

Faculty Senate  
September 11, 2024

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Welcome everyone. I am Jonathan Ochshorn, Emeritus Professor of Architecture and Senate speaker here for season four episode one of Eve De Rosa's term. We start with a land acknowledgment Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq' the nation, the Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign nations with 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 the Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people past and present to these lands and waters. Meeting is now called to order our first order of business is to approve the minutes from May 8, 2024 these have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript so if there are no objections we will consider them approved if you have minor connections you can always send them to the Dean of the faculty. So we are going to start with the proposed resolution on enhancing transparency in the tenure process external reviewers, Tracy Stokol, is online I hear, professor and Chair of Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee she will speak for 10 minutes and then there will be 10 minutes allotted for Senate discussion and let me just remind everyone since this is the first meeting that typically people who are commenting either online or in the audience should take no more than two minutes. So Tracy are you here?

>>Tracy Stokol: Yes I am, can you hear me? Okay great, thank you, so this is actually a revised resolution or proposal to revise the resolution that was approved as fallback in December 2021 and the committee the academic freedom and professional status of the faculty took it up again because we started discussing external reviews in one of our meetings, so what we have here is snapshots from the revised resolution and what you see in red is pretty much mostly wordsmithing which is just reducing the verbiage in the document and just changing it a little so the red lettering is deletions, and anything in bold is considered an addition, so there were some things that I wanted to actually highlight and the first thing that I wanted to highlight is one of

the reasons why we changed the resolution is because we disagreed on a resolution on what is considered an external reviewer. In the original resolution the external reviewer is considered someone who is not in the unit or department that could still be at Cornell or could be within the college or different department, and we felt that that was not the general perception of what an external reviewer is so we revised it to say that an external reviewer is external to Cornell University and took out the bit of it being not a voting member of the voting candidates unit. And then just a little bit of wordsmithing changes so nothing major in this part of the resolution that was revised. Next slide please. So again this is just rewording that a little bit and that's very minor changes, next slide please. So there is nothing to be changed with this, except for minor changes aside deletion and addition. Next slide please. And the list again most of this is just wordsmithing, and I believe this should have been provided to the Senators and if not we can certainly provide it and put it up on the faculty center website so you can actually read the changes because I'm definitely not giving you enough time to read them. I read really quickly. Next slide please. So the other substantial change is two and they are listed here, so in discussion through the dean of the faculty, we wanted to get some idea of what is a number that people should aim for because we keep hearing these disparate things so we wanted some guidance given to the different units, and the guidance that we received was eight external reviewers is the suggested minimum. The committee felt very strongly that we should add this wording about the list, that the list should include reviewers that were asked and declined. And if they give a reason for declining then that reason should be given. And we wanted to emphasize the individuals that declined to review promotions documents that should not reflect badly on the candidate and not be taken as the reviewer does not think that the person is suitable for tenure. So we definitely wanted that language in here. So everything is in bold here which I will give you a little bit of time to read of some additions that we really wanted to include that were not in the original resolution.

>>I turned off the video.

>>Tracy Stokol: And then next slide is pretty much the resolution itself and that's really hardly changed and again just taking on some acronyms just to make it easier reading. And so the actual resolution is not really changed, it's just the verbiage above the minor changes. And that was my

presentation so I'm happy to answer any questions that the Senate may have.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you are online and have a question or comment, raise your hand, digitally. If you are here in this place, step up to the front and grab one of these microphones. Okay this was someone asking the text to be larger if possible in the space here. Meanwhile while we we're fiddling with the text if anyone has a question or comment in this room, there are microphones that you can take just come right on up, and I will let you.

>>And if there are no questions or comments.

>>There is a question. Ken Berman online go ahead?

>>Ken Berman: Yes, Ken Berman, Senator from computer science, these changes seem reasonable to me but I have a question about one of them. You have indicated that you don't want internal reviewers, but I can think of times over the years where somebody internal in Cornell but in a different compartment is a world expert on the topic and we have to solicit those letters although quite reasonable to tabulate them separately but to actually say they cannot be reviewers strikes me as strong. Can you explain the rationale there?

>>Tracy Stokol: No we never said that at all, we just said that the external reviewers were clarifying external letters not those considered internal letters, so if there is someone as you said who is a subject matter who is not in the voting unit they would be considered an internal reviewer and not external reviewer. There's absolutely nothing to do with additional reviews that do come from either within the unit or the college, but they are still considered internal to Cornell University as a whole and that was a rationale.

>>Eve De Rosa: Ken this is Eve, The University faculty committee considered this resolution and also came to the same conclusion that there is nothing to negate those expert letters from within Cornell. What we are talking about are the minimum numbers of external letters that should all be arms length outside of Cornell. And while I'm up here anybody from the UFC please correct me if I missed anything. Another piece of feedback that came from Tracy, was

about having equal numbers of external identical numbers of external reviewers and listed by the department. What is more important to the committee that they thought was maybe being too descriptive but rather ensuring the amendments of it, so that the candidates are listed independent of the department creating your list. And then also they also liked the labeling of the source whether it was the candidates list or the department's list for the external reviewers.

>>Tracy Stokol: Ok so my understanding is that they wanted to take out the equal numbers and just provide the candidate we need a minimum of eight external letters. The chair should inform the candidate that a lot of people say no because they're asked all the time and they say no for that reason. So they are giving as many names as possible but leave it for the units I guess. I guess one of the reasons why we said equal numbers is because we did not want it to be weighted the selection of the external letters we wanted equal opportunity I guess for the candidate to provide external reviewers so as well as the department to provide external reviewers and so that when the chair solicited these reviews, that he could he or she could choose from equally from both lists. So if the candidates list is only three people long and the department's list is 15 people long then it's really going to be disparate and weighted more heavily on the department list so let me take that back to the committee and see if they want that because I think making them an equal number of lists is the fair process then saying that they should not be equal. And I'm not sure that's been too prescriptive but let me take that back to the committee with the feedback that we received.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay we have another comment online Tara question go ahead.

