Faculty Senate
September 10, 2025

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Senate Speaker Jonathan Oxhorn, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. We start with a 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. So, we call the meeting to order. The first order of business is the approval of the minutes from May 7, 2025. These minutes have been posted, distributed online as a verbatim transcript. Assuming there are no corrections by unanimous consent, the minutes are approved. If there are typos or other misspellings, just bring them to the attention of the Dean of the Faculty. So, the minutes are approved as posted. Our first order of business then is a motion to vote on SC Johnson College of Business Teaching-- Business Teaching Professor Proposal. Andrew Karolyi, Dean, Finance Jeanne Varney, Deputy Area Chair, Operations, Technology, and Information Management will make a five minute presentation. After which, there will be five minutes for Q&A. And I hope everybody sticks to the timeframe. Who is starting?

ANDREW KAROLYI: That would be me. Thank you very much. This is Andrew Karolyi, Dean of the College of Business. I'm on Zoom. I'm unfortunately not there in person. Thankfully, Jeanne Varney, my colleague, is there in person. We will both be able to answer questions. There is a slide deck, and I don't know if that's able to be presented to everybody. We have four slides related to the presentation or we could just speak through it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The slide deck is on screen here.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Everybody can see it?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Wonderful. Thank you. So, we come to you for authorization of the title for use in the College of Business. It, of course, as you know, is enabled by the Faculty Senate adoption from last year. We very much value the opportunity to recruit and retain top teaching talent with this, and it certainly aligns with a lot of our peer institutions across colleges and schools of business out there. This was originally drafted by an ad hoc committee of nine faculty, including Jeanne Varney, who is there in presence. It was chaired by senior lecturer Cheryl Stanley. There was extensive internal review through town halls, faculty surveys, and then ultimately a formal ballot. You can see the vote in front of you, overwhelmingly in support of. This was submitted by Dean of Faculty and Research, Suzanne Shu, in May, and it was reviewed and refined with feedback from CAP as well. And I'm going to hand this off now to Jeanne, who will continue.

JEANNE VARNEY: Thank you, Dean Karolyi. Thank you for your time this afternoon. We are proposing to adopt the teaching titles of assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and full teaching professor. We would like to also reserve the use of teaching modifiers or title modifiers of listening and emeritus or emerita teaching professor.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Could you step a minute closer to the mic, please?

JEANNE VARNEY: Sure. Is this on?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No. Can you please check the mic?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is on, Jeanne.

JEANNE VARNEY: Can you hear me better now? I can switch to the other side. OK. Thank you. Also-- I might be too close. We also maintain that the focus of these titles still are RTE focused for teaching, advising, mentoring, curriculum, and service to the College of Business. There are no research requirements for any of these titles as there are none today and we will not

require any in the future. The terms of the appointment also remain the same here, a minimum of a master's degree to hold any of these titles or relevant qualifications. They would be full-time positions and they would have a responsibility of the five teaching units, plus a [indiscernible] unit of service that is comparable to what we require today for our RTE faculty. And the appointment lengths would be three years for the assistant, which is comparable. Okay. Okay, is that better? Okay, good. All right. The appointment would be in length for three years for the assistant teaching professor, which is comparable to lecture, and the associate or full professors would be for a five year appointment. Next slide. The promotion requirements or the reappointments requirements would be again similar. For assistant professor or teaching professor, it would be for three years, and for the associate or full teaching professor, it would be you could be promoted after six years of service. So, it would be basically completing one reappointment, and then you may request the promotion. For the associate to the full, it would be after 11 years of service. So, the associate professor would serve-- teaching professor would serve for a five-year term, then after the second five-year term, be eligible for promotion. And the promotion for full teaching professor would require, in addition to the customary review, letters from internal and external associates, which could be the college dean, the program directors, and external engagement colleagues. The reappointments, again, would be based on teaching performance, such as evaluations, potential observations, and the exemplary service performance. The rights and governance. Again, voting rights would be based on ranks, which would be what we have today for lecture and senior lecture, and access to grievance procedures would be consistent with what we have today, and the final decisions would always rest with the college Dean. Next slide, please. The transition plan. Pending approval of Faculty Senate, we would like to transition our titles by the end of the academic year, June 30th, 2026. And this would be for lecturers to the assistant teaching professor title. And the optional in the parentheses there is for any existing lecturer or senior lecturer that would not prefer to transition their title, they may maintain their existing title. So, no one is being required to change their title. So, lectures to assistant teaching professors and senior lecturers to associate teaching professors, and then we would also open-- depending on timing, we would open up the application process for senior lecturers to be promoted to full teaching professors. Okay. And let's see And this promotion, like I had mentioned before, would enable or would require a dossier, internal and external references as well. And just the last note on the composition per the AACSB

