Faculty Senate
October 28, 2026
Meeting Minutes

SAM NELSON>>We're going to start right now. I'd like to call this Faculty Senate meeting to order at this time. And according to our tradition, I am going to read our land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ̀' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ̀' 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꞉nǫ̀' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ̀' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. Okay. At this point, I'm going straight to the approval of minutes for the October 14th minutes. Do I have someone move for the approval of minutes?

>> Motion to approve.

SAM NELSON>> Great. Do I have a second?

>> Second.

SAM NELSON>> Okay. That being approved, we will move on to what I'm sure will be a busy schedule today. At this point, I would like to call Dean of Faculty Chris Schaefer to a review of debate ground rules and procedures. Thank you, Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Good afternoon everyone. I just want to remind folks about our-- Next slide, please. --basic ground rules for debate. We will do our best to alternate between folks who are in favor and opposed to the resolution, alternating between folks in person and on Zoom. We ask people to keep their remarks to two minutes, and we ask that folks keep disruptions minimized. We want to give everyone an opportunity to both speak, and we want to give everyone an opportunity to hear what's being said. I want to say, just briefly, a note about how pleased and proud I was of us, of the quality substance of the debate at the last minute, and I hope we can continue with that on this and other issues going forward. Next slide, please. So, we have been given advance notice of some potential floor motions today. I don't know what will or won't happen, but I thought it would make sense to briefly talk about the processes for how motions will be handled today if they're made so that there's no confusion. So, we've been-- we've received advance notice of two different potential floor motions. The first is a motion to commit. So, if this motion were to pass, it sends a resolution back to committee with instructions for what that committee should do. We've also received advance notice of a motion to amend in the nature of a substitute. If that motion passes, then it replaces the text of the no confidence resolution in its entirety with the text of the amendment. So, the way this will work, if a floor motion is made and seconded, then at that point, debate will switch to the floor motion. Debate on the floor motion will continue until it comes to a natural end. So, no one remains interested in making additional points or until there is a motion to call the question. A motion to call the question is not debated. It's immediately voted on, and it requires a two-thirds majority to pass. A motion to call the question, it's basically like the Senate ending filibuster in the US Senate. So,

that would end debate, and then we would go back to voting on the underlying motion. And voting on the underlying motion will pass by a simple majority. If a floor motion comes up, either Sam or I are going to slow us all down and take a minute to explain what a yes vote means, what a no vote means, and make sure everybody's on the same page. This body isn't used to rapid-fire parliamentary action, so let's all take a breath, do it slowly and carefully. For voting, ask now everyone who is a senator, please raise your hand and hold it up. Oh my God. Okay, so we clearly got forum. Everyone who's a senator is going to be handed a pink card. So, when we vote folks in person, we are going to, you know, hold your hands up for a while. We are going to take turns with yeas, do a full count, nays, do a full count, abstentions, do a full count. In parallel with that, folks who are on Zoom, we ask you-- Oh, everyone on Zoom, put your hand up. I appreciate that, but we won't be able to distribute pink cards to folks on Zoom. When it's yeas, we'll ask you to put your digital hand up. When we're done with the count, we'll ask everybody to put their hand back down, then switch to nays, then switch to abstentions. And again, ask you to take patience as we count these four votes. Some of these may be close, so we want to make sure we have an accurate count. I'm going to briefly call for any questions or concerns about these procedures before we move on.

>> Yeah. Could you explain in the case of a motion to commit, what would be the committee that the resolution would be sent out to?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: The question is about a motion to commit. So, I'll just go ahead and say that the motion that has been communicated to me would commit the no confidence resolution back to the University Faculty Committee with instructions that the University Faculty Committee hold the resolution until such time as the Yates report has been delivered to the University Faculty Committee.

>> Five more.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: [Indiscernible].

>> [Indiscernible]

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay, if there are no more questions. Last few senators, we have a few more pieces of paper that are coming. Otherwise, Sam, I think we're good. Thank you.

>> Okay, at this time, we're going to do the proposed resolution. I would like Professor Paul Ortiz, senator and professor of Labor History, ILR, to come forth.

>> What the *** happened now?

PAUL ORTIZ: That wasn't me. I may be wearing boots today, but I'm not that. So, I'll go ahead and start. Dear colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to reintroduce this resolution. I will repeat a part of what I stated on October 14th because there may be colleagues who are not here yet. Others may not have had the opportunity to listen carefully to my initial introduction of the resolution. Hundreds of students, staff, alumni, and faculty approached the sponsors of this resolution to emphasize to us that the Jane Doe case is but a tip of the iceberg. Since October

14th, additional students and staff have approached the co-sponsors of this resolution. Truly shocking stories of sexual harassment, stalking, and intimidation in their units, workplaces, and academic departments. Some staff report that they have been warned by their unit supervisors that if they speak out about sexual misconduct at Cornell, they will be terminated. These incidents are happening right now, even as we carefully deliberate, and they will continue to happen until we take decisive action. This is why I beg you today, do not delay the vote on this resolution. Since the vote of no confidence resolution was introduced, a veritable fortress of silence has been breached and new spaces for truth-telling have emerged at Cornell. Cornell alumni have told of their experiences of being sexually assaulted on campus. Some of the women who were raped at Cornell in earlier decades are now writing op eds, signing petitions, and sending pointed messages, vowing to cease giving to their beloved alma mater until we finally address rape culture until we listen to stories of trauma that had been buried by successive administrations. I've been asked by a rape survivor at Cornell to share the following story for them. "I was a Cornell student from 1967 to 1971. My senior year, I was grabbed from behind by rapist on the street in the fall semester of 1970 near my sorority, Alpha Epsilon Pi, on my way back from the library, two days after my 21st birthday. He put his arm around my neck in a chokehold and told me not to look at him or he'd kill me. I was raped from behind on my hands and knees." Cornell alumni have flooded the email accounts of the faculty co-sponsors of this resolution with the demand for action. They want action now. They applaud the Sally Yates investigation and other inquiries, but they are appalled that we would wait weeks or even months to come to conclusions that stare us right in the face. This is why we reject the arguments of some who assert that we have not-- that we do not have enough evidence to judge whether the administration should be held accountable for what has been happening on our campus for decades, and what is happening at this very moment. Given that sexual assault and rape are a decades long crises at Cornell, why does this administration administer sexual harassment training to incoming students that is judged to be, according to those students, "a travesty, a joke, not taken seriously". This train wreck of sexual harassment training could have been avoided, especially when there are Cornell faculty who designed sexual harassment training modules for workplace in New York and beyond. Alexandra Klein, class of 2018, a former [indiscernible] of Sexual Assault Week at Cornell University, wrote recently, "That Jane Doe was failed by Cornell's administration" merely repeats a pattern well known to survivors at Cornell. Of the students in Cornell's 2025 survey-- Oh, and by the way, I did have some slides. I don't see the slides.

>> Yeah, I don't know--

>> What slide would you like?

PAUL ORTIZ: So, I have four slides. Oh, they're on. Okay, good. I have no eyes in the back of my head. Thank you, though. Most of the current and former-- Okay, let me go back. Guys, probably should've worn my glasses. Of the students in the Cornell 2025 survey who said that they had experienced non-consensual sexual conduct, only 23% contacted a formal resource. Who is responsible for this? Most of the current and former students who have approached faculty to share their stories for being sexually assaulted at Cornell have told us that they were afraid to report these assaults because they felt that Cornell has often treated rape as "a PR problem" rather than a heinous human rights violation. Why endure the humiliation and trauma

of reporting their awful ordeal to the university or to the police when they feel they will not be treated seriously? Successive Cornell administrations have created what survivors of rape referred to as a "culture of fear that prevents many victims of sexual assault from coming forward to testify about being assaulted." As one student survivor of sexual assault told me, "Cornell will quash any incident they feel tarnishes its brand." Resolution sponsors have been told this same culture of fear exists at the Weill Cornell Medical Center. Aggrieved individuals at the Ithaca and Weill campuses do not come forward often because they understand and/or believe that the ordeals will be swept under the rug. Who is accountable for this, colleagues? It took the courage of Jane Doe, the investigative journalism at Cornell Daily Sun, and student protests to do what the administration should have been doing all along, prioritizing the safety, health, and well-being of our entire campus above concerns over image or brand. The opportunity to do something of lasting significance against rape and sexual violence in the USA is in our hands today. As Amnesty International has recently noted, "The stories from Cornell are gutting and enraging, but not surprising for so many sexual assault survivors who know what institutional betrayal feels like in our bones." Cornell is just one example of universities that keep trapping generations of students in the same exhausting cycles of administrative indifference. Join me today in holding this administration accountable as a signal to our students and to this nation that we cherish the safety and well-being of all members of our community. Thank you.

>> Okay. At this time, we would like a couple to speak for either side. [Indiscernible chatter]

>> Go ahead.

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: Okay. There should be a slide. There should be a slide with the motion on it. We move to refer to the resolution back to the University Faculty Committee, with instructions that the UFC return it to the Senate floor for discussion at the first regular Senate meeting following the public release of the Yates report. And I have two things I want to say. One is the official rationale that we wrote with the motion, and one is my personal support for it. Sorry. I'm Inna Zakharevich. I'm a senator from the math department.

>> [Indiscernible].

>> [Indiscernible].

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: Okay.

>> This hasn't been seconded. So, to talk about the--

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: It's been seconded.

>> Second.

>> Point of order. I have a point of order about this motion. And my point is that this motion to commit to the UFC to wait until a later time to have it discussed is not what a motion to commit is designed to do. It has instructions, but the instructions are to do nothing. And so, this is a dilatory motion, and it's simply being used to stop debate. It is not a motion with instructions to a

committee to do anything.

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: It is, in fact, a committee.

>> This is for the chair.

SAM NELSON>> Yeah. This is what we'll decide in the vote. Thank you for expressing your opinion on it, but it's not--

>> What is your ruling?

SAM NELSON>> My ruling is that the motion to continue.

>> Why is it appropriate?

SAM NELSON: Because it's not up to me, as the Speaker of the Senate, to decide if something is going to happen or not at the UFC. I believe there are instructions that have been done.