>>Tara Holm: Thanks I am Tara Home I'm in the math department I would add to what she was saying with mathematics which is part of math and sciences, we have to have at least seven letters and five of them have to not come from the candidate and so if you impose equal numbers that implies we need to have a list of at least we need to have at least 10 letters which becomes quite a burden on my colleagues, so equal numbers would be quite a burden I think.

>>Tracy Stokol: For the faculty member you are saying equal numbers for the candidate to come up with the same numbers as a department?

>>Tara Holm: That would be a burden and it would also be a burden on I as chair have to make a heavy request to a lot of people logically I have to have at least 10 people or get at least 10 letters I will have to ask at least 12 or 15 people to get 10 letters and 10 people will be spending a big effort to write rack letters so it's just adding to the workload.

>>Tracy Stokol: Yes so I guess the list I don't see this adding to the chair's workload it's more asking the candidate to think of I guess at least if you're saying you need at least 12 to 14 people because some people refuse, you would ask the department to come up with six and the candidate to come up with six or seven, it's just providing a name and it's up to the chair to decide who uses that, and then at least the faculty can see and ad hoc communities and can see of the people that provided letters this letter came from the candidate and this one did not so it's just more that we feel the candidate should be given equal opportunity to provide the same number of suggestions for external reviews but who the department should choose is really up to them. We are not saying that the number that the letters that are solicited have to be equal between the two sections.

>>Tara Holm: Okay but it puts the candidate in a weird position where they are meant to be identifying experts but then if the department can only solicit two from the candidates list because we're not allowed to have so many that are from the candidates list we got plenty that we have independently identified as experts it just means that the people that, the candidate may identify the obvious expert and we will have to ask the non-obvious experts or the nonexperts and not be getting good letters. It feels quite prescriptive to be what I'm trying to say.

>>Tracy Stokol: Ok so in a smaller field you are saying that it's going to be difficult for a department or candidate to necessarily come up with enough names. So you are proposing that it's just yeah, okay so this was in the original resolution that never came up previously, and I'm just not sure what the solution is that would make people happy.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have another comment or question online, Ken go ahead.

>>Ken Berman: Yes Ken Berman again from computer science, first of all could you show us the language on this exact point I want to make sure it's consistent with what we do in computer science done it for 40 years, we normally ask the candidate to supply eight or so letters the department develops very large list that I have 30 or 40 and we we have the faculty meeting with tenure faculty and we decide we want to write typically 12 and then we make sure that we ended up with a couple from the candidates list at this notion of an equal number from the two strikes me as being at odds with what we historically have done. And I agree with the comment that trying to have equity there can easily be effective in substantially weakening the quality of the selection we have made.

>>Tracy Stokol: Yeah. Can we go back? One slide is that possible? So it says the length of independently used

>>I think we may have to go back one more. The list should be equal in length so you see I have not modified that was in the original resolution that was passed in December 2021, so that did not come up, I will take this back to the committee and say this has now become a concern since we are revising this is a new opportunity to change things particularly if you're not doing it I see there's another question.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a question or comment from Harold Hodes.

>>Harold Hodes: Hello Harry Hodes in philosophy, it's not completely clear to me what the value is, in having an equal number of initial names suggested by the candidate and by the department, I mean different departments are very different in some cases it might be that the candidates colleagues are pretty ignorant about good names to choose. And would want to give more weight to what the candidate suggests, and in other departments, there may just be so many appropriate names that the initial list coming from the department would make sense for it to be longer than the initial list coming from the candidate I don't see what the great value is in going for uniformity and all departments have to be using initially start with equal length.

>>Tracy Stokol: Ok thank you I really appreciate all these comments and as I said we will take

this back to the committee and if anyone wants to read this in more detail or revisions and would like or have additional comments to make please email me directly we are meeting again on 26 September so if you could get this back to me then so that I could get this back to the faculty center for potentially voting next faculty meeting this would be great to get it resolved but I appreciate hearing these comments about where these additional revisions are suggested thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I don't see any comments online or in person. I will wait a few seconds to see if anything pops up since we still have a few minutes, otherwise we will move onto the next agenda item. We have a customer here, pick up one of the microphones and see if they work. Any of them. Oh you are the next guy. My apology I have to introduce you. Engaging the viewpoint diversity in the classroom we have in person Steve Jackson Information Science and Vice Provost for Academic Innovation who will talk for 10 minutes after which we will have 20 minutes for discussion so go ahead. Sorry.

>>Steve Jackson: Thank you and we are also joined by Rob Vanderlan who many of you know is the director for Senate for teaching in a vision, so we are actually cramming in three different things. I will talk about one Rob will then take over and I will talk about the third one. Next slide please. Alright so this is an update item those of you who were on the Senate last fall may remember I came to in November with a set of concerns faculty began expressing around recording and sharing of information from lectures or classes with the outside world, we discussed some of the versions of this some of the particular concerns that drove that, there was interest in this expressed at the Senate meeting and afterwards we went off and did a bunch of work on this, I'm not going to talk through these but I'm happy to have discussion, next slide please. And so we worked with the EPC think you EPC University Council sorry that should be lowercase I mean university of lawyers to update the academic integrity code, we decided this was the best way to address this kind of concern. We don't need to look through all this way too much text on a small screen. What I want to point out to you is the takeaways basically where we arrived at is there should be no recording without instructor awareness and permission. But acknowledging that there are important STS and second-language reasons for recording. Secondly even in cases where instructors have given materials to all members in due course as a

default whether people have been granted permission to record there should be no sharing beyond the classroom environment without the expressed consent of the instructors. This is now written into the academic integrity code this is language that was developed for the academic integrity code. This has gone out to students in the essential guide to academic integrity that the students get, undergrads get I guess maybe graduate students get as well, each fall. So this is mostly an announcement item that this thing that we talked about last fall has been worked through and is now in place. Any quick responses on this question? Yes? Okay this way.

