

Faculty Senate meeting
February 11, 2026
Meeting minutes

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Senate Speaker, Professor Emeritus from Architecture. We start with the Gayogohó:nq' Land Acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy predates the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, the meeting is convened. We start with the approval of two sets of minutes, actually. We had a special meeting on January 21st, 2026, and then the last meeting of the last semester, December 10th, 2025. Both of those meetings have had their minutes posted and distributed online. They exist in the form of a verbatim transcript. So, if there are any minor transcription corrections or grammatical corrections, please just bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty. Otherwise, hearing no objections, the minutes are approved. We start today with what on the agenda says proposed resolutions. I want to clarify that these are draft resolutions, so they're not - they haven't been officially moved. The sponsors are still seeking input, So, it's not appropriate at this time to offer amendments since these have not been submitted as motions yet. There are three draft resolutions that are related to each other, and I'll just allow the Senators Bryan Sykes and Nate Mathias to explain what these entail. There'll be 10 minutes, and then another 10 minutes for Senate discussion.

BRYAN SYKES: Thank you. So, yes, we're here to discuss three draft resolutions, specifically resolutions to form an ad hoc committee to review Cornell policy 6.4, faculty handbook section 6.6, and the duties of the Cornell Office of Civil Rights Faculty Co-Investigator. Additionally, we have a resolution to create a disciplinary case reporting and attestation tool. And the final resolution focuses on a request for an annual university report on academic freedom. Next slide. So, during the Fall 2025, there were a number of faculty senate discussions that revealed major cleavages between the faculty and administration, underscoring and punctuating discordant beliefs and interpretations about policies and procedures that apply to civil rights and enforcement. And a number of those issues focused on unclear and ambiguous language, different legal standards applied by different fact finders, points of administrative discretion, information gaps in framing and understanding the problems that affect the faculty, for which some resolutions lacked important context and information, or that information was siloed into specific subcommittees of the Faculty Senate. And then, there were also increasing concerns about threats to and perceived losses of academic freedom, as well as the loss of shared values and trust between the faculty and the administration. And because of these issues, we propose these three resolutions to address these specific concerns.

NATE MATIAS: Next slide. Distrust matters because Cornell is at its best when we celebrate our differences and work to understand each other across those differences, something we get to enjoy every time we gather at graduation. And let's be honest, some of the really contentious, and

high stakes, and important conversations we had, in addition to revealing these issues that Bryan has mentioned, also dented some of the trust that we have that students' right to learn will be respected, that academic freedom will be protected, and that we actually have a way to balance those things and do right by everyone in the situation. Next slide. And so, the resolutions that we've put together have both an institutional purpose and also a community purpose. They have substance to them, which we'll talk more about. But they also have a preamble that reaffirms our commitments because when faculty senate votes, we are speaking for the faculty. And I've heard from multiple people that they weren't sure where the faculty stood on issues of academic freedom, on issues of right to learn, on civil rights issues. And so, these resolutions are an opportunity to collectively reaffirm to each other and to the university community what we believe in.

BRYAN SYKES: Next slide. So, the first resolution to create an ad hoc committee, the purpose of this resolution is to review Cornell Policy 6.4, the faculty handbook section 6.6, and the duties of the Cornell Office of Civil Rights with the faculty co-investigator. And the objective is to produce a policy report that reviews and evaluates points of similarity and difference in how the COCR and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty, the AFPSF, investigate complaints, define and interpret statutory language, evaluate evidence, and issue decisions. Next slide, please. The second resolution to create-- or in addition to that first resolution, there are several goals that we have outlined that include examining and recommending possible revisions to CUP 6.4, identifying ambiguous language, points of administrative discretion, also identifying excess confidentiality that impairs or limits the Faculty Senate deliberation on matters or resolutions that involve decisions within the jurisdiction of COCR and the AFPSF and different evidentiary and evaluation standards between decision-making bodies that can be assessed by independent legal experts. We are also-- This resolution also wants to identify temporal ordering and review times of processes related to complaint investigations, resolutions, appeals, and other imposed sanctions under 6.4 and the Faculty Handbook section 6.6. And then, lastly, this ad hoc committee would review the roles and duties of the faculty co-investigator in COCR. Next slide, please. The second resolution is to create a disciplinary case reporting and attestation tool. So, last fall we-- A number of the resolutions that came to the floor ultimately relied on information from the student newspaper and from other periodicals, which isn't the best source, in my opinion. It doesn't provide enough information or even reliable information, and there were a number of questions that a number of senators and faculty members had that we couldn't answer. And so, the purpose of this tool is to create a procedural reporting and attestation that could be used to inform faculty senate deliberations and resolutions as a part of shared governance, that is information sharing, thereby closing the existing information gaps. And so, the objective and goal of this tool are to inform senate about whether core issues, and elements, and processes, and outcomes of disciplinary cases were followed in a way that does not violate complaint and respondent confidentiality for members of the AFPSF. And this tool will also require committee members to attest that processes and procedures were followed and that it will allow for the reporting of any irregularities. And so, we've recently heard feedback from the AFPSF, and we'll adjust this resolution to also obtain reporting information from COCR and the faculty co-investigator in COCR. And so, we intend to revise this resolution so that the COCR, the faculty co-investigator, and the AFPSF each have an independent reporting mechanism whereby members of the investigatory and appellate bodies share information with the faculty senate on any concerns about the process, evidence, and/or

evaluation standards at any stage of a complaint and its resolution. Next slide.

NATE MATIAS: Yep. One other thing, we've heard from a number of administrators that they wish we all knew all the things they do to protect academic freedom that we don't necessarily hear about. And rights are not a numbers game, right? If my rights are violated and 99 other people's rights are protected, that doesn't outweigh the one that didn't go well. But we thought it might be a helpful tool for building trust if there were an academic freedom annual report, and so we have a resolution about that as well. Next slide. Finally, we just want to acknowledge the many people who've spoken with us. And note a few things, this is work, this is not nothing, but we think it's worth it. We're grateful to the AFPSF for the feedback that we're going to take into the attestation tool resolution. And we know it's going to be tricky to create something like a transparency report that actually works, but we think the endeavor of building trust is worth it. So, thanks, everyone. If there's time, we're happy to take questions. Hopefully, there's a little bit of time left.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Questions and comments. If you're here and have a question or comment, just step up to either of the mics. You can ignore the color coding for now. If you're online, raise your hand. We typically start online with-- So, Tracy Stokol.

