHEN: I don't know if it's on.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: It's on.

ITAI COHEN: Okay. Itai Cohen, Physics. Yeah, so I guess what-- One of the things that I'm seeing, which is problematic on the research side of things, is that because-- even though the funding agencies are being nominally funded at the rates that they're, you know, previously funded at, the money is coming in at a trickle. That's creating a pressure on faculty. We're not getting the same number of grants that we used to get. Now we have to start losing expertise in areas that we have been building for many years. And if by some miracle everything goes back to the way it was before, when this administration is over, we may not have anything left in our labs to be able to build on. So, I guess I'm trying to figure out if the university also has a plan for resilience on the research side and how we're going to enable the bridging. And this is not just for senior people like me, but also the young people who are going up for tenure. You know, they can't get grants right now. So, how do we bridge that divide? And are we assuming optimism that things will be at least better than they are right now? Or is this compact between the government and universities breaking down?

KAVITA BALA: So, thanks, Itai. Great questions, and questions that all of you know the FAU committee is really grappling with. This is a big part of what are the recommendations they're going to make around how should we think about resilience to the research enterprise. I'm looking forward to taking their recommendations and using that to drive strategic planning in going forward, starting once their recommendations come in. Some of the things we're looking at are sharing lab resources. For example, shared labs. We're actually funding some experimental prototypes on that so that if people can share resources, you can manage with fewer dollars and having people work together in a collaborative way to achieve that. That's one type of model. There are many ideas that have come out. The biggest method that people are using now, for those of you who were at the conversation yesterday, some of you were there at the leadership meeting, we've been backing off a little bit better this year than last year on our graduate students because that's a multi-year commitment. But I am hoping that we will-- I do think that last year and this year, I have to be careful, I do believe they're probably the lowest points. I think they're going to start seeing an uptick. Currently, while last year, we didn't even know if the agencies were going to get funding at the rate that they are. Now, it looks like there is funding, but it's not clear it's going to flow to us. You're exactly right. There's sort of a trickle that we have to worry about. So, we're thinking about how we could bridge, and we're going to start doing that over the next few months, along with the FAU committee, and move forward from there.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yuval Grossman. Oh, you want to--

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Just one addition, and it's-- You know, I don't want to forget to talk about the fact that so many of us are engaged in Washington on this very topic. So, clearly, foundations, universities themselves, cannot make up for the kinds of partnerships we've had with the federal government since the 40s. That message is being sent both by the AAU, also by the Ivy Plus groups in terms of trying to directly influence the legislatures. I think you've seen both on the indirect side, where we preserved our indirects this year at least, and on the budgets

relative to where they were originally proposed by the administration, much, much stronger outcome finally. There's a lot of efforts along those lines, and I don't know how successful they'll be in the future, but there's also a lot of discussion about this oversight issue on what's being spent, how the appropriated funds are being spent, and you'll hear more about that in the coming months.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And now Yuval Grossman, online.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Yuval Grossman, Physics. Unfortunately, I'm here to state again the issue with Israelis and pro-Israelis on campus. And I've been talking to both of you about this very recent, very bothering incident. And I'm not here to discuss those incidents or ask for specifics, but I think it's very important to put on the record that Cornell is still failing its Israeli and pro-Israeli students, and people are unsafe on campus. Thank you.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: I'm sorry, Yuval, I didn't quite get the last sentence that you said. You wanted to put on the record what?

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Israelis and pro-Israelis are still unsafe on campus.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Israelis are unsafe on campus. I see. Well, we've had a lot of conversations about that. We just opened this weekend-- KB and I were present at the opening or the groundbreaking of the new Hillel Center. It's going to be a great opportunity for Jewish students on campus. I've met with many of our Israeli students as well. I don't-- You know, I don't understate the concerns of those students and the worldwide anti-Semitism events that were anti-Semitic events that we're seeing. But we are focused, Yuval, and I do believe that our Israeli students are safe on campus. This is a safe environment. And one of the things that I'm pleased about is that this entire academic year, we've not had the kinds of infringement on other people's rights that we've seen in the past. That is, we've had demonstrations, but those demonstrations, time, place, and manner, consistent with our policies. They have not violated our expressive activity policy. So, I understand the concern, but I think overall, I'm pleased with where we are so far this semester on campus.

GILLY LESHED: Gilly Leshed, Information Science. I'm an RTE Bowers representative. I want to talk about the future of American University committee specifically and voice my concern about the membership of that committee that includes only or mostly tenured faculty, including as members of that committee, people from all walks of the community, the Cornell community and beyond the Cornell community, is different than having listening sessions and feedback sessions, because at the end of the day, the people who are forming their recommendations have their own perspective, and it's going to be different whether you're including the voices of other members of the community. So, teaching faculty who are teaching a lot of our students, extension faculty who are doing a lot of the connection with the outside community, students, parents, alumni, and all of those people. I think that's something that's really missing, and to me personally, a little bit of a disappointment in that committee.

KAVITA BALA: Thank you, Gilly. This has been raised, and I'll just mention a few things. The follow-up to this committee is going to give one report. We're doing a shaping our future follow-

up to build strategic initiatives that we use across, and we are thinking about the membership of that going forward. But in the current committee, there are subcommittees, and I don't know if they've been posted on the web yet, but they do have membership from the broader community that you were mentioning. RTE faculty for sure, not alumni, parents, and students on the subcommittees. The committees are still faculty-oriented. I believe there may be some students. And there are students and staff. Staff definitely, not sure about students. I think a few students. Alumni we're talking to. So, there is-- their subcommittees do have that membership, and I believe their plan is to post them so you'll see them.