>> I motion that we let the representative finish the presentation. [Indiscernible chatter]

SAM NELSON: You're out of order. You're not allowed to just stand up and start speaking.

>> I'm asking for the secretary, as the parliamentarian, to rule on my point of order--

SAM NELSON: Yeah.

>> With regard to the substance of it.

SAM NELSON: I have ruled. I think it is substantive enough to continue the nature of free speech in this issue.

INNA ZAKHAREVICH: Okay, so first the rationale. Many faculty members have contacted us to say that a vote now would be premature and that they need more information before deciding on the proposed resolution. Many have also expressed a concern that voting against the proposed resolution with the understanding that it could be reinduced reduced when more information is available might be misinterpreted as affirming support for the administration. This is not the goal of this resolution. To avoid this, we believe that the right course is to refer the resolution back to the UFC until the Yates report is released and faculty have had time to consider its findings and recommendations. Referral does not prejudge the merits of the proposed resolution. So, my person-- So, the goal of this is to bring the vote back-- first regular meeting after the Yates investigation so that we can vote informed. If we're going to declare no confidence in the administration, a vote where the power rides entirely on our credibility as a body, it needs to be more than just an expression of displeasure. It needs to be airtight to read as an indictment with clear points about what the administration did wrong and what we would have liked them to do right. But we don't have that information right now. And in order to get it, we need the results of the Yates investigation. After it has run, if there is evidence of gross negligence or malfeasance

or dereliction of duty, I will be voting personally-- I would personally be for the resolution. But we don't know that right now. And the way it stands right now, you must either vote for it with no specific evidence or vote against it, seemingly in favor of the administration. And this is not a choice that we should be asked to make. To those who say that this is an-- Okay. To those who say that this is an urgent vote at a time of crisis, if we want to stop what happened to Jane Doe from ever happening again, we need to work effectively, which means being deliberate, magisterial, and impossible to ignore. A vote with no preambulatory clauses and no demands is the opposite of that. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Is there anyone that wants to speak on that proposed amendment? Remember, we have a two minute time limit because there's lots of people that want to talk.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Senator from Iowa. Just to finish up what I was saying before during the point of order. This is really a dilatory motion. It's clear from listening to the mover of this motion to commit that it's because she and perhaps the other people who are joining this motion don't like the resolution. They feel they don't have enough evidence of it to support it. There are many people who feel do have enough evidence to support the resolution of no confidence. That is not a basis to commit this to the UFC to sit and wait. UFC has nothing to do in the instructions other than to sit and wait until an unknown time after the Yates Commission issues its report so that it would come back to the Senate. That's simply not the basis for asking the committee to do anything, because it's just basically cutting off debate. It's a disagreement with regard to resolution. And I think we've had enough silencing about our positions.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

CSABA CSAKI: Hello, my name is Csaba Csaki. I'm a senator from the physics department. I would like to say a few words in support of the motion to refer the resolution back to the committee. All of us are deeply disturbed by what Jane Doe has described, and her experience deserves to be taken very seriously, but as scholars, we must act based on facts. Before we can judge the administration's response, we need to know what was done and when. Just as importantly, we need to know what steps are not taken, what could or should have been done differently, and whether there were any serious lapses of judgment. These are exactly the questions that the independent investigation, led by Sally Yates, will answer. Deferring the resolution to committee does not prejudge its content in either direction. Depending on what the investigation finds, I may very well support the resolution, but only once these facts have been established. For these reasons, I support the motion to refer the resolution back to the committee until the investigation is complete. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay, From Zoom, the first person in line. Could you state your name too?

[Chatter]

>> Vivian.

>> Vivian.

SAM NELSON: Vivian. Can you hear Vivian? Okay. Who's the first person in line? Go ahead, Misha. Hello? Can you hear us? Are they able to hear us?

>> Yeah.

SAM NELSON: Okay.

>> Move to Jessica.

SAM NELSON: Jessica, can you hear me? Is Jen there? Jen, can you hear me?

JENNIFER COLT: Yes, I am here.

SAM NELSON: Go ahead.

JENNIFER COLT: I'm Jennifer Colt, the senator for the library. One of the most distressing facts about the Jane Doe case is that there seem to be numerous bystanders who stood by while her assault occurred and did not stop it. This motion asks the Senate to become bystanders. It asks us to stand by and do nothing until the Yates report, even though we can judge for ourselves that we are watching a poorly handled crisis unfold in real time. We have observed facts. I have seen for myself the administration's disinterest in the outcome of Jane Doe's case. I have seen the administration minimize and patronize those who speak up in opposition to their handling of this case. I have read about the president ineptly questioning bystanders in a way that gave the impression of undermining Jane Doe's story. And I've also seen that information withheld from the Senate. I have watched the president assert that only he, a man in his 70s, can lead Cornell through this crisis because anyone else would be too destabilizing. The Yates report will only be a very useful accounting of what has happened in this case and other cases. But it is only a report. Afterward, it will require action. And in fact, we already know what happens when this administration is given a report on sexual assault. The President's Task Force on Sexual Assault completed a report that made several recommendations. One of the simplest was to improve the fraternity's scorecards web page. Do you know what the first thing you see on the Chi Phi scorecard today is? It's that they won an award for contributions to the Interfraternity Council. The second thing you see is that they want an award for inclusion. Jane Doe's case is mentioned nowhere on their scorecard. If you truly believe that an administration that cannot even bring enough focus to this issue to improve a website can address this problem, then vote down the no confidence resolution, but do not pass this motion and turn us all into do nothing bystanders.

>> [Indiscernible].

DEREK CHANG: I'm Derek Chang. I'm a faculty member in history and Asian American Studies, and I am acting-- one of the acting senators for the department this week. So, the sole reason-- the sole reason for committing the resolution to the UFC is to wait for the Yates investigation before rendering a poll on our confidence in the current university leadership. We already have enough information. Cornell's administration has a long track record of not acting

to protect our students from sexual assault. For more than a decade, reports have told university officials, from Presidents Garrett and Pollack to President Kotlikoff, from Provost Kotlikoff to Provost [Indiscernible] , from VP Lombardi to [Indiscernible] , that sexual assault has been and continues to be a disproportionate threat to our female students and an enormous, perhaps the single most significant impediment to our educational mission. In 2015, more than a decade ago, then President Garrett wrote that Cornell's specific data from a national survey "underscored that there is still more work to be done to educate and help protect our students." She continued, "Even one instance of sexual assault on campus is one too many." We have enough information [indiscernible]. In fact, in the intervening decades, surveys have consistently reported that a quarter of our undergraduate women on campus have been subjected to non-consensual sexual contact. That's the cost of continued delay. Continued delay by this dilatory motion simply means that we continue to wait, to wait for the Yates investigation and to wait for university leadership that has no record of acting on this issue. And it also means that our students therefore continue not just to be in harm's way, but in fact, to be harmed.

>> [Indiscernible].

IMMANUEL TRUMMER: My name is Immanuel. I'm a senator from the computer science department. So, I want to make sure that I'm taking the right vote on this issue. I just started recently in the Senate, and I already feel that this might be one of the most consequential decisions that I have to make through my tenure. I had a look at the prior work and some of the prior work by Sally Yates, in particular, a report about the US Soccer Federation. I think it is a very thorough investigation. She has identified systemic issues and has identified specific people who were at fault. The consequence of that report, we had several people in high positions stepping down. There were people were fired. There were definitely consequences. I think perhaps the same thing might happen at Cornell. So, I understand there's a lot of pressure on us to make a fast decision. I propose to resist the pressure and set focus on making the right decision. I believe that the result of this report will be informative for us and help us to make the right decision here. And this is why I support the motion to postpone the vote until we have the results of that report.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay, back to Zoom. Charlie.

>> It's Noah.

SAM NELSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I can see it there. Noah.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Yeah. Thank you so much. So, I really strongly think that we need to vote down this effort to delay. And I'm going to tell you, you know, not from anything prepared, but just from kind of deep in my heart where I'm feeling on this and where I'm coming from here. The students who have reached out to me, the students I'm in conversation with, they're very clear that they would see a delay here as a kind of furthering of the status quo of Cornell does nothing. They just kind of wait it out, and we're ultimately left to suffer. They ultimately don't care. And for me, that is at the core of why I don't have confidence right now. And it's at the core of why, you know, I would ask all of you, if you were to really kind of think about where we stand right now, all of the information we have right now, everything that's been said, everything

that's been done, everything that's come out so far, can you honestly say today, "I have confidence in this administration that they are going to be the ones to right this situation and lead Cornell out of this crisis of sexual assault"? Why would you think that, is my question, if you can honestly say you have confidence? If you don't have confidence, the only thing to do is to vote this effort to delay the vote down so that we can go ahead and debate why we don't have confidence. And if you actually have confidence, tell us why you're so confident. And then, we can honestly have a vote about whether or not we're confident. Thank you.