requirements for a business college accreditation, we would need to maintain the under 40% percentage of RTE faculty.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have time for a couple of comments. If you're in-house, walk to the microphone and I'll call you. If you're online, raise a digital hand and I'll try to find it. Go ahead. And identify yourself and your affiliation.

TARA HOLM: Hi, my name is Tara Holm. I'm in the math department. Thank you. This was a really informative presentation, and this looks great to me. I'm just a little curious if you could share what a teaching unit or a service unit entails. Is that a standard unit?

JEANNE VARNEY: Sure, yes. A teaching unit typically comprises of one three credit course. There are exceptions to that for certain appointments that require extensive amounts of time, like a centers and Institute director or something like that. Service is comprised of advising, volunteering for advising clubs. Maybe you're a club advisor, you might be advising something like in Nolan, I'm from Nolan, Hotel Ezra Cornell, helping with that, attending freshman orientation sessions, faculty meetings. So, it's a wide variety of ad hoc, yeah. And was there a second part of that?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Well, we'll go online now to Michael Mazurek. Keep it short and identify yourself. And unmute yourself. While you're trying to unmute yourself, let's go in-house, and identify yourself.

RAJESH BHASKARAN: I'm Rajesh Bhaskaran. I am an RTE faculty member in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I'm really, as an RTE faculty member, really excited to see more colleges implementing the teaching professor title. So, I'm very glad about that. A follow-on question to the previous one in terms of the teaching load. Are the classes going to be-- is it a mix of large and small classes? So, I can imagine if it's three, three credit courses that are large, that would be-- even two, three credit courses that are large, that could be a very heavy teaching load. And the other question was on the implementation. When you say that the implementation will be complete by June 30, 2026, do you mean that you want everyone who wants to be

transitioned, will be transitioned by then? And then, can they start requesting the transition, you know, as soon as it's approved by the Senate?

JEANNE VARNEY: Sure.

RAJESH BHASKARAN: Thank you.

JEANNE VARNEY: Yeah, certainly. Thank you. I'll start with the second question. It's really, you know, pending on when we receive notification of approval. We feel that we are poised to begin the transition process as soon as we receive approval with putting out information to the RTE faculty explaining the process, and then putting together the information and the timeline, which again is pending here for the senior lecturers to apply for the full teaching professor title. So, it's a goal to be finished with the implementation process by the end of the academic year. It will obviously depend on timing for, you know, when we receive the green light to go ahead and proceed. But we feel we're organized and ready to move forward with the processes.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Jeanne, would you like me to jump in for the first one?

JEANNE VARNEY: Sure, yes.

ANDREW KAROLYI: So, just to keep it short, yes, we do have what we call amplifier credit for large sections. So, the typical teaching unit, as we call it, that three credit course that Jeanne talks about, we estimate is for about a full semester course of about 55 students. So, if you get larger sections, you get additional credit, teaching unit credit for that. And we have this transparent amplifier policy for the college.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we're out of time, but Michael, maybe keep it short and have a short answer, and that will be the last question.

MICHAEL MAZOUREK: Thank you. Michael Mazourek, Plant Breeding and Genetics. Thank you for the patience. I have a quick question, I hope, about the term length. In CALS, we have

had an issue with RTE faculty having one-year appointments. You mentioned a five-year appointment. I'm wondering if this is going to be an upgrade from moving from annual to five-year. Is there appointment security here? I'm hoping this can be a precedent for other colleges. Thank you.