JASON OLIVER: Thanks for coming. Jason Oliver, Animal Science. I'm curious if you put any thought into the way we could maybe restructure research agreements with industry, so restructuring IDC rates. I feel like, and I get this feedback from my department a lot, that the current structure system is incentivizing folks to run projects as gifts, or the rates are just so high, we lose interest from industry partners. And that could be a big opportunity, I think, for the university.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, this is a tough one. It's always been a tough one. Even at the negotiated IDC rates that we get with the federal government, 69% on the Ithaca campus on the endowed side, we lose money on research. Basically, the investment we make in facilities, the investment we make in startup, et cetera, the university is investing in that research itself. And of course, when you go to 10 or 15% rates, you're essentially subsidizing much of the operating costs of the laboratories in which that research is being done. I know that over the years, we've had a lot of conversations about can we discount those rates to be able to seek industry partners particularly that would be, or foundation partners, that would be willing to do this at a lower rate? I think we have to have a consistent policy on this. Otherwise-- And that is a consistent minimum rate. Otherwise, we're in this business of individual negotiations, individual deals with different external research partners. We also face this, of course, as you know, around IP associated with those. And very often, our industry partners are quite aggressive around the IP side of things. So, I just point out that there are certain fundamentals that we need to adhere to. We need to protect our publication rights, we need to protect our IP, and we need to, as much as possible, gain some partnership in covering the real raw costs of that research.

PAUL GINSPARG: So, last time--

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Identify yourself.

PAUL GINSPARG: Oh, sorry. Paul Ginsparg, Info Sci. Thanks. Last time you and KB were here, you discussed the aftermath of the agreement that Cornell signed with the federal government. And I'm wondering if there's any follow-up on that. We heard Itai alluded to money being allocated by Congress, but not being released. In some cases, that's by OMB, and it very strongly affects NIH funding, apparently. And I'm wondering if you feel that the government has held up to its side of the bargain, it's released the funds. And related to that, if Cornell, like other universities, has been asked to give lists of Jewish students and Jewish faculty members, and also if there's any follow-up on the questions of overhead rates being reduced.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Yeah, so first question, the government has restored all of our

research funding. I think the issue that Itai mentioned is really one that spans all universities, the way this is being-- Now we hear, for example, in NIH, there's going to be a two-tier review system, one scientific quality, and then a second evaluation whether, you know, you're from, who knows, from a state that doesn't get much funding, that's politically aligned in a certain way. Lots of concerns. I don't know that we know what's going to happen yet, but on the agreement, really everything has been restored as that-- And in fact, some of the grants that we thought would not be restored, we've appealed, and they have been restored. On the indirects, so the language, the congressional language this year prescribes the government from arbitrarily reducing the IDCs. So, for all the major federal funding agencies, the federal government cannot arbitrarily lower the IDCs as they had proposed, as we had challenged in court and has been upheld. And in fact, the government has removed all of its appeals of those court decisions. So, on the IDCs, for the current year, we're in good shape. Now we've put forward the FAIR proposal, which is another way to structure IDCs, and there's now a disagreement within the federal government that Congress says we like the Fair Act. The Congressional Budget Office is proposing something that's much more draconian in terms of, you know, a 15% cap. So, that is yet to be seen, but for the coming year, we're okay. And then, on the Jewish students list, we have not been asked for any lists. As I've said repeatedly, our agreement does not provide the government with any data other than they are legally entitled to. And we have not been asked for anything outside of that data, admissions data, anonymized admissions data that we agreed to and we've produced in the past for the government.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we started a little early. I think we'll end this session, this portion of the meeting, slightly early and move on to the next item, thank you very much, which is an introduction of Kyle Kimball, Vice President for University Relations, who will have five minutes. After which, the Senate will have 10 minutes for Q&A. Go ahead.

KYLE KIMBALL: Hello, my name is Kyle Kimball. I am the Vice President of University Relations, and I just finished my sixth month here at Cornell. I come to you from NYU, where I was Vice President of University Relations there as well, but there it's slightly different in that it's split up between communications and government relations. So, my charge here at Cornell is really focused on communications, government relations, and that's city, state, and community, as well as assemblies. The Office of Assemblies reports to me as well. So, what's really important to think about in terms of what my charge and my relationship with the faculty is really one of support. So, particularly in our communications function, we spend a lot of time-- Some of you may have dealt with our media relations group, some of you may have participated in a video podcast or that kind of thing. But what we're really trying to do on the communication side is really storytelling around the impact of your research and also helping you amplify your research, either getting you an editorial in the New York Times or some paper of record. But we really try to support the schools in the communication, and we work directly with the communication leads in your respective schools. So, typically, that's the assistant dean of communications or the director of communications. The way it's structured is that I have my charge, and my team, and university relations, but I also have a double solid line report to the assistant dean and directors of communications in your schools. And so, we work directly with them. It's kind of a two-way conversation. We are looking for stories to put in the "Cornell Chronicle", to put in a video podcast about the research that faculty are doing, and vice versa, your schools are reaching out to us to amplify the work that you're doing, and we're figuring out

different ways to put it out into the world. Sometimes that's a video cast. Sometimes that's something through the "Cornell Chronicle". We do a lot of social media. Again, we place folks in the paper of records, all kinds of things. The other support we really provide is crisis communications. We actually have had some incidents where if a faculty member is targeted by an external source, we will actually help that person strategize and help them weather that storm. The last thing I'll say is I was at NYU prior to this, but prior to that, I was doing something very similar, public affairs and government relations at an energy utility. So, I'm very, very familiar with crisis communications. I was at Con Edison for eight years, where every day was pretty much a bad crisis day. And prior to that, I was in the Bloomberg administration doing economic development and real estate. And the last thing I'll say is that my coming to Cornell last September was an interesting homecoming of sorts. Although I have never really been to Ithaca before my interview process, I was very involved in the establishment of Cornell Tech three jobs ago at the Economic Development Corporation, part of the team that actually put together the RFP and helped negotiate the deal.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thanks.

KYLE KIMBALL: So, I'll take any questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Questions, comments, podcast suggestions?

KYLE KIMBALL: So, my email is kek269. If you have anything you need, any support we can provide, I'm happy to do that.

PAUL GINSPARG: Paul Ginsparg, Info Sci. In your six months here so far, what would you describe as your favorite accomplishment?