TRACY STOKOL: Thank you. I'm speaking on behalf of the AFPSF, and I'd like to thank both Bryan and Nathan for this resolution-- or these three resolutions. We have discussed the resolutions before any more modifications that we received. And we are absolutely in favor of an ad hoc committee being established to review policy 6.4. And I'd also actually add policy 4.6 to that, which deals with unethical potential behavior and disciplinary actions against faculty. So, it's very vague. And I think that could be added to this ad hoc committee's duties potentially. We have no problems issuing an annual report on academic freedom from the administration. This can be done with confidentiality on the same lines that the Research Integrity Council reports to the Faculty Senate every year on the number of cases where there are either reported violations of research ethics, and those that have gone to inquiry stages, those have gone to investigations, and the final outcome without divulging any confidential information. As far as the attestation, we have strong reservations about this and are currently opposed to that resolution as it stands. And that's because we are quite concerned that if we are doing our best job on these committees as volunteer faculty, and we're interpreting these policies to the absolute T, and reading them over and over again when an issue comes up to make sure we are following them to the letter of the law, as Cornell has written. However, mistakes do happen. And we are quite concerned that if we attest that we followed the procedures, that there will still be some minor issue, minor mistake, or something that comes up that, despite our attestation, we will end up being the fall guys for a situation that may go sideways with the appeals. So, we are opposed to that attestation statement because we are quite concerned this could be used against us, and we have personal experience with us taking-- being blamed for something that didn't go as it should go, and this attestation statement is problematic in our view.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Who is first here? Go ahead and identify yourself, and try to keep it to two minutes.

TRACY MCNULTY: Sure. Tracy McNulty, Senator from Romance Studies. First, Bryan and

Nate, I want to thank you for your effort and the spirit in which you're proposing these draft resolutions. I think there's a lot to discuss there. As I shared with both of you in writing, I do have some questions about exactly what is being proposed. I think there's a need for quite a bit more precision. I want to second the comment that Tracy just made. I think that's an important one. I have a question, really, about the third draft resolution, the report on academic freedom. Could you say more about specifically what are you envisioning? Like, who would write this report? What would it be based on? I mean, I have to say, for example, I feel no confidence in a report that we drafted by the administration on this subject. So, I'd like to know sort of who would be involved. What would that look like? You know, how would a case that is a case of academic freedom be identified? Would this be on the basis of formal complaints? So, if you could just sort of flesh that out a little bit more.

BRYAN SYKES: May I?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes, absolutely.

NATE MATIAS: Sure. I think what we were envisioning was a report that was drafted by the administration. Ultimately, any transparency effort, and this is one of the things I study in my research, any transparency effort faces the challenge that they are created under situations where two parties may not be fully trusting of each other or they might be in a trust but verify situation, and so you create a description of what you want to exchange between your two entities in order to build that trust. And I think for someone who has absolutely no trust in the administration, adding more paperwork to that process might not be very persuasive. But to those who are willing to believe that the administration would, in good faith, report cases of formal requests to take action that would affect a faculty or staff member's academic freedom and report the process and outcome that was applied, I think that could go a good ways to building up trust.

BRYAN SYKES: And if I can just respond to the earlier comment about the attestation tool, I would just say that we're open to revising this resolution, and also that in our sort of conversation about this, we imagine this to be a reporting tool, not something that could be used against the committee members, but rather when the faculty receives information about complaints that the members of the committee have an opportunity to express themselves or any reservations or other issues that they may have identified or any irregularities. And so, that they're testing that that is what they identified, but not necessarily that the committee will be a fall guy for the administration in any sort of outcome.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman, online.

KEN BIRMAN: Yes, Ken Birman, Computer Science. I want to thank the team for putting these proposals forward and simply say that I believe that they are in good faith, and are constructive, and that this process really would have helped us last fall when we obviously struggled with a lot of issues. I don't believe that, at least I'm not aware of any situation where anybody who was on a committee was ever in some sense charged with failing to follow the policies of the committee. So, I'm not worried about this attestation concern, but perhaps the word attestation is simply too strong a word. And simply by adjusting the wording in a friendly motion, things could move forward. But I believe that these three motions are just what we need at this point. I can't say that

I speak for my colleagues because I didn't have a chance to discuss this with them. I'm out of town right now. But I think that my sentiment would match the sentiments of at least most of my colleagues.

BRYAN SYKES: Yes, and we're happy to change the word from attestation to certification, if that's helpful.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. Okay, Bill Katt, BTS, and hey, the microphone's on now. So, question on each of the three of these. For the first, we've heard from President Kotlikoff there is already a committee examining these policies. It's already been selected from our peers throughout the faculty. Can you speak to the value of starting another committee to repeat the same work before we know the conclusion from that already existing committee who's already done a lot of this work? For the second, who--

EVE DE ROSA: Maybe I should answer that before the second. So, we haven't formed a committee yet. And so, this is the work that will be happening in the coming weeks. But we do know that Katie King will be part of the committee, and somebody from the AFPSF, and the two of these guys here.

BILL KATT: OK, so it sounds like I misunderstood what already exists.

EVE DE ROSA: Yeah, it is moving forward but is not there yet.

BILL KATT: OK. So, for number two, if somebody had evidence that something went wrong in one of these disciplinary hearings, who would they report that to currently? Is there nobody on campus that already exists to do that? And do we want the faculty senate to become basically the de facto arbiter of whether disciplinary cases are proceeding correctly? In terms of the third, I always wonder when we post these resolutions, has anybody actually just asked the administration for a report like this, do we need a full resolution, or can we just ask somebody to assemble the report and share it with us.

BRYAN SYKES: Well, to the second question about-- Trying to remember it all of a sudden. Do you-- Who would you currently-- if there was a problem? That's a great question. I don't know the answer to that question. I think that that's something for members of the AFPSF to answer. But the purpose behind this resolution is not that if they are reporting it to someone else, we still are siloed off from having that information. And so, to the extent that the Faculty Senate wants to bring any resolutions or motions in and of itself with some level of credibility, higher credibility than the student newspaper, which, you know, I love our students, but we're talking about high stakes game here, or issue here, and so I don't think that we should ignore any sort of internal proceedings and information on them at that expense. And so, I would say that, like, yes, I'm sure there's some other reporting tool or mechanism. I don't know. I'll let the committee members speak for themselves. But I am much more concerned about how uncomfortable I felt last fall having to vote on something where I didn't have information from my colleagues. And that is concerning to me.

NATE MATIAS: And then, on that third question of why not just knock on the administration's door and ask them for a transparency report? Why ask Senate to vote on it? I think it's appropriate for the faculty to be the ones to make a request like this. Firstly, because we wanted to go through a process that solicits buy-in, and amendments, and input from the Faculty Senate. If we're going to ask for something that affects the faculty, it's reasonable to ask this body. And then, also for all the reasons we mentioned earlier about norms and community, where these things coming from the body that votes as Senate can be powerful, positive statements, as well as coordination with the administration. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: One more quick comment.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Can I use this one? The mic is at about the right height, and I'm holding a laptop. Thank you. Elliot Shapiro, RTE Senator from Arts and Sciences. I really appreciate the work you're doing and the spirit behind it. I had a sort of local question about the report on academic freedom. It's in the resolved paragraph, the last one, and it says, "Such a report would disclose the number of external requests and internal disciplinary proceedings that involve the university administration regarding faculty, student, and staff speech and behavior." And that strikes me as extremely open ended. I wondered if-- is that deliberately open ended? Is sort of any disciplinary proceeding involving those behaviors sort of by definition and potentially an academic freedom question? And I'm asking purely for information, but it felt like there was-- Again, I didn't have much of a sense of scale or whether the open-endedness was on purpose, or again, whether that's considered de facto an academic or potentially academic freedom violation. Thank you.