JEANNE VARNEY: Certainly. I can answer that first if you'd like. We currently have for our lectures, a three-year appointment. For our senior lectures, we have a five-year appointment. So, we are maintaining that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. I think we have to move on to our next agenda item.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, if there's time at the end, I suppose we could ask to have questions. But for now, we're going to move on to the College of Veterinary Medicine Department Merger. Toshi Kawate, Interim Chair, Molecular Medicine will speak for five minutes, and then we'll have five minutes for Q&A.

TOSHI KAWATE: Hi. I'm Toshi Kawate, Interim Chair of the Department of Molecular Medicine at the College of Veterinary Medicine. So, I'm representing the team to quickly summarize the proposal that we share and hope you had a chance to read the proposal of the department merger. Dean Warnick is on Zoom if you have any questions that I can answer. Currently, College of Veteran Medicine has six departments, and the biomedical sciences and molecular medicine that we are trying to merge are representing two of the three major basic research, basic life science research entities. Dean Warnick had idea of merge these two departments together a few years ago, but the conversation had kind of gained more attention when we finalized the plan to renovate the building that you're seeing there called Veterinary Research Tower. So, that's a 50 years old building that we need to rebuild kind of. Now, the two departments are physically separated currently. However, we are going to be in the same building in a few years, so that kind of promoted us to look into this merger plan more closely. Next slide, please. The rationale has five major points. The first one is that the two departments

actually share lots of research interests, especially in the field of cancer biology and developmental biology. And if you look at the name of biomedical sciences and molecular medicines, probably you cannot tell what we do, right? So, it's really a vague term. And the fact is that we do overlap quite a bit. At the same time, historically, biomedical sciences focus more on animal models and also like pathophysiological systems, whereas molecular medicine focuses on molecular mechanisms. So, by combining these two expertise together, we can build a much stronger research team that we hope is going to build a strong and robust cohort for doing translational medicine. And also, we share a teaching footprint among the departments. And then, probably some of you or maybe most of you have been department chairs or maybe going to know the pain of assigning teaching duties, especially if you share a footprint with other departments. So, by combining these two departments together, we think we're going to be more effective and also make sense to the veterinary curriculum. And the last two points are kind of related to each other. In the last few years, and also for coming a few years, we haven't been able to and probably won't be able to refill the positions that are vacated by retirement due to the current financial situations. So, we've lost quite a few tenure track faculty members and also the staff members. By merging two departments together, we can not only make operation more effective, but also maintain a critical mass. Our departments are the 20 tenure track faculty and so it's kind of smaller compared to, let's say, clinical sciences department that has over 110 faculty members. So, that was very important. So, with that positiveness, we casted a vote among the two departments. And among the 40 respondents, we had 31 positive. And then, the nine who were a little bit concerned about-- share the concern that maybe by joining two departments, we may lose our positive culture in each department. However, that concern has diminished massively as we talk together. So, this picture is actually a joint retreat we had in June between biomedical sciences and molecular medicine. And this was a nice showcase of what would happen if we merged, and then there was a massive enthusiasm among the participants. The new department will have the name Biomedical and Translational Sciences. The rationale for that are that this would capture-- this name captures really well with what we do and also the aspiration. So, that's the summary of the merger plan, and I'll take any questions if you have.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Again, if you have questions in-house, walk to the microphone or raise your digital hand. I'm not sure if Michael's hand is raised from last time. So, Michael,

unhand yourself or not. OK. So, is there any comments from in-house? OK. Seeing none, I think we'll move on to the next agenda item. Thank you. The next item is Generative AI in the Classroom. Steve Jackson and Rob Vanderlan will be presenting for 10 minutes. After which, there'll be 10 minutes for Q&A.