KYLE KIMBALL: Favorite accomplishment? I think what I have liked is, or what I would say is that this is really the first job that I've had where I came in without some sort of sponsor or some sort of mentor that brought me to. So, a lot of the jobs that I've had at this point are somebody recruited me specifically based on prior experience or some sort of mentor I've had in my life that says, "Help me come do this." This is really one of the first jobs I've ever had where I applied. Came to campus, didn't know Mike, didn't know KB, or any of the people that I interviewed with, Eve. And so, this is really one of the first jobs, other than my first job out of graduate school, out of the Kennedy School, where I've had to establish my own personal capital among people I have never met. So, that's probably, for me, my favorite personal accomplishment is completely different university, completely different culture, people I don't know, and coming here. I also should mention that I'm currently commuting from Brooklyn. And so, I come up here on Sundays, go back home on Thursdays. My husband and my daughter are going to be moving up here this summer. So, this is a huge leap for me professionally and personally. And the fact that it's been great, having fun, developing relationships all on my own is probably my favorite thing.

PAUL GINSPARG: So, now that you've accumulated all of that human capital, what do you expect to achieve with that in the next six months?

KYLE KIMBALL: These are good review questions. Thank you. Thank you. [Laughter] I would say that one of the-- my leading things that really matter to me is I think this really came from my time at Con Edison where you had a large, 250-year-old utility that they have the ability to just put on the blinders and just focus on getting the power restored or the crisis-- And to me, I think the thing that I learned is that in communications and in relations, that a lot of these large established entities really lack emotional intelligence. And I've actually often thought about going back and getting a PhD in organizational behavior around this idea of emotional intelligence for large corporations, because it's not really a concept I think that totally exists yet. And so, for me, emotional intelligence in the context of a university is really about transparency. And so, to answer your question, I think for me to be as transparent as possible, to be as emotionally intelligent as possible and to be the person who helps a big organization understand how it's perceived externally and how its actions are heard by people who don't understand universities, our relationship with the community, our relationship with our schools, the internal community. So, having a foot in a lot of different worlds to make sure that I'm the translator and listening to what's going on, and how we're perceived, and how our words land with people, and how to reach people through transparency and emotional intelligence.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman?

KEN BIRMAN: Yes, Ken Birman, Computer Science. Thanks so much for coming and speaking with us. It's great to get to know people. I don't want to point fingers at individuals, but I will say that one thing we learned over the last couple of years is that what I'll call off the cuff remarks are very often taken out of context by different groups. And your job is particularly sensitive because essentially any comment you make in front of any group where there are people present who aren't just your close family friends is a formal interaction. I'm wondering-- You know, again, I don't want to point to individuals or specifics, but I assume you've studied our recent history. How do you want to approach things to ensure that your role diffuses situations rather than inadvertently inflaming them?

KYLE KIMBALL: Yeah, I think one is, I mean, I assume that I'm being recorded at any moment in time. That's probably number one. And two, I think transparency sends a message that you are doing the best that you can to tell people the truth and what you know. So, I really try to lead with transmitting that I'm trying to be as transparent as possible. And I think the third is if I don't know the answer to someone's question, I am not afraid to say, "I just don't know, I'll get back to you." And I think a lot of times, people get in trouble when they answer questions that they don't necessarily know the answer to, but they want to seem like they do. So, I would say those are probably my three strategies.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, that last one is one I should learn from. Thank you.

GILLY LESHED: Gilly Leshed, Information Science Bowers. Thank you so much for coming here and for that long commute. My question is about how people today receive their information. It's probably not as much from podcasts, the younger generation, podcasts or newspapers, but it is going to be from LLMs like ChatGPT. I wouldn't even say social media anymore because that's like gone. Now it's all about chat bots. How are you planning for the office to optimize for this kind of communication that is behind the scenes gathered, and then

produced to people who want to get that communications about Cornell?

KYLE KIMBALL: Yeah, I think it's a really good question, and it's a really difficult time for a communicator to get across because most of the time, it just doesn't really feel like anyone's listening because they're just being bombarded with so much information. And now, there's sort of a filter, that it might not be real or that it's fake, or that it has some agenda to it. And I do feel like you can see how people take communication, and they sort of take in maybe 10% of it. One of the things we are really trying to do in the communications group, not only in my communications group, but also with the communication groups that I share with the schools, is be more disciplined about engagement metrics. So, we can see if somebody clicks through in an email, and we actually can get demographic information, not personal information, but we can sometimes get demographic information about who's looking, who's clicking, how long they click through. And various units and departments are more or less disciplined around engagement metrics. So, that's number one is really seeing what's actually working. I think the second is rather than consolidate, I think there's sometimes an impetus for big organizations to say, let's do it all from the center. And instead, I think Cornell has the right approach in that it's actually a very decentralized communication approach, in that each school has its own channel, has its own brand. But I'm not sure the schools are yet totally zeroing in on who their audience is. And again, you do that through engagement metrics. And some schools are going to be more effective through Instagram, some are more effective through LinkedIn. I think it is a very difficult problem, and it's somewhat of an existential problem, but the tool we have right now is looking at engagement metrics and being more disciplined about that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: OK, thank you very much.

KYLE KIMBALL: Thank you very much for having me.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We're going to move on to two proposed resolutions. Three of them were discussed last month, and that's been whittled down to two. These are now official motions, so they will be discussed by the promoters of the motions for 10 minutes. Then, there'll be 10 minutes of discussion, and this will go to a vote. And I'm just stalling because there's an interesting slide up there that you need to pay attention to.

EVE DE ROSA: Hi, everyone. I just want to bring your attention to three talks that are happening on Monday. I announced two of them in the Monday message, but the third one, the past president of Iceland, will also be on campus for a messenger lecture series. So, there will be a series of three talks, but the first one's on Monday. Thanks.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, I'll let the proposers describe the motions, and they will have 10 minutes. Go ahead.