TRACY MCNULTY: Tracy McNulty, Senator from Romance Studies. The motion to defer rests on the assumption that in voting yes, we would effectively be making a finding of wrongdoing before a full investigation could take place. But this is not a legal finding for a guilty verdict, and we are not a court of law. Instead, we are asked to vote on whether we have confidence in the administration's ability to address the sexual assault crisis on campus. In my case, the answer is an emphatic no. President Kotlikoff has offered as evidence of leadership the fact that he convened a presidential task force charged with understanding and addressing sexual assault. When we look at the members of the task force, however, we see that it was made up largely of administrators with no special expertise or competence in this area. This follows a pattern we've seen repeatedly over the past several years, where the president's office puts together a committee or task force whose membership cherry picked by that office over represents the very administrators and campus units whose practices should be subject to scrutiny. It sidelines relevant faculty expertise and completely sidelines democratic processes for identifying and electing committee members who will truly represent campus constituencies. This is a pattern we've seen again and again, most recently, when the administration chose to ignore the resolution concerning abuse of temporary suspensions that this body passed overwhelmingly in November of last year. And it was subsequently passed by each of the campus assemblies. The administration not only chose not to address the serious violations of due process we identified or to allow a new democratically elected body to come up with a new policy, but actually doubled down by creating its own committee, again, largely made up of administrators who answered directly to the president or to VP Ryan Lombardi, the very person responsible for the most egregious due process violations, to rewrite the student code of conduct itself in a way that would allow for the harshest measures to be imposed without hearings or legal process. It effectively institutionalized the very abuses we sought to remedy. In all of this, we see a consistent pattern of Mike Kotlikoff deciding again and again that he alone knows what is best for Cornell and will do whatever it takes to impose that vision on the rest of us. This needs to change, and I believe that only a vote of no confidence will break through that hubris. Thank you.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. I want to thank all the students who wrote to all of us recently. It takes a lot of courage to talk to a group of professors you've never met to let them know how you feel. And they were form letters, and I don't care. It took a lot of courage to write those letters asking me to support the overall motion. I want to thank the students who've talked to me in person to say the exact thoughts. I want to thank professors who talked to me to support or object to the resolution. I want to thank everyone who's made their voice known. But I also want to highlight all the people who haven't made their voices known because they are absolutely terrified to speak in this environment. If we represent our faculty, if we do more than represent ourselves, we have to wait until the faculty we represent feel comfortable enough to let us know

how they feel for or against. Also, and I apologize if this is not germane to the motion on the screen, but I do have to say we've heard a couple of times there was no expertise on these panels the president has assembled. This is a lie. There's a lot of expertise on those panels. And there's insult to our colleagues, our friends from down the hall that people keep saying there's not enough expertise on those panels. If we want more input into choosing people, that's one thing. You should have recommended a way that we might have that, but we need to stop acting like people didn't know what they were doing or what made up those panels. There was a lot of talent in those panels. We've been getting good results.

>> So, Rebecca.

REBECCA SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

SAM NELSON: In the Zoom. Rebecca?

REBECCA SCHNEIDER: Yes. Can you hear me? Yes. All right. Great. Thank you so much. I'm Rebecca Schneider. I'm the senator right now for the Department of Natural Resources and Environment in the Ashley School in Cals. Our faculty overwhelmingly are in support of not waiting, not holding off, and voting on a no confidence. The rationale is that first, this resolution, as it's currently worded, is really about the overall issue of whether we have confidence in our leadership and how they're functioning, even at this point in time. Although, yes, we would like to definitely want more information about what happened two years ago, the reality is we were shaken by how little was done in the past four weeks. No timely response occurred when the situation showed up. And because of that, without having taken leadership, that's what allowed the media to take control of the messaging. And it continued on. It was always information was slowly given out. And that's-- So, we don't have confidence actually, right now in our leadership. The second big issue is that actually, this resolution has three different audiences. One is how we, you know, what we think about how well our administration is functioning. The second, though, is to our students, because universally we're all getting messages from our students about how they don't feel supported, how they're afraid to be on campus. And we need to-- And they say we need to see support from our faculty because we don't see it from our Cals, our Cornell leadership. And that's a second almost independent reason that we need to vote yes to that resolution. And the third is that we need, as faculty, to offset what's been done to our reputation nationally and internationally. We need to show that, no, all of Cornell does not just like, "Oh, we'll just let it wait till we get more information." We have to show that right now, we think there's a problem in how this is being handled. And we have to show that through the vote of no confidence. And then, when the information from the reports do come out, and I have great hope for them, and I was delighted that Sally Yates and her team spoke at the provost meeting, and I was encouraged by that, then we can work with what that information is and move on and say, "Okay, now what do we want to do?" But right now, our students need to see our support, and that's what our department supports. Thank you very much.

IRIS PACKMAN: My name is Iris Packman. I'm a Senator at ILR RTE. I'm going to take a moment and point out who is standing here, who is saying we need more data, and who knows in their bones that we have a crisis that this administration has not addressed effectively. For those who want data, we have data. Looking at the violations that were publicly available through the

Office of Civil Rights, there were 68 formal complaints brought against students for prohibited conduct. In 21 of those cases, they found the student responsible. 17 of those involved sexual assault. Of those 17 cases, only two students were expelled, and six were suspended. One dropped out. The other eight were never removed from campus. Now you think about this. You're a parent. Your kid's looking at school right now. They're a senior, and they're wondering, "Where should I apply?" I'm looking at those numbers and saying, "Gee, half of the people that Cornell found to have committed sexual assault are still back on campus, and they never had a discipline." But here's what they did get. Let's see. We had 12 pieces of a written reprimand. So, you know, if your school tells you not to do it again, maybe you won't rape someone again. Eight cases of directed study. That means you had to attend a workshop. Six cases with a no contact order. But you're still, you know, going to class and parties and things, and the perpetrator is still there, walking around. They just can't be in, you know, certain formal spaces with you. We had an apology letter. I'm pretty sure that's not going to be the kind of restorative justice that the survivor needs. One revocation of University housing privilege and a reflection paper. And this is only data from four years, because they've only reported that. We don't have the last two years of data. But The Sun, the Cornell Sun journalists, amazing journalists, reported today that we did get a hold of the reflection paper prompts for one of the Cornell seven. This is a student who was found responsible for attempted sexual exploitation when he allegedly did lines of ketamine off of Jane Doe's naked body with a group of other men. He was found responsible for that. Here's a prompt. "Please provide a detailed proposal for future university educational materials to train undergraduate students around the intersection of social media use and sexual harassment, as well as bystander intervention." Do we have a crisis that hasn't been managed well? We don't need more data to answer that question. Please don't delay this vote.

MIKE THOMPSON: Mike Thompson, Senator from Material Science and Engineering. I am equally appalled at the behavior of the students and the lack of action by the university, not just the administration, addressing this problem of sexual assault on this campus. And we are as guilty as the administration. Two years ago, this body should have been out front demanding that there be action. So, when we say no confidence in the administration, we better include ourselves in that same group. I am speaking for this motion. It is still not a motion that I really like, but it is a better of two evils. The motion that we had before us said that either I said, I stand with the administration and say that we don't have a problem, which is not true, or I sign on to an intellectually dishonest motion that has no clauses, no specification of who we are referring to beyond the administration, and no recommendations either of what has happened or what will happen in the future. I would have gone much further in this motion to commit, and I would have asked the UFC to bring forward, not necessarily after the Yates report, but bring forward a motion that was specific, with clearly identified issues that articulate the concerns that we have and the problems that we can address now and say we're failures on specific administration and with recommendations that would mean that we have done something rather than just a toothless, meaningless resolution that we are not in support of the faculty. That's what we need to have before this body. And I would be happy to vote up on that kind of a resolution in two weeks. But what we have in front of us is just intellectually dishonest to me. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Julianna.

JULIANA HU PEGUES: Hello, colleagues. My name is Julianna, and I'm an associate professor

in the Department of Literature and English. I'm also a survivor of sexual assault. Last week, the award-winning Lakota poet and recent MacArthur genius recipient, Layli Long Soldier, read her poetry at Cornell. The reason I mention this is because Long Soldier's first collection of poetry is titled "Whereas" and offers a trenchant, poetic response to the congressional resolution of apology to Native Americans, an act initially signed with no tribal leaders present. Nor was the apology read out loud. Long Soldier underscores that deferment, silence, and inaction as responses to violence, no matter how carefully crafted, are in themselves a form of violence. When my colleagues fault the no confidence resolution for its absence of preambulatory whereas clauses or attempt to delay what is urgently needed to repair leadership and confidence at Cornell, these actions strike me as particularly callous deflections. For in these bureaucratic maneuvers, I do not hear compelling evidence of confidence in this administration. To the contrary, I see defensive posturing that mimics the administration's own response. As Long Soldier reminds us, such words and actions are never benign, but rather make us complicit in power structures. After Cornell Sun students laudably reported on Jane Doe's lawsuit, President Kotlikoff waited more than two weeks to respond to Cornell staff, students, and faculty. In that eight minute address, video address, he rehearsed PR talking points. He never once apologized to Jane Doe. Yet he invoked the idea of community not less than five times. Colleagues, managing violence, or worse, attempting to remove violence from public purview does not mitigate harm. In reality, it reveals a university leadership that has caused irreparable harm to its community of students. The current administration repeatedly promises to listen and to demonstrate transparency, but has failed to do either. We need to do better. Colleagues, please pay attention to women, femme, and non-binary students to women, femme, and non-binary, junior colleagues to women, femme, and non-binary faculty and staff who lack protections. We must signal our solidarity with survivors of sexual violence. As faculty, please recognize our power and responsibility to do better, even if the administration does not. I oppose the motion to delay, and I support the vote of no confidence. Thank you.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. I move to extend the debate by ten minutes.

>> Seconded.

SAM NELSON: All in favor, say aye.

>> Aye.

SAM NELSON: All opposed? Okay. Passes.

KRISTIN ROEBUCK: Everybody hear me? Kristin Roebuck, associate professor of history. I came up here to give a very different kind of remark about the importance of deliberative democracy and the importance of being allowed to vote. Because what we have before us is a motion urging us to vote to stop people from voting. It was introduced at the very moment that the Senate opened in order to prevent debate on the underlying motion. So, it is an attempt to stop a vote and an attempt to stop a conversation that is urgently needed. For those who are criticizing the underlying motion, that is within your rights. The appropriate way to do it, if you think it is an intellectually dishonest, toothless, meaningless resolution is to vote against it, to

argue against it, and if you're so committed to solving this problem, introduce your own resolution. To attack the integrity and intelligence and the information on which your colleagues are acting is [indiscernible]. About 11 months ago, the president of the United States said to a female journalist, "Quiet. Quiet, piggy," because she was asking about sexual abuse and why he didn't want to talk about it. She was asking about Jeffrey Epstein. Why? We are having a quiet piggy moment at Cornell. If you want to vote against the resolution, vote against the resolution. Don't tell me we can talk about it and tell me we can vote on it. And by the way, this is not just about one case. This is not just about Jane Doe. And if you're telling me we need to wait for Sally Yates to give us more information, I'm eager to find out what Sally Yates is going to find. But let me tell you something. We keep talking about Jane Doe. There's a magic act going on where hundreds of victims of Weill Cornell who were abused for ten years, leading to over a $1 billion settlement. Those hundreds of victims are disappearing along with them because that makes it easier to say it's not a systemic problem. We have evidence, systemic problem, because otherwise Cornell wouldn't be paying $1 billion. And if you're thinking, "Well, it's our fault," I was just accuse. I was just told I was guilty as this administration. Sir, I am not. I am not. If you think we need to be collaborating with the university administration, the people who cut us out of conversations and cut down costs, how are we supposed to do that when we cover it up? That's what they did for ten years. And then, when the settlement was agreed to, did they hold a press conference to tell us all how we can do better? No, they did not. No, they did not. They don't want to stop. They don't want us to know. If you feel like you don't know enough, there are two reasons. One, they don't want you to know, and two, you haven't worked because there's a tremendous amount that.

