
Faculty Senate
December 11, 2024

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Five seconds. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Speaker of the Senate, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. As usual, we start with the land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy predates the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, we start the meeting with the approval of minutes. These are the minutes from November 13th, 2024. They have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. Unless I hear any corrections, I will assume unanimous consent to approve the minutes. And if you notice any typos or other small things, you can bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty. There's one other item for which I request unanimous consent. It has to do with the agenda. Steve Jackson, who was on the agenda, cannot be here today. So, I propose to distribute the minutes allocated to him to the various agenda items as needed. So, hearing no objections, we will do just that, have a little bit more time for the other items. We start with the resolution on the selection process for external reviewers in tenure cases. Tracy Stokol, Chair of Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee from Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, will have five minutes, followed by 10 minutes of faculty discussion. Is Tracy online? Ah, sorry. Before we go, let me-- There's a slide building trust and inclusivity. The bottom line is that we have three microphones so that we can distinguish and allocate a fair allocation of time between those people with comments in favor, people with comments in opposition, and comments that are neither in opposition or in favor. So, these are the three red, yellow, and green microphones. And so, if you're in person and the comment period is in effect, please come up behind these microphones, and I will let you know when it's your turn. We will alternate, as usual, between the different positions and between the people in person and the people on Zoom. There's also an idea of maintaining decorum, especially in person. Avoid the kinds of hissing and other sorts of comments that are not appropriate in this kind of a setting. Did I miss anything? Okay. So, is Tracy online? So, unmute yourself and go for five minutes then. Not online? We're looking for Tracy. Can you? Okay. Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty, will present this issue.

EVE DE ROSA: This was a work that was started under the previous Dean of Faculty, Charlie Van Loon. And this is all about increasing transparency in the tenure process. And so, there are about four resolutions, and this is the next in the series that we want to consider. And this is basically defining what an external reviewer is and is not and also defining the independent list method for inviting external reviewers. So, in terms of background, external letters, if this is approved, would be people who are outside of Cornell to provide that arm's length assessment of the candidate's work. Internal reviewers are still permitted. So, people internal to Cornell who are still arm's length are still permitted and will be included in the dossier, but they won't be the minimum of five external letters that are required according to the handbook. So, the independent list method is asking that the candidate have a list that's created independently. Some departments and units have this practice, but many do not, where they might wait for the

candidates list to then generate the departmental or units list. What we're asking for through this resolution, or at least the academic freedom and professional status of the faculty committee, they're the sponsors of this, what they're requesting is that the candidate and the department create their list independently without seeing it. And then, when you go to invite reviewers to have a balance of candidate and departmental invitees to determine the source. So, there could be sources that were both on the candidate's list and also on the department's list, which is fine. To list the number of reviewers specifically on the candidate's list and also to say how many external reviewers declined and for what reason. Next slide, please. And so, it's a very simple resolution. Whereas the selection of external reviewers is essential to the tenure process, and we're defining external as external to Cornell and those minimum five external letters. Whereas the candidate input to the process should be structured in a way that is fair and transparent. And that's now doing an independent list creation, and then noting who is from which list. And then, be it resolved that the independent list method for selecting external reviewers be adopted by every college and school. And now, we can open the floor for discussion.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Try to keep the comments to two minutes and identify yourself and your affiliation. And if it's just a comment, I guess you can go to any microphone.

JOHN SIPPLE: John Sipple, Global Development. Can you give us a sense of the variability around the university? I'm not familiar with how varied the practices are.

EVE DE ROSA: We have 82 departments and probably 80 different procedures. Because Charlie was socializing this method, some colleges and schools did actually start to move to the independent list method, but it was never legislated. And so, that's what we're doing now. But some departments do not do that. I would even say many.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm seeing no comments from in house or on Zoom. I'll wait another few seconds.

EVE DE ROSA: It's funny. The last time it came up, it was very controversial. So, I guess we resolved what we needed to resolve.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, could you clarify if it's coming to a vote on Qualtrics?

EVE DE ROSA: Yes. So, not hearing any need for mending this resolution, this will come to a vote on Qualtrics, and we'll send it out tomorrow. And everyone, I'd like you to consult your constituents. I know many have started to go away, but we can do this over email. Maybe sharing the Senate summary with them and letting them look at it before voting. That would be great.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we're going to go to the next agenda item. This is a Faculty Senate resolution to condemn Cornell Vice President Joel Malina for violating faculty academic freedom. As you know, this is the main motion that is now being amended. And for those of you unfamiliar with Robert's rules, an amendment sort of takes priority over the main motion. Vote on the amendment first, and then depending on the outcome of the vote, that either gets attached to or does not get attached to the main motion. Robert's rules also permits an amendment to an amendment, and we have one of those as well. And in the same analogous fashion, the

amendment to the amendment takes priority over the amendment. We vote on that first. If that passes, then the amended amendment is up for discussion and a vote. If that passes, that becomes attached to the main motion. If it doesn't pass, we still have the main motion unamended. I hope that's crystal clear. So, to get this started, we will have a two-minute introduction to the amendment. And then, we will then go to the amendment to the amendment. Vote on that, then go back to the original amendment, vote on that, then go back, if necessary, to the main motion. Let's see how this all works. And we'll try to alternate between those opposed and in favor, both on Zoom and in person. So, I believe Risa is going to just explain the context of the amendment to the main motion.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: You should.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: All right, hopefully, this will be more clear than the process. You explained it very clearly. Thank you. So, I'm Risa Lieberwitz, ILR, and the co-sponsors, the Faculty Senate co-sponsors and I took in and really considered carefully what we heard from the Senate discussion of the original proposed resolution, which I believe is still up there. I don't know.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. So, the original one, the original proposal was a resolution that had two aspects to it. One aspect was dealing with the statements by Vice President, Joel Malina, and the other aspect of the original resolution dealt with the increased policing and increased camera presence on campus. And so, what we heard from a number of people from the Senate was that they suggested that we have two separate resolutions. So, basically, the content and the purpose of the original resolution hasn't changed, but what has changed is the division into the first resolution that we're going to be voting on now in terms of amending the original into the first amended resolution. That one deals only with Malina. The second one deals only with the second amendment, which we're not discussing right now, deals only with the increased policing and security cameras, okay? So, that was the main purpose of the division. Now, we also made some changes based on what we heard about some of the language in the original resolution. And so, some of that shows up as using the terms Faculty Senate demands, and then whatever it is that we demand. So, we included that as well. Now, as I'm sure you all know, since all of this had started and the discussion has evolved, it was announced that Vice President Malina is leaving the university, and he'll be leaving as of January 5. And so, we went back and amended the proposal about Malina to actually focus on what we're demanding from the university, that it do in relation to Malina's statements, and we removed the particular provision that had to do with demanding a public apology from Malina. And if he didn't apologize, then he would face censure. And so, our thinking was to focus on the university's response. I think that's all I have to say, but I hope that everybody had a chance to look through the changes.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Let me just clarify. We couldn't literally divide the motion. Robert's rules doesn't permit it. So, what Risa is talking about, the Second Amendment is actually going to be another motion, another main motion, and the amendment to the amendment has nothing to do with policing and surveillance. It actually has to do with restoring the clause that you