BRYAN SYKES: Okay, thank you. Bryan Sykes, Senator from Brooks. So, Nathan and I met with the Dean of Faculty, Provost Bala, the AFPSF, and COCR, and there's broad consensus that there's a need for this ad hoc committee. And so, we request that it therefore resolved that the faculty senate commission an ad hoc committee that will review Cornell Policy 6.4, Faculty Handbook Section 6.6, and the duties of the Cornell Office of Civil Rights Faculty Co-

Investigator to produce a policy report that evaluates, or reviews, evaluates, and recommends revisions to the Cornell Faculty Senate regarding the multiple policy 6.4 documents with the goal of reducing future differences in outcomes of the COCR, AFPSF, and decisions by the university administration. We also be it further resolved that the committee's policy report at a minimum examines and recommends possible revisions, examines and recommends possible revisions to CUP 6.4 for ambiguous language, points of administrative discretion, excess confidentiality that impairs or limits faculty senate deliberation on matters or resolutions that involve decisions within the jurisdiction of COCR and AFPSF, different evidentiary and evaluation standards between decision-making bodies, the temporal ordering and review times, processes related to complaint investigations, resolutions, appeals, and imposed sanctions under CUP 6.4, and Faculty Handbook Section 6.6, and the role and the duties of the faculty co-investigator in COCR. Next slide. Be it further resolved that the committee's policy report identify, classify, and explain any additional Cornell policies, procedures, and handbooks that may be in contradiction of shared governance principles, contain ambiguous language about processes or procedures, and or reserve administrative discretion in adjudicative processes. Be it further resolved that the committee's policy report include a summary of the standards of evidence used by other universities in New York State for civil rights and academic freedom cases, and a mixture of the two, as well as the results of an independent legal analysis on the question of which standards of evidence to use in such cases, including citations to case law. Next slide.

NATHAN MATIAS: What I'll add to that is that we're really grateful to everyone from different parts of the university to talk with us about this and work together, and appreciate President Kotlikoff, you know, expressing earlier in this meeting support for people to come together around this. One thing that came out of that, and President Kotlikoff also expressed, is that the thing that's especially urgent is to do this harmonizing of standards of evidence. And so, one of the things we hope that this ad hoc committee will do is will be to start there, even as it also looks at this broader question of looking into the language and processes that Bryan has explained in greater detail. So, thanks, Bryan. So, the other resolution that we're putting together is one that basically requests that the university administration strengthen trust in the processes by developing some kind of annual academic freedom transparency report. You can read more of the details in the resolution. And there's also some discussion in the online site as well. And that's also something that's come up in the conversations we had with the various parties. And it's something that Bryan, and I, and our co-proposers would strongly encourage that people support. I don't know if you had anything to add to that, Bryan.

BRYAN SYKES: No.

NATHAN MATIAS: And beyond that, we thank everyone for your contributions to the process and appreciate your informed votes and comments.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, there's time for questions, comments. I remind you that this will be coming to a vote via Qualtrics. This will be coming to a vote via Qualtrics. And if there are comments online, raise your digital hand. Otherwise, we'll start in-house. Go ahead, identify yourself.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. Let me start by asking, since that wasn't full text, is there any

difference between what we'll be voting on and the text currently under the pending matters page in the Senate website right now?

BRYAN SYKES: No.

BILL KATT: Okay, so I've got to beg you, get rid of the AAUP sections. The AAUP does not represent the faculty of Cornell. You told us last month the goal was to have a statement of values shared by the Cornell faculty, and that's not it. So, this is needlessly divisive, and you are defeating the purpose of your legislation by including that. Getting rid of it fixes a lot. The other specific thing I'd indicate-- I won't go into all the complaints. The other specific thing I'd indicate-- Can we go back? Can you show a slide where they had the big whereas took a whole slide? Oh, this one. So, the report would include aggregate counts of incidents by group and across types of protected action. And here's the problem, because the president has told us that we're not disciplining people over protected action, we're disciplining them over rights violations. We heard the same from the general counsel. If this is what's being requested, we're going to get a big blank page of nothing every year. And that's just going to drive further distrust. So, I beg you to go back. I would beg you, ask Eve not to hold this vote, take these back, do the revisions you said you were going to do last month, and make this something that I can vote for, because right now, I have to ask everybody to vote against these.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do you have a response?

BRYAN SYKES: With respect to the first point about the AAUP, we included that statement as a reference to a citation for a set of shared values I think that we all agree with, or not, but it was not an endorsement of the AAUP or any of its other actions or beliefs, but mainly a statement about what faculty governance is supposed to represent theoretically at least. Do you want to respond to the second point about protected action speech for the academic freedom?

NATHAN MATIAS: I can briefly [speak] to that. I think it's right that the creation of any transparency report will require careful consideration in creation. I think there are lots of ways to do it in ways that are not going to be trusted by people, but there are also going to be ways to do it that can be trusted. And this resolution isn't crafting such a thing. It's urging the administration to create such a thing, and so we would hope that this would kick that process off in a helpful way.

BRYAN SYKES: I'm sorry, I forgot to respond to the revisions. Just very quickly, I wanted to say that we did discuss what was mentioned in the Faculty Senate the last time, and we also heard from the Chair of the AFPSF and other members, which is why we are not bringing one of the other resolutions to the floor. And so, I want you to understand that we have taken into consideration what was shared the last time during the meeting.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

TOM FOX: Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics. I just found myself wondering who is actually going to prepare this report? The administration is large.

BRYAN SYKES: That's a great question. Well, it's our understanding that there are other offices on campus that produce similar information. And so, how the administration decides whether to produce such a report would be entirely within the purview of offices on campus that collect that information.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman, online.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, thank you. Ken Birman, Computer Science. I want to say that I'm broadly quite favorable about these two resolutions, and I hope that they'll move forward and that we'll be able to vote positively on them. But I share the view that any reference to AAUP doesn't really belong here. It's a separate entity. It's controlled by its own leadership and its own structure. Not all of us have a voice in it, and although it's a type of a voice, I don't think it can be described as representative of the faculty right now, because so few of us are members. So, I would also urge that all mention of AAUP be removed from this document.

BRYAN SYKES: OK, noted.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Just a point of information, of course, only the Senate can change the document through an amendment process. It is no longer owned by the sponsors, it's owned by the body as a whole.