SETH SANDERS: I'm Seth Sanders from the Department of Economics. I am extremely nervous. I actually hate public speaking, and I apologize. Let me start by, you know, thanking everyone, people have spoken publicly and forcefully. And I want to be sure that people understand, I think, that sexual assault on college campuses is an enormous problem. So, nothing that I say should be taken in that light. It's happening here. It's happening at our institutions. It's a real crisis. I think the issue is what do we do to really effect change? And the answer to that is, I don't know. I don't think that this is an issue when we have confidence in, you know, I don't think setting up as having confidence in the administration or supporting the administration. Right. I think it's legitimate to think that you don't know whether to have confidence, because you don't know what happened or why in the Jane Doe case, or in the whole way things were being handled. And we need, you know-- In my department, there's a diversity of views on this, and I respect people tremendously who are for this resolution and those who are against this resolution. They've made thoughtful arguments that, given the real cause and made me think. Overall, 80% of the people in my department are against the resolution at this time. And independently, before the idea of waiting for the Yates report came about, volunteered the information that they would like to see an independent report before they made a final decision that they were against it at this time. But they were certainly willing to change their minds based on independent. The Yates report will be of great value that will help determine what the administration knew, what they should have known, and what they did about it. Most importantly, it will help us to understand how to protect our students. It is understandable that emotions are high and we feel compelled to act. But if we want real change and proper accountability, we need to understand fully what went wrong, why, and what needs to change. And for that reason, I'm for this resolution.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay, Edmundo. Edmundo Paz-

EDMUNDO PAZ-SOLDAN: Good afternoon. I am speaking in a dual role. I am a professor of romance studies, and I also have a 19-year-old son here at Cornell. As a faculty member, well, I've been reading a lot about the case, and one of the things that has impressed me most is the article by my colleague scientists, women scientists who are not only-- they were not only focusing on the last two years, they were focusing on the last two months of what the administration has been doing. And one of the things that surprises me is the lack of empathy, the lack of compassion from the administration, the way they have allowed to turn this crisis into this public relations nightmare. Instead of turning this into trying to deal with the situation, why don't we try to turn it into a situation in which we become, again, a leader? I know the university can be a leader. I mean, when we had the crisis of the pandemic crisis, the university responded very quickly, and we became like a model for other people to follow. So, now you are trying to tell me that we cannot act quickly? The administration has acted quickly with the Gaza encampments and all that. But suddenly, with this case, there is no urgency, and we can wait, and we can continue being the rape university instead of having a leadership in this situation. That's what my colleagues say. Colleagues from sciences and the humanities. And also, that's what my son says and all his friends. And there are students who do not want to wait until they finish having a major. They want now to this be addressed because they are concerned that, you know, we are becoming-- we have become a laughing stock. And this is not because of you or because of me. It's because the administration has not been able to handle a very difficult situation.

>> [Indiscernible]. When I got in line here, I had some remarks, and I wanted to say to everyone-- I'm going to change course a little bit. I'm going to just tell a personal story and respond to the claim that we should be as responsible as this administration. And why haven't we done that? I personally, in a much less egregious and much less horrific fashion, have experienced bullying and sexual harassment in my own department. During Kotlikoff's time as provost and during his time as president, I have seen nothing change. I brought this to my colleagues, to my unit administrators, and time and time again, I was asked things like what I had done to provoke the situation. I was told that it would be mitigated by a one-on-one meeting when it affected my tenure case, and later there was a 19-page rebuke of my department proving sexual harassment, bullying, and a toxic work environment for junior female colleagues, I went to the dean to say, "Here are three really constructive, very possible, plausible ideas to make this better, to make it so that my female students aren't going through this in ten years, and that my female colleagues are going through this in five years." On multiple occasions, I was told that that's not possible. It's too difficult to make that kind of change. I was laughed at by someone in the dean's office. A request from meeting with Kotlikoff during his time as provost was ignored. So, we have been making noise. We have been talking about this for more than a decade on the personal front, on the student front, on the staff front, on the Faculty front. My inbox is flooded with hundreds of letters from alumni, students, parents urging us to hold this administration accountable. Finally, this is not time to talk about this is a premature vote because we have been making noise for as long as I have been at Cornell. This is not time to talk about we need to wait for more data. The data is there. This is not time to say we're not sure. All of the arrows point to no confidence in how things have been handled. I highly support the vote of no confidence and feel that the motion on the floor today is simply an effort to fizzle what we have put forward.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. I move that we remain as remaining speakers who are up and in line to limit themselves to two minutes, and then we call for a vote on this motion after that.

SAM NELSON: Do I hear a second?

>> Second.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay. Any opposed?

SAM NELSON: Okay.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Yuval Grossman from physics. And I'm speaking today on behalf of many faculty members, both from the physics department and from other departments who asked me to talk on their behalf. They would like us to keep open the possibility of waiting until the Yates report is available before making a decision. Much of the information currently available is in dispute, and more importantly, there may be important details we do not know about. Many faculty members believe that we need a more complete and reliable picture before we can make an informed decision on such an important role. For those reasons, I support the motion.

SAM NELSON: We're going to go there. Linda.

LINDA CANINA: Okay. Hello, everyone. I want to thank everyone for sharing everything that you've been sharing. I'm learning a lot today from this meeting. I've been on the Faculty Senate for several years, and one of the issues that I have been having is that information is being conveyed as if it's a fact. And when I go try to look for the source of those facts, I'm having a hard time finding them. I think that this whole discussion, and not just this discussion, but the discussions that we've been having over the past couple of years, would be more effective if, when somebody says something, they actually provide the resources that back up that information. Because for this case, I'm learning things today at this meeting that I have never heard before. And I'm the type of person, maybe you might call me naive, but I look at the good in something before I see the bad. So, I have full confidence in this administration. And if I were to vote no confidence in this administration, I would also vote no confidence in this faculty Senate and the staff and all the faculty at this university, because I hold us all responsible for what's going on. And one of the other issues that I'm having is people give criticism, but they don't give a recommendation about how to solve it. Sexual harassment is a world problem. It's a problem everywhere. The way Penn got rid of it is they took the Greek life off campus. We can do the same thing. But I'm wondering, what other suggestions do people have here in order to solve this issue, rather than just blaming the administration, whoever the administration may be? It's all of us. I would like us to move in a positive way forward, if somehow we could do that. Maybe we brainstorm about ways to solve it and do it.

SAM NELSON: Thank you.

JULIA CHANG: Good afternoon. My name is Julia Chang. I'm an associate professor of

Hispanic studies. I'll be very brief. I'd like to speak to two points. The first point is the idea that this is a premature resolution, and that we should therefore delay. When a junior colleague comes up to their third year review, if they have performed negatively in those previous two and a half years, they still get a negative review. They don't get to say this is a premature judgment. We have had plenty of time under Kotlikoff's administration to have a negative performance review. And to the point that we should be speaking about the facts. I only have two minutes, so I'll give you one. You may or may not know that after Jane Doe became national news following the Cornell Sun's article, the administration published an FAQ page answering questions that were frequently asked about the sexual assault case. A couple days after they posted it, they edited the statement. So, it originally stated that the Cornell University Police Department shared "all investigatory information with the Tompkins County District Attorney's Office in 2024." The page no longer includes that statement. The FAQ page has been updated at least twice since the original posting. You can look it up in the Cornell Sun. All the screengrabs are there. We cannot have confidence in an administration that can't get its own facts straight.

>> [Indiscernible] I'm raising questions today about the data that we do have, if we bother to look, which raises questions about lack of investigations or formal complaints of sexual violence, as well as about discrepancies between official university procedures and their apparent implementation. I think there might be a slide that I need. Thank you. I want to highlight the mechanisms, which even those reports would become formal complaints are made to disappear. How Title IX office handles formal complaints is not on the faculty. It's on the office and those above it, which happen to be the vice president of student and campus life and the Provost. In the academic year 2020 to 24, thousands, according to research, of Cornell students experienced sexual violence. Hundreds reported it to Cornell. Of those hundreds of reports, 68 formal complaints were recorded. Now, according to the report resolution flow chart for students, which is what students are told they can expect, what follows next is an investigation, but that's not how the policy was implemented. 21 formal complaints that were pursued were resolved by a hearing after investigation, and 26 with an ultimate resolution, largely without being investigated. This is because investigations pause during alternative resolutions. The Title IX coordinator must determine that they have sufficient information about the matter. But there's no standard for what sufficient means, suggesting that what counts as sufficient is discretionary. Second, the vast majority of ultimate resolutions are resolved through a very mysterious form in which complaint withdrawn is listed as an outcome, but the process is said to have resulted in sanctions and remedies. It's unclear what exactly is going on, but one plausible explanation is that these 20 cases were resolved through retroactively applied informal resolutions. I infer this, and I can explain later because of how the guide for Formal Complaint Resolution explains things. According to Cornell procedures, none of this should be happening, as informal resolution is only available as an alternative to signing a complaint before the investigation and adjudication begins. In a nutshell, the pattern that we see in the published records should not exist. Yet more cases are adjudicated following this pattern than any other form of resolution. So, the requirement to withdraw the complaint, which was a part of this process, is difficult to reconcile both with stated criminal procedures as well as with timeline. Informal resolutions do not, should not apply to pipeline cases. The issue is that the formal complaints listed in the data and statistics site include conduct prohibited by Title IX. This matters because the absence or presence of investigations determines the sanctions and remedies, even though students are told otherwise and are told that there's something like an equivalence of potential outcomes and, "any sanctions

or remedies that could be imposed by a hearing panel after hearing under these proceedings are also applicable to alternate resolutions." And yet, in tables three and four, you see that that's not what happens. So, what does this mean for how we understand how students make choices to proceed with an alternate resolution or not? Am I out of time?