>>Elliot Shapiro: Elliott Shapiro, Knight Institute for Writing, to disciplines and RTE at large math and sciences. Can you, I'm glad to see this, I think this is really important, and very curious to know why it is not applied to office hours and other student interactions?

>>Steve Jackson: Yes good question, so this gets a little bit legalistic but New York is a one party consent state for recording which means the default in the state is anyone can record anyone else at any point without permission so we are already doing a carveout against the basic intent of the law but we are basically saying is that we believe classroom space is we have a compelling interest in legal terms in the distinctive nature of classroom spaces to override what is otherwise the intent of state law. We believe we can stand behind this if a case were to come forward, once you start talking about office hours, starts looking like many other kinds of interactions and many other kinds of organizations and is not clear that we can make a case, that University office interactions are so radically different than other kinds of office interactions and other fields and industries such that we could uphold this under law. I recognize that this is a concern sometimes expressed by faculty. This policy does not cover that and our judgment right now is that this policy cannot be stretched to include that and we will be talking about that for feedback around that.

>>May I ask a question? Hello?

>>Yes Florentina Bunea please.

>>Florentina Bunea: Hi I cannot hear what else is happening in the room, so this is more towards



the way that this thing is worded. It is [indiscernible] what is the resolution applied to taking photos, so I specifically have blackboard lectures and there's a consistent stream of photography happening during my lectures.

>>Steve Jackson: Yes this does apply to photos taken in the classroom.

>>Florentina Bunea: Okay in the classroom. Thank you.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Thank you Risa Lieberwitz ILR. I would find it useful if you could review because I don't recall if we voted on something at the prior meeting? And in general what is the process for changing the academic integrity code?

>>Steve Jackson: So, we did not take a formal vote when it came last fall, we went and worked with the EPC, they helped develop this language in the text, if you may want to speak to this, my understanding was this was perceived as an adjustment to the academic integrity code and not something requiring a vote.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Yes that and also the urgency of it, considering the faculty were feeling very vulnerable in the classroom, and so we felt like we should address it immediately, have it go through our education policy committee, but you guys will learn we have an academic integrity working group, and we are revising the code so that's why I feel like the work through shared governance in terms of the Senate will happen this year. So at this time we just needed to add the recordings to academic integrity, and then we already have the thing about sharing notes, this was just sharing notes and recordings.

>>Steve Jackson: So there's 200 people standing and it suggests we take these two and then move on to our next topic but I'm happy to take other questions after and separately.

>>Michael Clarkson: Michael Clarkson Senator of commuter science, since this is in the academic integrity code that means penalties for this usually involve grade penalties in the course. I'm trying to imagine what the reasonable grade penalties are and I wonder if EPC has

discussed this if a student did violate this, how did for example failure of the course or reducing their grade, suffice as the right kind of penalty for this kind of violation.

>>Steve Jackson: We would have to, it would depend a lot on the case and this particular circumstance, recall that particularly egregious violations could also be covered in the University's policy so if the student wanted to inflict harm on another student or faculty member by outing them, in a very aggressive way on social media that caused harm or danger by the individual that would become separately and above from this so that would be in addition to an academic integrity policy. I mean the feeling is that you know this includes failure of the course which is fairly substantial penalty, it could include the full range of sanctions that are attached to academic integrity so particularly egregious cases could be handled with other means as well but wanted to have something that spoke to the specifically in the classroom, and I would say also to set the norm and the practice because I think right now there's a lot of unevenness or maybe unshared understandings about whether this is okay or not I think that's true among faculty very true among students who have very little sense at all what the norms are in sharing beyond the classroom so this is partly meant to set a threshold or baseline to settle the discussions.

>>Iris Packman: Hi Iris Packman Senaotr with ILR RTE, I was curious about how you establish permission. Is there a blanket assumption that you do not have permission unless it's been explicitly given? And have instructors all been informed that they need to make this announcement because I'm wondering if someone is not aware they take a picture they posted on social media they are facing this or is there an assumption there that they don't have permission so what is that process?

>>Steve Jackson: So this is part of the socialization of the new policy I hope you will help share this with faculty colleagues, I think we sent a note around or will be sending another one around in this message, students have gotten this through the essential guide to academic integrity my hope is to get some time with the student assembly sometime this fall to also share that with it will take some time to socialize this, if instructors want to amplify that in their class by saying hey remember, there's this new policy and this is how this should operate in our class that is welcome but it will take time for us to all get on the same page around this.

>>[Indiscernible]

>>Steve Jackson: People on zoom should mute themselves and maybe David one more and I think we do need to move on. We have limited time.

>>David Delchamps: David Delchamps, electrical computer engineering. Two comments, one for Michael Clarkson. Okay. Here we go. Anyway, For Michael, grade penalties are not the only kind of penalties but that's the only kind of penalty the instructor can impose if an instructor wants another penalty imposed the instructor proposes that to the academic integrity hearing board and they can impose a higher penalty. The second thing is in the code there's a section called academic misconduct which is sort of like bad behavior, disruptive behavior, I'm just wondering whether this might belong there. That's all.

>>Steve Jackson: We talked about this with EPC and council there's actually a small mention of some ancillary issues under that section the classroom misconduct it was decided that when we put it in there it got stick together with other things so partly because it was a change to the code of expectation we wanted it to have its own subsection named subsection but I'm only giving you the core part of that there's a mention earlier on the quick mention earlier on and there's a mention in the academic misconduct part too.

>>Eve De Rosa: And David basically in the academic integrity you cannot do this with notes so it was adding recording to that.

>>Steve Jackson: Okay so next slide please. Oh yes I will turn things over to Rob.

