JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. We start with the land acknowledgment. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, we call the meeting to order. The first order of business is approval of the minutes from November 12, 2025. These have been posted, distributed online as a verbatim transcript, so there shouldn't be any corrections except minor typos and such things. If you see one of those, just notify the Dean of Faculty's office. And hearing no objections, minutes are approved. Our first order of business then after the minutes is a proposed resolution regarding collaborative scholarship. Tracy Stokol, who is Chair of the Academic Freedom and the Professional Status of the Faculty Committee, and in her other life, Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, will have 10 minutes to describe the resolution, and then there'll be 10 minutes for Senate discussion. And I've been told that the default, if nothing else happens, is that there will be a vote via Qualtrics in the next week or so. But I'll give you a chance, if you feel that more discussion is warranted, to make a motion on the voting at the end of the discussion to proceed with the discussion at the first meeting in the Spring term. So, we can delay the vote if you think more discussion is needed. But if I don't hear anything, we'll vote via Qualtrics. So, Tracy, I think, is on Zoom. Go ahead.

TRACY STOKOL: Yes, thank you very much. Wow, that's a huge thing. So, the committee has been working on this for quite a while, and this is just a summary of the preamble or the rationale for the resolution. We all know that Cornell, as well as other Ivy League schools, have a tradition of individual accomplishments that are recognized for promotion with tenure. But more and more, there are faculty within certain units and that are hired to do collaborative research, or are

encouraged to do collaborative research, or are expected to do it as part of their role as a tenure track professor. And submitting multi-institutional and multi-investigator proposals where there's more than one primary investigator was encouraged when we started this whole resolution, was encouraged for submission for federal funding. And it is not only a desire for faculty in the RTE positions to do this kind of collaborative work research, but as I said, it can be an expectation of tenure track faculty as well. So, in order to see the lay of the land, we conducted a survey and got responses from several unit heads, and they all said that collaborative research was valued in some units. The collaborative research was only an expectation of the RTE faculty. And in other units, the collaborative research, people were hired to actually do collaborative research as part of their tenure track activities. But across the board, there seemed to be a general lack of clear guidance of faculty, what they should put in their tenure doses or what should be put in internal and external reviewer requests for promotion as to how collaborative faculty is viewed and judged and how it contributes towards the evaluation for tenure, which is what led to this resolution. So, can I have the next slide, please? So, here is the resolution. You can read it as well as I can, so I'm just gonna abbreviate it, but collaborative research has lots of advantages, bringing diversity, innovation and effective solutions to complex problems. Currently, there is insufficient guidance and criteria required for successful promotion given to faculty who have an expectation for participating in collaborative scholarship, such as being a co-primary investigator. Some units believe that this is not as good or qualifies as much towards tenure as being a primary investigator. Next slide, please. So, we want it resolved that Cornell University recognizes the value of collaborative scholarship and considers engagement in such scholarship as tenurable activity if it is commensurate with the expectations of their faculty member's research efforts. We further resolve that the weighting of collaborative research in tenure decisions will be determined by each unit; more weighting may be applied for a leadership role in collaborative scholarship. Be it further resolved that participation in collaborative scholarship may be an expectation of an individual faculty member, but it's not required of all faculty members in the department, so you can still keep doing your individual thing and you don't have to do collaborative scholarship as in being a co-PI on grant applications in order to get tenure unless that is an expectation of your position in your unit. Next one. Be it resolved that individual units or departments support their faculty performing collaborative scholarship by creating guidelines that they make available to faculty as to how this collaborative scholarship

will be judged when they come up for a promotion to tenure and also what will be provided to internal/external reviewers who are going to be giving input on that promotion and that are heavily weighted when we're evaluating our faculty for tenure. And the guidelines should also be given to provide faculty ways in which they can demonstrate leadership in collaborative scholarship versus, "Oh yeah, I'm just a collaborator, and I just participated with data analysis on this study," versus, "Yes, really, I helped drive this study. And without me, it would not have happened or it would have been more difficult for it to be happened." And we further resolve that the guidelines be widely promoted within the unit or department and uniformly applied within the department for promotion purposes. We don't think that this needs to be prescriptive and that all units need to follow specific guidelines, we just recommend that the guidelines that work for that unit or department be developed to just give faculty more guidance on how they can best prepare their dossiers for promotion with tenure. And that is the end of the resolution, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, if you have questions or comments from the gallery here, step up to a microphone. If you're online and have questions or comments, raise your hand digitally. And identify yourself.

STIJN VAN OSSELEAR: This on?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

STIJN VAN OSSELEAR: Stijn van Osselaer, Johnson School. I would like to ask that we have a full discussion of this motion, or whatever it is, because I think that this is a wonderful sentiment in the proposal, but there are costs to it as well. When I think about my own school, it's perfectly understood that collaborative research is valued. Almost all of our research is collaborative, and I don't think that our faculty, I'm a department chair myself, would be looking forward to creating very precise guidelines about this. I also think that adding another line to solicitation letters to external reviewers again makes it less likely that those external reviewers will read the whole document that is sent to them. So, I believe that there are some opportunity costs to this, and so if this is purely a sentiment, I'm all for, but if this creates more work and more lines in these types

of letters, I would vote against this.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Tracy, do you have a response?

TRACY STOKOL: I guess, this is just me speaking on behalf of myself and not on behalf of the committee. I don't think it is-- I understand your concerns about the increased burden as far as coming up with guidelines. I disagree that they need to be precise, and prescriptive, and follow-- be very rigid. They can be flexible. I just think that because guidelines are not currently available that it would really help faculty in these positions have more clarity on what is expected of them versus informal discussions between chairs, which may not be equitable or applied equitably across faculty depending on the situation. Whereas if there are-- and we discussed this at length, that if there are some kind of form of written guidelines that are established by each unit, that at least the tenure track faculty member will have something to fall back on as to the general expectations of that unit for if they're performing collaborative research versus hearing one thing from the chair and an entirely different thing from faculty who are voting on their tenure dossiers, which we hear all the time from faculty in the different departments that the faculty aren't sure who they should listen to and they try and please everyone, which is really just adding to the stress and lack of transparency with the entire process, which is our goal to just make it much more transparent and much more equitable across the board for the faculty. So, for me, the increased burden on the units to come up with some general guidelines that they can give to faculty weighs less than that this is really gonna help our early career faculty and have more clarity when they're actually applying for tenure, which is an incredibly stressful process. And honestly, I think giving more guidance to reviewers as to how that unit views collaborative scholarship when they're evaluating the tenure dossiers is not going to decrease the number of external reviewers that agree-- Sorry, my husband's home. I'm talking at a Zoom meeting at the Senate, so-- And my dog's barking. Sorry about that. So, I don't think that's gonna decrease the number of people who are going to refuse to do these tenure promotional letters, which are a huge burden for them anyway, and just adding one line, I don't think is going to change that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have another comment from in-house. Go ahead, identify yourself.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. Tracy, I wonder if you can just speak to what the process looks like right now. I know there may be no way to meaningfully say what the average is, but if I have a million dollar a year grant and there's three PIs on it, how much credit does that give me towards tenure right now?