KEN BIRMAN: I'd be happy to offer a friendly amendment to strike wording related to the--

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: There is no such thing as a friendly amendment. [Laughter]

KEN BIRMAN: I actually want to vote for this thing.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, just to let you know, if someone wants to propose an amendment, it must be seconded. And our agenda really can't support this kind of activity, although it is permitted. I'll leave it at that. Are there any new voices before you speak? You'd like to--

BILL KATT: Yeah, I will second what Ken Birman just said to strike that language from the whereas statements.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do we have the capacity to take a vote? We were going to try to organize a vote on that question. To be clear, the amendment is to strike-- Is it a sentence, a clause, a passage?

KEN BIRMAN: Strike all references to the AAUP.

NATE MATIAS: So, I could read what I think you're referring to, and maybe you can tell us. So, there is a whereas that says, whereas a functioning university depends on the transparency, trust, clarity, consistency, and cooperation that derives from shared governance, where faculty have access to information, involvement, and matters concerned to them, the authority to examine these issues and make recommendations and to question all sanctions, dismissals, warnings,

reprimands, course cancellations, et cetera, as "guardians of academic values against unjustified assaults from its own members," per the American Association of University Professors, AAUP recommendations.

BILL KATT: Yeah, I would say that we want to strike everything from comma as guardians to the period.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I just want to ask, is it clear? I'm unable to repeat that since I don't have it in front of me in writing, but is it clear what the amendment is discussing? Yes. So, we apparently have the ability to do a poll for the Zoom people, and we'll take a hand vote here.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Sorry, I thought you had asked for discussion about this, and two of us have our hands raised online, and we weren't called on before this goes to any kind of a poll.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We can have discussion of the amendment only. Is there anyone who has comments on the amendment only?

CHANTAL THOMAS: Yes, I would like to speak to the amendment.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. Go ahead.

CHANTAL THOMAS: Thank you. And I apologize for being off camera. I wasn't wanting to actively participate. But I just wanted to speak to the point that the incorporation by reference of the AAUP is not appropriate for Cornell University's statement. I would just point out that the 1940 statement is incorporated explicitly in the Cornell Policy Statement on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech and Expression, which is posted on the website at the Office of the Dean of Faculty website. And there is an explicit reference. I'll just read it, but I can post the link in the chat. It's at deanoffaculty.cornell.edu, and it states that the university affirms the importance of extending to all students and employees the core values of free, and open, and clear expression, et cetera, et cetera. And then, as stated in the American Association of University Professors AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, et cetera. So, just I do recognize, and I think that I see the argument that the AAUP is currently constituted is not necessarily representative of the entire faculty. It is a voluntary membership in that sense. But I think specifically this statement has been incorporated as part of the official policy of the university, it has been published as such. And so, in terms of-- And I didn't-- You know, just reacting to what I understand to be the citation. If the citation is to this 1940 statement, I would say that's appropriate to be incorporated, not because the AAUP is representative, but because it has already been incorporated as official university policy. So, you know, that's again just a very provisional reaction to the discussion I wanted to contribute with. Thanks for the time.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Noah Tamarkin.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Yeah, hi, thank you. Noah Tamarkin, Anthropology. Just on the suggestion that the AAUP is somehow exclusionary or not open to everybody on campus, every single one of us is welcome to join it, and many of us are members. And if you're not a member and you don't like the way it is, you're certainly welcome to join. I don't really understand the

attack on the AAUP here. And it would be helpful if the people proposing the amendment could clarify, like, what about the AAUP statement do they feel it goes against what they think Cornell should stand for regarding academic freedom? Because I'm very confused about that point. Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: I'll try to represent as best as possible what I heard. All I heard is that a minority of the faculty are voluntary participants in the AAUP. And this is not to talk about our policy on academic freedom, but just to remove the phrase as highlighted on the slide, the reference for the recommendations of the AAUP.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are there any other comments on the amendment itself? If not, then let's go to a vote. First, I will ask you to raise your hands or take the poll if you're online. Raise your hands if you are in support of the amendment, which would delete the clause referring to the AAUP. And hold your hands up while our counters count. You got it? Yes. If you're opposed to this amendment, raise your hands. And hold them up high. And senators who are abstaining from this vote, raise your hands. The amendment passes. I assume we have a quorum.

JILL SHORT: Yes. Yes, we do.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: OK. So, now that the amendment has passed, we have like three minutes if anyone wants to make a final comment or question on the motions themselves. Seeing none, you will have your final wish when you vote via Qualtrics on these two motions. Thank you. We now have an academic integrity code and accepting responsibility update. Liz Karns, Provost Fellow for Undergraduate Education, Statistics and Data Science, and Senator Michael Clarkson, Computer Science, will have 10 minutes, followed by 10 minutes of Senate discussion. Go ahead.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Hi, thanks. I'm Michael Clarkson, Computer Science. So, this is an update on where we are in terms of considering some revisions to the academic integrity code that we originally reported on back in December to the Senate. And we're moving hopefully closer to a resolution and a vote later on. So, could I have-- You're already on the next slide. Thanks. Okay. I want to begin by affirming that our core principles here for academic integrity aren't changing. This is not about some sweeping, drastic change to the code, but about some much-needed updates that we think will be helpful to everyone. We still maintain that this is really about honesty with respect to intellectual efforts and that students' work should be their own. That's the core of it. Next slide, though. What we do want to update are three major things. One is a process called accepting responsibility that we've reported on to you before, but I'll remind you about what that is in just a second. Centralized record keeping as a part of academic integrity across the university. And finally, some updates much smaller in scope that are necessary for graduate students. And this all comes out of work that a committee did, the academic integrity working group that the dean of faculty convened back last academic year and that I served on as well. Next slide, please. Okay, so a reminder of what accepting responsibility is or perhaps the first time if you've ever heard of it. The background of this comes out of the fact that Cornell's approach to academic integrity is currently rather putative in nature, especially as compared with many other universities and our peers. So, the idea of accepting responsibility was something that a few of us as faculty in the Bowers College came up with, maybe three, four