eliminated. And it was something that I'd like to deal with now, and then we'll get back to the amendment. So, this is an amendment to the amendment to restore one of the clauses. It was put forward by Mark Lewis.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible] So, this is an amendment to the amendment to just restore one of the missing clauses. And would you like to--

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: It's integrated into the amended-- It's not a standalone motion.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do we have the--

MARK LEWIS: I don't need to because the previous slide explains what happened since this was put forward. [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I believe that once an amendment, whether it's an amendment to an amendment or an amendment to the main motion has been brought to the floor, it can't simply be withdrawn by the person who put it forward, but it has to come to a vote to withdraw. So, we can vote to withdraw, or I could ask for unanimous consent to withdraw the motion at the request of the person who promoted this.

CIT Support: Anything that we want people online to be able to hear needs to be said into a microphone.

CA SHUGARTS: Hey, Jonathan, this is CA Shugarts. I'm just letting you know that no one can hear what's being said in the room.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we're aware of that now. So, to reiterate, we had an amendment to an amendment, and the sponsor of that amendment to the amendment wishes to withdraw. Because this has already been brought to the body, the Senate, I'm asking for unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment to the amendment at the request of the sponsor of that amendment to the amendment.

MARK LEWIS: I think that there's something that there's a misnomer here because the amendment I recommended was with regard to the original resolution. So, it was not put forward as an amendment to an amendment. It was put forward as an amendment to the resolution that was originally proposed.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Somehow, this got processed through the university faculty committee and came out in this manner.

EVE DE ROSA: So, Mark, I will let you know that the sponsors amended the original with your language, and the only thing that they did not incorporate was this. So, those resolutions in the

amendment. [Crosstalk] Okay, so let's first decide whether the unanimous consent for the amendment of the amendment, that we're not going to consider it. You don't have to do anything. Only if you dissent. So, is anyone dissenting?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If anybody objects, raise your hand.

EVE DE ROSA: A point of information. Come on up, David.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, the request from the audience is to explain what we are voting or not voting on. And this is what came to me as an amendment to an amendment, and it's on the slide. And it's a clause that was in the original main motion that was removed in the amendment to the main motion and then restored through this amendment to the amendment. That's what we were voting to now eliminate again. Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate demands Vice President Malina issue a public apology for his statements which violated faculty academic freedom that he made at the September 30, 2024 Hillel parents meeting or face the vote on his censure.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Could we see the actual amended motion with the cross outs and the yellow and stuff on the screen, rather than see an original motion?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: In context.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I think that would really help.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That is number two.

MARK LEWIS: I can explain what I was trying to do.

EVE DE ROSA: Let me just explain. So, Chelsea, our Associate Dean of Faculty, is going to put up with all the strikes and replacements so that everybody could see. So, she's sharing the screen.

MARK LEWIS: Can I have one minute?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Sure, go ahead.

MARK LEWIS: So, the original motion had some language in there that did not include faculty senate demands. That was one piece I asked Risa to change, which I think that they did. I also requested that if we're going to demand something-- There should be a consequence when someone does not adhere to those demands, and I requested we add this language about censure if VP Malina refuses to apologize. We discussed this last time. Since that time, we have a new amendment, which includes the fact that VP Malina is retiring, in which case, we don't need to have a censure, a consideration of censure or an apology when someone's going to retire. So, that's where we are. Hopefully, it makes sense.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, I come back to the request for unanimous consent to delete this amendment to the amendment, which shows up as a yellow highlighted text. And I will wait a few seconds, and if I don't hear any objection, then that withdrawal request is approved. Okay, I hear no objection. So, the amendment to the amendment is disposed of, it's withdrawn. We're back now to discussion of the amendment that was just presented by Risa Lieberwitz. So, I think if you're here and you would wish to talk in favor, make comments in favor or opposed to the amendment, not the main motion. Remember, we'll vote on the and discuss the main motions later. First, we're just talking about the amendment. And if you have any comments, either in favor, or opposed, or neutral, come up to the appropriate microphone or raise your hand in Zoom. And I see Ken. Could you just raise your hand, Ken, if you are either, if you're opposed to this amendment? Okay, go ahead for two minutes, please.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Berman, Computer Science. I'm opposed to this because I think it has us going down a path of voting on an absurdity. I would suggest that this also be withdrawn, and then that we vote down the resolution simply because it still focuses on President Malina, on Vice President Malina, who's leaving. It just makes no sense to me that we go forward, even though I supported this before he resigned. So, I think the whole process has fallen apart, and we should just clear this entire piece of it off the slate.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm looking for someone who wants to speak now in favor of the amendment. Go ahead and identify yourself.