TRACY STOKOL: So, I can't answer that question because A, our survey did not get into that specifics, and B, I think it varies across sections based on the makeup of the committee at the time we had all these discussions, which has changed, so we've had multiple faculty on the committee that have had input on this resolution. So, I think it varies by unit, and I think some faculty do have guidelines, more for RTE faculty than for tenure track faculty. And again, a lot of people said, "Oh, it's just informal discussion between the chair. We have no written guidelines." And so, I can't answer that question except to say that other committee members that in their unit, a co-PI on a grant was not considered as valuable as being the PI on the grant. And whereas other units I've heard that is considered equal when it comes to the discussion with tenure, which is why this cannot be prescriptive and needs to be decided by each unit.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we have another comment in house. Identify yourself, please.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi. Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. I appreciate the comments from our colleague at the Johnson School about additional burdens. None of us want that. I think what's being asked for here is quite reasonable. This is an ad hoc committee with two, three hour meetings that drafts something that comes back and gets approved by the department faculty. And I think it could do a lot to help junior faculty have confidence and understanding about entering into collaborative work and understanding the degree of credit that they're going to get for it. Honestly, I think it would save much of the faculty time in casual conversations mentoring junior faculty around exactly this issue, which we spend a lot of time on. So, I'm fully in support of this and hope we can pass it. Thank you. A minor comment. Tracy, to modestly reduce the burden of producing this guidance, perhaps your committee could promulgate a couple of best-- what you consider to be good examples of documents that describe how to consider collaborative research in a tenure process. If you had two or three examples that

you distributed, that could maybe help departments. Thank you.

TRACY STOKOL: I am speaking as someone who was participating in some of the conversations in the AFPSF committee on collaborative scholarship and just want to share that there's guidance from examples like NIH, different societies, humanities societies. So, it's not only for the biomedical sciences. It's for all disciplines, and it's out there. There's a lot of expectations for our newest faculty to get large grants. And in order to get those large grants, you have to be a co-PI. It's not available really to them to be a sole PI. And so, it's as simple as them telling their faculty colleagues what expertise they brought to the collaborative science, and how important their expertise was to the work getting done, and for their collaborators to write a simple letter stating the same.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have another comment in house.

TOM FOX: Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics. With respect to what Chris Schaffer just brought up in terms of specifics, I actually saw something in the resolution that struck me as a geneticist is going in this direction because in genetics, when we want to know what a gene does, the first thing we do is get rid of it and ask, "Does anything go wrong?" And in the resolution, they specifically point out that you should look at the question of what would have happened had that individual not been participating in the collaboration. I think that's a useful thing to have written down because it is a way to focus a discussion about the value of collaborative research. And I agree that we don't need more burdens, but anyone who is being asked to review the work of someone who is highly collaborative has got this problem, whether it's in a resolution or not. So, I don't see that as really changing how someone would respond to a request or review.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I don't see any hands up in Zoomland. Are there any other comments? We have a few more minutes if necessary. Tracy, go ahead.

TRACY STOKOL: Yeah, I just would like to follow up on Professor Schaffer's comments. So, I appreciate the sentiment for us to provide some concrete examples.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] .

TRACY STOKOL: Do you think that needs to be part of the resolution or can be a follow-up to the resolution that comes out of the committee so we can obtain examples from people who've been actively involved in that?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Eve De Rosa.

EVE DE ROSA: I can share. Through the Dean of Faculty Office, we can share resources to support it if this ever becomes a resolution.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The comment was, follow-up would be perfect. Okay, there's one raised hand. surprising from what I heard earlier about the loss of voice. Elliot Shapiro, you're on.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Yeah, thank you. I hope my voice operates okay. I wasn't gonna say anything in part because I'm an RTE faculty and we don't have tenure, but I just want to acknowledge that in the humanities, there's very little value given to anything collaborative. The assumption is that the stuff you do on your own is what counts. At least this is what I hear from people who go through the tenure process. And so, while all of the talk so far has been about scientific research, I think it's also really important that the humanities find a way to value collaboration. Thank you.

TRACY STOKOL: So, just in-- Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

TRACY STOKOL: Okay, great.

KEN BIRMAN: It's easy to hear you, it's no problem. It's Jonathan who's hard to hear.

TRACY STOKOL: Oh, sorry. Okay. So, just in response to that, we use the term collaborative scholarship because this is meant to apply across the board. This is not just for the biomedical sciences. This is for everyone, including the humanities.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have one more comment, and I think that's all we'll have time with. Identify yourself.

ARIANA KIM: Hi. Ariana Kim from Music. Kind of adjacent to the comment about humanities. Coming from the performing arts and having a lot of collaborators in the visual arts, working together is one of the most important things in terms of our research. And collaborating, whether it's composing a piece, curating a series, performing violin and piano, voice and harp, those are some of the most integral components of how we put together our dossiers and how we see our research. And although our research isn't necessarily as tangible as grants and articles published, those elements are crucial and I think one of the most important things we do. So, I think to think of it in a broad spectrum would be also important.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. As I said at the outset, the default will be that you will get a Qualtrics vote unless there's a motion for voting that seeks to delay the vote until the first meeting in February. So, if I don't see any such requests, we'll move on to the next agenda item, but I'll wait for a couple of more seconds. Okay, so we're gonna move on, and you'll get a Qualtrics email. The next agenda item is Academic Integrity Code and Accepting Responsibility Pilot Program Update. Liz Karns, Provost Fellow for Undergraduate Education, Statistics & Data Science, and Senator Michael Clarkson, Computer Science, will have 10 minutes, and then there'll be 10 minutes for discussion.