>>Rob Vanderlan: Hi everybody, Rob Vanderlan, the Center for Teaching Innovation. We spent a fair amount of time in the summer thinking about what might disrupt our learning in the fall, trying to learn the lessons from last year, and thinking about what might be on the horizon this year. Composed challenges to faculty in the classroom and then students. So I'm going to walk through some of the resources that we created and shared. And also encourage you to share them

with faculty in your departments. And also maybe share with the message that if things arise or faculty have questions we are always able to work with individual consultations, that's particularly valuable when things go differently than expected and we are happy to make those sorts of meetings. The first is and I know many of you probably missed this you are walking in the woods last night or something but there's a presidential election this year, there's a national election, and we've learned the hard way that these elections can have quite an impact on our students and on the student learning environment 2016 was probably the real case of that, that was I think a moment that surprised a lot of people I don't think we we will necessarily be super surprised this type, but the idea of a very contentious political election a very close political election one that might not be decide on election night and an election where there's a lot at stake for a lot of our students in particular ways, means that we are sort of right it having an impact on our teaching environment. So we just want to encourage faculty to think about this in advanced and so much easier to prepare a classroom environment in advanced for disruption than it is to respond in the moment when you're sort of taken off guard or surprised. The first is recognizing that many of our students are likely to have a strong response and that response is varied. We have students that will be supporting different political candidates, students supporting different political candidates for very different reasons. And keeping that in mind that it's very unlikely that our students will all feel the same way about what happens is really I think important. The second is thinking about especially for particular disciplines or courses, are there pedagogue opportunities here? Are there opportunities to adapt course content to issues that are relevant to this election campaign, to help make the learning more relevant to our students in particular ways. This resource has some ideas for how to go about doing that. The second is just a simple reminder: think about your assignments, maybe no amount on election night or the night thereafter, think about where your students are going to be in their headspace when you're making your plans. And then just a gentle reminder. There are restrictions on what even faculty with academic freedom in the classroom can and can't do in the classroom, policy 4.18 you see referenced here, we cannot advocate for particular candidates or particular political platforms from the classroom, but you can certainly and I would encourage you to encourage students to vote, to get involved, to learn about the issues and the topics. Next slide please. We also saw a lot of controversy last year on campus, political events that began half a world away that resonated across the country, certainly on our campus. That could certainly happen again in ways

that we can predict and also in ways that we cannot predict, so we created a number of resources to help faculty prepare the classroom environment for those eventualities. It starts with building and taking the time to build a sense of community in the classroom a classroom that has built up a sense of communication shared values, and trust, it does a lot better with the sorts of politically contentious issues come to the floor, we also have a lot of resources on ways to engage viewpoint diversity in the classroom to surface political differences points of view, to create an environment where students feel empowered to venture risky ideas and the ideas make it critically examined but done in a respectful and inclusive way. I'd also point out that the intergroup dialogue project has a great resource as well, strategies for cultivating democratic education and dialogue, I think that combined with our engaging viewpoint diversity gives you a lot of options to think about how you might want to do this in your classroom, and then finally just a reminder about inclusive teaching strategies and so many of these can do a lot of the work creating that classroom environment that is more resilient to the robust and can handle challenging moments. Next slide. Finally, I'm just like all doom and gloom. Teaching during periods of disruption. This is something these are resources we began to develop during the pandemic, largest disruption to the learning environment that I've experienced and can think of. But we've continued to develop these because disruptions to the teaching environment can happen in a lot of different ways. We've all known faculties who start to teach a semester and for health reasons can't continue and having to make that transition mid semester. Sickness is always a risk. There are lot's of risks. There's a particular risk I think is worthwhile thinking about in the coming semester and year. I draw yourr attention to the email that went out to the grad school last Friday, on teaching in research continuity in the eventuality that there be any sort of labor disruption with graduate students. That's always a possibility and it's always worthwhile thinking about how you may prepare in advanced. So this research teaching during periods of disruption is designed broadly to accommodate almost any disruption but it might be particularly useful to look at through that lens now. And really I won't go through the specifics here, but preparation in advanced and making sure you have access to the grades, the course materials that you would need to assess learning, preparing a communication plan in the interest of disruption so that students who may not have any idea what this impact of this is on them have as much current clear accurate information as possible, and then thinking about what adjustments you might need to make to your course expectations, or plans. All of that is available in these

resources. I'm happy to answer questions in the time that we have ahead, but again you can also reach out directly either with big picture questions or very specific course level things. Thank you.

>>Steve Jackson: The only other thing I will follow up with here is to actually go back for one second. I hope people are following the updated resources coming from the grad school. That's the you're getting the updates on bargaining as they happen, that's the best source on where things are at right now. So in case it gets lost in your inbox as it does in mind, a graduate union update at [gradschool.com](http://gradschool.com) and there's a really good set that will be extended and updated in FAQs at [unionupdate.gradschool.cornell.edu](http://unionupdate.gradschool.cornell.edu), and to be clear the things at the top are linked so we will circulate the slides after the meeting so you have access to the underlying ones but they are also easy to find teaching.Cornell.edu. The last thing I will say, sorry I keep coming back, we are at a moment where we are particularly interested to hear from departments and colleges about the specific impacts they can imagine disruptions having on them, on their teaching and research operations in particular. That's going to be really important as we begin to think through contingency planning which is starting to happen, we continued to bargain in good faith we are hopeful that we will reach a resolution without a work stoppage but it seems certainly possible that there will be a work stoppage in the next couple of months. To that end, we also begin to think about how this is going to impact different parts of the University, differently and begin to make contingency plans accordingly.

>>Steve Jackson: [NO AUDIO 41:54-44:13]...people about how they engage with students around the certificate is absolutely the right of unionized workers at Cornell to strike, in the event of a work stoppage, our job as faculty members is also to treat students who choose to strike any children to choose not to strike treat them equivalently. We don't change the treatment of our students in response to that. So the notion of contingency planning is not meant to predict an outcome it's not saying we are pretty sure a strike is going to happen, but we are also trying to not be caught totally flat footed, most of the guidance that is in the document preparing for disruptions is really focused at the teacher level, and it gives a lot of latitude to teachers to think through and begin to think through, this is kind of in the preparation stage how they might respond if there was some kind of work stoppage which a disruption in this case could be these

were originally reworked from our COVID resources actually. It gives them a lot of contingency to think through how they might respond in their own classroom environment, so I don't think it's at all at odds with our commitments on academic freedom and it does not presume outcome or direction of individual faculty members, it's a little bit more like the University thinking through in some ways the same thing that focused when the UAW went on strike earlier this semester it's the practical question of how are we going to feed our students, that was the practical question the University was thinking in that case, in this case how do we continue to get through to the end of the semester say in the teaching and the research context and the events of the work stoppage.