STEVE JACKSON: All right, well, thank you, everybody. I'm Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and faculty member in Information Science and Science and Technology Studies. Rob is, as you will all know, is the director of our excellent Center for Teaching Innovation. Next slide, please. So, we wanted to talk to you a little bit. The last time that I was at the Senate was the last meeting in the spring, and at that time, we were just putting out into the world our survey that went out to all faculty and students in the Spring. Thanks to presumably many of you for filling it out. So, we wanted to give you some update on that. We wanted to remind you of and share back some of the work we've been doing around principles, but also activities of the GenAI Education Working Group and tell you a little bit about how we're taking all this in and responding to it in our response to generative AI in teaching and learning at the university. And if you want more information on a lot of what we're talking about today, this website here, you can find almost everything we're saying today or you can link through to other sources that have it in more detail. Next slide, please. Okay, so this too many people and impossible to read slide are members of our generative AI education working group. A lot of the stuff I'll be talking about today comes out of the activities of this group. And some folks in the room are involved with that. It's centrally primarily faculty, also staff and some student representation. We will be expanding the student representation. We have a few people joining this this Fall. Next slide, please. All right, this is an important point I want to remind you of. I came to you with a version of this in Spring. This is a very lightly revised version of that based on some ongoing discussions in the group and feedback from Senate in May. This is how we're responding to generative AI in the classroom. These are the principles we are steering by here at Cornell. So, it's about the integrity of the faculty-student relation, a commitment to experimentation, evidence, and learning from experience, the centrality of faculty judgment and expertise in the classroom, responsiveness to real student needs and uses, recognition of both AI goods and harms, respect for institutional and disciplinary heterogeneity, and grounded in the extension and renewal of Cornell's core mission and values. So, this is an approach that we believe is balanced, it's

experimental, it's evidence-based, and it's also pluralistic. We do not expect this to show up in the same way or for faculty, or departments, or colleges to respond in the same way because teaching cultures at Cornell are not one thing, right? That's an essential value of this committee. Next slide, please. Okay, so the survey stuff. There's a lot here. We're going to give you a little snapshot today. I will say that the full results of the quantitative parts of the survey are available to you and in fact to the world on the website I put up earlier. So, the academicinnovation.cornell.edu/gen-ai/ has all of the quantitative results. The qualitative results are not posted there and will not be posted directly there. We continue to process those. We are working on a process for this Fall to code and report back. We will show you some examples of it today. And because I have been asked this question and to forestall it, yes, the qualitative results, which amount to hundreds and hundreds, maybe thousands of pages, were read by humans, these two humans right here, all Summer. And that is, we will be reporting back to you more on that. We had quite good response rate overall, we think, on the faculty side. So, 32%. More than 700 faculty responded here at Cornell. I think that's a really good number, and there's good, rich, and pretty balanced insight. And the student survey was higher numerically, but lower percentage-wise, and we could talk about some theories about why that would be. This is not wildly out of line, but student survey response rates to other kinds of surveys we put out at the university. Next slide, please. All right. In some ways, this is the meta number, the sort of the barometer question that we asked. Overall or in general, GenAI tools have improved teaching and learning at Cornell. And here, you will see a perhaps not surprising to you discrepancy between where students on average land on this and where faculty on average land on this. So, for faculty, only 16% believe either strongly agree or somewhat agree with the statement. Students are 40% either strongly agreeing or somewhat agreeing with the statement. Importantly, and this is borne out in the qualitative data too, neither group is monolithic. And no discipline or field is monolithic either when you break down into the college breakdowns or look at disciplinary things. So, there is range and heterogeneity running all through the survey. But this is an important, on average, distinction between faculty and students on this question. Next slide, please.

ROB VANDERLAN: Okay. Hi, everybody. I'm gonna talk about this. Can you hear me? Microphones. Look at that, I can do this. Awesome. This is another, I think, important