NATE MATIAS: Great question. We deliberately left it a bit open-ended because there are a great number of details that any process to create such a report would need. And we thought we could go into the weeds and work through all the legal, and privacy, and procedural details, or given the fact that senate, particularly in this case, has an advisory capacity, we could use this as an opportunity to express the will of the faculty, and then meet the administration in the middle on the implementation. Though, since these are drafts, if anyone has specifics you'd like to see in this, the next month is a great period to reach out to us. Thanks.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We're going to move on to item Student Conduct Code Review Update. There'll be 15 minutes of presentation and 10 minutes of senate discussion. And I believe there are one or two presenters here who will introduce themselves since I don't really have the names in front of me.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: All right. Hello. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ashleigh Newman, and I am an associate clinical professor of clinical pathology in the College of Veterinary Medicine. And I'm a member of the Code and Procedures Review Committee, and I am joined by my Colleague here who will introduce herself.

JENN MICHAEL: Hi, everybody. My name is Jennifer Michael. I'm the Senior Director of Student Experience in the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning. We're very grateful to be here today and get the feedback that you'll share. As members of the Code and Procedure

Review Committee, we want to begin by sharing a little bit about our role.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: The Code and Procedures Review Committee was convened to gather feedback and make recommendations regarding the content and structure of the Student Code of Conduct and its associated procedures. We are a non-voting committee, which means our role is to listen, gather input, and share that feedback with the committee regarding proposed revisions to the code and the Student Code of Conduct procedures.

JENN MICHAEL: It is important to recognize that this session is not about who holds authority over the code or its procedures. That topic is outside the scope of our charge. We are here to focus on the recommendations for improvement to the code and the procedures themselves.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Additionally, if you have feedback related to individuals who work in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, OSCCS, we kindly ask that you direct that feedback to the Dean of Students, Marla Love. This session is not the appropriate space for personnel-related concerns.

JENN MICHAEL: So, the session will run with-- We start with an 11-minute video that provides an overview of the current structure. And after that, we'll have time for suggestions and feedback from all of you. Yes, please.

VIDEO: This video provides a general overview of the 2020 Student Code of Conduct and the associated procedures at Cornell University. Let's start by clarifying what we mean by the Student Code of Conduct and the associated procedures. The student code of conduct, or the code for short, defines prohibited student behavior. This includes, but is not limited to, conduct such as underage alcohol consumption, theft of property, or engaging in hazing. The code applies to all students and student organizations when conduct occurs on campus or on property used for educational purposes. It also applies to student conduct involving university computing and networking resources from remote locations, online behavior, or any conduct that threatens the university's educational mission or the safety of individuals. You can find the current 2020 code of conduct online by scanning the QR code on your screen. Some community conduct is not covered by the code. For example, faculty and staff conduct does not fall under the current code, nor does conduct of Weill Cornell students and students that are not degree seeking. Additionally, some student conduct is covered by alternative processes. Conduct related to academic integrity is addressed through the Code of Academic Integrity. Sexual and related misconduct is addressed through the Cornell Office of Civil Rights. And conduct specific to athletic teams covered by the NCAA is addressed directly through athletics. The procedures, on the other hand, refer to the step-by-step process to resolve a conduct case. The procedures identify the various ways that a case can be resolved to reach a final outcome. The various pathways a case can be resolved will be shared later in this video. You can view the current 2020 procedures using the QR code provided. Together, the code and the procedures establish behavioral expectations and articulate the process to uphold community standards and ensure a safe, fair, and educational environment for all of the campus community. Both the code and the procedures are eligible to be reviewed annually to ensure each remains relevant and effective. The process to do so is outlined in the code. The code and the procedures are administered by the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, a department within the Office of the

Dean of Students in the Division of Student and Campus Life. This office was created in 2020 to administer the current code and procedures through an educational and restorative student experience that uphold community standards while promoting personal development. The office engages in prevention education and strives to support students navigating conflict in a transparent, fair, and equitable process. Let's now turn to a high-level overview of Cornell's student conduct process under the current code and procedures. This slide depicts a snapshot of the entire process of the procedures. The top boxes reflect the initial assessment of reports, while the bottom section inside the bolded red box are the possible resolution methods under the procedures. Let's zoom in for a better understanding, starting first with the initial assessment. The initial assessment starts when an incident report is submitted to and received by the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, followed by the review and assessment of the incident report by staff in that office. From there, there are several potential courses of action. First, no action is taken in situations where the behavior reported is not a violation of the code or there is no respondent identified. Another option is that the report could be referred to a different office. If the report does not rise to the level of a conduct violation, or if the report is required to be addressed by a different office, it will be referred elsewhere. For example, if the report alleges sexual misconduct, it would be referred to the Cornell Office of Civil Rights. If the report involves a Greek life recruitment violation that did not allege alcohol, hazing, or other prohibited conduct under the code, it would be referred to sorority and fraternity life. If it was a minor infraction of residence hall policies that didn't meet the threshold for the code, it would be referred to housing and residence life. For some cases, interim action is taken. The procedures permit the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards to put in place a range of interim actions, which can include restrictions up to and including full temporary suspensions. Full temporary suspensions broadly prohibit the student from being on campus and from continuing academically. Other forms of temporary suspension allow limited access to campus and the ability to continue academically. Temporary suspension is imposed only when immediate action is necessary to protect the complainant or the university community. All forms of temporary suspension can be appealed to the vice president for student and campus life or a designee. An additional level of appeal to the provost of the university is available when a full temporary suspension impacts a student's academic continuity. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards also completes an ongoing assessment of whether or not the interim action remains necessary and can modify interim actions at any time as appropriate. The initial assessment is also when an intake meeting is held with both the complainant and the respondent, collectively known as the parties. The current code and procedures outlines the role of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards to resolve complaints between parties. A complainant can be either an individual who is personally impacted by the behavior reported or a designated complainant. A designated complainant is typically an individual that represents a university department that encountered the alleged violation. The most frequent examples of designated complainants are sorority and fraternity life, housing and residence life, or the Cornell University Police Department. The respondent can be either an individual student or a registered or recognized student organization. If the respondent is a student organization, the president of that organization serves as the representative of the student organization for the purpose of the conduct process. Once we have a complainant and a respondent and the intake has occurred, we move into the resolution process. Let's look now at the possible resolution options under the current procedures. Based on the party's intake, there are three possible ways to resolve the reports that come in. One method of resolution is non-conduct resolution. These are cases that