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Okay. I can talk later, but it has implications for consent. If students are ill-informed-- [indiscernible]. And the violation of consent in the context in which sexual violence occurred because consent was violated repeats the same mechanism violation that they were forced to choose between two things between a rock and a hard place. Neither one which you want. Thank you.

BETH MILLES: Beth Milles, I'm a senator from the Department of Performing and Media Arts. I'm also on the UFC. Also, I'm a parent of a Cornell student, and I'm an alum. So, particularly as we all are completely heartsick and I moved my home actually listening to everyone today because I felt conflicted about whether or not this vote should happen. But I've moved to the side of the microphone, even though I hate the red and green, because I want to have the debate and the discourse. I don't want to stand up already telling you what I think because I'm not just going to do it. Okay. So, I just want to say a few things. In the Department of Performing and Media Arts, we've polled our faculty, and there was an overwhelming majority who vote yes. So, that's part of why I'm standing at this microphone, even if I feel conflicted, as many of us do, about whether or not we should have resolution and more statements embody in the resolution. I do feel somewhat that if we do vote this yes to the initial resolution, we are implicating ourselves in the best way, in the way that we take responsibility for where we live and work. And so, the one thing that I would like to say to people who feel so strongly and passionately and who articulated things I was too afraid to say, is that no matter how the vote goes that we work together. I'm so tired of people standing on one microphone and judging people on the other. I understand we have to take action. I have gotten millions of letters. Not just from students currently, but from almost every woman I went to college with who has also been a victim of sexual assault. As many women are, there are so many things to talk about. Please, let's talk about it together and not sneer at each other when we disagree or if we can't see an argument. That's the only thing that I want to say. I'm seeing my department will want us to vote yes. But I have conflicted feelings, and I don't want to be judge for those feelings of yes, I stand up for them, but I want to be able to have a discussion with my colleagues. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: And this will be the last comment.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government. I'm not going to be very long. [Indiscernible]. I'm opposed to the motion to commit in favor of the resolution. I would call attention to the language of the resolution. If this were a simple request to postpone consideration for the resolution until the Yates report were published, there would not be any necessity to refer it to the faculty committee. Now, why would you want to refer it to the Cornell Committee rather than a simple resolution, simple motion to postpone? Historically, the Cornell Faculty Committee has been very aggressive in suppressing faculty Senate resolutions and amending them, postponing them, doing whatever they wanted with it. If this were a very simple motion with the

intent that has been described to you, really, then the Cornell Faculty Committee would not be involved at all. There is no guarantee, in my mind, that if this motion to commit would have passed and the committee were to make a report that we ever see the resolution of no confidence come before this body in the way that it stands now. So, strongly urge you to vote no on the motion. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: [Indiscernible] to come forward and explain the voting methods. Great.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: So, folks, again, we're going to take our time and count votes carefully. So, voting yes on this motion will commit the no confidence resolution to the University Faculty Committee, which will hold the resolution as is until the Yates report is released. At which point, the University Faculty Committee would bring this back to the Senate at the very next meeting unedited. The University Faculty Committee intends to follow the instructions on this if indeed this matter is referred to the UFC. Just a brief point of order relative to Professor Bensel's comment. The UFC did not welcome this resolution or seek it. This was proposed by senators, and I met with them to work through the parliamentary procedure to enable them to bring the resolution that they wanted to.

>> I have point of information. Richard Bensel.

SAM NELSON: [Indiscernible]. Okay, just to make sure everybody is correct on this, and it's very simple. If you vote yes on this one, you're actually voting to hear the results of the Yates. If you're voting no, you're going to vote on the original resolution.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Are you ready to vote on Zoom?

CA SHUGARTS: I'm ready. Everyone, just please, when you put your hands up, just give me give me enough time to count.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay? So, everyone in favor of the resolution, please raise your hands. Everyone in favor of the motion to commit, please raise your hand.

CA SHUGARTS: Okay, I'm going to count hands online now. So, if you've put your hand up, stay. If you haven't put your hand up, this is your last chance. Please put your hand up so I can count. I don't want to miss anyone. Okay, I'm going to count now.

>> Can you please confirm whether it's only senators that should put their hand up?

CA SHUGARTS: Absolutely. Only senators should be--

>> Okay. Someone's going to check that on the back end?

>> Only senators should be voting.

>> Yeah, but who's checking that?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: We are a body of honest folks. We distributed red cards to folks who attested to as senators, as anyone who raises their hand on Zoom to be attesting they are a senator if they do that.

>> All right. But wait, we're voting on the motion that's up on the screen, which is on our screen. Are we voting on the original resolution?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: We are voting on a motion to commit the resolution to the UFC. It's the motion that is on the Zoom screen.

>> Okay. Thank you for explaining that. I'm taking my vote down.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: CA, if you could let us know when-- Take your time. Let us know.

>> I understand from hearing people speaking that there may be people raising their hands who are not senators.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: CA, I'll ask you to take time to quickly cross check the list of names for folks who have their hands raised relative to our list of senators. If anyone has their hands raised on Zoom who is not a senator, who is not of voting rights, please lower your hand now.

CA SHUGARTS: Okay, I'm going to count now. So, know if your hands down-- Thank you. Just give me just a second.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Folks in the room can rest your arms. We have a count. Thank you. To the question on Zoom, voting yes would be voting to wait for the Yates report, as we've stated.

>> Point of order. You just said a vote yes is a vote to wait until we have the Yates report. But that's not the motion. The motion is a motion to refer the resolution to the UFC.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: The motion is a motion to commit. The effect would be [indiscernible].

CA SHUGARTS: Okay. So, I believe we're at 22. I believe everyone is a senator. There are some newer senators whose names I'm not familiar with. I'm pretty sure everyone who has voted is a senator, though. And it's 22. Yes.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you, CA. Jill confirms.

>> So, I believe there's a point of order.

>> --that everybody who voted as a senator as opposed to--

>>

JILL JUST CONFIRMED THAT CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yes. Thank you. Professor Lieberwitz had a point of order asking if we've confirmed that folks voting are senators, both Jill and CA,

staff members and the Dean of faculty office have cross-referenced against our list of senators, and we believe this to be accurate. Okay, folks, everyone opposed to this resolution.

>> I see someone online who is [indiscernible] , but not a senator.

SC: You actually see someone that is not a senator that is voting? Yeah. Can you tell us that person's name? We'll ask that after the vote.

[Crosstalk]

CA SHUGARTS: Okay, I'm going to begin to count, so just leave your hands up.

>> Put your hand down. Ask everybody to put your hands down because people are still voting for.

[Chatter]

>> Hi there. Just an observer. Some of the people who voted with their hand up haven't put their hand down. So, check your hand if you voted for the motion.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: So, should only have your hand up on Zoom if you are intending to vote no on this motion. Folks who are here in Schwartz Auditorium, you can rest your shoulders. We have an accurate count.

>> There is at least one person with their actual hand, not the Zoom hand up. Michael Ashkin.

[Chatter]

SAM NELSON: Yes, you can take your hands down if you vote in here. In here.

CA SHUGARTS: Okay. Online, it looks like 31, including Michael. I got Michael.

>> Some people voted both. So, it's done inconsistently. There's some people who didn't put their name down.

>> I believe there may be four people that did not put their hand down. I'm just guessing here. I'm just an observer. But some people are doing it now. Okay. Look, it's decreasing, but I think there are two people left.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Folks, if your hand is up now, you are being counted as voting against this resolution.

CA SHUGARTS: Okay. Including Michael, 30. Okay.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay. Any abstentions? Any abstentions on Zoom?

CA SHUGARTS: Please, everyone put your hands down so that abstention people can vote.

[Chatter]

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay, so we have 48 in favor of the motion to commit. We have 76 opposed to the motion. The motion fails. No confidence resolution is once again open for debate.

>> Or someone could call the question. I move to end debate on the no confidence resolution. That motion has not been seconded. So, once again, debating.

KATHRYN BOOR: I'm Kathryn Boor, professor in CALS food science department. We're all horrified and angry about what Jane Doe experienced in October 2024. Our community is hurting, and we want accountability and action. A challenge we now face is to focus our anger to most effectively create better, more supportive processes for survivors of sexual assault, not just here at Cornell, but across our entire state. And we have that opportunity in our hands right now. In moments like this, there's a natural desire to try to identify one focal point for blame, and administrators are easy targets for anger. However, our central administration isn't the right target in this situation. At precisely the moment when the institution must move decisively, leadership to stabilization risks slowing the very changes that our survivors need the most. We should resist actions that are primarily expressive if they do not also advance reform. If the threshold for removing university leadership is lowered to a tragedy that exposes institutional shortcomings, we risk substituting reactive politics for principled governance. This is a time for us to pull together, to identify and call on our faculty and others to help us create a community where all clearly understand that when one of us is dehumanized and abused, we all are, and where we all feel empowered and obligated to act to preserve each other's dignity. A vote against this resolution is not a vote against accountability. It is a vote for the form of accountability most likely to protect future students. Please join me in pledging to work together with our community to get to a better place. The lives of our young people depend on it.

SAM NELSON: Okay, next.

>> [Indiscernible] , chemical and biomolecular engineering. And I support this resolution because I think our leaders have not been leading as they should. I support this resolution because through this and other recent crises, Cornell's administration has managed situations rather than lead our community. They've been reactive rather than proactive. They've reacted in order to appease, often with the focus on the priorities of outside parties. They have aimed for neutrality in our national context, even as this context has moved further and further away from alignment with Cornell's institutional values of greater good and in person. While our administration has managed, Jane Doe has led courageously and with a profound impact on Cornell and the wider public. While our administration has managed our current students in some quarters, the student protesters have led as the whole world watches on. I support this resolution because Cornell must take bold action to reform and replace institutional structures that permit and even promote experiences like Jane Doe's. More generally, Cornell's administration must show bold leadership, administrative leadership, intellectual leadership, and emotional leadership, and define institutional excellence in a manner that prioritizes human well-being and upholds our institutional values. Our students and community deserve leadership, not

management.