comparison of faculty and students. How often have you used generative AI tools this semester? And we group them into big buckets. The big takeaway here is that while 56% of faculty have either never used generative AI tools or use them quite rarely, 70% of students are using them daily or several times weekly. So, we've got a pretty big discrepancy between how often and frequently our students are using these tools versus how often our faculty are using these tools. And I think that's one of the things that we've been thinking about in our response. Next slide, please. This matters, I think, because when we queried students, they're using generative AI tools around their learning in lots and lots of different ways. We asked a range here, explaining and clarifying materials, technical support, that includes coding, help with language to collaborate and refine drafts to summarize sources, all the way over to the second to last column there to complete entire assignments. Obviously, complete entire assignments is very concerning, maybe under-reported because these are students reporting on their own behavior, but the rest of this is a wide range of behaviors, and one of the challenges of a survey is it's rather blunt. You can imagine ways in which all of those uses might really help support student learning. You can also imagine ways in which similar uses might undermine their learning or, in fact, be an academic integrity concern or violation. The point here, I think, is there's a lot of nuance in how students are using them. Next slide. We have, as Steve said, a lot of open response. There were thousands of entries. We thank everybody who took the time to share thoughts. Characterizing the faculty responses, there was a wide range of perspectives and a lot of thoughts at the polls, those who thought that AI needs to be banned, that it means the end of higher education to those who think that either it's amazing and awesome or that it's just inevitable, and everybody needs to get on board. That said, I found in my reading that there was widespread concern about the impact on learning. And that was true of people who were opposed to generative AI. It was also true of those who actually were quite enthusiastic about its possibilities, but we're still concerned that it not undermine learning. There was many expressions of the need for faculty support around academic integrity concerns and also a frequently expressed desire for the training of all students, and sometimes it was expressed as the need for training for all faculty and students on generative AI literacy. Next slide. Here's just a couple of samples about the impact on learning. Learning is difficult and uncomfortable, and generative AI offers the allure of solutions to those problems without the concomitant discomfort. A more balanced approach, generative AI has the potential to leverage a student's own creativity and effort. That could be transformative, but also

it could allow them to offload their cognitive functioning to the tool, which could be destructive. Next slide. Students who had a similarly, interestingly, I think, students had a similarly wide range of responses, also students calling for Cornell to ban generative AI to those who are quite enthusiastic. I think there was also a concern about the impact on student learning and sometimes even it's expressed as I have a concern about what impact it has on my learning. But there were also a lot more enthusiasm and concrete ways in which students were using it that they testify to improve their learning. Next slide. So, here again, just a few quotes. And we'll share these slides because I know we're moving fast. Students need more support in learning how to use the tool. The next person, it's amazing study tool, and shared some of the ways in which they're able to use this tool to supplement their learning in ways they're not getting from the courses that they're taking. And then, a concern that students are offloading a lot of the work of critical thinking onto generative AI. This is just a brief summary of those quotes. There's a lot of nuance that we're continuing to work on and tease out. Next slide. So, I just want to talk briefly about how the Center for Teaching Innovation is using this response and then everything we've also heard from all the faculty we're working with to tailor our sort of second set of resources. We responded immediately after ChatGPT and we've revised our responses over the summer. And one of the ways to characterize that is a sort of leaning into generative AI or leaning out approach, and we're supporting both of those approaches. So, our new workshops are symbolic of that. We have a learning without AI, designing assignments and course policies that help ensure that students aren't using AI to circumvent important learning and complete assignments. How do you redesign your course if you're really concerned about that? And then, also a sort of leaning in approach, human-centered generative AI for teaching and learning. How do you bring those tools into your course, change your assignments and your assessments to integrate those? Next slide. This is just a stretch of our resources. It basically says, "Look at our website, connect with us." Next slide.

STEVE JACKSON: All right, so I want to talk very briefly about the AI plus AI problem. This is something we've been in discussion with Eve and the Senate about. AI plus AI, artificial intelligence and academic integrity. One thing I want to point you towards is some excellent work that Liz Karnes, Provost Fellow, has done over the Summer that's now reported on the CTI website around evidentiary standards for AI, academic integrity cases involving generative AI.