LIZ KARNS: Hello, everybody. It's 35 degrees. I feel like it's Spring. Okay, if we could have the first slide please. Three things I wanna talk about. There we go. First, I wanna talk about the Accepting Responsibility Pilot, which I think I was here maybe a year ago, year and a half ago talking about it. Give you an update about how that's going. Secondly, some proposed revisions that we have to the Academic Integrity Code, and these will be just high level ideas. We do not have language yet, so no debating over specific words. And third is to talk about an Academic

Integrity Registry and what that would look like. Okay, next slide. So, currently, we are running the Accepting Responsibility Pilot. We're in our fourth semester. This semester, we've had 58 students in 22 courses. We have two facilitators that we work with. They're grad students in philosophy. Actually, both of them are writing theses on ethics, so they're really well suited to the discussions that we have. We've had no subsequent violations this semester in the three participating colleges. I don't know everything about the university. I don't have everything, all the information about other colleges and schools, so I'm not sure what might happen to some of these students. To date, we've had 60 courses that have gone through it, and this is really good because it's given us a variety of situations, both teaching situations and assessments to react to. So, we started out with just CIS core courses, coding, stats, things like that, and now we've extended into some of the sciences. We've got chemistry. I think we have a physics course. We have several philosophy courses. So, we're seeing essays, essay issues, and lab work issues in addition to coding sorts of things. And that's good, right? It gives us a sense about where things are going and the types of problems that we're seeing. There was a big shift, as we all know, about a year ago when ChatGPT became everybody's best buddy. And I'll say one of the things that we saw as a shift was students. We asked them ahead of time, "What happened?" What was the circumstance before they've attended the workshop? So, what was the event? And most of the time it would be, "My friend and I were working together and submitted the same answers." And what we saw was this shifted to, "I used generative AI to get the answer." So, it's got a sort of interesting effect, which is students don't have to talk to each other, right? They don't have to work together, so that key networking piece might be missing suddenly. But it is an interesting thing, I think, because they're turning to this resource, not to each other, right? So, they're not even checking in as much with each other. We're seeing the same pattern this semester, mostly generative AI issues. When students come to a workshop, it's about an hour long, and we go over a very structured process, but the very first thing we tell them about is what happens if you have an academic integrity violation on the record. And that's usually a big surprise to students. And then, after that, we talk about-- or they identify their values. In these workshops, everybody talks. It's limited to eight people, and every student will definitely contribute to each of the questions. So, we talk about their values. We talk about choices they've made in the past that were good choices to try to anchor their thinking in that past good action. And remember that, you know, they're not always making a bad choice. This isn't about punishing them. And then, we talk about

what are their future habits that they need to really think about in order to avoid this problem in the future? So, that's the workshop. We've had eight cases with subsequent violations, and I looked at those last night. Six were in the same semester, and it's hard to tell if they were simultaneous, right? Some of them were actually in the same course, and I know that for some of them, it was like instructor saw it once, and then they saw it the second time, third time. So, there's a grading lag that can happen. So, those six, I'm not as worried about. There were two that it happened in subsequent semesters. And those students, you know, we wanna know what happened there? And is there something we could change about the pilot that would help them? But so far, it's a very low recidivism rate, which I'm pleased about. The next slide. So, some of the proposed revisions to the academic integrity code that we're looking at. The first one is the clarification of the investigation process. I get a lot of questions from instructors about can I actually talk to a student before I formally declare that I'm calling them for a primary hearing? You've probably seen that we've generated guidelines for if you have a concern about unauthorized generative AI use that we can suggest that you gather evidence in the following ways. And those things help instructors know when to apply this and also what the right standard of evidence is, right? It's clear and convincing, which is hard for some people to get their head around it first, and so again, we spend time talking about it. The second is probably the biggest change, and this would be the creation of a warning, right? For first-time violators or-- well, first-time violators that the instructor agrees a warning is appropriate. So, first, the instructor has to agree to it, and this is to recognize that it's an educational institution. We're not here to catch people and punish them, and they should have a warning that, no, what you did was wrong. I will say that every other institution I've looked at, they have a warning in place. It's always part of the process. So, this is something we really need to fix. Third thing would be this replacement of the college-based record-keeping system. Right now, every college has their own hearing board and a record-keeper, and if you have-- if you're an instructor and you have a violation for a student, you email to that instructor, or to that record-keeper, rather, and then the record-keeper emails it to the college, and there's a whole bunch of email that happens. We want to replace that with a central system, and that's key to having the warning as well, right? We need to know they don't have a past violation. The only way to do that is to have a centralized system. And then, last, we'd like to add some examples, additional examples to the list of what is considered a violation. For instance, presentation of false citations, right? That's something that should be, could be

considered a violation. False citations, as we know, are occurring a lot with ChatGPT type things and need to have some sort of ability to address those. There's also some things in the academic misconduct portion which might get better moved into integrity. For instance, in misconduct, we have that if a student uses an unauthorized electronic device in an exam, that's considered misconduct, not integrity, right? So, we might question why that is really a misconduct issue, right? It doesn't seem right at this day and age. And we will see much, much more technology coming into the exam room, right? Watch for those meta glasses. They're here. Okay, next slide, please. So, the registry that I've talked about is it's going to take a while to stand up, 12 to 18 months. I've been working with CIT to get a proposal in front of them if the Faculty Senate agrees that this should be added to the code. It will be very similar to the current academic concerns report. And if you're an instructor, I know for myself, this has been fantastic that I no longer have to figure out what college to write to the advising office, etc., etc. I just go to that form. It's made my life much simpler. We'll also have an improvement in the security of the handling of information. Right now, again, it's either email or secure file transfer. Should be that, but it's often email, and this is just something we should tighten up. We'll also restrict access in terms of who can get this information and an audit trail about who actually does access it. And finally, every record keeper we've talked to has said this would be fantastic because it would reduce their administrative burden. Right now, they have not only to deal with the email flow, but also then to update their own records in whatever form they have them. So, those are some of the things we're looking for. Okay, there's our question sheet. If you want to ask us any questions, send notes there. But happy to answer.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yeah, if there are any questions in-house, come up to the microphone or raise your hand digitally. We have someone coming up in-house. Identify yourself.