>>Eve De Rosa: I would add that is certainly not neutral at all, what that position is just with the UAW strike is encouraging people to do strike work. And for the UAW strike it struck work that was retired employees were being solicited to do where current employees were being solicited to do struck work and as you said this was similar so the message I think that's going out is that faculty will be at the very least encouraged to do struck work, and that is very much a position about the strike and that does affect our academic freedom to engage in governance that takes position about how the University governs itself including in terms of fair contracts, and I wanted to raise that because it's presented as a given here but I think that there are different positions people can take about it.

>>Steve Jackson: I take that point and I'm happy to bring that back up. Oh yes, do I have time?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have maybe eight or nine minutes.

>>Steve Jackson: Okay so I will go through this quickly. Next slide please.

>>Ken Birman had a question before we got disconnected. I wonder if he can still ask it?

>>Steve Jackson: I think we better move on if there's time at the end and can ask it in the question after this next item because I want to at least put this on the table. All right so this actually touches on some the things that Risa just raised and it's around a discussion that I hope

we can start to have around academic freedom in general but particularly the thing I want to talk about today is academic freedom and classroom speech, and I'm pointing you to the main university policy on this the faculty statement on academic freedom and responsibility which was most substantially drafted in 1960, and updated fairly modestly I would say in 2021, the University statement is drawn I would say primarily on AAUP principles that go back to 1915 and 1940 and some updates to the 1970s. And the part I want to make here because we have lots of discussions and some people have a good sense of these lines and some people less so. But the point I want to make here is the question I want to ask is how do we think about academic freedom specifically in the classroom context? So I want to set this aside from other kinds of categories that are laid out separately in the AAUP, basically the AAUP it can jump in and correct and add to this but essentially are three categories of speech academic freedom that are named under those guidelines one is the kind of speech you can think of that is research speech or speech in your research capacity, as a faculty member, and the others extramural speech which is basically speech in the world at large like your speech as a citizen. And the third one is the fact classroom speech and sort of all of these are named in the AAUP, and reflected broadly in the Cornell principles, so to be clear, there are certain kinds of constraints in the classroom environment that are different, but the kinds of constraints that exist in other kinds of environments, so if we go back to AAUP principles classroom speech is limited by topicality broadly is the speech connected to the subject of the class as determined by disciplinary peers. We rely on political scientists to tell us what is prevalent to political science, we rely on physicists to tell us what is relevant to physics etc. And by restrictions this is the restriction that Rob just mentioned, on direct advocacy of electoral campaigns I cannot stand up at the front of my class and say I think we should vote for candidate X and here's why. You can absolutely drive them to the polls and support them to vote you can support them to vote where their vote makes a difference, all of that stuff is fine we will have I think a robust get out to vote operation at Cornell we usually do I encourage you all to participate in that. The other thing I want to raise and this is some older language and newer language that's been coming into our world over the last couple years, but speech in the classroom may also be conditioned by the University's title VI, title VII and title IX obligations title IX people are broadly familiar with, title VI people becoming familiar with, and is all around the civil rights requirement that all students receive a school environment free from discrimination and harassment based on race, color, or national



origin including shared ancestry or characteristics, I think title VII is you can think of it as the workplace version of that so if you had an interaction the same kind of categories but apply them to a person you have working interactions that might come up in your dealings with the TA for the class for example in the research lab. Next slide please. So, one of my frustrations in thinking through these things as a faculty member and as we try to sort out challenging situations in the world, is that it's been a while since we've had a serious faculty level discussion of these issues, I believe, we are still going back to principles that are core to the University core to universities in general through the AAUP and I would say core to Cornell through the statements I've mentioned but I also think it does not name all of the values and responsibilities may be on the other side of freedom and responsibility question that I think many of us hold by so this is one version of an extension of these things which is given as an example this is not part of policy, there's no wider ambition here beyond kickstarting a conversation among faculty I think this is a faculty, I am essentially a faculty member believe it or not, I'm still half time faculty and again it's the 88-99 appointment or something like that. But I really think that this is a discussion that needs to be had and we had and periodically refreshed at the level of the faculty because I think it's a faculty choice and a faculty decision. So these are some of my values, this is how I think about how I operate in the classroom, they may or may not be your values what I would hope is that we can begin to have discussions may be at a department level which it usually isn't happening at a department level about what we think how would we articulate if it was about to us about our own work or the work of our local colleagues in the department, how would we describe what we think are academic freedoms and responsibility, so this is one version of that, I will not walk all the way through it, there's other things that I think we are naturally that they mention here that would probably also play into this so when I'm teaching introduction to X-ology, I'm also accountable to what x-ologists in the world think X-ology is, I don't just make up my own version of a intro syllabus, I may be constrained by curricular structures by an agreement I have with my faculty colleagues that well if you're teaching the intro class, in the second year class we know we need them to do this so make sure you cover this in the first class. That's another very ordinary version of this. Next slide please. Yes, so that's it that's actually it. That and discuss, so I have encouraged chairs and associate Deans I talked to try to begin to have these conversations with faculty in their departments, you can use it if you want it can be freedom and responsibility in the classroom you can have people articulate this is what freedom