years ago, started thinking about it as a process that would be founded on educational outcomes and interventions rather than punitive measures and grade penalties. So, we eventually secured permission to start a pilot on this in spring 2024 in Bowers with just a few courses. That has now grown to over 60 courses across many colleges at the university. We've had nearly 300 students go through the process and participate in this pilot program. Of those students of note, only two of them have ever become recidivism cases at this point, which we believe compares favorably to the rest of the university in terms of primary hearing outcomes. The intervention that we make in this is primarily in the form of a workshop that students have to attend, a workshop that focuses on values, and choices, and habits for the student, both in the context of whatever academic integrity event occurred that led them to be in this situation, as well as in their future. And that future means both in academia as a scholar, as a student at the university, as well as future workplace that they might be into. Next slide, please. The process itself you can think of as kind of an alternative resolution process to the standard academic integrity primary hearing and appeals process. So, there are four really major points to this, five maybe. First off, the instructor and the student both have to opt into this. This is voluntary. The primary hearing and appeals process remains the norm, it remains primary. But if both the instructor and the student agreed to do the accepting responsibility process, there's four things that happen as a result of that. The first is that the event that led to this, whatever the student cheated on, is not deemed to be a finding of violation of the code of academic integrity. And that's important in terms of what questions the student may be asked in the future. For example, if they are ever asked by a government security clearance office, law school, or medical school to answer certain questions, they have to hopefully respond honestly. And this gives them the ability to firmly say, "No, I was never found guilty of a violation of the code of academic integrity." That means that the event that led to this doesn't have to have a permanent lasting stain on their future. And that's attractive in the cases where students committed small mistakes that are more addressable by education rather than punitive measures. The second thing that occurs is that there is no primary hearing. The student, in fact, does not have to sit down in a formal hearing context with the faculty member, although informal conversations are still certainly possible. And the student waives their right to an appeal to an academic integrity hearing board or a dean as a result of this. The instructor, in turn, is limited in the penalties they can provide. It's just to the work that was involved. So, if the student cheated on one problem set or one paper, the penalty is limited to that rather than being a flat-out F in the course or perhaps worse. As I mentioned, the student has to attend a workshop. This is the key component of it. As part of that, they complete some pre-writing assignments. They attend a workshop with maybe a dozen other students who are also going through the accepting responsibility process. The workshop is facilitated by a trained mentor. It originally was my colleague in this, Liz Karnes, who is online today. She's actually physically in Germany. She couldn't join us here. And later, we have been training PhD students who are experts in philosophy, and ethics, and so forth to help facilitate these workshops as well. That's a way to make it scale better. After the workshop, they also get an opportunity to submit another written reflection on what had happened and to make plans about what they will do in the future if ever faced with a stressful situation that leads them to want to cheat again, whether that's in academia or in life. Of course, we don't want this to be a free pass that just infinitely gets extended. So, a student is only eligible for this once, at most once. If they've ever gone through the process before or if they've ever committed an academic integrity violation and been found guilty through the primary hearing process, they can't get it again and just get it written away. At most once. Now, implementing that does require some additional work. So, if we could go to the

next slide, please. The second piece of this, as a major part of the proposal, is a centralized record-keeping for academic integrity events at the university. Right now, the way this is implemented is that each of the 10 dozen colleges, whatever, has its own implementation of record keeping from this, which spans from electronic databases to paper file folders. We are hoping to build a centralized university record-keeping system for this. Those of you that are faculty may be familiar with the system for reporting academic concerns. So, that's the kind of thing that you should have in mind for this. In fact, my colleague Liz has been meeting weekly with CIT to explore the building of this kind of system, a kind of centralized web portal for you to report academic integrity events in it, any charges you might make, any decisions about primary hearings or about accepting responsibility offers. It turns out this is a really great opportunity to reduce some of the burden, we hope, associated with academic integrity overall by automating at least some template letters, some emails, and that sort of thing. It's really promising for that. And it will enable us to ensure that there's a consistency of record-keeping. Students found guilty in one college don't suddenly-- their home college doesn't find out about it. That sort of problem will be eliminated by this. Next slide, please. And as a smaller set of changes in scope, there are a couple things addressing graduate students that need to be updated in the code right now. So, we've been working with Josephine Martel, who I think is probably online at this point as well, from the grad school. The first is to clarify what the scope of academic misconduct is, that it's not about cheating in a class, but about this new bold-faced phrase here, published in professional work, including manuscripts under review for publication. And the second thing is that AIHB panels, hearing board panels that are convened according to the graduates' code of legislation, need to contain appropriate representation from graduate students as well as graduate faculty if they're hearing an appeal from a graduate student. So, we're adding that to the main university code of integrity as well. Next slide, please. Okay. So, the next steps on this, we currently have a document of red line edits of the current code of academic integrity out to two groups, the educational policy committee who's reviewing it, as well as the council of academic integrity hearing board chairs and recorders, who Liz and I have also met with twice over the last two years in order to refine these ideas. I believe they're currently voting on it, in fact, right now, to approve it and give us feedback. So, after we have the approval of those two groups, we plan to come back with a full resolution for you and documents for you to read and to provide comments on the Dean of Faculty website and in the Senate here as well. So, hopefully, that'll happen in April if things go well. That's all.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Just under 10 minutes.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: You're welcome.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are there any questions, comments?