RAJESH BHASKARAN: I'm Rajesh Bhaskaran, Senator for Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I think the accepting responsibility is a great pilot, and it is consistent with the growth mentality that, you know, the way to learn is often by making mistakes. And there is a lot of evidence that if you make a mistake and then correct yourself, that's a very powerful learning experience. It stays in the brain. So, I feel like this is the right approach. And would it be

possible to scale up to the entire university? Because I think this should be a default academic integrity process, and we would be helping-- Academic integrity is like a huge issue with ChatGPT, but we would be, you know, addressing that in a very kind of holistic way that would help students grow as human beings, which is really very key with all this technology. So, thank you very much for your efforts. And, you know, I'm interested in how it can scale up.

LIZ KARNS: That's a great question. And actually, I have an answer, which is that the provost is very supportive of this and does want to see this rolled out to the whole university. So, part of the having not just accepting responsibility role, that also means having a-- the changes in the code because under a pilot, we can do all these different creative things, but we need it. If it's a whole university, we need the code to change. And we need to do this record keeping.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Michelle Crow.

MICHELLE CROW: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, I also-- I think my comments are really going to echo the last speakers. I admire this work. I think this clarification is really, really important and perhaps overdue. My concern is for the students. The faculty are getting more guidance and figuring out what constitutes an academic integrity violation. But are the students getting the same kind of guidance in what constitutes an academic integrity violation? Because it is so fuzzy. I work only with multilingual, mostly international, some immigrant students. And it is hard to work out, you know? It's just very, very fuzzy these days. It's always been fuzzy. It's always been fuzzy. But with the with technology, it's just gotten fuzzier and fuzzier. So, we've put some guidelines for students on the English language support office website to kind of help students that I think would be helpful for all students. But I would just love to see more of an effort, you know, on the on the student side, I guess.

LIZ KARNS: Yeah, I think there have been various efforts. You know, at orientation, they talk about it. Nobody hears it. Nobody cares, right? This is not what they want to hear. I encourage instructors to talk about it at every assignment and to say what it means in their classroom, right? It's really clear that students care a lot about it once you've called them on it, right? So, they learn very quickly about it. I think that those broad things we'll definitely try to keep doing. But it's

instructor based. We've got to have instructors. And we want instructors to have more education about this as well.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Charles.

CHARLIE WALCOTT: I'm Charlie Walcott from Neurobiology and Behavior. One of the comments I have heard repeatedly from faculty is that the system is so complicated and so difficult that on some occasions, they simply ignore academic integrity violations. So, I think it's very important, however we come out of this. And I think your proposal is excellent in terms of doing this. But however we end up, we should try and find a way of communicating it broadly to the faculty that it's not a terribly complicated process, that it's something that even they can do. [Laughter]

LIZ KARNS: I know these are smart people, right? It turns out they can follow the process. Yeah, faculty get confused about it in part because it's not typical, right? Our system is unusual in the way we do it. So, that's something we can work on education. Next year, I definitely am planning to build out some faculty outreach things for both new faculty and to go to each department and talk to departments about it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have another comment in house.

GILLY LESHED: Thank you so much for working on this. Gillie Leshed, RTE at Bowers. My question is about severity levels. I think there aren't enough guidelines for how to deal with different levels of violations and the penalties involved. And I think that would be useful both at all levels, guidelines for faculty, students, the registry, the warning system, and so on.

LIZ KARNS: 100% agree, and you could be on my advisory panel, right? Because that's what we need. We need to figure out what are the-- Again, I've looked at lots of other universities, and they do have guidelines and they have, you know, this is what looks like a minor offense, this is a major offense, etc. Right now, it is still up to the instructor each time, and it's hard, right? It's very difficult. So, yeah, we need to work on that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have time for maybe one more comment if there are any.

TOM FOX: Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics. Just a quick question. When you say a non-reportable warning, you mean it gets reported to the central system but not outside of the university, is that correct?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The response was that's correct.

LIZ KARNS: Yeah, that's correct. And this is another thing we've worked very hard to be clear on because there's many questions that are asked of students in the future. We don't know all of those questions. What we tell them is that this is a warning and it does not go out if a dean's certificate is requested in terms of have you been found in violation of an academic integrity code? And if they have a warning, they have not had a hearing and therefore, they have not been found in violation. So, we've been working with council's office to make sure that we get this exactly right. Good question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other comments or questions? Thank you. We'll move on to the next item, which is Announcements and Updates from the Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa. And then, that will be followed by 10 minutes of Q&A.

EVE DE ROSA: Good afternoon, everyone. I just wanted to remind everyone that we have four new resolutions that three more colleges will be able to use the teaching professor as a new title, and we have a few more proposals coming in. And so, that's growing. And also, the resolution on the overuse of temporary suspension, that was also approved and has been sent to the president for comment. So, just wanted to remind you. And I highlighted the 24 did not votes. Please, if you're-- Obviously, we don't have to worry about quorum anymore, which is a good thing, but I do think we can do better. And so, if you're in that 24, just reach out to our office when you know there's a vote, one's coming up this week, just let us know that you didn't receive the link, and we'll send it to you. Next slide, please. So, we called the enabling legislation working group or task force T4. And now, we have E4. So, we are-- Yes, Michael, we want continuity between