BEGÜM ADALET: Begüm Adalet, government senator. Hi. As I've mentioned before, and I promise this will be the last time, but I am from Turkey originally. So, part of the reason I've not returned to Turkey to teach has been that I would not be able to freely teach the history and politics of that country. Its historical and contemporary treatment of women, LGBTQ, Kurdish, Armenian, Yazidi, Greek, Jewish, Alevi, and many other minority populations. I found refuge here. I've encouraged students persecuted for their research on these issues to come here. But it's increasingly difficult to do this if we're under threat of surveillance from the administration. So, as the final resolution suggests, we want to have assurance from the Cornell administration that they will be adhering to our statements of academic freedom, and freedom of speech, and expression. We're terrified that our syllabi and our course descriptions might be summoned and scrutinized, not just by the university administration, but an incoming government. And this goes not just for those of us who study empire, and militarism, and critical race theory, but also for those of us who study gender, gender identity, sexuality, trans life, those of us studying climate change, fossil fuel, humanology, public health, anti-democratic and authoritarian regimes and movements. So, all of this, not just for the humanities, but for the medical school, for biology, for physics. All of us will be under scrutiny. This will have implications for higher education and our ability to teach our students and to have community with them to make them comfortable. So, we need some type of assurance from the university administration that they will not engage in any surveillance of our teaching, which is the central part of the resolution, as I see it, and does not necessarily pertain particularly to an outgoing member of the administration. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Let me just say, I recognize it's very difficult to separate the amendment from the main motion. But if your comments are basically about the main motion in

general, I would ask you to wait until we're ready to discuss the main motion. The discussion of the amendments right now should be about the amendment itself and not about the entire main motion. And I know it's hard to just talk about the amendment without talking about the main motion. And I'm not criticizing you or anyone. I just want to make that point that if you have something about the main motion, better to wait until we're back to that.

BEGÜM ADALET: I guess I heard the objection as we were objecting to the main motion.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: It's very hard to make that distinction sometimes. Someone opposed? Identify yourself.

DAVID LEE: Well, David Lee, a Professor Emeritus in the Dyson School, JCB, and faculty trustee. Now, I'm really confused because I wrote up my remarks so I wouldn't get confused, and they were based on there being two amendments. So, now, I'm going to have to sort of wing it here. Jonathan, if I may, let me just try to pull out one. Most of my comments are on the main motion rather than the amendment. I do think, as the previous individual mentioned, I do think this is kind of a hopeless case, to be honest. It's so complicated. I'm not even sure we know what we're voting on anymore. I do have one question or one point on process that pertains to the amendment, as well as the main motion, but certainly the amendment. And that is there were 64 co-sponsors of the main motion. Both the primary amendment and the secondary amendment that we just disposed of only have seven co-sponsors. So, my question is really sort of a question point of information, whatever, of the sponsors, Risa or other sponsors, is I'd like to know what happened to the 89% of the co-sponsors that were included in the original amendment. Were they contacted? Did they support the main motion that they signed on to two months ago? Do they have second thoughts, or did they have second thoughts since then about the advisability of this whole resolution in whatever iteration, with or without amendments? Question. I'll reserve my other comments for the next step.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: You could just quickly respond to that.

EVE DE ROSA: The reason why we now have fewer supporters or co-sponsors, not supporters, but co-sponsors was because of just logistics of going back to that many people multiple times. And so, since the requirement for a resolution is for senators and there are other ways to put a resolution on the floor, we thought that since we had seven faculty senators who were co-sponsoring it, that logistically, it made sense to just move forward in that way. So, I don't think that anything should be read into it other than that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead. Identify yourself.

MARK LEWIS: Sure. Mark Lewis. Is it on?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yeah, you're on.

MARK LEWIS: Mark Lewis. So, I just wanted to point out that I am likely in favor of this resolution. I just don't like the title as it is on the slide now. It's different. It's different than what-- Oh, that's not that slide. The next slide talks about condemnation of a particular person, and I

don't think that's what we're trying to do.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

MARK LEWIS: So we should-- Okay, but I don't think we want publicly out there, on our website or in writing here, that the Faculty Senate is condemning a particular person who has not had an opportunity to say anything here in the Senate. So, can you go to the slide, please?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is the title.

MARK LEWIS: Can you go to the slide, please?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure.

MARK LEWIS: So, I think we just want to correct that. This is why I'm in the middle, not on either side. I think we want to correct it. That's not the title that we should be thinking about this, as a condemnation of a particular person at the university. I just want to make that clear. That's all I'm here for. Thanks.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm not sure how we deal with the status of a title, whether that's just something that's informal. It's not the motion itself. If someone has some advice for the speaker, I'd appreciate it. But first, let's move on, and then come back to that question when we have some more information. I want to go to Zoom, but first, Kelly and Annetta, can you raise your hand if you are in favor of this amendment? Okay. Kelly doesn't have a hand raised. Annetta, you go first then.

ANNETTA ALEXANDRIDIS: Yeah, just a little-- Annetta Alexandridis, History of Art. I just had the impression concerning the last point that in the amendment text that was circulated, the word condemned was replaced by concerning the utterances by Vice President Joel Malina. And I just wanted to reiterate or support what Begüm Adalet said before. I think even if Vice President Malina is leaving the university, I find it's still very-- because what he said was an attack on academic freedom, and I find it super important that administration make this very clear once and for all. And that I think is made clear in the amendment to the original motion. And that's why I want to support it. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Kelly, are you opposed or-- If you're opposed, could you raise your hand?

KELLY HUME: I'm sorry. We're supposed to be talking about the amendment, right? Whoever put up the word document with the highlights and the cross outs, that is the amendment? Or is this on the screen the amendment?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think we should go to the document that I have because this is not fully representing the amendment [indiscernible] .

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: What we saw previously with the yellow highlight was the

amendment to the amendment. There's another document that just shows the highlights for the amendment.