There is a folk belief out there, held sometimes by students, sometimes by faculty, that AI violations cannot be prosecuted because there's no smoking gun. There's not the quote you can go and find, and the student took the quote in a classic plagiarism case. You do not need a smoking gun, right? So, Liz and working with the university council's office, the lawyers, has worked out a set of defensible evidentiary standards that you can use to systematically bring a case of generative AI when you have probable grounds that this has happened, right? And the university and the lawyers will stand behind this. Next slide, please. Oh, I'll point this as well, and we can talk about it later. We've been working on-- one of the challenges that comes up in the survey and in our conversations is some misunderstanding or confusion among students about what the course policies actually are. Recall they're navigating a heterogeneous landscape. Policies are different course by course. So, this is an effort that we've developed based on the Creative Commons licensing system, if you are familiar with that model, which is an effort to standardize sort of a grammar for expressing course level policies around generative AI. And these can be used, next slide, please, in combination to express-- Your policy could be AI free. In this course, there is not-- we do not use AI, and here's why. Or it could use some combination. So, this would be assignment specific, approved tools, and used with attribution. We can share a lot more about this. This is linked through the site. Next slide if there are any.

ROB VANDERLAN: Next slide, and I'll go super quick. There's just so much to share on all of this. We are also piloting a couple, three different course level generative AI chat tools. And if you're interested in thinking about how to integrate a tool like that into your class, reach out to the center, and we'll talk to you. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thanks. Again, come down if you have questions in-house or raise your digital hand.

STEVE JACKSON: We'll share the mics, I promise.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, I rushed you for nothing.

STEVE JACKSON: It seems impossible that there are no questions about generative AI.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Generate some using your smartphones.

STEVE JACKSON: I'm sure.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Do you have any other, since I rushed you. Ah, a comment. Identify yourself. Thank you for coming down.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. So, I know you told us last year that we have Cornell specific AI tools that are sort of barricaded from the internet and it's all Cornell. How updated are those? Are those always going to be the most current models of, say, ChatGPT, or do they tend to run a little behind?

STEVE JACKSON: They are running behind. So, actually, Rob, do you want to-- Because there is a recent update.

ROB VANDERLAN: So, yeah, they have in the past occasionally run behind. But Copilot, which is the tool that is in a Cornell-protected environment, was updated to GPT-5 within just a couple of weeks of its release. And I haven't verified this, but I've talked to people who said the performance is notably better. So, if you tried Copilot a few months back and weren't super impressed, it might be worth taking a look now.

STEVE JACKSON: Yeah, and a reminder that those tools are ephemeral. So, what that means is that things you enter in do not go back into the model or the mothership, which is good. That's privacy protecting and protective of our intellectual property and so on. Yeah, so that is a place to direct it. Now, students, one phenomenon we've seen at Cornell and at other institutions is that students are using whatever often, and we've seen some hints that students are reluctant to use the institutionally sanctioned thing for some fear or folk theory of a sting operation or that somehow Cornell is watching what they're doing, which is not the case. So, there are some limits.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Nathan?

NATHAN MATIAS: Hi, Nathan Matias, Communication. First, this is an extraordinary amount of work and understanding. So, thanks to you and everyone involved in it. I'm curious. I know I and others have done work to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of generative AI in our classrooms. And I'm curious to hear whether there are efforts that would make it possible for us to pull what we're learning through these workshops or otherwise. I'm sure it's deep in the CTI site already.

STEVE JACKSON: Yeah, so thank you, Nathan. A great question. One of the things that we're doing with the pilots when we engage in tool pilots and we sign faculty and classes up through it is working to study the outcomes of that. So, we are trying to build the knowledge base on that. There is, of course, the beginnings of a systematic research literature around this, and that's also gathered at CTI, and we point people to it. And then, the last thing I'll note, this is a little bit outside of something you might encounter directly, but we've been working on the procurement side, so when vendors come to us with models, or proposed models, or interests in us adapting their tool, we've been working on sort of enhancing the CIT procedures around this, around different kind of great sort of graduating upward sets of requirements on experimental versus pilot versus university-wide licenses. And part of the university-wide license is if a company is expecting us to use a generative AI tool in their classroom, we expect systematic, open science, high quality educational research. We expect more than a marketing pitch.

ROB VANDERLAN: And I'll just say one last thing as the question comes to the microphone, which is it is a tremendous undertaking to figure out all of the different experiments that are happening. So, I guess I would challenge you, and I hope to bring this to your department. If you're doing something in your class, evaluating a tool or trying something, reach out to the center and just let us know. We are trying to collect these stories and amplify them, but they're happening everywhere.