our titles. And so, we do have permission from the provost and also the four deans of the contract colleges to move forward with extension professor in the same way that we did with teaching professor. And so, we have a working group or task force, and we will use the model of the teaching professor, the research professor, the clinical professor. Enabling legislation should be a really efficient, I think, process. So, we're hoping to bring this to the Senate for approval, and discussion and approval, hopefully, in the early spring. And this is the group. These were all-- the four people were nominated by the deans of the contract colleges who are primarily using the title of extension associate and senior extension associate. And so, it made sense to start with those four deans and their representatives. Next slide, please. So, the pop-up soups have been a great success. We had an impromptu one yesterday. Thank you, AAP, for covering us when we had to cancel the one in the law school because of a snowstorm. But we're going to continue these. And we've also reached out to the Agritech campus, and we'll do a pop-up hopefully on that campus as well. And happy to bring people from Ithaca to the Agritech campus for that if they would like. But I just wanted to share. And I'm going to shame everyone who's not an engineer because it turns out the engineers are an exceptionally social group. So, they have shown up to every soup no matter where it is. Either they really like free food or they're really a social group. But I just wanted to share that this has really been wonderful watching colleagues who haven't seen each other. So, people are coming out of their labs in their offices. And so, we've seen people pulling up chairs, together thinking about collaborative work. And so, I just wanted to share that that will continue. Yes, focusing on building good things. As you just heard just now, the accepting responsibility I believe is something good that we've been building. And we can continue to do so. So, we do have a few colleges that are willing to pilot accepting responsibility next semester. We're working out the logistics of that, and hopefully, that will all come to fruition. And we're also hoping to receive a green light on the accepting-- I mean, sorry, the academic integrity registry. And what we've learned by having the academic integrity working group, which is all the chairs, academic hearing board chairs, and their recorders, also in the professional schools, not just focused on undergraduates, we have learned how much risk there is in record keeping and also the ability to follow a student's-- So, the decision-making for whether someone has violated an academic integrity code is sitting with the instructor, and that instructor could have students that are not in their college. And this obviously has to be reported out to the college and is dependent on us and other humans and open to flaws. And so, we are

trying to recreate a common system very much like the student conducting code. So, the next thing that I wanted to say is also another positive thing that we're building is we have a draft resolution. It was posted a few weeks ago. This is from Senators Bryan Sykes and Nate Matias. And the UFC has given them feedback. They see it as a very positive resolution. And so, they decided not to present it today, but they're going to go and try to incorporate the feedback from the UFC and come back in February. So, hopefully, we'll be discussing that. And basically, it's a proposal to create an ad hoc group to do the work of fixing the deficiencies in Policy 6.4 in collaboration with both the Cornell Office of Civil Rights but also with General Counsel's office. Oh, and then, I was told to get a personality. So, we have an opportunity. I hope that those of you on Zoom who are still on campus will come to our faculty reception immediately after the meeting. Just come on down. And we are going to do what Chelsea Specht created, which I'm now calling a tradition, is basically, you put your name in a hat and volunteer to be on some of our faculty committees, and we'll draw names out of the hat for some swag. And so, Chelsea's going to come down and do that for us. Unfortunately, Adam, or fortunately for Adam, he's working on the future of the American University and he's in Washington, DC, meeting with politicians. And so, it's hard to say whether that's fortunate or unfortunate, but he is doing work for the faculty, but he isn't going to be able to be here at the reception to do the swag. So, just wanted to remind people to come on down. And if anyone who has questions, I'm here.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, if you have questions for the Dean of Faculty and you're online, raise your hand. Or if you're here, feel free to come down to the microphones.

EVE DE ROSA: Well, that's great. And luckily, our next speaker is here. Oh, okay. Here we go. Thank you. Hi, Risa.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Risa, go ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Hi. Yeah, Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. So, I wanted to ask whether there are plans, and if there aren't, hoping that there will be, to have President Kotlikoff come to, you know, and I think also Provost Bala would be good to invite as well, to come to the Senate to discuss the agreement that Cornell reached with the Trump administration. The town hall that

was held, you know, it went very quickly. There were a zillion questions, apparently, that came in on Zoom and didn't get answered. And I think that, you know, it's quite clear that the Faculty Senate would have very particular interests in discussing this. You know, it's a complex kind of a thing to talk about. So, could you talk about that?

EVE DE ROSA: I reached out to the president's office immediately after the town hall, and we've worked on a date, so the best we could do was to have him come in March to talk about the agreement. So, it's planned, but just not as soon as we would have liked.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, I'm just appalled. I mean, March-- Obviously, I understand, it's difficult to do planning, but March seems really inadequate. I mean, it doesn't-- You know, it doesn't seem to me to really show a priority that the administration might have with the Faculty Senate. You know, I mean, we not only have our meeting date, but we have the other date that's reserved. I'm sure that if something special were set up, people would come, you know? I know it's difficult, but March just really seems-- I mean, to me, it's actually showing a real lack of priority to actually engage with us.

EVE DE ROSA: You got Chris napping.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, we have one more agenda item, which is an introduction to the new Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Thomas A Lewis, who is also in religious studies and German studies, so a triple threat.

THOMAS A LEWIS: Great. Thank you very much. It's really great to be here. Thomas A Lewis, I usually go by my initials, TAL, and I'm a professor in religious studies and German studies. My scholarship focuses very much on the intersections of philosophy of religion and ethics with a particular focus on German intellectual traditions. A lot of my scholarship concretely has been on the German philosopher Hegel and also more recently thought more about the construction of religious studies as a discipline and the way in which it interacts with philosophy and other disciplines. I just arrived at the beginning of August after having spent 18 years on the faculty at

Brown. Prior to that, I was a faculty member at the University of Iowa, and then at Harvard before moving to Brown. At the same time, I've been-- you know, as much as I've been very much a part of the faculty over the course of this time, the last several years, I've been deeply involved in graduate education. I was most recently the Dean of the Graduate School at Brown, and part of what really excites me about being so involved in graduate education, I would say, are two things. First, is a sense that in dealing with graduate education, we're dealing with a lot of things, but among other things, we are dealing with the future of the institution of the university. And for those of us who care deeply about what universities are, what they mean for society, thinking about how we populate their future is one of, you know, for me, one of the most valuable and crucial things that we do. Secondly, one of the things I really loved from the first part of my work in the Graduate School at Brown was getting the opportunity to work with faculty and graduate students themselves from across the university. It's absolutely fascinating to see both the commonalities as well as the real differences that take place between what graduate education looks like in math, in philosophy, in various parts of engineering, in public health, and getting to see and engage with what graduate education looks like in those different contexts has been really exciting. I want to take a few minutes today to say a little bit more about what I've been doing over the last several months to try to get a sense of Cornell, talk a little bit about this current moment in graduate education, and then turn a little bit more concretely to admissions, which I think is on many of our minds. So, if I can turn to the next slide. Over the last four months since I arrived in August, there's been a lot of effort on my part working with other colleagues in the graduate school to get to know many of you, to learn about and hear about your individual fields and the challenges as well as opportunities you see there. So, one of the first things we did was try to set up listening sessions with directors of graduate study from the various academic areas, from social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences, as well as the humanities, and really hear about the particular experiences there. We've hosted two meetings that are for DGSs as a whole, and part of what was really important to me in those meetings is not simply the kind of general us sharing updates from the graduate school as well as hearing and taking questions from you and from the fields, but also providing opportunities for fields that have provided real leadership and are doing innovative things around the SPRs or innovative things around professional development to talk DGS to DGS and share some of what they've been doing. Part of our goal is to make sure that we provide the kind of venues for you, for DGSs