KELLY HUME: So, I'm in favor of the amendment, and I wanted to second what Mark said about-- I realized that you said the title of the resolution isn't part of the resolution, but it's present with the resolution, and I totally don't feel it's appropriate to publish something that condemns a person. We can condemn what they said, condemn their actions, but not condemn the person. So, I'm in favor of the amendment because this says concerning. That's all I wanted to say.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Right. So, I hope that's clear that as part of the amendment, the title has been changed as well. While we're looking at that, I don't see any people opposed, so we'll go to another comment in favor. Identify yourself, please.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Hi. Noah Tamarkin. Anthropology is what I'm here representing, and I'm also in Science and Technology Studies. Two really brief points on the question of why the number dropped. In addition to what Risa said, I just wanted to add I just came from an anthropology faculty meeting and just double checked with everybody, many of whom were original co-sponsors and are not listed now, and they still support this. They support the amendment. It just was a matter of like, well, do we need to do this too? Like, no, I guess we don't need to. So, it really was a logistics issue, not a lack of support issue in my experience. The question on whether it makes sense to censure Malina, given that Malina is leaving. The reason I think it's actually useful, whatever we end up with the title, is that it's a really concrete example that was reported in media. And so, we have something to hinge. It's not an abstracted like, hey, support academic freedom. It's like, hey, this thing happened. That's an example of something that we actually were going to condemn, and I think there's a lot of power in having an example. Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: I just wanted to do a logistical check. I think that we can have Risa and the co-sponsors just check to see if any of those original faculty members want to add their name to this, and that's fine.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are you wanting to speak in favor? I still don't see any other-- Yes. We have a point of information.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't mean to be a pest, but I just want to clarify, at least from my understanding, since I deferred on my comments on the amendment. Essentially, the amended resolution as it now stands, as I understand it, essentially divides the previous resolution into two completely different parts, right?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Not exactly. It extracts one part.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It extracts one part for a subsequent resolution.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes. So, what we're essentially dealing with now is the remainder of the original resolution with those adjustments, and taking out the part about security and oversight.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And some word changes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Then, I do have some further comments.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. We'll get back to the main motion, of course. Go ahead and identify yourself.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. I'm speaking in favor of the amendment. Okay. And I don't think it's just the separation that's going on here. A, the language changed. It's concerning Joel Malina's comments, not condemning Joel Malina. And one of the reasons I didn't join as a co-sponsor of the original motion was I didn't like the idea of condemning a person. I thought it was ad hominem, and I think this is way better the way it's written. Second thing, and this is a difference from just splitting off the police security thing, the business about getting the university to come up and make a strong statement, I think, is important. And, you know, aside from apologies or anything like that, I think it's really important for the university to make that assertion that we're not in the business of surveilling faculty members. And I think that's really important.

TARA HOLM: I would love to answer David's message or comment. I agree completely that the administration should not be surveilling classrooms and, you know, everything that we've heard about Joel Malina's statements-- I'm Tara Holm. I'm a senator for math. Everything we've heard about Joel Malina's statement is hearsay in The Sun. What he did right in The Sun, his words are, "University administrators have no purview over classroom instruction, nor should they. Any review of faculty classroom activity appropriately lies with the faculty who are committed to promoting inclusive academic spaces that are free of unlawful discrimination and harassment." It's pretty clear to me.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are we ready to vote on the amendment that will happen in-house? No. We still will go back to the main motion. This is just on the amendment.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The amendment is essentially the motion, right?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No. We'll go back to the motion. This is just the amendment to the motion. We will have time to discuss the motion after we get the vote on the amendment. That way, we'll know whether the motion is amended or not. Wait a second. Maybe Risa should explain, since she put both the motion and the amendment together, what the difference is.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Well, I mean, I think it's actually a procedural question. The question is, which are we voting on? Are we voting on the original resolution, or are we as a body going to vote on this amended resolution? And so if we vote for the amendment, it's to vote that the

Senate will be ultimately considering the merits of the amended resolution. And so, that's why there's going to be a separate discussion. If this amendment is passed, there will be a separate discussion of do you support this resolution as amended? Does that make sense?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, remember, the vote on the amendment is not a vote on the motion. You can be in favor or not in favor of the motion and have a completely different vote on the amendment because you will have a chance to vote on the motion, whether or not it's amended or not. And that's a separate question, okay? So--

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is what we're voting on right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're voting on whether or not this is what we're going to vote on. Does everyone get that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You're right. Okay.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, do we have an ability for the Zoom people to vote? Do they know?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jill's gonna watch the forums.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. And then, in house, are we ready for that vote?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Only senators can vote. So, I guess all those in favor of the amendment to the main motion, raise your hand and hold it up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the Zoom vote says support the motion as articulated, but it's support the amendment as articulated, correct?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is there a way for you to send us exactly what we're voting on? We can't see it on the screen, and I'm a little confused.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: It was sent already as document number two, I'm told.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Document number two, okay.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, they're getting tired. Hands down. Those opposed to the amendment, raise your hand and hold it up. And those who abstain from voting, raise your hand and hold it up. Can someone count them, the abstentions? So, we've conducted the vote in-house, and we're waiting to tabulate the Zoom votes. The amendment is approved. Now, since we've

disposed of the amendment to the amendment, we voted to approve the amendment to the main motion. We can now discuss the main motion as amended. Again, if anyone has comments in favor, come to the green microphone. Opposed, come to the red. And if you are on Zoom, just raise your hand. So, why don't you start? Identify yourself again.

DAVID LEE: David Lee, Professor Emeritus in the Dyson School, JCB, and faculty elected trustee. I strongly object to what I guess now is an amended motion. I don't usually like to read my comments, but I got so thoroughly confused in reading through the three versions and looking at what was stricken and what was still in, that I figured the only way I was not going to be confused is if I wrote out what I said. I don't like doing that, but if I'm confused, then you're going to be even more confused. Two points, really. In addition to the one I mentioned before, which I just thought was peculiar to have almost 90% of the co-sponsors not appear. Whether they're interested, it just wasn't clear to me. We had an answer to that, and that's fair enough. So, I have one particular point, one general point. The particular point is that the motion asserts that Mr. Malina threatened, quote, surveillance over faculty and their speech. That's not what he said. He said, he used the word, at least if you believe The Sun's reporting. And again, this is an important motion based on one article in The Sun, which is peculiar. Why is that important? Why is that difference between scrutiny and surveillance important? Surveillance has two meanings. It can mean simple scrutiny. In fact, they're synonymous with each other. That is, examination, inspection, analysis, and so forth. Or it can carry a more nefarious meaning, spying, espionage, and so forth. And I think that was the meaning that was intended in the motion. Mr. Malina used the word scrutiny, which is what department chairs and deans do all the time for as long as I've been here, 42 years and probably twice that long. They do that all the time in annual performance reviews, and tenure reviews, promotion cases, et cetera, et cetera. So, scrutiny of our teaching, scrutiny of our research, scrutiny of our extension and outreach work happens all the time. I don't think we have any objections to it. But scrutiny has somehow in this motion become translated into a more ambiguous surveillance, which, as I said, has multiple meanings. Is the Faculty Senate then going to throw out the process of scrutinizing faculty work, teaching, research, extension, and outreach? Are we throwing that out the window? Are we going to be telling department chairs and deans that you can no longer send independent people to watch a lecture or a peer review of a lecture, et cetera? So, that's one concern I have. This is ambiguous language to begin with. And then, secondly, more importantly, I want to reemphasize a central point that was made by several senators in last month's meeting. This entire resolution, including the reintroduced language in Mark Lewis' amendment, which was taken care of. In my view, this greatly and inappropriately over-personalizes and vilifies a particular Cornell administrator. Vice President Malina, as someone just noted, has responded on the record immediately after the Cornell Sun article, and I'm guessing, long since ruse the day he used the language he did. I don't know that for a fact, but I would imagine he does. Yes, his after the fact language was partial. It wasn't complete, and he certainly didn't prostrate himself in front of us. But yes, he did make a mistake. Who amongst us has not made a mistake in our language, in our teaching, advising students, professional presentations? Are we all error free? I doubt it. I certainly am not. Would each of us following those errors that we might make like to be greeted with a censure by the Faculty Senate every time we made an error? Given the fact that he has also retired or leaving Cornell, I think it's almost sort of sticking a thumb in his eye as well. I believe the words used by Ruth Collins at our meeting last month were exactly on point. The resolution in whatever form is overly censorious. Those are the words she used. The amendment that we just rejected added