in the classroom should mean in our discipline and university, this is what responsibility should mean in the classroom and should mean and our discipline of our department and university, there's some really tricky questions right? Just to point these out right away I think this is actually some of the complexities of navigating the world right now have to do with this, so what do you think even if we can arrive at something that we feel good about in the classroom you can arrive at in the department level, how do we think about classroom adjacent spaces, labs, studios, office hours living learning spaces, engaged teaching environments will bring students out to the world, one of the great challenges that people will know, in the old categorization of speeches that in fact, probably those categories never were actually practically distinct and arguably they are becoming less distinct so many of our biggest challenges is coming instances where these categories kind of collide in how they overlap and collide and how do we think through that? So that's the invitation and I don't know what the right form of this is, what I think with the right form is for the faculty to be talking more to each other about these questions at a local level, if people are interested in working up something more substantive, or more generalized from the basis of those local conversations I'm happy to learn from them and participate in them. Wherever helpful. But I do think it's a kind of question that we as faculty need to start having amongst ourselves so that we arrive at answers that we can all be happy with. And that we feel actually reflects our own sense of freedoms and responsibilities in the work we do in the classroom today. So there may well be thoughts on this, do we have time for that?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Unless we take it from yours. So without objection let's just reallocate a few minutes from this agenda item from the next if there are any last minute questions.

>>Steve Jackson: Gilly.

>>Gilly Leshed: Hi Steve. I have a quick clarification question: does classroom speech relate to faculty speech and student speech in the same way? Are there any distinctions, are there thoughts about how classroom speech coming from the classroom versus the student might differ, and the way that they are handled and the impact on the classroom community, on the students in the faculty and so on?

>>Steve Jackson: That's a very good question. I am particularly interested in hearing what I was speaking about primarily is from the standpoint of faculty members. Students are bound by other kinds of student code of conduct, and we could have this around students as well, we often rely on faculty to be the arbiters of sort of any conflictual and challenging student speech in those environments, the immediate on the scene arbiter, some of the resources that Rob provide are good at helping faculty think through those situations in which an explosive situation may be coming up but they may feel a little bit like deer in the headlights on how to manage and part of that is preparation and building kind of the climate in the community in which better richer more varied conversation more honest and open conversations can be had. But what I'm interested in hearing potentially is how we think about the role of faculty members specifically. David, and Harold if we have time.

>>David Lee: Thank you Steve. Brings a lot of interesting conversations, I had one that came up that actually in one of the listening sessions for the expressive activity policy, that [indiscernible] has been having. And it relates to this topicality question, I don't know the chapter and verse of a AAUP's rigs on those, or guidelines on this, but it strikes me that it seems quite limiting I know there's a lot of potential for going off in the other direction and it becoming politicized and so forth but it seems to me there's a lot of instances and I found over my 40 years of teaching, a lot of instances where either the material you're teaching can naturally lead into discussions of politics, I mean for example I tried international trade, do we have tariffs or not? Well we have a couple of candidates now and one wants tariffs, so there is a natural collection of the material to a political issue that comes up, in addition in class we get questions that often wander into other areas that we want to address and of course in office hours you have questions that come up on all sorts of topics so I'm a little concerned that you know there's already a lot of self censorship that goes on among faculty members, and I'm just concerned about what I think is an overly limiting interpretation on the topicality. The topicality matters. Regardless of whatever AAUP says, I'm just bothered by it, and most of what you have covered seems very reasonable but that one seems to be a bit problematic.

>>Steve Jackson: Yes so the AAUP guidelines are not that long on topicality, there's not a lot more than what I kind of explain here it's the basic principle that that is one point in which there

could be a limiting factor, there's also I find it not super useful and specific tool partly for the reason you mentioned that conversations go well, and part of that art of teaching is kind of managing that and following it also right in constraining and putting it right on track, if it's becoming problematic in ways that challenge the classroom environment and well-being of students in a deep way. But I also think that the topicality so I talked about that reason the other version that's come up is it's not meant to be a conservative break on the evolution of fields right? So at a certain point in time a person in field x I think it's relevant to the field may in fact evolve, and we expect our classrooms and fields and the disciplines to evolve. So I actually do not find topicality a super useful limiting factor in this way because when you get into the limits of individual cases and details of individual cases, I don't think it provides you this very clear and easy guide for determining which direction to go.

>>David Lee: Okay thank you.

>>Steve Jackson: Harold and Risa, then I think we probably have to move on.

>>Harold Hodes: It's Harold Hodes in philosophy, mostly I guess I'm reiterating David Lee's worries. I'm wondering whether the rules enforced now require faculty members who are teaching that normative issues to be coy about expressing their own views. And I can well imagine that someone might complain about the fact that this professor is indoctrinating us, when in fact in order to avoid such a charge I can well imagine that professors would be tremendously reluctant to actually say what they think on certain matters. And that I think would impede learning and impede discussion. So I don't know, I guess I feel it would be good to have more clarity about what limits, what sort of self-censorship is appropriate in faculty members. I hope it's not a high level of self-censorship.

>>Steve Jackson: I think that's a good and important question, the rules in place there are not a lot of rules in place I think that's actually part of the story here, so what I would say is everything you said, I would say articulates a value that some value you are going to put on the freedom side view that freedom and responsibility, or whatever you do with it but that's exactly the kind of conversation that I want faculty thinking about to be talking about, I also share that concern, I

think that's a really important question for us to think through, as we think about academic freedom and classroom speech and how we teach in general. But that's part of the reason I want there to be a more robust and widespread conversation on this than we had today because people are self censoring, I would want them to say hey I'm self censoring and I don't think that's right and I actually think that I want articulate a more robust set of things on the freedom side, and or I also think there are particular responsibilities may be particular kinds of things I want my faculty colleagues to be doing that I think they are not doing that we are under serving our community or our students on but both sides of these I think need more development than we have because the existing rules are not rules or applied as rules. I would be happy to chat later. You asked for one.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR is also the president of our Cornell chapter of the AAUP. The AAUP I think the position was not accurately presented, the AAUP doctrine well not doctrine but policies and principles including a report from the freedom in the classroom makes clear that controversial discussions are part of academic freedom, it makes clear that the notion of discussing issues that are germane to the subject matter is a broad area not a narrow area. So the AAUP's position is consistent with what David Lee was saying and Harold was saying. In terms of encouraging broad statements, broad discussions, not narrow ones. And I encourage your office and perhaps other offices to send out the actual AAUP documents because there's a number of them and I would be happy to supply them.