EVE DE ROSA: I can say that the Council and the EPC have been favorable.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Thank you. Elliott Shapiro, RTE Senator from Arts and Sciences, and I'm in the Knight Institute. So, I'm-- Oh, it's weird, you're behind me. So, I'm a writing teacher by trade, and I also work with and train a lot of other people who teach writing, graduate students,

and advising faculty. So, I have a lot invested in academic integrity, and I'm really grateful for the work you're doing and have done. It's really weird, you're standing right behind me. Yeah, thank you. I want to address you. Thank you. No, I really appreciate the work you're doing. And I think I would, having not read the draft, or at least the draft of the revisions to the code itself, I hope, first of all, there's some discussion about the importance of academic integrity, not just as something you don't do, but as a whole series of things that you do do that apply not just to students, but to all members of an academic community. And in fact, that's some of what denotes membership in an academic community. I will also note that I have a question coming at the end of this, at the end of the comment. The second thing is that the current system is challenging to work with. And when I've advised people about whether to do it, the system itself is a big disincentive. And so, I think having a process that is less of a pain and less painful to go through for the instructor, I think will be a really good thing. And so, I really appreciate the approach you're taking. Like, for example, you mentioned the possible penalties. An F in the course is not necessarily the penalty, as you know. That is just the most severe penalty a faculty member or an instructor can assign. My question is, you described the current code as punitive, and I would like to hear a word or two about why you consider that punitive. Thank you.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Sure. Let me try to unwind all of that. So, first off, you said you hadn't seen a draft. That's true. And we didn't want to bring to you something that hadn't gone through those committees yet. However, if you want to know more about accepting responsibility, the website, which was on that last slide, you will find all of the procedures laid out there. And so, that's essentially what we are just streamlining into the code there. Yeah.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: [Inaudible]

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Yeah. So, you said you meant revisions to the current academic integrity code. The bulk of those revisions is putting some of that text or a version of that text into the code. You can pre-study it there if you want. Ok. I forget what the next thing-- Academic integrity overall is a positive thing. In fact, the workshop leans very heavily into that. For example, one of the assignments they do in it is identify their own personal values with respect to their behavior, not just academia, but including academia, and then identify how they violated those values as part of what they did. And so, that emphasizes the positive part of it for it there. Punitive, you brought up. Some ways you could consider our current code to be punitive are that when a student is found guilty, there's sort of no notion of is this a felony or a misdemeanor? Or if you've ever had a traffic ticket, not that I've ever had one, but you can sometimes go to traffic court, and there are ways of not having such high penalties that follow you around for a while. That, in a sense, is what accepting responsibility is. It's really meant for those incidents where a student copied a piece of work for someone, for example, but it wasn't a flagrant, terrible violation of academic integrity that deserves to follow them around in a letter that later dean certifications will have to mention. And therefore, they will have to explain to whatever entity they're trying to get employment from, or whatever, that makes a request for Cornell for that information. The other thing is the penalty. So, right now, the penalty can be up to an F. And there are instructors in my department who do have policies. I don't want to throw them under the bus. But a violation of this kind of academic integrity is an automatic F in the course. It is possible, in some cases, that's too much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thanks. Hadas Ritz, online.

HADAS RITZ: Hi. Hadas Ritz, Cornell Duffield RTE Senator. So, I have a couple of questions. One is a quick clarification. So, you said that the instructor and the student have to agree to the accepting responsibility. Does the instructor decide on a per class, per course basis or on a per incident basis?

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Hi, Hadas. Good to see you again. It's on a per incident basis, and in the pilot, the course had to opt into it. So, you know, sort of two-phase. If the course was opted in, then the instructor could do it on a per-incident basis. Once we make this available to the whole university, it's to everyone on a per-incident basis.

HADAS RITZ: Okay. So, I guess my follow-up question to that is whether there are any concerns about kind of biased application, like maybe an instructor would offer this to people that they like and not offer it to people they don't like, or something like that. So, maybe if you have any thoughts about that. And then, my second question is not about the accepting responsibility program, but about the kind of academic integrity hearing board appeal process. And basically, I've been kind of surprised, very surprised actually, at a few successful appeals. And to me, it feels like if an appeal is successful, it either indicates that the instructor was being like unfairly malicious in some way, which I don't think is common, hopefully, or it means that there was a real misunderstanding or a difference of understanding about what the burden of proof is, maybe something like that. So, I'm wondering if you can say anything about kind of the appeal success rates, and what you think the implications of those rates are, and whether there's gonna be any effort to kind of clarify burden of proof or things like that to kind of bring down the number of apparently unjust findings of responsibility.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Thanks, Hadas. So, the first question about bias, I think that problem, first off, already exists. I'm going to be a mathematician and reduce to a known problem here for a second. That problem already possibly exists with academic integrity. I don't know how to measure it. But your concern, I think, was maybe about whether students would unfairly not get access to accepting responsibility. In this case, if a student got an offer for accepting responsibility and wanted to prove their innocence, they could opt for a primary hearing. So, that part of it is fine. If the instructor is not willing to offer accepting responsibility, that's not something that we can intervene and tell the instructor, "You're teaching your class the wrong way with respect to academic integrity here." I'd be interested in your feedback on other thoughts about how to mitigate that. Now, to your second question about overturn rates with the boards, I do not have data on that. I will toss it to Liz, who's more in touch with this, if she's online and she wants to say anything.

LIZ KARNIS: You know, I have to agree. We don't have a lot of information. There's not anything compiled each year that lets us track that at the moment. Hopefully, that's something we can get some insight into. I will say that we have fewer cases going to the board, though, because a substantial portion of them are pulled off because they do accept in responsibility. So, cases where a student might say this was unfair, they're not even going to a board at this point.

EVE DE ROSA: Hadas, I just wanted to say that we do get annual reports from every college

and school and every hearing board. So, we do have data, and we can look into that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Who was first? Go ahead, David. And we don't have that much more time and a lot of interest, so maybe try to keep it to a minute.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: This will be fast, I think. David Delschamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. One of my departmental colleagues, and I don't know whether this is true, says that the draft of the new code, and by the way, I've served on the committee that shepherds the code many times, the draft of the new code now calls what we used to call academic misconduct, which is things like disrupting a class, you know, like that kind of thing, folds that in as an academic integrity violation. Now, is that true or not? I'm just curious.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: I understand where your colleague's coming from, but that's a misreading of what the current draft says.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Got it, okay. I just want to make sure I can reassure him that that's the case.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: That's very much a misreading.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: One thing for Hadas, you know, having served as the engineering AIHB chair for a number of years, the vast majority of the overturned rulings, overturned guilty findings, have to do with standard of evidence. Is this clear and convincing in our opinion? That's what the board says yes or no to.