back language that was additionally censorious. So, I objected to that. I object to this. Finally, this is the third time in three months that we've devoted significant time to this matter, to the exclusion of far more important business we have at hand. We could have been discussing the expressive activity policy further in addition to what we did, we could be discussing the growing and frankly massive problem we have with academic integrity, or many other matters. How do we as an institution expect to be taken seriously by the administration, the trustees, and our colleagues if we spend our limited time tailoring ad hominem tax on administrators? Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman, are you opposed or in favor of this motion?

KEN BIRMAN: I'm on the red side.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, then I'm going to have you wait and go to someone in favor. Try to keep it to two minutes.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. David Lee is absolutely right that the use of surveillance is in fact related to the close scrutiny that Malina, Vice President Malina promised the parents in that meeting on Zoom that was hosted by Hillel. There was nothing neutral about what he said. When Malina made those statements, they were based on focusing targeting two faculty members for their viewpoints about issues dealing with Israel and Gaza, and he was clearly reassuring the parents in that meeting that there would be surveillance through this close scrutiny, not only of these two faculty members, but all teaching. Let's be real about the context of how this happened, and how damaging that is, and the real chilling effect that those statements had on many, many faculty. And so, the resolved clauses address that. Malina never denied that he made those statements. He never actually took responsibility. He even did admit, I think in a PS or something, exactly where he wrote it in the letter that faculty were reasonably concerned about what he said. And now, the focus is on the administration, those remaining. What are you going to do? You've never publicly rejected Malina's statements. And we need this reassurance that the university administration commits and recommits to respecting all faculty academic freedom. And so, I think this is still a very, very important statement. I don't know of anything more important than what we're discussing right now. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Ken Birman, two minutes.

KEN BIRMAN: Yes, Ken Birman, Computer Science again. So, originally, when this was first proposed and actually before the acting provost stood up to comment on the Malina's comments, I was strongly in favor of the ad hominem attack. I was actually strongly in favor of directly criticizing Vice President Malina and I was inclined to support what Rias is trying to do here. And I voted for it once already, even though it turned out that that vote didn't count. Now, at this point, we have a series of issues, I would say, in my view, at least. One is that I believe that this-- well, first of all, that Malina is leaving. Secondly, the vice provost speaking to the Senate said that his comments didn't reflect the university position and the university does not engage in surveillance. So, we had a response. And Vice President Malina, on his way out, did write a letter into The Sun and said that, no, that's not what he intended. Now, furthermore, if you read the articles about the original meeting with Hillel, surveillance with the camera type stuff, that all related to safety on campus and had really very little, if any, connection to his remarks about the

three faculty of color, I'll comment, that he didn't like and that he wanted to see scrutinized. That's what offended me so much. I hope it offends everybody. But I would argue that the resolution as it's currently being proposed and worded somewhat deliberately misconstrues the situation, and that troubles me because I don't want the Senate on record inventing a pretext to make demands for things which we've actually already received. So, at this point, I'm opposed to the revised motion, and I think it should just be struck down.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. David Lee, I agree totally with you, your comment earlier about the overly censorious nature of the original motion. I think the amended motion is a lot less censorious, and that's why I might not have gotten up here to speak in favor of the original, but I am speaking in favor of this. Second of all, I think that this is a lot less about Malina and a lot more about getting reassurance from the university that they're not going to surveil or scrutinize our classes. And honestly, with all due respect, I think it's disingenuous to entangle the kind of scrutiny that Malina was clearly talking about with the kind of stuff we ordinarily do in tenure motion cases. I don't think that's at all what he was talking about. And so, that's why I'm for this. And that's why I'm much more for it than I was before, because it's not about Malina. It's about principles.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. I spoke last month about how unfortunate I find that we would be using academic freedom as a pretext to condemn speech that we haven't heard. Nothing has changed. We still haven't heard the speech. We still don't know what the context of the speech was. We don't know what questions the vice president was asked. The only thing that's actually changed is that we no longer have the opportunity to invite him to talk to us about that because he's retiring. Today, I want to talk about point two, though. This idea of surveillance, which, you know, another word for surveillance is oversight. And, you know, I read this part of the resolution to a couple of students I work with, and they universally found it horrifying that the faculty would say that the administration has no business making sure the class is being taught or actually the class is being taught. They said they would lose faith in the quality of instruction at Cornell if the faculty demands this. And I think that's worth considering, that if we are serving the students, this doesn't serve the students. This serves us personally. And we can look at our national and global institutions. Very few institutions of any size have ever been successful at providing 100% of their own oversight and not falling into self-serving corruption. The last thing I want to mention is a couple of months ago, the Faculty Senate had a meeting with this sitting president and sitting provost. And one of the questions that we asked them is if a faculty member has posted anti-Semitic comments or become known for their anti-Semitism, how can you be sure that won't make it into the classroom? I don't find it all unreasonable that a parent would also have had that question. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Maria, online.