and fields to be hearing from and learning from each other. I think of the General Committee, that elected body that really represents the graduate faculty as being a really key site. Part of what the General Committee does is we get proposals for program revisions or for new programs, but part of what I've really seen as valuable in that committee is it's a space to hear from a group of faculty as well as some graduate students who are really committed to graduate education at Cornell about what they see as issues, how they're thinking about things. I've been very curious in the SPR process and the ways in which we track students having milestones so that we are supporting them and proceeding in a timely manner through the field and through the program to completion and how is that working. So, really trying to talk with them about that. And lastly, the individual field meetings. I've gotten to meet over the course of the semester with a number of fields to just spend some time looking at the data on the field, on admissions, on the student experience, on the outcomes, and learning from the field about how they interpret that data, what they're seeing as exciting possibilities as well as some very real challenges. So, that's been crucial for me. Thinking about this moment in graduate education, I probably don't need to tell you that we are looking at a lot of really challenging circumstances, and there are some senses in which it feels like a convergence of really difficult pressures. As I think about where we are, I think about extreme pressure in federal funding, which in many of our fields is absolutely crucial to supporting many of our graduate students. At the same time, the expenses related to supporting our graduate students has been increasing with the increases in stipends. Among the students themselves, we see in some cases shifting career trajectories, and frankly, in many cases, shifting expectations from graduate students. I think some see a kind of broader cultural shift in graduate students today versus 20 years ago. I think there's much we might discuss in that. I think a lot about the role of policies and of trust in that context. Perhaps a little more recently, though not that recent, the questions about visas have been very important for international students, and on the domestic side, particularly for master students, limits in federal loans that are likely to go into effect that create real pressure. In that context, I think it's easy to feel somewhat beaten down, to feel demoralized. I wanna acknowledge that and name it. At the same time, one of the things that I think is really vital is how we respond to those pressures. If we can look at the next slide, I think we will see changes in graduate education. We've been talking about this for a while in many sectors. I think many have been dissatisfied with various aspects of graduate education for a while, but frankly, it's been quite resistant to change and hard

to change for some good reasons as well as difficult reasons. But I think we're at a moment where what I hope to see, what I hope to facilitate, is some proactive engagement with how things may look different going forward in ways such that we can shape some of that rather than simply reacting to something that is beyond our control. I think there are a lot of areas where this can happen, thinking about innovation in our curricula, both in the content and form, thinking about the relationships among fields. One of the things I find so exciting about Cornell is the field system, the role of minors, and the way in which work across traditional disciplines is encouraged, but also various forms of flexibility in what that looks like. I do think we're at a moment where I want to think about streamlining things like time to degree, attending to academic standing in ways that really support our students in making the kind of progress through the program that they can. Now, as I think about these kinds of efforts and initiatives, I think about you. That is, I don't think it's the role of the graduate school to simply come in and say, "Here's what your graduate field needs to do." To the contrary. I think the most important, significant, and exciting innovations in these areas are going to be ones that come from the faculty in the field itself, sometimes from our students, who I think we do need to be in close touch with on this. But my goal is really to work with the individual fields and work with the fields together to think about how do we facilitate some of the innovations you might want to try? How do we connect you with people maybe in another field, maybe in a very different part of the university who's actually been doing something that looks kind of like what you're talking about and might be a really good resource for you to talk to? I do think it's really crucial and also exciting to have that option, to have that possibility to work closely with faculty in the fields on what they are doing and how we might shape the future of graduate education. I do want to talk a little more concretely about graduate admissions because I think this has been on a lot of people's minds, both last year's admission cycle and what's coming up. If we can go to the next slide, I want to start with master's education and say a little bit about that. One of the things we're doing is trying to get just clearer data so we have a clearer picture on application numbers, how many students we're admitting, what our actual yield numbers are, and some of that material has been a bit piecemeal across some of our different colleges, departments, and fields. But then, I want to look a little-- and we're trying to gather enrollment targets this year, and in some cases, if fields or departments-- If units are thinking about a particular target for international students and a particular target for domestic students, that's helpful for us to know, so we're surveying fields

about that. If we can go on to the next slide though. There's been a lot of talk and concern about graduate admissions already, and I think it's helpful to look at some of what our overall numbers are. This slide really focuses on the master's programs. The blue on the left are the entering cohorts for each fall for research and professional master's programs. What's noteworthy here is you see overall, we saw this past Fall a slight decrease in the number of incoming master's students, but not dramatic, so it came down a little, but not dramatic at all. I would note that our overall graduate international student enrollment dropped by 4%. So, again, I don't want to trivialize 4%, but neither have we seen a collapse at this point in our international graduate student population. Cornell fared much better than many other institutions did. On the right-hand side of this slide though, you see our total master's student population, and there you see that because many of our master's programs are actually more than a year, we probably have the largest master's enrollment this Fall that we've ever had, assuming that if we go back more years, those numbers were even smaller. So, we're not seeing that kind of decline that sometimes I think we were worried about for this Fall. Going on to the next slide, thinking about PhD programs. First of all, we're really looking ahead. We're trying to get a sense of what fields are looking at for their targets this year. I will say when I met with DGSs over the course of the fall, this was one of the very big things on people's minds. We've done a lot of surveys. We've done a lot of asking fields what they anticipate. They were initially projecting targets that were about 72% of the average for those previous four years. So, if we exclude this Fall, it was an outlier. We look at the last three years, what were our average targets? We're at 72% of that. Concretely, that means up from where we have been-- were last year in that kind of cataclysmic year, but still down from where we have been historically. We are updating those projections now. We've got emails out to fields asking for updates. I will say that-- and we're also surveying colleges if they're making changes in TA policies, et cetera. When I think about admissions on this, I think of it as an emotional tightrope. I have to tell you, I have real concerns. I don't want to downplay those. There are a lot of pressures. Overall, our application numbers seem down from last year. At the same time, the tightrope element of this is what we have seen so far is not something like collapse. And I know for those of-- you know, you can get really focused on one year's cohort, and it can feel like we are witnessing the end of doctoral education as a whole. That's not yet what we're seeing though. So, I want to look at the numbers for this fall. If we go to the next slide. So, if you look at that 25 to 26, that 471, that's our incoming cohort of PhD students who