SHIMON EDELMAN: Am I on? Thank you. I want to read the comment that I posted also on the Faculty Senate website. I'm a professor of psychology, not a senator. Here's what I have to say about this. President Kotlikoff's repeated attempts to deflect attention and criticism from his failures by offering multiple variations on the theme of we are all responsible, we must work together, underscore the need to hold the university leadership responsible for its actions and inaction. I must place the word leadership in scare quotes because, of course, our true bosses are the members of the moneyed elite who serve on the Board of Trustees. The board protects its puppets, allowing them to rule by diktat. So, much for shared governance and shielding them from responsibility. I fail to see how faculty or students or staff can have confidence in the system. The sexual assault affair, the current one that has justly shaken the Cornell community, is merely one of the many reasons to vote in favor of the no confidence resolution. Thank you.

>> I just wanted to make a motion to hear from two undergraduate students who have been impacted by this issue. I think this is a major concern to them, and they're asking us to be able to give them a voice. So, is there a seconder?

>> Seconded.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Any opposed?

>> Wonderful. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Please let them go first.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Make sure to state your name.

VERONICA MA: Hello, faculty senators. My name is Veronica Ma, and I'm a junior in the College of Arts and Sciences. Thank you for letting me speak to you all today about the no confidence resolution. Even though I attend Cornell now, I began my undergraduate journey at a small liberal arts school in rural Georgia with about a thousand students. My female friends and I would often walk around campus at night for hours and never feel endangered. A fellow transfer student told me that when she was a freshman at her old school, she would sometimes have too much to drink at parties. But she too was never scared because she knew that her community would take care of her. Upon arriving at Cornell, we both realized that Cornell is not that community. During my first week here, I was horrified by the dangerous fraternity culture on this campus. I remember a young woman was walking alone in college town. Her steps were slow and shaky. She was obviously intoxicated. I came to realize that this was normal at Cornell. Freshman women dangerously intoxicated, trekking 30 minutes back to their dorms on North Campus past midnight, and no one stops and helps them. That same year, the number of undergraduate women experiencing non-consensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation at Cornell rose from 23% to 35%. And then, in my junior fall, I, like many of you, read a horrific article in The Sun detailing how a young woman was unsuccessfully drugged and gang raped by seven men for seven hours. In the days that followed, this administration published quiet statements on their website, not even bothering to send out a formal email to the

student body. Many of my professors continued class as usual, not even mentioning the rape case, while me and my fellow students were barely able to go to class. That same week, the administration was invited to attend the Student Assembly's town hall. Only [indiscernible] , the director of athletics. I watched as my classmates made powerful public comments, expressing their grief and telling their own stories of sexual violence. Why should my peers and your students have to retraumatize themselves in order to be heard by an administration who will not even show up and listen? Why should they have to continuously fight to feel safe on this campus while their professors won't even bring up the incident in class? And it's not just one case on one campus. Take Doctor Darius Perdue, who worked at Weill Cornell for 16 years. During his time at Cornell, he would ask boys as young as 13 years old to masturbate in front of him. In total, sexually abused 50 male students. And what did Cornell do? They failed to escalate these allegations and failed to conduct proper investigations. As students, we count on our professors to stand with us, especially at horrific and delicate cases of sexual violence. Every student deserves safety. Every survivor deserves justice. This administration failed the 50 male patients. It failed 35% of undergraduate women. And it failed Jane Doe. How many more students does this administration need to fail? How many more survivors need to retraumatize themselves for the administration to listen and make real change? I urge you to stand with your students. I urge you to vote no. Thank you.

ADRIANA VINK: My name is Adriana Vink. I am a representative on the Student Assembly, one of the parallel shared governance structures to the Faculty Senate here. Speaking from the perspective of the Student Assembly briefly, we have passed a number of resolutions since the news of Jane Doe's lawsuit became public last month. We've asked for academic flexibility in times of campus crises, beginning a process to redesign orientation consent materials. We've condemned the delays and lack of transparency in communications to our community. We've endorsed legislation that would close legal loopholes in cases of sexual violence, and we've demanded free Cornell health counseling for survivors of sexual violence. As the student assembly, we have recognized that the moment to act is now. Personally, I'm a senior here, which means I was here on campus in fall of 2024. On November 8th of that year, I received an email, a crime alert. "The victim reported being sexually assaulted by several males and coerced into consuming ketamine and other drugs." It read. I received one other email that semester from President Kotlikoff on November 26th, while students were away from campus for Thanksgiving break. What followed was two years of silence. The sole exception, of course, being the Presidential Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault. Dean Love, the task force's co-chair, was interviewed by student reporters from the Cornell Daily Sun before the task force had even made its findings and told them, "The charge was never for us to solve the problem." I stand here today to ask you, if it's not their charge, then whose is it? And what was this task force even doing other than saving face for Kotlikoff and his cronies? I'll note that the task force recommendations were published in March of 2026, and as of this fall, none of them, not a single one, has been implemented. This moment is an opportunity for us as a community to take action. But I have zero faith in President Kotlikoff and his administration to lead that charge, considering he and they were in charge in 2024 when Jane Doe's case was mishandled. And considering that President Kotlikoff has been either president or provost for the past 11 years, during which time we have only seen statistics of sexual violence get worse and worse and worse here at Cornell. More than 1 in 3 undergraduate women experience non-consensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation in their time here at Cornell. And those are my classmates. And those are

your students. Students who are afraid to speak up on this issue, let alone report sexual violence.

>> You're out of order. You're running out of time.

SAM NELSON: It's not your job to say when time is up, okay?

>> Yes. Thank you.

ADRIANA VINK: As our teachers, your voices are critical. Jane Doe knows this, and that's why she wrote you all a letter. And I was going to quote from it, but I've run out of time and I'm out of order. I urge you all to vote yes on no confidence.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. We've come to the ten minute extension of our regularly scheduled meeting time. I move for a 30 minute extension of the meeting.

>> Seconded.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Any opposed? Two opposed. All in favor? In the opinion of the dean, the ayes have it. The meeting is extended for 30 minutes.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. I want to begin by saying I agree with all the sponsors and the supporters who said-- I agree that sexual assault is a horrible problem on this campus. And it doesn't matter it's a horrible problem on every campus. It's a horrible problem on this campus, and that's what we're addressing. I agree that outcomes have been entirely unsatisfactory. Where I disagree is that following policy, we should blame somebody because everything we see is that policy is followed and by a policy is the problem. And when I brought this up two weeks ago, I was told that people have worked really hard to change policies. The administration that wasn't responsive. And since that time, I've had really good conversations with administration. I'm a nobody. I'm not a professor, let alone a professor. I don't have a grant. Since I had a really productive conversation with Katie King, head of civil rights. Yesterday, I've had really good emails with President Kotlikoff and various administrators. So, I don't know what the sticking point is for others. I know it's not my experience, and I wish everybody was having my experience of having easy access to administrators. But we don't need administrators to do everything. We are the faculty Senate. We are leaders on this campus, and as we know, any senators can come together to put something on our agenda. And any 51% of senators can vote to pass a resolution, and the administrators can't do anything about that. So, I browsed our archives to see what we have done. The last time we seriously addressed anything pertinent to sexual harassment in the last decade, the time the current administration put in place, was 2018 to 2019. There were five meetings in which we addressed policy 6.4, which are policies for handling sexual abuse, and they were mostly nuts and bolts. Two meetings where the administration sent in to us. And the most recent address was in December of 2020. A senator explained that it was too easy to hold the faculty member accountable for sexual harassment, and asked us to make it more difficult to find faculty guilty of sexual harassment to raise the evidentiary standards. We've only looked at tracks once in all that time, and it was to advise our judicial system. So, I'm reluctantly and sadly going to move to make an amendment in the nature of a replacement, substitution. Thank you. I think Jill has the slides.

SAM NELSON: So, this is an amendment similar to the one that we just ended up--- I'll go ahead and read it so we don't waste much time. Whereas the rape and sexual assault-- Okay.

>> [Indiscernible].

BILL KATT: So, I think that if we're going to hold anybody accountable, and I agree that we need to hold somebody accountable, we should be holding ourselves accountable. I believe that President Kotlikoff setting up a sexual task force two years ago wasn't enough, that us saying that we should make it harder to hold people accountable was even worse. I think that we are leaders on this campus and that we should be looking at our own failures. And I saw somebody typed on Zoom that fresh eyes and hands and ears should be looking at this, and I would agree with that. So, whereas the rate of sexual assault on Cornell campuses is unacceptably high, and shows no sign of falling-- That's the data we've seen, and I totally agree with that. It is unacceptably high, and we see no sign of falling. Whereas the faculty senate has identified key failings in Cornell's handling of sexual assaults on its campuses. And we have done exactly that over the last couple weeks. Whereas the faculty senate has the power to review and revise Cornell policy. We've shown that during Covid. One of the hardest things this town has faced. We tackle racism. We tackled systemic racism, and we made progress. During the last eight years, we got [indiscernible] and the right to vote. We have shown that we can tackle big things, just not this big. Whereas, numerous faculty senators have identified their inability to make meaningful changes to Cornell policy pertaining to sexual assault. I think that's horrible. I think we need to do better. Whereas, new voices are widely acknowledged as being able to bring fresh ideas and overcome roadblocks that have become ingrained into governing bodies; and whereas many among the faculty and student populations have said that it is imperative to hold those responsible for these failures to task via a vote of no confidence. Be it resolved the Cornell Faculty Senate declares no confidence in Faculty Senators who were seated prior to the 2026-2027 academic year; and be it further resolved that the Cornell Faculty Senate will thus impose term limits upon all members. Be it further resolved that no senator who has served for six or more years, that's two terms, shall be eligible to run for election to another term. And finally, be it further resolved that in the case that all faculty members of a unit have served their maximum term in the Faculty Senate, each member shall be allowed to serve up to six years more than any other member of the unit. Should someone second this, we can then vote on it. Should it pass, I will immediately move that we delay the vote on the full motion because we replace the text of the motion for six weeks so everybody has time to consult their constituents, propose amendments, and let the UFC--

SAM NELSON: If I could just interrupt. If no one seconds this, it goes right. Do I hear a second? Thank you.