MARIA GONZALEZ PENDAS: Yeah, thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, I'd like to speak in support of the resolution and in support of what those that have come before me have expressed. I actually think that when we're in the Senate, we do serve faculty's purposes. That's our job. It's wonderful to take into consideration students' opinions, but we're here to defend our interest as a Senate, as a faculty Senate. I think it's important to call attention to the fact that this is a resolution that asks for the university offices of the president and the president to support the faculty and that we're

showing concern for the ways in which autonomy, freedom of expression has been curtailed over the past years. As was said before, we've dedicated a lot of hours to this because this is a real concern. So, I think it would be really a lost opportunity for all of the discussions that we've had to come to nothing. This is a great chance that we have with explicit example that now puts the attention on the office, on the institution, and on the individual. I think, actually, that helps our purposes, which is to show concern for the ways in which the institution is not speaking up, you know, to defend what are they doing to defend our spaces. I appreciate everyone that has spoken against the resolution and sort of defending the offices of the vice president, but in a way, what we're asking is for them to do that job. Why? They are the ones that need to do the job of explaining why and how are they supporting our autonomy, our freedom of speech. I think that this resolution does just that, asks the office of the vice president to do that work, and I strongly, strongly support it for those reasons. And you talk about why don't we talk about academic integrity, expressive activity. This particular resolution is doing just that with an example. It comes down to that. A lot of us in the humanities, as Begüm was saying, are concerned and have been scrutinized in ways very insidious over the past year about the kind of classes that we teach, the events that we put together, and this is an opportunity that we have right now to show as a Senate that we are concerned for the future of our autonomy.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'll go to Yuval.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Hi. So, let me just repeat what I said. It's already the third time that I'm saying it. I really hope we will turn this resolution down. The main issue has to do with the fact that nobody knows what's happened there. And that's extremely problematic. And, you know, if we want to have a discussion about the whole issue at hand, let's make it. Let's bring people in. Let's engage in conversation with the administration. That's not the way to go. So, I really hope we will turn it down, not because of what is in there, but the way it is actually written. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'd like to end with two more comments, and then go to the final motion since we're running out of time. So, keep it short if you could.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Okay, two really brief things. First, we've heard twice now about doubts about The Sun's reporting. I don't understand this. I mean, I don't get why we're questioning their journalistic integrity in this context.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Identify yourself.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Sorry. Noah Tamarkin, Anthropology and STS. The second was, every time we do a new course, it gets evaluated in our departments, their curriculum committees, and it goes to college, university-wide committees. Evaluation and surveillance are not the same thing, and to suggest that they are is, as has already been suggested, disingenuous and also really dangerous. We're not calling in this resolution for everything goes, we do whatever we want. We're saying we have in place all kinds of peer evaluation, including peer teaching evaluations to evaluate us as teachers. This is about the university administration coming in to surveil particular courses that they have political problems with. That's what this is about. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, one more comment opposed. One more comment in favor. We'll go to you first. Identify yourself.

RUTH COLLINS: Ruth Collins, Molecular Medicine. So, I think the issues of faculty independence and faculty-free speech are obviously very important topics, and as my colleague Yuval Grossman has mentioned, we should really have debate on these issues. And I think the fear that is expressed by many faculty is a legitimate fear, but this resolution is not the venue. It's a shambles at this point. We have now debated this resolution on three separate occasions, and it's been mixed up and rearranged. It's on these extremely important and legitimate issues. There's such a shambles about it that we're not even sure how many sponsors there are. There hasn't even been a debate that-- The sponsors of the resolution have not even themselves logistically had time to sort of get organized. And I think that indicates that we're not taking it seriously. And the reason why we're not taking it seriously, as was pointed out, is because it's all about shaming and criticizing Malina. And the really bizarre part about this, we wanted to censor him, we want to invite him, we could pelt him with eggs. That's clearly the sentiment that's going on here. And the strange thing about it is that the sponsors of this resolution, it's been mentioned multiple times to them that there is evidence that directly contradicts their interpretation of events. And so, when in science, you have evidence that directly contradicts your hypothesis, you either change hypotheses or you find a way to explain the data that contradicts your hypothesis. The people involved in this resolution have done nothing of that sort because it's all about shaming and criticizing. It exacerbates tensions between academics and administration. And this is not apologizing to the administration. The administration, as has been pointed out again, have come here on multiple occasions to advocate faculty's free speech and freedom to teach in the classrooms. There is responsible freedom, and that is consistent with the mission of the university. I think it's the sponsor of this resolution failed the fundamental test of academics, which is they have ignored the data. And this is why I think we don't do these legitimate topics any service by passing this resolution, much as though I think that people feel strongly about this area. Thanks.

BEGÜM ADALET: Begüm Adalet, Government. So, there's a reason why we name the type of kind of peer observation that that Noah was referring to or kind of course observations done by colleagues. We don't name these surveillance or close scrutiny because they have completely different functions and they have different implications. And the title of the resolution has changed now to concerning the remarks rather than condemning or publicly shaming an individual. And what all the three points that we're hoping to see have the word public, publicly reject the claims. So, the provost coming here behind closed doors reassuring us is not enough. Malina himself had a chance to publicly deny or reject the way that the events of the meeting were reported in The Sun, and he did not. And so, what we're asking for really is a public reassurance from the administration, precisely so that we can have peace of mind as we research, as we teach, as we teach the matters that pertain to our specialties. And, this is the most important thing because we also hear about faculty members, not only not just kind of students reading these reports of our activities in the classroom being surveilled and scrutinized and terrified to speak to the types of sensitive topics that we cover, not just in humanities, but the social sciences and natural sciences, and also that we've heard of faculty hesitate to publicly state their views about things like the expressive activity policy because they haven't been reassured about the fact that they will not be scrutinized or punished by the administration for speaking up