have no outcome of responsibility. Examples of reports that result in non-conduct resolutions include applying the Good Samaritan Protocol, which is a Cornell policy that encourages others to call for help when a student needs assistance from consuming alcohol and other drugs. In non-conduct resolutions, educational conversations around the intent of behavior versus the impact of behavior or warning letters for particular minor offenses, such as possessing a forged identification card or very minor theft at the Cornell bookstore. Another potential pathway is alternative dispute resolution, or ADR. Wherever possible, the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards tries to explore ADR. ADR is how the majority of conduct cases are resolved. It's important to note that an ADR resolution is completely voluntary and requires both parties to agree to this pathway. This means one party cannot insist on ADR if the other does not want to do it. Therefore, if there is not agreement about pursuing ADR, the matter will be resolved through the third option, a formal complaint. If ADR is mutually agreed upon, there are many possible avenues, including mediation, a restorative justice conference, or others. The ADR options incorporate varying degrees of restorative practices. Another important note is that ADR resolutions are all agreement based, meaning both parties have to agree on the outcome. If an ADR resolution cannot be reached, the conduct case must then be resolved through the formal complaint process. Overall, the ADR process is the most restorative and the most collaborative way to resolve a conduct case. The third and final option to resolve a complaint is the formal complaint pathway, which involves a full investigation. This is also the resolution method that takes the longest amount of time. There are three ways that a formal complaint can be resolved. First, a formal complaint can be dismissed by the director of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards. Examples of a dismissal is when the alleged behavior is not corroborated and therefore there is no violation of the code, or when there's a non-responsive complainant. If the director does dismiss the complainant's formal complaint, the complainant can request a hearing panel to review this decision. The hearing panel can uphold the director's dismissal or reinstate the formal complaint. You'll learn more about the hearing panel process shortly. The formal complaint can also be resolved via alternate resolution, which is not to be confused with alternative dispute resolution mentioned previously. An alternate resolution in the formal complaint process is a negotiated agreement between the complainant and the respondent and is the most common resolution under the formal complaint pathway. As was the case for alternative dispute resolutions, both parties have to agree to participate in the process and the ultimate outcome of alternate resolutions. The procedures currently require that all investigations be paused during the alternate resolution process, so that does lengthen the investigation timeline and the total time to resolution. Finally, a formal complaint can be resolved via a hearing. The hearing panel pool is comprised of 55 students, staff, and faculty members within the Cornell community. Five of these individuals are selected from the hearing panel pool to convene for each hearing. The hearing panel reviews the investigative record and report, determines whether the respondent violated the code, and determines the appropriate sanctions, if applicable. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards has no influence in the decision made by the hearing panel. A hearing panel decision can be appealed to a three-person review panel. The review panel is selected from the aforementioned hearing panel pool. Again, the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards has no influence in the decision made by the review panel. Thank you for your interest in the Code of Conduct and procedures. To learn more or to view copies of the 2020 Code of Conduct and associated procedures, please visit scl.cornell.edu or use the QR codes provided. Thank you.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Okay, so just to reiterate, during this session, our role is to listen and document. We're going to be taking notes, but we won't be responding to questions or debating points. That's not our place here. Instead, we are here to ensure that your voices are heard and your suggestions are brought back to the committee for consideration.

JENN MICHAEL: We'll now open the floor for your feedback, and thank you for being here to help us with this process.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, again, if you have comments from inside, come up front. If you're online and have comments, raise your digital hand. Go ahead. Identify yourself. I don't see anyone online.

TRACY MCNULTY: Hi, my name is Tracy McNulty, Senator from Romance Studies. Thanks for your work. I have a question. I know you said you didn't want to answer questions, but it's really a question about your process, which is that you're probably aware that this body passed a resolution in November about applications of the Student Code of Conduct and specifically about abuse of the temporary suspension provision, right? So, we identified a number of problems and also called for a certain number of remediations. And I'm wondering if you have seen that resolution and it's supporting documents, and if those are factoring into the work that you're now doing as a committee.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: So, I can say that again it's not that we don't want to answer questions, we're just trying to be uniform about it. We're not necessarily spokespeople for the code, but that, yes, aware of the resolution, and yes, we are looking at temporary suspensions as a part of the process.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering, also about the temporary suspensions. I know that some folks think of this kind of revision of the way we're doing things with regard to the student code as being kind of a sinister central administrative power grab of some kind. I don't see it that way. On the other hand, I think the bar is way too low for temporary suspensions. And we saw that last year in spades. That's thing number one. And that's got to be fixed, okay? That's thing number two. And in my opinion, thing number three is the more I look at the judge, jury, executioner structure of the new thing, the fishier it looks to me. I mean, I really don't like the idea of someone whom I admire a lot, Ryan Lombardi, for example, hearing appeals of his own rulings. I don't think that looks like a very just system. OK, so that's what I have to say, folks. That's my feedback.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Let me just ask if-- Ken Birman, are you supposed to unmute yourself, or do you have another question?

KEN BIRMAN: I have a question. Not really a question, more of a comment. In the fall, we saw-- I'm sure Richard Bensel is about to make the same point, that we saw a number of cases that were very, very prolonged. Richard introduced a number of motions related to one person in particular. I noticed that during the little video, there was no mention of the expected delay that a student might confront in an emergency appeal to the provost, for example, or the routine appeals of the process. So, I would urge that either the video be redone or that some other way of

communicating time frame be considered because I think it's very important for the students to understand, you know, where they stand in a process and how long it will take, and it informs their choices and their decision making.

RICHARD BENSEL: So thank you for the opportunity to-- Oh, Richard Bense, Department of Government. Thank you for the opportunity to review the process. Gene, I think you served on the hearing panel for Surrealm, is that right? GENE: Yeah. So, it was a very nice video, but it's a little bit off the point because it sanitizes a process with respect to interim suspensions that I think is very flawed. The disciplinary process now lacks a neutral adjudication process in which the complainant, the prosecutor, the judge, and those who hear appeals are independent of one another. What we have instead is a process in which these things are combined in one authority, an authority that consistently misrepresents itself. For one thing, the central administration refuses to acknowledge that police officers formally acting as complainants are often actually representing a high ranking official in the central administration whose role then remains anonymous. And in the Ginsburg case, which was just heard finally, 333 days after the supposed infraction-- in the Ginsburg case, President Kotlikoff actually directed arrests at the scene of the event and has thus been involved directly or indirectly in her entire prosecution. I think the only way to restore credibility and a sense of justice to the disciplinary process is to seriously limit the role of the central administration. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do we have other comments or questions? Do you have any closing words?