>>Steve Jackson: Yes and they are linked through the slideshow too.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay we have to move on. Thank you. Okay we are going to move to the next agenda item, and turn it over for announcements and updates to Eve De Rosa Dean of Faculty, and Chelsea Specht associate Dean of faculty.

>>Eve De Rosa: Hi everyone I wanted to remind you there is a reception immediately after, I encourage faculty, I just sent out a blast for them to come meet you guys, so hopefully there will be faculty out there waiting for us. Please pick up these posters. We are using these to help your departments know where to go when they want topics to come to the Senate, or if they want to discuss things that we are actively discussing in the Senate. Here is essentially the work of the

nominations and the elections committee. The nomination and election committee is a committee that's been elected by the entire faculty to build our ballot for elections but also to appoint faculty members to the different committees we have 12 plus 2 working groups. And actually 13 plus 2 working groups, so this is who they have appointed these of the new appointees for the coming year. If you have any concerns about anybody you see listed here just let the office know but otherwise I would accept that everybody approves their work, next slide please. One of the working groups that we are standing this year, is to look at the academic integrity code, and we are going to be working on making it more efficient, we are learning that especially our newest faculty, they are not pursuing violations of the academic code and so we are working with all the colleges and schools including the professional schools, the graduate school law school tech, the vet school, are seeing increases in academic integrity violations, we had last year talk about the pilot program in Bowers CIS, the college for computing and information science, and that program is also going to help us build standardized ways of communicating and getting the data of where we are seeing academic integrity violations, is it being reported to the students college, etc. And that pilot program is also trying to move Cornell from being one of the most punitive universities in terms of academic integrity to one in which students have an opportunity to learn and this is the work of this committee, I have names for all but two and I will send out invitations to the people who have been nominated by the college and schools. Next slide please. So I am linking to the graduate student unionization, as well the updates, I think the updates are important for faculty, Risa absolutely it is our academic freedom to choose how we engage with any work stoppage, but I just want to let people know that if they make whatever choice they make they can be planful about it, and so just to think about research and continuity and what it means to you. As an individual. I wanted to update the Senate, so the hard work of the T4 committee, who worked to think through adding teaching Professor, RTE title for academic titles. So Michael over here, Michael Clarkson and Charlie [indiscernible] our previous Dean of faculty, did beautiful work to get all of the colleges and schools to have an enabling legislation, we approved it, that allows colleges and schools to now cater this title to their specific units. And so this went to the academic committee of the academic affairs committee of the Board of Trustees, I presented it there, they approved it, and the government committee just has to update the bylaws and the titles and all colleges and schools can bring this title and start to advertise probably in November or December. And a few of the colleges already are writing their

legislation. Road trip. Thank you Sen. Lamb and Sen. Holm, so we had our orientation for new senators last week and had a little cocktail party with all the other assemblies and with our interim President and interim Provost. Maybe it was the wine, I don't know, but basically putting walking for what we talk I guess I don't how to say it, but the idea that we do represent three campuses and so in speaking to both senators, I realized that there's an opportunity and so uninviting senators to come to the [indiscernible] campus and the tech campus with me, and what we will do is have a faculty forum for those campuses and hear about the issues local to them, and so you will higher up bus and up to 50 people the first 50 people who want a calm, we will do that. So over this academic year we are going on a road trip, and everyone can decide for themselves if they have the time and energy and I think it would be lovely, I just wanted to change the dynamic a little bit, break the mold just a little bit for us to have I think just context specific conversations about our campuses. Next slide please. And the final thing that I wanted to do. I've been really thinking about how do we build our community. I think a lot of us are struggling, and are feeling a little bit vulnerable. That's what I'm hearing around campus. And so I changed the prompt a little bit from what I wrote on the agenda, and want us to think as our faculty over the academic year, what it means to be at Cornell. Considering our founding principles of any person, any study, and what it means now relative to when the vision was accentuated, but also what it can mean into the future. And so I think we are at a time of transition. We have an interim provost, an interim president, and maybe a gift that we can give to the new president and the new Provost is what the faculty's vision is for themselves, and so that's the conversation I would like to have, I'm gonna set up a few of these conversations around the campus, and maybe we can also have them go to [indiscernible] what is the future of any study in that context, what's the future of our academics in our study on the tech campus? And so we will have a launch, I thought today people could start thinking through what it means to them any person, any study now and 10 years from now, we also have an opportunity so we invited the interim president to come and speak to justice senators, so it's just us, and him. And I thought this is also an opportunity for us maybe to have that conversation there, and so with that, I open the floor to anybody who would want to start contributing to that. And maybe they'll keep up that prompt for the slide before. And I can do the awkward silence thing really well. Yay Risa is on her way.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Risa Lieberwitz ILR, I was waiting since I talked a lot but I'm so glad I think this is a very worthy discussion, and what I would put out there is any person any study in relation to who is doing the teaching, and so what I want to point to is who actually has academic freedom that's meaningful, as an extension from our last discussion, who has academic freedom in the classroom, in extramural speech, and research, and governance which we call intramural speech, who really has that academic freedom that's meaningful and what does it mean to have you know the statistics, more than half or half of the faculty who are not on the tenure track for tenure?

>>Eve De Rosa: Less than half.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: Okay close staff?

>>43%.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: About 43% of the faculty colleagues do not have job security and they are not in a tenure-track toward job security, what does that mean for what we teach, how we teach, and whether any person can study in a broad way, by having a faculty who are free to be question and be controversial to push against the status quo quote.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you for starting the conversation and as you can see one of the things I did emphasize was that this is from my point of view at least, that what I considered the any person is about our community. I think that's what she is speaking to, who we are as faculty, but also I think I want us to also be visionary and better about our studies in academics. And one of the things that I'll likely do after each of these events is ask people who participated in these events to articulate their futuristic, personal study, and then we will save all of these and compile them and hand this gift to our next president and provost. I know faculty are not shy. Is that you Noah? Come on up.