on these issues. So, it is absolutely essential and vital that we spend as many sessions on this question as we need to, in fact, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Okay, so this will come to a vote after the meeting via Qualtrics. And we now have to go to the second main motion, and maybe you can put that slide on the slide. We're going to start with Risa again, who moved this motion, who will explain the second main motion, which you'll also vote on after the meeting, and we'll have time for discussion after a brief presentation.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: All right, thank you. Yeah, so now, we're moving to the second part of the division of the original motion. And I would point out that it has been renamed, so we don't have to discuss that perhaps anymore, and everybody's gotten a copy of this in their email from the Dean of Faculties office. And so, a lot of the cross outs were from the original motion that had to do with Malina statements, and the remaining material is all about the-- well, starts with Vice President Lombardi statement at the Hillel Parents meeting regarding increasing police and other security presence and installing cameras in all new and renovated buildings. And then, the focus shifts to something that was in the original motion about Cornell University policy 8.1, which is called responsible use of video surveillance systems. And that's developed more in this motion, more information about its removal from the policy library at Cornell, and it's no longer in the archives either. And simply in the Cornell policy and library, it says that the policy's been removed from the university policy library. The requirements are still in place and are under revision, but there's no way to actually find the original policy. Unfortunately, someone still had it, and so we quote from that. So, the whereas is then shift to demands that-- Well first, a recognition that the faculty has a significant interest in ensuring that policing and surveillance technology are used only for appropriate security purposes without infringing on privacy, academic freedom, and freedoms of expression and assembly. Oh, I'm sorry. Oh yeah. It does shift to those are more whereas clauses and the need for consultation with the faculty senate over these issues of privacy, academic freedom, and freedoms of expression and assembly. And then, given that there are current revisions taking place, then when we move to the actual resolved clauses, those correspond to the whereas clauses because the resolve clauses include the faculty demand that the Cornell administration provide public information about these plans for increasing police and security presence and increasing security cameras, and then also calls for the Cornell administration to engage in meaningful consultation and negotiations with the governance bodies that include the faculty Senate about these issues to ensure that these rights are protected. And then, the final resolution be it finally resolved deals with the Cornell administration engaging in consultation and negotiations with the governance bodies, specifically about the revision of the Cornell policy 8.1. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, once again, if anyone wants to make comments opposed or in favor, and you're in person, come to the appropriate microphone. If you're online, raise your hand. And we'll start with Ken Birman who has raised his hand online.

KEN BIRMAN: Ken Birman, Computer Science again. I think the goal here is perfectly reasonable actually, but I don't understand why we would need a resolution that makes demands. We often as a Senate invite different administrative officials that could include the chief of police on campus to explain their goals. I would be in favor of doing that as a friendly invitation. This

strikes me as unnecessarily aggressive. And returning to the prior motion, I think it emerges from a misconstrual of Malina's remarks, an interpretation under which campus safety is being interpreted deliberately as surveillance of faculty members and demonstrators, which I think is a connection that's really very stretched, even from The Sun article, which didn't really characterize those remarks that way. So, I'm opposed to doing this as a motion and I'll vote against it, but I'm completely in favor of the Dean inviting the chief of police to come and explain their plans.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have some neutral comments--

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Molecular Biology and Genetics. Just reading the first resolve clause, it strikes me as ambiguous as to whether we're really asking for specific locations of cameras, which I think is a terrible idea to make that public since the real point of these things are crime deterrence and response and telling people where their cameras are hidden as a matter of course may not be the smartest thing to do from a law enforcement perspective. And I think, you know, the worst case scenario here is an active shooter, and the police are going to want to know where and when as much as they possibly can because they're going to run towards it. So, I want to make the question of whether we're really asking here in this resolution for specific locations, or some more general policy issue about where.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. I don't know if Risa, or Eve, or anybody can speak to this, but I'm curious. Do we know who is in charge of making these new policies? And have we made any attempt to invite them to speak to us? How do we make that attempt to speak to us? And is passing this demand the best way to get them to actually come here and speak to us?

MARIA GONZALEZ PENDAS: So, I can let you know that anything that we legislate as advisory and who oversees the policy is the executive policy review group. And so, I don't know anything about policy 8.1, but we can definitely have someone from that group come to the Senate if needed.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Are there any other comments on this motion? Someone coming down. Another in the middle.

GILLY LESHED: Gilly Leshed, Information Science. I'm a little confused about the content of this having been sent to us only yesterday, and now we're supposed to vote on it. So, I feel uncomfortable voting on content of a resolution that has been changed substantially, and we've only seen the text.

EVE DE ROSA: So, Gilly, this was sent on Friday. Yeah. And I was just reminding everyone yesterday.

GILLY LESHED: Sorry about that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Also, just to clarify, this is also going to Qualtrics, not being voted on during the meeting. Any further comments?

NATHAN MATIAS: Hello. Nathan Matias, Department of Communication. I've spent the last 10 years of my life supporting scholars at risk, including people who face threats of violence and attempts to do severe harm to them and their families. And this question of surveillance of classrooms is definitely one of those issues. And in related work to just understand Cornell's own policies, I reached out to the relevant folks at Cornell and was told that I couldn't be told what the monitoring and surveillance policy was. I couldn't be told when it would be revised or what the plans were for revising them. So, I do think that if there is a way that we can get some clarity on what these plans are, it'll be really important for faculty safety, as well as these issues of freedom of expression. It would certainly help my work to support a lot of faculty at this university behind the scenes. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Go ahead.

NOAH TAMARKIN: Noah Tamarkin, Anthropology and STS. Just a very quick point on where this comes from. This is not an issue specifically related to the Malina situation. It was first bundled that way. However, this came to anthropologists attention last year when we were reviewing plans for the renovation of McGraw, and the plans included all of these surveillance cameras, and we said, "We don't actually want that." And history also, the other department in the building, said, "We don't really want that either." And we were told you don't actually get to choose. We're going to do what we're going to do. This is what's happening. And so, part of this is sort of a long standing question of wait, why is it that we have actually no say at all on the surveillance and security camera on this campus? Why is it that the departments who are directly affected not being considered at all? So, that's, for me, part of why this is a really important issue is realizing this is a specific space where faculty governance is being directly undermined.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We actually have run out of time for this discussion, but I will just look around to see if anybody has a final comment before going to the next item. Come to the microphone, and maybe this will be the last comment.

MARK LEWIS: [Indiscernible] . So, there used to be something called Public Safety Access Committee, PSAC. I just Googled it and I couldn't find it. The page says it's not found. But that would be the place to get someone to come here and discuss things. I think Dave Honan has a title now. He used to be the Chief of Police. Now, he's titled as Vice President of Public Safety. So, it does seem to me that there is a person that we could ask to come here and tell us what's going on. Just wanted to mention that. Thanks.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Okay, I think we should move on to announcements and updates. Eve DeRosa, Dean of Faculty.