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Yeah, thank you. Thank you all for your feedback and engagement. I also wanted to say there is a website that details that there will be a 45 day open Cornell community feedback period. So, I would encourage you all-- There is another question-- to participate in that phase.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead, Betsy. BETSY: Yeah, two comments is, one, who can fill out a complaint at the very beginning, the first box? Like, I think it would be helpful to know who's allowed to fill those out, and the answer may be everybody, but I think you should make that clear. And then, I also think a timeline for each of these steps would be helpful to give an amount of time to make that more clear.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: All right. I also wanted to make sure that, again, on the website, it's there, but if you do think of things later or would like to share without speaking in front of everyone here, you can email codeandprocedure@cornell.edu, and that's a website-- or sorry, email that we're accepting feedback with. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Our next item of business is a presentation from Elaine Westbrook, the Carl A Kroch University Librarian and Vice Provost, who will talk for five minutes, presumably on the university libraries, and then that will be followed by 10 minutes of Senate Q&A. I think Elaine is online, so you can unmute yourself if you are.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: All right. Can everyone hear me okay?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: OK, great. All right. This is a lot to present, but I'll try to do this as quickly as possible. So, I wanted to get in front of this group just to share some things that are coming down the pike and ways that you can engage and contribute. But I could just start off by saying that it's no surprise or secret that higher ed and Cornell have been facing some challenges over the past year. We know that many of you, all of you, depend on the library for your research, teaching, and learning needs. And so, we know that some of the changes that we have to make are going to impact you, and so we have come up with a long term strategy to talk about how do we manage untenable situation with regard to our collections and the subscriptions that we license for you to do your research, teaching, and learning. I also just want to mention that we work very closely with the medical library while at Cornell Medical, and we have jointly worked with them on doing a lot of licensing. However, today's presentation will focus largely on the Ithaca campus and not our campuses in New York. Next slide, please. So, the question is, how do we get here? The biggest challenge we have is the budgetary situation. And so, the budget for collections has been flat or has been contracting over the past several years. And this is not just a Cornell problem, but this is happening across higher ed. The cost of journals continues to increase exponentially, far greater than inflation. And this has been a problem literally for the past 30 years. We've been dealing with a serious crisis, and it has not gotten better. It's just gotten worse. The other thing to keep in mind is that collections, or I would say articles in journals, just keeps getting more and more. There are more journals every year. There are more articles every year. Just to give you a statistic, there are approximately 47,000 academic journals. That's a lot, and so we're always being asked to license more and more journals. And given the growth of journals, this is just not sustainable. The other things that are playing into this is the fact that there are more researchers internationally, technology is changing, the way people can produce scholarship, and then of course, publisher parish is also a culture that has fueled the surge in academic research. And I would close by saying this is just not sustainable for us, and we can no longer afford to buy access to journals as the prices continue to go up and our resources go down. Next slide, please. So, I just wanted to give you a picture into part of our collections situation. And so, right now, we spend approximately 80% of our collections budget only on electronic materials, right? So, that is a significant shift away from things used to be. But more importantly, in this slide, I'm demonstrating that three multinational publishing companies control 25% of our budget. So, that might not seem like a big deal, but I can tell you this wasn't the case 10 years ago. 10 years ago, this pie chart was much more varied and looked quite different. But we're at this point where the publishers are consolidating, and they are responsible for more of the publishing and research that is going on. And this is a troubling trend that we see. And so, I would predict that Elsevier is going to continue to take up a bigger share of the pie. And I also want to make it clear that Elsevier, Wiley, and Springer, they publish in all different disciplines, but primarily, they are STEM areas. What else can I say? Okay, next slide, please. So, I just want to give you a picture of how expensive many of these journals are. And so, one of the things that we're looking at now is Wiley. And so, I have good news. So, from the time I shared this presentation until today, we've figured out a way to not reduce our Wiley subscriptions right now. We believe we will have to do that next year. But for now, we are basically going to stay the course, but it's still important for you to know that this is \$1.1 million.

This is a lot of money. And here's just example four of the titles that-- it's like the cost. Like, for one journal, we're talking about \$39,000. This is not sustainable. Next slide. Okay, one of the things that we have to do is also unbundle our Oxford University Press package, and that is something we're working on right now. And Oxford University Press, I mean, this is a lot less expensive than Wiley and Elsevier, as you will see, but this is still a significant amount. And you should also know that Oxford University Press obviously covers a lot of humanities, but it covers STEM as well as the social sciences. But again, here are some examples of the cost of some of the titles that we have licensed in the past. So, the one thing I can also mention is when I use the word unbundle, that means that I'm moving away from this big deal package, which is in the-- I would say once journals became primarily electronic, publishers started bundling hundreds and thousands of titles, and calling it a big deal. And the challenge is these big deals leave us very little flexibility. The costs continue to go up. And quite honestly, the big deals have come to the point where we license these big deals because we only want the premium content. So, it's kind of like a cable package. Like you only want HBO and Cinemax, but you have to pay for that and about, you know, 300 other stations or channels. So, this is something that we're moving away from to get a little more flexibility. Next slide. So, this is the big one, though. Elsevier Science Direct is by far our biggest license. We have a three year deal where we're paying \$3 million a year for \$9 million, and we can no longer afford to do this. This is just one of these situations where it's not just us that we can't afford it. I know that Columbia is canceling their Science Direct big deal. I know that UNC Chapel Hill has done it, Emory, Colorado, many organizations, many great universities cannot afford this content. And so, we are working on figuring out how we're going to do this for this entire year. So, what we are doing is we are being very thoughtful, and we are looking at lots of metrics to make good decisions about which titles you'll have instant access to and which titles you will have delayed access. And so, we are taking this entire year to make decisions, and then we will have a new, I would say, contract or license with Elsevier that will start in January of 2027. Next slide. So, as I started to mention, our journal subscriptions, we have to look at many different metrics. And number one is budget. And we have to live within our means. And so, that's the first thing we look at. We also look at the usage. With electronic journals, we know how many times they're being downloaded, and, views and things like that. That's important information. We look at the authorship and how much researchers are authoring articles in these journals. We will engage with anybody across campus. You can invite me, or you can invite your liaison librarian to come talk to you about, particularly, Elsevier journals, because this is a very big package that we have to unbundle. And we're in the process of negotiating, and we're actually going to continue to negotiate with Elsevier between now and summer. And so, this is a very lengthy process. But I think what's really important is that we will be engaging you in this process, and we will not make decisions just based on usage. So, for example, we know for a fact that if we were to make decisions on usage, we know there are certain departments in the humanities and social sciences that we would never license those materials because the numbers just don't compare to what we see in chemistry and some other areas. And so, we have a very thoughtful process where we don't only rely on one metric or indicator to decide whether or not you're going to have instant access or delayed access. And again, all of you have a liaison librarian. And so, I encourage you to reach out to that librarian with questions that you have because we have a lot of time to go through this process, but it's going to be here before we know it, and I just wanted you to get as much advanced notice as possible. Next slide, please. As I mentioned, it's about delayed access, right? And so, I know many of you have used our interlibrary loan service. And one thing I could say is