LAURA DANIELS: Laura Daniels. I'm a librarian here, and I'm inspired by the courage of Jane Doe. And I'm inspired by my colleagues who are willing to speak up and demand better for our students. And I'm particularly inspired by our students. And I'm having a really hard time not crying. The status quo is unacceptable. More information about exactly how we got where we are today will be crucial to enacting real, substantive change. However, no additional information is needed to clearly see that where we are now is unequivocally not okay. This resolution is not an

attack, and it is not a demand for anyone's resignation. It is a statement. I do not have confidence in the current administration to effectively address the myriad issues we face, and I do not see another, much less better proposal on the table for expressing that the status quo is unacceptable. So, if you share my doubt, please show our students that they have our attention and that we intend to do better. Please vote in favor of this resolution.

SAM NELSON: Linda, do you want to speak very quickly?

LINDA CANINA: Yes, I read it via the chat, but somebody came up with a good idea that any cases that are brought forward now go to the Ithaca Police Department, or if it's Weill Medical Center, will go to the New York Police Department. That way, it wouldn't be officiated by Cornell, since so many people don't have confidence in Cornell's ability to handle these things, and then they would just be handled by the legal system. That might be a short-term solution, actually a long-term solution. I don't know why that didn't happen before, but I think I would like to put that on the table as a recommendation of what could be done immediately.

SAM NELSON: All right. Thank you very much.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR Senator. I'm just going to reiterate some key points about the information. We do have the knowledge. We do have to vote no confidence. And I certainly am in favor of this no confidence resolution, for which I'm a co-sponsor. So, we know there's an ongoing crisis and there's an upward trend of sexual assault at Cornell. I'm not going to repeat the numbers. We've heard them many times. And they are as disturbing every time that we hear them. And there's also the issue of the Cornell Medical College and the many years of neglect and really covering up complaints that were filed. Secondly, this crisis demonstrates a systemic problem that must be addressed in a systemic way. We have not seen that from this administration. And as people have pointed out, President Kotlikoff has been either provost or president for 11 years. Also, we use the term in the resolution Central Administration, which is used in our faculty Senate procedures, and it's used in other contexts. And so, I think that is clear enough what we're talking about with regard to the central administration. We also know that instead of taking some kind of systemic approach as leaders, the Cornell Central Administration has had a reactive and piecemeal approach, which has eroded the trust of students, faculty, and staff, and the central administration has the ability to lead systemic change at Cornell, and perhaps not just not having the ability, but they don't seem to have the desire either, to really lead systemic change. The appointment of the Presidential Task Force on Campus Sexual Assault in February 2025 is not an adequate or an effective response to the report of sexual assault by multiple perpetrators in the Jane Doe case. We heard the quote that one of our students discussed with regard to Love saying it's not designed to solve the problem. The task force on Sexual Assault was made up largely of administrators. It did not draw on the range of faculty expertise here at Cornell, including faculty who have worked on the ground in making organizational change on these systemic issues of sexual assault. Cornell has avoided having any real strong response to the long-term problem of culture and conduct of Cornell affiliated fraternities. Even now, when President Kotlikoff talks about looking at fraternities and hedges and said, "Well, but, you know, we have to be really careful because [indiscernible] like attorneys." That is not serious leadership. Further, faculty, student, and employee governance bodies have been excluded from plans for addressing problems of sexual assault. Of the 19 members appointed to the task force

on campus sexual assault, only three faculty members were appointed, and none of the faculty were identified as members of the Senate, the faculty Senate. None of the students-- There were three students. None of the students were identified as members of the Student Assembly. And further, we've had ongoing exclusion from the now named Cornell Office of Civil Rights, which does not consult with the Cornell faculty about the policy changes and policy that are written in that office on Title IX, even though we have experts on the faculty about Title IX. And so, students, faculty, and staff have lost trust that sexual assault cases will be handled properly. We have lost confidence in the University Central administration that they will take the actions that they have not yet taken, and thus I strongly support the no confidence resolution. Thank you.

DAN HIRSCHMAN: Dan Hirschman, professor of sociology. Not a Senator, but one of the faculty cosponsors of the resolution. There's a lot that I would love to say to you all. I think about what might be most useful. One thing I am a scholar of higher education. And so, for me, coming here relatively recently, four years ago, it's interesting to see this administration's priorities and where it puts its time and energy. And the comparison, I think, between the future of the American University report and the campus past sexual assault really, really demonstrates where this university is putting its time, energy, and resources, and bringing faculty in. I was sort of delightfully surprised by how expansive that committee was, how open it was, how many drafts would share. I met with people contacting me multiple times, as in many of my colleagues. Right? That was a much better process. That reflected a real interest in the administration, and putting something together that was valuable for our community and beyond. That was not the process for the campus task force for sexual assault. I have colleagues with expertise in this area who volunteered to be on the committee and were turned down. Right? They did not bring in subjectivetees internally or externally. And unsurprisingly, the results they came up with are really small. It's not going to fix the problem. It's not even close to fixing the problem. In fact, comparatively small ball because when Kotlikoff announced interim measure over the last faculty Senate meeting, there were things that weren't even rooted in that report, things like a colleague just mentioned, making the police department no longer in charge of investigating certain crimes, including an outside independent agency. Kotlikoff announced that by Fiat. No more mentioning the task force report. Similarly, suspending Greek life, abandoning it, making any kind of action to reform it, really not mentioning it at all. If the report reflects the administration putting its positive foot forward, how can you have confidence in that? Thank you very much.

DEREK CHANG: I'm Derek Chang in history and Asian American Studies. I'm acting as the senator from history today. I want to speak directly about whether we should have confidence in this administration to lead us in this crisis. As I mentioned in my previous remarks, leadership has known for more than a decade that rates of sexual assault on campus are unacceptably high. Leadership knew prior to the events of October 19th, 2024 that this was the case. Yet only after the incident became public, only after the national crisis of the story and after students, staff, and faculty protested that this university's leadership act. This is not the proactive, forthright response to the issue. I remind you that this is the same university leadership that acknowledged the failure to adequately report foreign gifts and contracts is a violation of its participation in the Higher Education Act Programs and Program Participation Agreement as outlined in the US code. In essence, this leadership acknowledged that it violated the law and cost the university $30 million as a penalty. The same university leadership that acknowledged that the policies and

programs have had in place at the time, the criminal sexual abuse offenses committed by Weill Cornell by a doctor were not adequate to detect, prevent, and to respond to sexual abuse patients and in fact failed to detect and sufficiently respond to "the actions in question". Current university leaders cost the institution $1 billion to settle the sexual abuse case. I asked my colleague where in this record we find evidence that any of us should have confidence in the current leadership to move forward with sensitivity, with effectiveness, and with urgency. I simply see no evidence, and that's why I support the resolution.

ARIANA KIM: Ariana Kim, associate professor of music and faculty Senator. I just want to say two brief things. But before that, I just want to respond to an important item that Bill Katt referred to. We've not tackled or solved racism. Because there are hierarchies built into almost every structure on campus, it allows for a fear culture to exist in and of itself. If we want something to change in that, why shouldn't that come from leadership? If we want leadership to allow people to feel empowered when they're untenured, when they're RTE, when they're graduate students, when they're students, there are already enough pressures for people to feel comfortable speaking out. If we want to change that ability for people to have a voice, why not let that happen from the top down? We have not seen that. I was too afraid to speak up because I was pre-tenure. It then affected my tenure piece. I can only imagine what it might feel like for students who have their own peer pressures, who have their own social groups to answer to, who think about their grades, who think about job prospects, who think about internships. These are things that can be aspiring from the upper administration, and we have not seen that. My experiences are far less horrific and egregious than what this Jane Doe and so many other Jane Does have experienced. But the kernels are the same. The other thing I want to point out, and just remind ourselves that the reason we are here talking and we finally have the platform, a microphone, and a voice is because suddenly there's an international spotlight on our campus. This is not new information, and it is time that we hold our leaders accountable for change.

DAVID DAMON: Hi, my name is David Damon. I'm not a Senator, but I'm in the government department in the Brooks School. I was in the co-sponsor of the resolution, and I was legitimately, genuinely on the fence about it. But I've become a co-sponsor of the resolution, and I do support it now. And what changed? I came to the last Senate meeting and I heard President Kotlikoff speak on leadership. I asked the leadership [indiscernible] resigning, even if you had done nothing wrong, even if Sally Yates comes out and said our processes are great, simply because it happened on your watch and because giving up being in charge might be a powerful focal point for change. His answer was that leadership meant being in charge. In charge to an end? It was not a priority of this administration for 2024 sexual violence, nor was it raised to the level of urgency that other crises had been. He went to the New York Times as provost to write about what Cornell was doing about Covid. But for him, I told him I thought it was fine. It was wonderful. He went to the New York Times president on free speech. Good, too. Even if I disagreed on the substance. He did not go to The New York Times to talk about sexual violence and the crisis of sexual violence, or what we should do about it. And we ask ourselves, why not? We all know the answer. The answer is because it is normalized. It is treated as something that we should expect to happen at a college campus. There is a crisis about free speech. We constructed that crisis. It was a real crisis for some, not a real crisis for others, but it was a crisis for him, and he spoke out about it and acted on it. He did not on sexual violence, nor has any of the administration. I shared the outrage raised by Chris Roebuck about being said, that we're all

part of the problem, but I also sincerely felt the outrage about our own failures and the senate failures. And I think absolutely the Senate needs to insist on its own authority and take a leadership role here. I think there's an opportunity for doing so right now. But there is a difference. At the end of the day, central administration are the only people who are accountable for the whole institution. But what we do here, what we choose to do here, what we don't choose to do here. It was said earlier in the Senate, it was repeated here that if we had a leadership change after every sexual assault, we'd be in constant turmoil, most of it. Well, maybe that is what it would take to make what has been a crisis for a long time for many of our colleagues and students, a crisis for our leadership as well. And maybe by making it a crisis for our leadership, we actually can create the space for the types of structural changes that will change the culture rather than simply treat culture as something over which we have no agency and to which we are not accountable. I want to end by taking the last second as I was denied to Jane Doe. I felt unsupported. I felt unsupported and disbelieved by President Kotlikoff, diminished my confidence in the administration's ability to approach my experience with the understanding, sensitivity, and fairness I hoped and expected from what happened in my dreams and for many others.\ I urge everyone to vote yes to no confidence.