>>Nathan Matias: Hello, Nathan Matias, Senator, communication department. I just want to reflect that quite a few folks in our department some of who studied questions related to student



diversity have been concerned about the impact on our campus and other campuses, Supreme Court decisions and so forth, on enrollment, there have been really dramatic and I think MIT a 10 percentage point reduction in the percentage of black students, just in one year for example. So I think as we think about this any person, one of the things that I think our department would be very eager to see a president take on would be what can we at Cornell do in the policy realm to ensure that our institution is able to continue to live up to even what we've accomplished in the past.

>>Eve De Rosa: I think part of this exercise thank you so much, I think what's important in this conversation is that we are also listening to each other and this is going to be crucial to this. That we are listening to each other we learn to respect each other and the expertise that we bring to this university so I mean one thing we could also do is have this conversation and departments and I'm happy to be there.

>>Laurent Dubreuil: I have the pleasure of being the senator of two departments for one semester, Romance Studies and Comparative Literature. I would say that part of the revolution and [indiscernible] that Cornell brought was precisely this any person plus any study, which for any study would be practical elements of self-knowledge but were not taught at the time in the US. I would say that historically and probably today as well, Cornell has focused a lot on any person not to say it's perfect, but clearly a huge part of the conversation that is just beginning today will really explore what any person could mean. What I feel and most of my 20 years here, is that the any study part has really been shrinking quite dramatically, and especially the innovation of Cornell that consisted in including the applied part of knowledge, has led to the situation today where we see everything that is from the research and not directly applied so the humanities, theoretical part of the sciences tend to be under attack and tend to be shrinking quite dramatically. And I would like us to really understand that for the same reasons, it was relative in the 1860s to include a vet school, more professionalized elements of knowledge it is absolutely crucial and relative today in a world that is more tech oriented and more engineered I would say, it is absolutely crucial to expect and expand the role of what is theoretical and what is not immediately apply.

>>Eve De Rosa: Thank you.

>>Begum Adalet: Sorry sorry okay. Begum Adalet, government, I missed the new senator rotation with the national conference. This is my first formal senate meeting and... Sorry my first Senate meeting and it has felt a bit like a quick flash to be honest. We started with being told how to respond to the likely graduate union strike and how to prepare for that, and being told about how to limit ourselves with topicality and how to respond to controversy around campus and ending with any person in any study.

- Eve De Rosa: So I'm going to reinterpret it, I think. But your impression is that at the first top of this or a good portion of our meeting you felt like your academic freedoms were being restricted? So I would say that Steve would not have wanted that to be the communication that it was more about as faculty, how do you manage your classroom, and every faculty can approach their classroom as they wish so for those who might want one of those tools here we are, for those that don't need them and don't want them, don't use them. I think that's where we are. And then in terms of this conversation I really am thinking about what we owe each other, so one is very much about us as scholars what we do in the classroom and what we do with our scholarship but also I want this to be a conversation amongst faculty where we learn from each other. So for me, one is self oriented and the other is very other oriented. So Will will be our last. Of course we can still do this over wine, so... Will.

>>Bill Katt: Bill Katt, CVM, just thinking outside the classroom a little bit obviously this is a research university and something that comes up whenever people talk about the next couple of years of research is that research funding is getting incredibly difficult to get, the amount of funding has not gone up by a penny, the cost of research has skyrocketed, so I think how we continue as a research university and continue especially with the associate professors finding funding to get their labs open is going to be part of that conversation.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay. We have one more agenda item I do want to remind everyone there's a reception following in the park atrium which is somewhere out there. We have now five minutes for good of the order, speaking will be an [indiscernible] Grossman Department of

Physics.

>>Yuval Grossman: Thank you very much. So as we all know last year was extremely hard, and I really hope next year we do better. And there's many things that should change at Cornell and to that I will talk about one case that is in regards to us as faculty members. What we observed is many instances of political activities in the classroom we have touched up on earlier in this meeting, and what I would like to do is tell of the way that I was seeing those and share some of the reaction that I got from faculty to students and how they felt this activity affected them. I trust that we all agree that all students should feel welcome at the academic setting that they must attend. This is especially important for those that are more on the passive side do not have the means to actually be involved in the counter activity. Let me briefly discuss these two examples so we have an idea of what's going on. The first involves a chair of the department who uses the department email to send a political email to everyone in the department, stating I'm doing this not as a chair, and every student was shocked by this email feeling that the chair inappropriately used a position to distribute that content. I assume the chair did not realize how offensive and inappropriate this was. She could have sent it from her personal email using a personal email that she has, instead she used the email that is provided by the University for academic purposes only for activity. The second example I would like to mention is the course syllabus. So the professor wrote like this: College is an exciting and formatting time but can be stressful. And then he moved on to give examples and the first example is from the genocide in Gaza and then he continued and said if you need support, please do not hesitate to reach out to me or others here at Cornell. And this is shocking. I would like to believe that this was done with good intention and that the professor did not understand how offensive and how inappropriate it was to include such extremely one-sided words in the course syllabus. And what happened after one student dropped the course immediately after seeing the syllabus. That's the impact of doing it. So these are just two examples and unfortunately I have many many examples, it's been a very widely phenomenon on campus. And what I'm here to tell you is I need all of us to actually please try to keep it out of the classroom. In particular it is not about debating what is okay and what is not okay to do in the classroom, it's about us. It's about us to say do I really want to bring this into the classroom or maybe I should keep my activism outside of the classroom. I personally always do this. I will never come to reflect in the classroom, I will never say anything about what's

going on. I will not share my personal story in the classroom. I will keep it outside of the classroom and I really hope that we all can come to agree that we should come to the students keeping our personal things in a way that is not offending them. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. That is our last order of business. So remember to go to the park atrium, and the meeting... It's right out there. Oh not the park atrium? It's right here is the name of the location of the venue. The meeting is adjourned.