our services are quite efficient, and we believe that in this situation, we can basically get you what you need anywhere from two hours to perhaps three days. And what we'll do is we will use a third party to expedite access so that you can get the materials that you need. And so, just to be clear, we license thousands of titles. And in this situation, if we're not licensing the title, the only way you're going to get access is through interlibrary loan and document delivery, and we will provide that service for you, and we will try to get you the material you need as quickly as possible. And that's what I mean by delayed access. You will not be able to just get it instantly like you do now, but you will get it, hopefully, within 48 hours or less, but I know in some cases, it could be longer. Next slide. Okay. So, what can you do to help? Well, this academic publishing ecosystem is not sustainable, it's not equitable, it's not open. There are lots of problems, and I can talk about all of these for hours. But one thing I could just say is that one of the challenges we have is that the publishers own the intellectual property. And so, the first thing you can do is return your own copyright and not relinquish it to the publishers. Secondly, we want you to talk to the societies because what's happening is more and more societies are selling their journals to Elsevier, Wiley, and Springer. And as societies are trying to generate revenue, that is creating problems because once it goes into one of those big publishers, the costs go up, and then I cannot afford to license it. Number three, if you are in a society, if you are the editor, if you're publishing for them, you have to advocate for price transparency and affordability and to say, "Look, we are working. We are giving our free labor to this journal or to the society. The least you could do is be transparent about your costs, whether it's your article processing charges or the cost to the library." We need your advocacy. Fourth, work with us. We have amazing experts in the library, whether it's copyright or liaison librarians. But if you're interested in flipping your journal, and you want your journal of your society or another group to be published by a nonprofit, as opposed to one of these multinational companies that are making billions of dollars off of your free manuscripts that you give them, we can talk to you about that process. It's not easy, but it's something that we do have expertise in, and we can help. And fifth, open access is important, and open access is often misunderstood. And I would just ask that you think about what open access means and that open access journals still are peer-reviewed and quality journals, and not to think about open access only as predatory journals, or the paper mills, or the bad things that were happening. So, there are lots of things that you can do to help. Next slide. So, this is just wrapping up. Here's my contact information. Here's our webpage where you can go and find updated information. And then, there's this link to cul-unbundling@cornell.edu that you can send your questions or concerns to us. We want to hear from you. And we recognize the inconvenience that this is going to cause, but we want to work with you to find a way to get you what you need. So, I'll stop here and take any questions that you have.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: SC Prior.

SC PRYOR: Hello, Elaine. Thank you so much for coming, talking to us, telling us bad news. Never fun, right? Cornell used to have an open access fund to encourage us to publish in open access journals. So, far as I know, that was actually closed.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: That's correct. Again, unfortunately, that's a casualty of our budget. We could not afford to provide those funds to pay for article processing charges.

SC PRYOR: Thank you.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. I was wondering if you could speak a little bit more about how the interlibrary loan really works at a nuts and bolts level. Not too deep, obviously. And would it be viable to talk with our interlibrary loan partners and say, "We'll buy the Elsevier, you buy the Wiley, you buy the Oxford Press," and sort of try to split the difference that way so everybody is getting the journals, but not necessarily buying them?

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Sure. So, the first thing is interlibrary loan is essentially you make a request, and I have a team of folks who will find a library that owns that particular book or who could send us a digital copy of the article. It's kind of that simple. And we also have an agreement with the Ivy Plus Libraries, where you can borrow things directly from them. So, it's a pretty straightforward service that we have, and it's been amazing because we've never been able to buy everything. But we will definitely spend more time on promoting our interlibrary loan and document delivery services so that you know how it works and how you can take advantage of it. As far as your second question, I'm in contact with my colleagues all over the world about this very issue. But one thing we have to be pretty clear is that we cannot talk to other libraries about prices and collude to drive down the prices. That is an antitrust violation. And unfortunately, some of our colleagues sign non-disclosure agreements, and so you can't even have a discussion about what things cost. So, we are in alignment with all the librarians. We are basically on the same page regarding these costs, but it is not tenable for us to say, "Well we're going to do Elsevier, and you're going to do--" That is just not the way it works. And all of us license Elsevier, all of us license Wiley, we all do Springer, and the electronic content is-- it cannot be divided because of copyright rules. So, we have copyright. That is a major impediment to sharing information. And the second part is antitrust rules make it difficult for us to divide up all the content and different organizations or universities by different publishers. That's just not the way we've been able to do business.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We're sort of out of time, but I'm going to keep going, and we'll try to make up the time somehow later. We'll go online to Betsy Bihn.

BETSY BIHN: Thank you. I was wondering if you-- if there's a master list of the journals you are considering dropping as you unbundle that's transparent to the faculty or that we can share so that people know what's being viewed using your metrics, what you're likely to get rid of.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Yeah. So, what we will do is-- Again, we're still in negotiation, so we're a really long way from that, particularly with Science Direct and Elsevier. But we are happy to send out a survey that will include a list, right? And so, you will have an opportunity. And also, working directly with your liaison librarian, that's another way to be able to share your feedback because we have a lot of indicators that we use. And I just also want to be clear that if we make a mistake and we end up canceling a title, we often have the opportunity to swap titles and say, "Look, we made a mistake with this one. We're not going to cancel that." So, there are a lot of mechanisms in place that we can work with all of you. And if we make a mistake, we can reverse it.

BETSY BIHN: Okay, thank you. And just for my ignorance, does every department have a specific liaison librarian?

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Yes.

BETSY BIHN: Okay, thank you.

BRYAN SYKES: Yeah, I have a quick comment and quick question. Oh, Bryan Sykes, Brooks Public Policy. Many associations, as a part of their memberships, also provide the very access to some of the journals that may be in the collection itself. And so, I was wondering if you've thought about communicating with faculty about what professional associations they belong to that provide access to those journals already. And the same is true for graduate students. And then, I guess the quick question that I have is more around the negotiations. You've alluded to how our labor as editors and members on the board contributes to the money that these publishers make, but there's also the labor that goes into actually just being a reviewer if you're not a member of the editorial board. And so, to the extent that faculty are doing reviews for a number of different journals, I'm wondering if that's part of the negotiation strategy because if faculty just stopped reviewing, then the journals don't have anything to put forward. And I know that sounds absurd and ludicrous, but you know, that is still a negotiation tactic or strategy potentially.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Yeah, I mean, I could say that there are some institutions. So, for example, the University of California had canceled its Elsevier contract, and many of the faculty decided to boycott Elsevier journals. So, that is a personal choice for people to make, but it has been done at several institutions. I think to address one of the earlier comments you made, we operate at a scale, like we license millions of things, and so the fact that many of you might have access to a few titles is not something that we've really engaged in a discussion about because at the end of the day, we license for everyone and we have copyright rules that we have to follow. And so, individual licenses don't necessarily support the way we make materials accessible.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Mark Lewis online.

MARK LEWIS: Thanks for the opportunity. I really appreciate your presentation. It was really enlightening, even though you may be aware, I do hear a lot about this in my home because I'm married to a librarian. But my question-- I have one comment and one question. A comment, firstly, I think I understand it to be that every department has a librarian, but every librarian is not assigned to a single department. So, what I mean by that is there may be one librarian for two or three departments, not one librarian for every department. That's just clarification.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Absolutely.

MARK LEWIS: Yeah, that's what I thought, just being efficient. And then, the second question. My question is about archive and indexing. What I don't understand, and maybe you can help me understand, is if archive is a place where people can put preprints, and they stay there forever, and then one may have a two-day delay to get the actual published article, is it at all possible to index it to say, "I can't get you a published article today. Maybe it would be a two- or three-day delay, but this may be the same article in archive, which you can't have access to immediately." Does that make sense what my question is?