EVE DE ROSA: We can invite VP Honan and also Chief of Police Bellamy. I think that that's more than appropriate for us to invite them to the Senate. Okay, next slide, please. So, I just wanted to update, at least put on the record in the meeting, that we have a new resolution, Visibility of the Chair's Letter. It was strongly supported. We still have those 20 did not votes that we're going to work on. Hopefully, those are logistical things that we can fix, rather than a lack of engagement. So, for these votes that we're about to take as well, please consult your faculty, and it's as easy as forwarding the Senate summary on Friday, just so that people are aware. And

so, that gives them an opportunity to give you feedback before you actually submit your vote. Next slide, please. Shared governance is beautiful and messy. That's what we experienced today. Even with me trying as best as possible to give us the choreography for today, it was still, you know, a challenge but I think we did it, and I think we're going to come out better with a democratic process that leads to a resolution that we can all vote on. The sense of the Senate resolution just did not pass. So, this was the sense of the Senate resolution that was asking for the Dean of Faculty to remind departmental chairs and faculty that academic listserv should be served for academic content. And this is something that happens uniformly or regularly by the deputy provost. So, if there's an inappropriate use of the academic listserv, the deputy provost does actually reach out and speak to whomever used it inappropriately. So, despite me no longer having this potential additional job, we can still get the work done. And today, we voted. I wanted to stay neutral and wait until the body has voted and given their comments. So, we now have two motions that we're going to vote on. One is the amended academic freedom in the classroom resolution. And so, the amended language was accepted. That is what we're voting on. And then, the surveillance aspect, surveillance on campus, that is a new motion, and that also will be voted on. So, you'll receive a Qualtrics link after this, and that's what we'll ask everybody to send in their feedback after consulting hopefully. Next slide, please. I wanted to bring this slide back. And the reason I put this slide in is I was hearing from faculty that it felt uncomfortable sitting in the room when people are responding to, rather than listening to what's being said at the microphone. So, it's a reminder of upholding the quorum. And I think that we did a better job today. And also, the other part of this slide, and all of this really is about building inclusivity and trust, but having the three microphones also gives the opportunity for the people who aren't necessarily in favor or in opposition to whatever we're discussing. And so, hopefully, people will start to feel that they have a space and they're invited up to give their comments. And in response also to hearing from people, this discomfort about the quorum and this need for us to really balance the views that are being shared by the senators and faculty, we're also going to hold a faculty forum in January before our next Senate meeting. And there, we can discuss potential community agreements or something like that, just for whomever wants to come join us. I will invite everyone, remind everyone, so that we also have a body that's constructive and meaningful. Next slide, please. Right. This is Chelsea.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Yeah, I just want to quickly do my annual plug. So, one of my jobs-- So, Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean of Faculty. One of my jobs, roles in this position is to work with the nominations and elections committee to get people involved in the different Senate committees that we have. And all of you who I'm looking at here and then online are members of the senators. And I just don't want you to feel like that inhibits you from doing work on some of our amazing committees that are underlying a lot of the resolutions and proposals that come to you to consider. So, your voice can really be amplified, and the voice of your constituencies be amplified if you participate in some of the Senate committees. And so, what I'm listing right here are some of the different Senate committees that have vacancies, and we're looking to find volunteers who would be interested in serving on these committees. We do a great job. I have to say my committee does a great job in forwarding names of people that they feel would do really well in service on these committees. And I was speaking to some of the chairs of these committees today that it's similar to you have a graduate student and they're applying to jobs, and all of a sudden, a light goes on. It's like the perfect job for them. You can see how they work and they will-- the place and the voice that they'll be given by that position is sort of amplified by the

nature of that job. And we try to do that when we're placing people into some of the Senate committees. You hear somebody, and they have an interest in academic policies or academic freedom, and you can say, "Hey, they really should serve on this committee." Or, "I'm really interested in this. I should serve on this committee." So, I encourage you to go to our website. Look at the different committees that exist. See if those would be committees that some of you would like to serve on or if you know people in your departments that you think are just perfect fits for these committees. If you stay after today, we have an opportunity for you to write your name on a little piece of information that tells us which committees you'd like to serve on. And then, we'll hold a raffle where I'll pull those names out of a basket, and you get cool swag just for volunteering to put your name in the hat to potentially be asked to serve on a committee. So, it's like really low stakes for getting awesomely cool swag. So, please stay around afterwards. And also, think about it as you're walking around your day and you identify individuals or yourselves who you can imagine would love to have their voices heard through the work of our Senate committees. Yeah, there's one more slide. So, again, additional committees. And if you have any questions about what these committees do, there is information online, but feel free to reach out to me. And between myself, and Jill, and CA, we have a really good idea about what these committees do and the role that they play, and I'm happy to talk to anybody kind of ad nauseum about the work of these committees and how important they are in faculty governance.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And we do have an item on the agenda for questions and answers, Q&A from the audience or from the Zoom. If you have any comments for the Dean of faculty.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Indiscernible]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a couple of minutes.

ASHLEIGH NEWMAN: Ashleigh Newman, Department of Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences. I'm here today just to make an announcement on behalf of FACAPE, which is the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education. I just wanted to put a plug out there if anyone's interested in volunteering to serve as a faculty team liaison, so basically working with student athletes. If there's a particular team of interest that you have, we'd love to have you. And I'd also like to build a database of faculty across undergraduate majors. That way, if coaches during the recruiting process are working with high schoolers that are trying to figure out what they want to do and what they want to major in, they maybe have an idea, and the coaches are really acting almost as college counselors trying to guide them like this major may be good for you. Apply for this program. Or when recruits are visiting campus, if you'd be willing to meet with recruits of various sports to talk about your major, make sure like is this the right fit for you, or maybe you'd be better suited-- Have you ever considered this major, etc. We'd just like to build that kind of database of faculty willing to interface with student athletes, both current and prospective. So, thank you. I'll share my email with Eve. So, if you are interested, feel free to email me. Thank you.

CHELSEA SPECHT: Ashley is a perfect example of a chair of one of our Senate committees who has taken some of the work that the committee traditionally has done and is extending it into understanding current needs of our students in ways that we as faculty can really benefit our community across campus. So, thank you, Ashley, for your amazing work.

ALEX NADING: And I'll say I got really good swag when I volunteered, so put your name in. I love the blanket I got. Thank you, Chelsea.

EVE DE ROSA: I actually wanted to just say thank you. I know today, especially for the newest senators, or those of us who are not deeply knowledgeable about Roberts rules, I appreciate everyone just taking a breath. You know, considering what was in front of them, voting, and now I think we have two amendments that you can go deeply consider. And so, thank you for that. And join us for the reception.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Where is the reception? Reception is right out the door. If you're on Zoom, you still have five minutes to rush over here. Are there any other comments or questions, or are you ready to adjourn? Okay, hearing none, meeting's adjourned. The reception is out that door.