started this past September. That is quite small compared to those previous years. As you can see, those initial projections for the coming year are a target of 539, better than 471, but still, you know, certainly down. But I think it's no less important to pay attention to those previous two years, right? What we saw in those numbers of 979-- I'm sorry, 797 and 790 were historically large years, right, for the university as a whole in terms of incoming PhD students. And part of what I want to emphasize is that it can be easy to get used to larger numbers or to get used to changes in numbers fairly quickly and not realize that those were also outlier years, right? It also means that in terms of the total student population, this most recent year has not dramatically transformed the total student population. I also want to acknowledge that it is certainly the case that the average number for the university as a whole almost certainly does not match your particular field circumstances in one direction or the other, that growth, say, of those previous two years, those really high years, not every field was really high there, and that's very true. If we can look at the next slide, and this is the last slide I'll have for you, I can show more. The total enrollment-- Do we have the next slide there? There, great. This is the total enrollment in doctoral programs, right? And you can see that we've dropped a little bit to 3,611 this Fall, but that frankly puts us back a few years but not in a dramatically different context. That is worth noting. Part of what we really see with PhD programs is because they are long, one or even two smaller cohorts do not dramatically change the total population. Again, it's this tightrope. I don't want to say, "Oh, everything's fine. Don't worry." On the other hand, I don't want to say, "Because we had this one bad year, the program is disappearing or even two years." And we certainly may see some coming adjustments. I also want to note that in terms of decreases in incoming cohort size, that's been spread out across divisions, right? Social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences and humanities have all felt that. I will say the somewhat of an outlier is that the decrease has been notably less in the humanities, both in the incoming cohort for this fall as well as projections for next year. So, the decrease has been less in the humanities. They're not as far from normal as the other units are or the other areas. I'm going to pause there. I would love to take questions, whether about specific surrounded missions, I have a lot more to say on that, or broader issues in graduate education. I'm really pleased to have this opportunity to meet with you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, if there are any questions in-house, walk up towards the

microphone. And if you're on Zoom. Let's start with Ken Birman on Zoom since he's already there.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah. Thank you for a very interesting and data-filled presentation. I thought this was very valuable, and I hope we see a lot more like this in the Senate going forward. On these last two slides about doctoral enrollment, one interpretation a person--

THOMAS A LEWIS: On which slide? On this one or--

KEN BIRMAN: This and the prior one, the admission slide, the entering cohort slide. Would be that the people in the program are staying a bit longer. I mean, look at the sharp drop. And yet, the total number of students hasn't dropped as much. So, it strikes me that this is telling us that students are staying longer. But that may not continue. That may be a side effect of worries about visas or about a job market. And we could see a substantial shortage of students, basically, to do things like grading, and teaching recitations, and so on, if it suddenly empties out. Is that an interpretation that makes any sense? Or do you think that that's not valid?

THOMAS A LEWIS: Yeah. So, it's a great set of questions. I mean, I think there are a lot of issues there. I would say that on the one hand, it does in part reflect long times to degree. And I think one of the things that happened nationally after COVID was we saw more extension in how long graduate students or PhD students were taking in their field, in their programs. And that makes a difference. So, that's one thing. Even if our times were shorter, though, if our average time-- Let's just say, across all the areas, our average time dropped to 5.5 years. Even that shorter timeframe, that's still enough cohorts that are here at any one time that the one change, one smaller cohort or two smaller cohorts takes a while to work its way through there. So, in other words, that effect is exacerbated by longer times to degree, but it is not unique to that. We would see that anyway. Secondly, though, I want to say my view is when we have these long times to degree, that means more students that we are supporting for a longer period of time. And part of the reason we don't have funding capacity to admit new students is precisely because we have these students who are still here who we need to make sure we are funding and that they are completing where that's possible. My view is if we can decrease some of that time to degree, that

enables us to have the capacity, partly about funding, partly about faculty attention, advising time, et cetera, to be able to admit slightly larger cohorts because we're not-- each student becomes frankly less expensive over the course of their lifetime.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have an in-house comment, and then we'll go back to Zoom.

GILLY LESHED: Thank you for the presentation. Gilly Leshed-Bowers, RTE. So, I'm the Director of the Professional Master Program in Information Science. And I'm really surprised that you were presenting master's information because we are used to falling between the chairs. Professional master's programs are not organized into fields, but instead by departments and colleges. Communication falls between the graduate school and professional master's programs directors and students. Sometimes they get a petition form that they need to fill with the signature of the DGS, which they don't even know what that stands for. So, my question is, do you have any plans to better integrate the master's programs into a structure that would make sense for the graduate school, the faculty, the different units and the students?

THOMAS A LEWIS: Great. I love that question. You're right that we're pulling together that data here. And I think one of the things that I have found intriguing and was important to me about this role is that we are double title of Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Graduate Education. And that Vice Provost for Graduate Education has that broader remit to include programs like the so-called delegated programs, et cetera, that are graduate programs, but don't quote report up through the graduate school. And I think we're at a moment where there's broad recognition that when we want to get the big picture, when we want to provide full support, we need to be thinking about those, you know, both research and professional masters broadly in more collective ways. So, I think about that. You know, when we're looking at changes to loan limits for domestic students, that's something that really bears on all of these areas. When we're thinking about the impact of visa restrictions, that bears on all of those. So, yes, we are working to improve that communication. I think one of the-- You know, the pieces for me is figuring out where do we most effectively delegate particular activities, responsibilities? Our goal is not to encroach, but some of what we're doing now is trying to compile some of that information so that you and we have that bigger picture that helps you