MICHAEL CLARKSON: I don't want to take up too much time, but just to offer the evidence for what I was just saying, there is a reclassification of certain things going on from classroom misconduct to academic integrity, having to do with misuse of technology. And now, you should have in mind generative artificial intelligence during exams, and perhaps even meta glasses that students are wearing. That's what we're thinking about. So, this has been in conjunction with Steve Jackson's group on academic integrity, plus artificial intelligence, the AI plus AI group.

TARA HOLM: Thank you. Tara Holm from mathematics. I just want to attest to how empowering this pilot has been in mathematics. My colleagues who have participated greatly appreciate the seamlessness with which it works. I unfortunately had to be a witness in an academic integrity case yesterday, and the faculty member said, "I don't know what happened to the pilot. My course was in it last semester, and now I'm not. And I'm so sad because it is just so much more." Yeah, anyway, it's fine. I encourage us to get there as quickly as we can.

RACHANA KAMTEKAR: Rachana Kamtekar. I'm from Philosophy, and I'm substituting for Harold Hodes, who couldn't be here. I just wanted to clarify something. What was written said that the event would not be recorded as a violation of the academic integrity code. But I think maybe what I heard was that the event would not be considered a violation of the academic integrity code. So, I guess if I suspect that my student has cheated, I'm perfectly happy to refer them to this process, but I don't want to have to say that it wasn't an academic integrity violation. It's just a matter of whether it goes on the record, right?

MICHAEL CLARKSON: To be more technical, it's whether it's a finding of violation, and that's the sort of thing that has to be reported in a dean's certificate, and that leads to calling before a hearing board for recidivism cases.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. A constituent asked me to ask, next time this came up, how would you handle a group project in which everybody had obviously put their name on the project, and less than everybody had non-ethically completed their share of the project?

MICHAEL CLARKSON: Thanks for that question, Bill. That was actually a large part of discussion when we started this pilot. In particular, because of low-level computer science classes, and now I am blaming my own self, about group work and how hard it is to distinguish that in computer programming. And so, the guidance on the Accepting Responsibility website has been written, and you're welcome to consult it there. I'll briefly summarize it as it's not appropriate to offer accepting responsibility to one student out of a group until you've done the evidence gathering to be sure that that's the only student you should offer it to. Until then, you can continue to find evidence. In fact, one of the small changes we're going to add to the code when you see the red line version is to clarify, it is okay for faculty to seek evidence before convening a primary hearing. And so the process there needs to be the faculty member investigates well enough to know who to charge and what to offer.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Liz, any final comments?

LIZ KARNS: No, all sounds great to me.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Great. Eve?

EVE DE ROSA: So, I just want to let everyone know the resolution will be coming to the Senate in April for a vote.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We now have two good of the orders. Or is it goods of the order? I'm not sure. And I would ask Richard Bense and Tara Holm to divide up the remaining time. Let's say four minutes each. Well, I'm just reading what I'm reading. So, whoever it is, we have four minutes each. Go ahead, Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Jonathan. Richard Bense, Department of Government. Two days ago, the Code and Procedures Review Committee circulated a proposed revision of the Code of Student Conduct. In that draft, the committee has left intact the general institutional design, an institutional design that combines arrest, prosecution, punishment, adjudication, and appeal in the hands of the central administration. As you know, we in the Faculty Senate recently and overwhelmingly passed a resolution that strongly recommended that these procedural elements be institutionally separated. And in addition, that the review process be constructed in a much more democratic manner. Over 30 members of the working group who sponsored that resolution have indicated an interest in proposing a new resolution that would respond to these weaknesses in the revision that the Code and Procedures Review Committee, and we will soon be asking the University Faculty Committee to place that resolution on the agenda of the next

session of the Faculty Senate. So, this is really in the form of heads up on what we will propose.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. So, introduce yourself, since I have the wrong name written down here.

CAROLINE LEVINE: Hi, everybody. I'm Caroline Levine. I'm a professor in the Department of Literatures and English, and this is my student colleague, Patrick Gritten. We are here on behalf of a group called Plastic Free Cornell. We are working to phase out single-use plastics at Cornell. Those are plastics that are intended to be used once and thrown away, like a lid on a coffee cup. There's lots of evidence that microplastics and plastic pollution are dangerous to people, animals, ecosystems, and especially to underserved communities, since plastic pollution tends to be, both the throwing away and the making of plastics, tends to be worst in the communities that are largely minoritized and impoverished. Right at the moment, as EV use is cutting down on fossil fuels, the fossil fuel companies are planning to ramp up the production of plastic. And this is very dangerous worldwide. There's an attempt to have an international plastic treaty that the fossil fuel companies very intentionally derailed this past summer. A lot of people, and we have often been told this, think that recycling is a good solution. But in fact, 90% of plastics are not recycled. They end up in landfills and oceans. Plastic water bottles are particularly troubling. Up to 400,000 plastic water bottles are purchased here at Cornell every year, 400,000. And our tap water is very safe, safer in fact than bottled water, in part because it doesn't come with microplastics. So, we're proposing a phase-out of single-use plastics here. Right now, Cornell is lagging behind other universities and colleges that have phased out single-use plastics, including UVA, the University of California system, the University of Vermont, and UC Boulder. Most importantly for us, the SUNY system has begun a single-use plastic phase-out. And of course, Cornell couldopped into that and has not so far. So, since our core community values include serving the greater good and preserving the environment, we are very hopeful that all of us can come together as a community and make the shift. Now, I know some people are concerned about cost, and we're definitely looking into that. That's at the top of our agenda. But one thing we've noticed already is that there are lots of savings involved in not using single-use plastics. So, it's not clear that this is going even to be expensive. We have seven faculty co-sponsors of a resolution that we would ask you please to look at and consider. And we're available to answer questions when the time comes, but we would really be grateful if the Faculty Senate would consider adding your voices to a resolution that's also going through the GPSA, the Student Assembly, the University Assembly, and the Employee Assembly. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We are adjourned. Cheers to everyone.