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Oh, completely. I mean, you're absolutely right. That is-- I had to remove that slide because I only had five minutes, but that is one of the things our interlibrary loan does. People make requests, and we sometimes send them to archives. Sometimes we send them to [indiscernible] Trust. Sometimes we send them to other repositories like SSRN. So, we are committed to getting you what you need. And we could say, "Hey, we can get you this preprint." And then, maybe six hours later, here's the published article or the version of record. And to your earlier point, you're absolutely right. I mean, every-- I don't have enough librarians to have one librarian to every department, but I have librarians that cover multiple departments and multiple schools. So, thanks for bringing that up, Mark. And then, the other part I wanted to mention is-- and I don't know how many more questions I'll have time to ask. Fundamentally, I believe this is a racket. All of you produce this intellectual property, you give it to publishers, and they package it up, and they sell it to me for millions of dollars. You do the peer review largely for free and you produce the intellectual property, the content for free, and then their shareholders make billions of dollars. It was not always like this. There was a point where you all had control over scholarly communication and the publishing. That is no longer the case. It is more concentrated, it is more profitable, and it is unsustainable, and that's why we're-- that's the biggest reason why we're in this pickle.

MARK LEWIS: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it.

TARA HOLM: My name is Tara Holm. I'm from the math department. I do have a library liaison, and I know who it is. I do have a library committee in my department, and my department has not been able to get very transparent information from our library liaison, and I suspect it's because he does not know it. And so, I would advocate to you, please do make this process transparent. There was the beginnings of an unbundling of Springer, and the math department library committee was heavily engaged in trying to figure out what was going on and what we could cut or what we should cut. And I would ask that you make these metrics very transparent. Math is a lot more like the humanities than like the sciences when it comes to libraries. We need our books. And I would plead that you be transparent with the budget, just as you have asked us to plead with the publishers to be transparent in their pricing. Please be transparent with us, for example, with the math library budget, with the math library endowments. And we would like to be engaged in that process. I would be delighted to invite you to our faculty meeting on May the 6th at 2:30 PM.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have little time. There's two more people online. I'm hoping those can be the last two comments. Mats Rooth, go ahead.

MATS ROOTH: Hi, this is Mats Rooth, Linguistics. Thanks for the presentation. Really interesting. I'd just like to check on what happens when a journal is flipped. Okay, so there's a journal which costs you \$30,000 a year. Then it's flipped to a group of open access activists who publish a journal. They have trouble getting any money at all. Do you send them \$1,000 instead of the 30,000, or what happens?

ELAINE WESTBROOK: That's a great question. It depends. There are so many different models that exist. But I know-- I mean, linguistics is an example. There have been some journals that have been flipped in that area. The one problem is that it costs money to publish. And so, I'm not saying that you're going to-- Miraculously, all the cost of publishing a journal will go away. Someone has to pay. The difference is when you flip it and it's a nonprofit, like a press, like a university press, I should say, like a-- not Oxford, not Cambridge, but a Cornell University Press, Duke University Press. The goal is not to generate more revenue. The goal is to publish it at cost and to generate enough revenue to maintain the operations. And so, it could be a lengthy process to transition, but unfortunately, I just don't have the time to go into the different kinds of models. There are some cases where we give money to open access publishers so they continue to publish. There's some cases where we give whatever we paid for the license, and that is how they generate, or that's how they continue to sustain their business. [Crosstalk]

MATS ROOTH: If I can follow up quickly. I'm involved in publishing, not a journal, but proceedings. And yeah, we've lost our publisher, and we've been offered an arrangement with Cambridge. They will charge the authors \$1,000 for each article. We can't even get \$1,000, period. Not from Cornell, like total \$1,000.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Yeah, that-- Yeah, go ahead.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: One more comment from Professor Fatemi, and then I think we have to end this discussion for now.

VALLA FATEMI: Thanks for this illuminating discussion and alerting us to what's coming ahead. I have some familiarity, and I've published in one journal that is a nonprofit and is completely transparent about its costs, but they depend on universities to voluntarily provide the costs that are needed to do that publishing, and they open their books about that. I've actually tried to contact the libraries before about can we support them when we do publish with them so that they can operate at cost, but that didn't go anywhere. Is there some different procedure that I should use to help our library support these journals that are trying to do the right thing and operate at costs as a nonprofit?

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Yeah. I mean, I'm sorry to hear this story because we definitely want to be able to support the publishers that are doing the right thing. We believe in open access. We believe that the research that you publish and the research at Cornell should be available to the world, we really do. The challenge is we are so fiscally constrained. We have very little money left to do the kind of supporting things like you mentioned. And I know there are several journals that are trying to make a change. And I've had some discussions with some of them and trying to figure out how can we support them. And it's just been really difficult. I mean, we're just so constrained. It would be good-- If you wouldn't mind just emailing me, and I'll definitely take a look and see what we can do because sometimes we can also contribute other ways than financially.

VALLA FATEMI: Yeah, and maybe as budget gets freed up, as you go through all this in the coming years, maybe some of that could be allocated to these contexts. But anyway, thank you again for all your efforts.

ELAINE WESTBROOK: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we have to move on. Our next item of business is a faculty disclosure form, a presentation by Avery August, Deputy Provost, who will have as little time as can be made possible. No more than five minutes, Avery, if possible.

EVERY AUGUST: All right, well, thanks for the opportunity. And I'll try to make this quick because this is an opportunity for us to share an approach that we're taking. If we can go to the next slide. So, some of you may be aware of this. And I just wanted to set up this context because it's been many years in the making, and the National Academies has been assembling groups to really try to address this issue of preventing sexual harassment in higher education. Many of you may have read news articles about this issue. Next slide. We've had a group at Cornell that has been engaged in this as part of the action collaborative, and I've indicated their names there. Lauren Branchini from the former Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX, and now the new Cornell Office of Civil Rights. Laura Rugless, who was the director of that office who since left. Chris Schaffer, who has been very engaged in this process for many years and we've consulted with. He's on the line now. We were trying to do this together, but he was traveling, but I think he's on the line and can answer questions around the action collaborative. And then, Carol Grumbach, who was with us in the Office of Provost, and they had been engaging with the national academies around this issue. Next slide. We sort of picked this up from a different perspective and have been working for some time now to develop a process for trying to get at individuals that we're hiring within faculty positions to get a sense of whether they have violated any of their employer policies related to or governing unlawful discrimination and harassment, including academic and research or financial misconduct. We've spent a lot of time trying to work on fine-tuning the language on this disclosure form. We've gotten feedback from the deans, from the associate deans of academic affairs, from department chairs, from academic HR, Office of General Counsel. We've worked with the dean of faculty, who shared this with the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty, as well as the UFC. And so, what we're now sharing with you is the final version of this form that we will be deploying for individuals who are applying for positions at Cornell. Next slide. And this is the form that individuals who are applying to Cornell who will be asked to disclose or consent. The process will be that individuals who are being invited to interview on the campus. So, your sort of smaller list of finalists, three to five individuals, will be provided this form to fill out. This form will then be sent to academic HR, who will then assemble the material. If there's anything that's disclosed, we will follow up with the institution and the individual to get a better understanding of what's been disclosed. The idea really is to try to protect the individual who might have allegations or rumor, as well as protect the institution from hiring someone who may have violated their employer policy at a previous institution. And so, we really want to make sure we do a fair analysis of those findings and then provide that information to the unit so that they can make decisions. We don't anticipate that this will be a huge number of individuals, but we do want to make sure we have a process for determining whether an individual that we're looking to hire has violated an employer policy. Next slide. And this is the process as I just went through. The departments will provide their finalists that we're going to be invited to the campus for interviews with this form, and that form will then be sent to the HR unit. So, the department will not see the form. We're trying to separate the process so that the interview process and the hiring