IRIS PACKMAN: Iris Packman from ILR. RTE Senator. I think it's important that we restore confidence in this university. And when major things happen like this and everyone is watching, it's important to show that the university is self-aware. And this vote would be a chance to do that. I'm a Cornell alum. My husband is an alum. Many of my relatives are alums, my siblings, grandparents, parents, in-laws. We love this university, and we want to see it be its best. And this vote is a signal that we are aware of it and we're going to take action. And I am excited for the next chapter after we get through this, of what those steps will be. But we can safely say that what has happened has not been sufficient.

SAM NELSON: [Indiscernible] before we move on to the next quarter.

LEE HUMPHREYS: I'm Lee Humphreys. I'm in communication. I'm a faculty senator stand in. Our Senator recently had a baby, so I'm here to represent. But today I'm reading the letter that was referenced in the chat, which is the letter from a number of women in STEM to here at Cornell to the Cornell Board of Trustees. "We read as faculty who have devoted much of our professional lives to co-creating a community at Cornell dedicated to do the greatest good. We're compelled to write about the lasting harm inflicted on our students by sexual violence on this campus and the failure of Cornell's leadership in their response, which has created a second crisis on top of the first. Regardless of what the courts decide, after due process is followed, the men directly involved and everyone who saw the Snapchat yet did nothing at the very least violated the expectations we have of all Cornellians. There is no ambiguity about that. Cornellians everywhere needed to hear President Kotlikoff and Vice President Ryan Lombardi say so plainly and forcefully, and to be unambiguous in taking responsibility from that day the story broke. Cornell's response left an appearance of insufficient transparency and accountability, and a focus on damage control for the administration's failure to engage directly with the difficult situation it was responsible for addressing has undermined and continues to undermine the ideals of leadership we teach our students every day. What our community needed was clear leadership. Instead, it faced a leadership vacuum. President Kotlikoff did acknowledge missteps in the response to this crisis, but this acknowledgment was swiftly followed by an argument for how a

change in leadership at this moment would destabilize the university. We argue that President Kotlikoff's resignation would improve stability by resolving an ongoing crisis of legitimacy and recognizing a failure of leadership. We do not support waiting for the results of the independent review being led by Sally Yates. No outcome of that special committee would change our opinion that we urgently need to act now to restore confidence in Cornell leadership, both locally with our students and faculty, and externally in the greater international community. In this explosive moment, Cornell can make a better choice. We recognize President Kotlikoff's many years of dedicated service and his contributions to Cornell. Our concern is that his lack of response lacks the clarity of judgment and decisive action that this moment required of Cornell's president. We believe that President Kotlikoff should be asked to resign. But for that to not be a hollow action, the Board of Trustees must hear the faculty, find us a new president who shares our empathy and humanity, and replaces student well-being, safety, and education front and center. We need leaders who think for themselves. How do we not just get our university through this, but do the right thing and play a leading role nationally to move from failing our young people to lifting them up? Let's make Cornell the place where things start to change." Signed by women leaders in STEM and engineering. I look forward to sending the full letter to all of you.

SAM NELSON: I'd like to call Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty, to come up and explain what's happening next with the voting.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you, everyone, for that lengthy, very respectful, and substantive debate. I couldn't be prouder of this body and our faculty for considering these issues so seriously. Senators should receive an email tomorrow with a link to a Qualtrics to vote. Voting will be open until noon on Friday, November 6th, I believe, a week from Friday. I will send the results later that afternoon to senators shortly before public release. We've reached the end of our extended time, but I'm going to ask for some forbearance for this body and move to extend the meeting by ten minutes and adjust the agenda. I move that we allow ten minutes for members of the University Faculty Committee to make an initial presentation of the UFC sponsored resolution. I move that my announcements and the two good of the order items, be delayed until the meeting in two weeks.

>> Seconded.

SAM NELSON: All in favor? Say aye.

>> Aye.

SAM NELSON: All opposed? Okay. Motion passes.

ADAM SMITH: Good afternoon, everyone. Adam Smith. I'm associate dean of the faculty and faculty member at anthropology. I will try my best not to take all the ten minutes because I realize that people have places to be, and I'll try to be as quick as I can. I'm here on behalf of the University Faculty Committee with my colleagues, Dan Buckley and Suzanne Charles, in order to present a resolution that seeks to utilize the power of the faculty to address the present crisis of sexual assault, something that I think we've heard quite a bit of today. This resolution is independent of the resolution that was our focus today and will proceed on its own pace. But we

wanted to bring it forward now in order to invite a consultative discussion with all of you. We want to invite substantive ideas and suggestions in order to sharpen the proposals that are outlined here and to take advantage of the deliberative wisdom of this body. We would invite you to please post suggested friendly amendments, concerns, or new ideas as comments on the Pending Matters page on the Dean of Faculty website. You can also feel free to email your ideas and suggestions to the Dean of Faculty as well. We will gather everything and bring a revised text forward at the next opportunity of the Senate. Now, taken together, these resolutions propose a faculty-led research effort to find approaches that work, a campus wide approach to engagement affecting and empower the voices of our local community and put initiatives into practice, and an ongoing faculty-led assessment to inform campus whether our approaches that were employed are actually helping our community. Together, we've defined three mechanisms that give the faculty a sustained role in ending sexual violence at Cornell, and we look forward to your questions and to your suggested amendments. I should note that the University Assembly and the Employees Assembly are already moving ahead on one of our portions of our resolution, and so we look forward to working with our collaborators as well. Let me read the resolution for you to give you a sense of what we have in mind. Can you bring that up? Whereas sexual assault inflicts lasting harm on members of our community, and its persistence at Cornell constitutes a pressing crisis. Whereas the scourge of sexual violence undermines our students' ability to learn and faculty members' ability to teach, striking at the heart of the University's educational mission. Whereas survivors, students, and members of the wider community have called on Cornell faculty to take sustained action to confront this crisis with the seriousness it demands. Whereas Cornell educates leaders of the coming generation, and how the University meets this moment can demonstrate what a community owes to each of its members. Whereas healing from sexual violence and rebuilding trust within the Cornell community will take time and require sustained opportunities for members to be heard, reflect together, and help shape the University's response. Whereas the Faculty Senate's response to this crisis should draw on the faculty's capacity for rigorous inquiry, reasoned deliberation, and independent judgment to help all members of the Cornell community learn, teach, and work free from sexual violence. Next slide. Be it therefore resolved that the Senate recommends that the University establish a standing, faculty-led research center focused on sexual violence and its prevention, beginning work no later than the Fall 2027 semester with adequate funding for at least five years. It should be free to publish its findings and should report regularly to the Faculty Senate and the Cornell community. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate shall invite the Student Assembly, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, Employee Assembly, and University Assembly to co-convene a Joint Commission on Sexual Violence, composed of members appointed by each participating body. This Commission should build upon and extend the work of the Sexual Assault Task Force by engaging with the Cornell community in an ongoing dialogue aimed at identifying strategies for reducing rates of sexual misconduct on campus, evaluating the effectiveness of approaches that have been implemented, improving university systems to support survivors and respond to sexual assault, and fostering a vibrant social life free of sexual violence. The Commission shall make recommendations in support of shared governance for consideration by the various assemblies. The central administration shall provide adequate staffing and support for the Commission to conduct its work. Next slide. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate shall establish a standing Faculty Committee on Institutional Administration, composed of faculty appointed by the Nominations and Elections Committee with the concurrence of the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall review the effects of administrative policies and procedures, and

provide the Senate with analysis, recommendations, and constructive criticism in support of shared governance. The committee will be empowered to evaluate, assess, and make proposals to enact positive change in our administrative policies and procedures for Senate consideration. The Committee's initial focus shall be on the University's response to sexual violence, including implementation of the measures announced October 13, 2026, the University's response to the recommendations of the Sexual Assault Task Force and the Joint Commission, as well as to the findings and recommendations of the independent review led by Sally Yates, t The review of Greek life, including criteria for whether, and under what conditions, suspended fraternity social activities may resume, staffing and budgets for prevention and survivor support, and university investments in healthy spaces for student extracurricular activities, including ongoing planning for Collegetown's revitalization. The Committee shall report regularly to the Faculty Senate. Lastly, be it further resolved that the three entities established above, individually providing state-of-the-art comparative national research, local engaged understanding, and considered judgement, shall work together to provide an integrated framework for addressing sexual assault on campus And I'd be happy to take a few minutes of questions if we have time.

SAM NELSON: Are there any questions at this time? Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: This is just procedural, and maybe I missed it, but is this going to be considered the first meeting where this resolution is considered since we really aren't talking about it? Or is this just an introduction? And then, there will be two more meetings.

ADAM SMITH: I think that would be a favor of this just being an introduction because we would really like this to be a deliberative process where we can really collect as much wisdom and feedback.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, BTS. Could you just speak briefly to how faculty will join in in the center and obtain funding? What will that process look like?

ADAM SMITH: So, I think that's one of the levels of detail that we have not engaged with yet. But we know, as we've heard already today, that there is extensive faculty expertise already on campus. It would be wonderful if we could have an opportunity to bring even more to Ithaca in order to improve our capacities. That would be terrific. And establishing a form of research entity that can really do the serious work together, that can actually speak with a voice to the campus as well, that I think elevate all the research that's going on campus. And we will get a chance to really use the primary tool of the faculty to address sexual violence on campus. And that is our delivery across research.

SAM NELSON: All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. At this point, I'd like to move to adjourn. Do I have a second? All right. Thank you very much.