know, is what's happening in your field atypical, or not a field, as you're saying, they're not organized into fields, but what's happening in your program, is that typical for what's happening at Cornell? Is that an outlier, et cetera? So, yes, we're working on that. I appreciate the engagement with it, and I hope to talk to you more about it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Richard Bensel online.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yes, thank you for your presentation. I have a number of comments, or two or three. One is that the graduate school has implemented a number of reforms over the last three years that have really complicated, I know, I was director of graduate studies when they were implemented, complicated graduate training at Cornell and teaching in general. One is the unfunded mandates that the graduate school has made, which I find really reprehensible because they order us to provide funding for students, but it doesn't come from the graduate school. So, it contracts the size of the graduate program. Another one is the ban on TAs after seventh year, which is a real problem. But those combined with a contraction and the size of graduate departments, there's a threshold for graduate training. You need enough graduate students to have a community, and these kinds of reforms are reducing the opportunities and prospects of such communities. And as part of being DGS, I asked the College of Arts and Sciences, I said, "Look, if you reduce the number of graduate students, you reduce the number of TAs. If you're increasing undergraduate enrollments, then where are the TAs going to come from?" And what they said in response was that they were going to hire temporary or non-tenure track kind of faculty to fill in the shortfall. It would be good if you would come back and really talk about these changes, their justifications, their implications for teaching, and for the mission of the university. We are-- That's one of the things that the Faculty Senate is dedicated to. So, I really appreciate it, and I think many of us would appreciate if you were to come back and we'd have a full discussion of these changes and their implications. Thank you.

THOMAS A LEWIS: Yeah, great. Thank you very much. One of the things I really valued over the course of the Fall but look forward to next iterations of are precisely the conversations with faculty from the fields about how things are going. And I will say the changes in expectations around funding, Summer funding, and just broadly funding in extended years, I heard a lot about.

The language of an unfunded mandate was not a small piece of a number of those discussions. So, I hear that. I take that seriously. I think about part for me of the importance of having those conversations as well as ongoing conversations is that if we're making changes, to do that on the basis of consultation, engagement, input from the people who it's going to affect. So, I think that is really important, and I know that those do have an impact on just the experience of graduate education and what fields can do. And there was a kind of convergence of a variety of different pressures that really affected things. In terms of the particular issues around what this means for teaching, one of the things that I think is really striking is that that looks different in different colleges. So, part of what we're trying to do is make sure that we are in communication not only with arts and sciences, where TAing plays such a prominent role in the funding of so many of the PhD students, but also in CALS and other areas where graduate students are typically TAing, but not in the numbers. The kinds of pressures that I was talking about at the beginning are placing pressures and will place pressures on the number of TAs that are available. I think that is likely, and I think that is going to require some real thinking about how do we adjust to that? What are the places where-- Can we make sure that we are dedicating the graduate TAs in the most important places? Where that is, I don't have the formula for, but I think that's where part of the input that I think is crucial from the fields needs to come from. Are there other-- What are the other ways that that gets met? But I am also concerned about the experience of the TAs themselves because I want their TAing to be a valuable experience for them, not simply a matter of, I don't know, some version of number crunching or them feeling like it's an unrewarding experience for them. So, I think highlighting that is crucial. I will say part of my role as Dean of the Graduate School, as I see it, is to advocate for those students, and I want them to be having a transformative educational experience that will contribute to undergraduate education, but I also want to make sure those graduate students are not simply a means to that. In terms of an invitation to come back and talk more, I would be very interested in that and thinking about how to frame that. I'm thrilled to have the opportunity to engage and interact with you. So, I know there's a lot more to say on that, but Eva's standing here, and so I'm going to pause there.

EVE DE ROSA: I was going to offer that we could have the faculty form, if you would like, which are more conversational.

THOMAS A LEWIS: Okay.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have an online question/comment from Michelle Crow.

MICHELLE CROW: Hi. So, thank you for this presentation. Really informative. I direct the English Language Support Office, and we provide writing and speaking support in the form of credit bearing courses, tutoring programs, a whole number of things to master professional students, master's research students, PhD students across all 11 of the colleges and units here at Cornell. And I've been hoping to meet with you, and I just haven't made the time. I apologize for that. The point I want to make is, first, the students that I work with are very, very scared right now. This is, as you know, a very hard time, number one, to be a graduate student and a very hard time to be an immigrant student or an international person in the United States for reasons that many of us are familiar with and I don't have to repeat. One thing that I've always loved about the graduate school here at Cornell is they've always done a lot of different kinds of events and activities that are community building, that are supportive of diversity, equity, inclusion in a whole range of definitions of those terms, and also focus on professional development in a whole variety of activities. And I'd love to hear your vision for this-- for what I'm talking about basically.

THOMAS A LEWIS: Well, I mean, first of all, I really want to acknowledge the point that you're highlighting in terms of what a challenging moment this is for many international students and reading various headlines not only about incidents that are happening today but also about some of the proposals being considered raising a lot of concerns for both current and prospective international students, and that's very real. I think it makes it that much more crucial that we really highlight and continue to emphasize and double down on the kind of support for belonging broadly conceived for students who are here at Cornell from a variety of places, backgrounds, and experiences. And I think as we've got so many pieces, so many demands, whether it's calculations about how many incoming students we can support and that kind of thing, it's crucial that we not lose track of precisely that, the importance of fostering that belonging to a diverse and inclusive body of graduate students. I think that there are a number of ways that we do this. I think Sarah Xayarath Hernandez here in the graduate school really has been a national

leader in thinking about diversity and inclusion as it bears particularly on graduate education but also the interface with faculty through mentoring. I also think a lot-- I really value the Big Red Barn right next door to us here and having seen graduate education and spaces at other institutions, the kind of community of inclusion that that can foster and just spending time there in the evenings, and the level of energy and sense of community that you see there is really something remarkable. That doesn't mean that we can be in anything like complacent because it's clear that we need to make sure that we're being intentional in the programming that happens there to make sure that it's inclusive and thinking about international community and other underrepresented students as well. So, that's some of it in very broad terms, but I think it is a really key issue in this moment.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Great. I think it's probably a good time to break off and adjourn the meeting. A reminder that there is a reception and apparently some swag to be given out right outside those doors outside of Schwartz Auditorium. And if you're in the Zoom audience and you want to run up here, your presence would still be appreciated in terms of fostering our own community. And there is no good of the order in case you're wondering. It was canceled at the last minute. Thank you. We're adjourned.