process moves as quickly as possible, and then our HR units will follow up if needed on any information that comes forth, either with the institution that the individual is coming from, as well as with the hiring unit to determine the next steps. And so, then offer letters for new positions will include now language that says that we will be doing this information, and the offer will be contingent on successful completion. As I said, we don't anticipate that this will be a large number, if any, but we wanted to make sure we have a system in place to address this particular issue. So, I think Chris is on the line, and if you have questions about the work that the National Academies and the collaborative did, he might be able to answer those questions as well that align with this approach. I think the next slide is just for questions. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are there questions? We have time for one or two if you want to come up to the front. Identify yourself.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: I'll go with this one. Elliot Shapiro, RTE from Arts and Sciences. Thank you. This seems really important. It went by quickly, and the questions had to do with prior employment. Of course, some people are hired out of grad school and may not have been technically employees. I assume, again, this doesn't hopefully apply to very many people, but does the language cover that as well? I mean, did you violate things where you were before, even if where that was graduate school?

EVERY AUGUST: Yeah, that's a good question. And you're right about the term employment, but this is intended to address a prior institution where someone's appointed. So, that's an important point for us to ensure that everyone is aware of that. And yeah, thanks for that feedback.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Noah Tamarkin.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Yes, hi. Thank you. I just have a quick question. I'm thinking and tying it into the academic freedom questions. I feel like we've seen a number of instances in the past few years of various faculty being targeted within their institutions for their political views or process activity, and those would potentially show up as a potential violation, depending on where they're coming from and what was going on. And so, what I'm wondering is how is this actually going to be evaluated? And will there be a mechanism to make sure that we're just not rubber stamping other institutions violations of academic freedom and separating it out from like harassment and that kind of issue? Thank you.

EVERY AUGUST: Yeah, thank you for that question, Noah. And actually, part of the reason this has taken quite longer than we anticipated to do is to address that particular concern that has been raised. So, can we go back to the form, two or three slides prior? There we go. So, the first paragraph, we spent quite a bit of time trying to use language that really focused around unlawful discrimination and harassment, which is where my understanding and, I agree, the concerns come from. So, that's the first point is really to sort of focus in on that issue. And then, the second is this is-- there's a process for evaluating what that policy-- You know, even if one would anticipate that another institution will view issues around free expression and academic freedom as having been unlawfully discriminating and harassing against someone, we would be able to take a look at what that is and determine whether we-- you know, the conditions under

what that would happen and what decisions we would make in terms of moving forward with that person. So, we're really trying to address that particular concern while also trying to make sure that we address the other, you know, really serious issues.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you, Avery. We now have a good of the order, but before that, I seek unanimous consent to give our Dean of the Faculty, Eve DeRosa, just a few minutes to say a few things before we get there. Hearing no objections, we will add a few minutes to the faculty meeting. Go ahead.

EVE DE ROSA: Very generous of you guys. So, I just want to go very quickly through the updates that I had. One, we know that we approved the Collaborative Scholarship Resolution, so that is now Resolution 210. I wanted to share with you that we have a retirement advisory council now, and this has been a topic that a lot of faculty as they're planning for retirement feel vulnerable. And so, we have made a process where we have 12 faculty members who have a spectrum of time away from the university who can advise faculty as they plan in a confidential and one-on-one way. This is a collaboration between CAPE and Melissa, who supports them. Next slide, please. We're going to have another packed meeting next month. And so, again, we really want to bring the three resolutions that were presented today as draft resolutions. We'd love for those to come to the floor, so please provide them feedback so we can keep things going. We only have a-- we have quite a bit of work to do over the next couple of months. I guess the last thing I want to share-- Two. The next one, the next pop-up suit is in the computer and information sciences. It's in the new building. Come along. We're expanding how much we're going to cater so that more people can come and see the new building. And then, two, we're going to have a field trip again to Geneva campus, to the Agritech campus. It's on a Wednesday, April 15th, and we'll have a bus to transport you to that pop up soup event. And that will be it. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And our last order of business is a good of the order. We have Emily Zinger, a librarian who is online for five minutes. Go ahead.

EMILY ZINGER: Hey, thank you. Where are my slides? Hi, everyone. My name is Emily. I'm a librarian at Cornell, and I'm here today to represent the employee emergency CARE Fund. Next slide, please. The CARE Fund offers grants to staff and faculty who need help during a qualified non-reoccurring emergency. So, this includes situations such as a natural disaster, a catastrophic illness, a domestic violence emergency. So, for example, in past hurricane seasons, we've been able to support remote Cornell employees who experienced loss from severe storms. Next slide, please. The CARE Fund is overseen by Human Resources and run by a team of volunteers from across the university. It is for employees by employees and is supported by your generous donations. Next slide, please. It is open to Cornell employees who hold benefits eligible full or part-time position. And though I hope you never have the need to apply, know that the CARE Fund is available as a resource for you. So, in the past 15 years, 405 employees have received over \$500,000 from the fund. And if you're already a donor, thank you for the help you've provided for your colleagues in moments of need. But each year, grant applications surpass what our total donations can support, and this leaves a critical unmet need for help in our community. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. Currently, only 46 faculty members contribute to the CARE Fund. That is less than 2% of faculty at Cornell. And I personally think we can do better

than that. Next slide, please. We've set an aggressive goal to raise that number to 50% of faculty at any level of contribution. That could be a one-time donation, could be a few dollars per paycheck. Any amount of giving at that level would ensure stability and sustainability of the fund, and it would lead to larger awards, expanded eligibility, and greater reach for the fund. Next slide, please. So, if you're not already a donor to the CARE Fund, I'm here today to ask you to help. You can contribute in many ways, via automatic payroll deduction, Venmo, PayPal, check. Automatic payroll deduction, which is how I give, is quick to set up and a great way to know that you're helping others every month. You can also pay forward Cornell Appreciation Portal points to the fund. And I know not everyone is in a position to give, especially in this financial climate, but there are other ways to help. So, if everyone who is here today leaves and tells two people about what you've learned about this, that'll help spread awareness. So, next slide, please. Thank you for everyone who already donates. Thank you in advance if you're considering to donate. And thank you for your time, especially as we've gone a little over today. My email is on this slide. You can feel free to send me any questions that you have. Thank you.