IRIS PACKMAN: Hi, thank you for this. Iris Packman, ILR, RTE. I'm with the Climate Jobs Institute. So, yes, I'm in ILR, but we look at climate issues. I was curious. I have two questions.

One, is the university tracking how much is being used of its own tools? And has there been any discussion or measurement of the environmental impact or resource demand that is associated with that, especially if we're promoting and increasing the use of AI? And then separately, I love that you have tools that you're putting together for coursework for if you wanted to have a new AI policy, for example, we do a lot of student research assistance and wondering if you have similar type guidance for faculty who are working with students in like a research capacity.

ROB VANDERLAN: Man, there's just so much to do. Yes, we do not have guidance on the research. And in fact, what I'm doing tonight is guidance on our own team and how we're using it. So, I'm not sure I know much about the research thing. I will say on the resource, and Steve is probably a better person to answer this on the environmental concerns, but one of the attractions of the sort of course level chat tools is that they're not large language models. They're small language models. And so, their resource use is a lot less.

STEVE JACKSON: So, on the environmental implications, that was a-- So, on the faculty survey, this wasn't a question on the student survey, but we asked about a series of concerns. One was environmental implications of generative AI. One was around privacy. One was around intellectual property. And basically, faculty were concerned about all of it, right? So, they were like 60 to 70% were very concerned or somewhat concerned on all of those. This is a little bit outside of the work of the working group, but it is an area I care and do research on and am very interested in myself. And I've been working with the Cornell Sustainability-- Sustainable Cornell Council to work up a working group and a set of metrics that are specific to computing and IT. Right now, the way we report metrics, it gets wrapped into facilities. And we're trying to figure out if we can figure out a way of measuring and bringing that in, like naming IT and computing specifically. So, that's in early stages, and that will take a while. And it's actually very complicated to measure, as you may know. But we are working towards that goal.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So, we have about at least three more commenters and only two more minutes. So, let's try to keep it short. Elliot Shapiro.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Yeah, thank you. Thanks to both of you for the work you're doing and to

the Senate, the deans for sharing this with us. Just quickly, one thing I've become aware of really talking to faculty who use AI in their own work is they've talked about the difference between some of the free tools and some of the subscription tools. And it seems as if this may be another version of the old digital divide or the ways that students with more resources are getting advantages. And I don't really have any insights about how to engage with that. I'm just sort of curious about whether that's something that was reflected in the data at all.

STEVE JACKSON: I can say very briefly, yes, that is a concern, and it was reflected in the data. We did ask if students and faculty, if they were purchasing their own tools, and a substantial portion, a minority, but a substantial minority was, and we are concerned about that. And if you have good ideas about how we might grapple with that, please bring them to us. I will say that is one of the principle of equity as part of what's driving the point about Cornell-wide resources like the copilot of Cornell-wide subscription that everyone has access to. It doesn't fully balance the scales because the cutting edge models have a different set of capabilities. I will say that one of the-- This is a bit of an aside but related, one of the points that is made in the academic integrity or defense of academic integrity context is that, well, the AI models aren't that good or they're, you know, they still make mistakes and I can tell when they make a mistake. I think the hopes that we can rely on hallucination and error as a long-term solution is fading, honestly. I think the models are getting much better very quickly. And so, the general baseline is way up. The general baseline models from now are at a radically different place, even than they were a year ago, I would say.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Identify yourself, please. Identify yourself.

LINDA CANINA: I'm Linda Canina. I'm from the College of Business. I'm a faculty member at Nolan, at the hotel school. I teach corporate finance, and I've been trying to use ChatGPT to help me grade some of my assignments because I can create a rubric. And then I test the rubric. I have it grade, and then I see how it does, and it's doing an excellent, unbelievably great job, much better than I would do. But one of the problems is I have to upload each file, and then have it do its thing, and cut and paste, and create a Word file to then share with the students. But I'm wondering if the university is thinking about having the ability for ChatGPT to connect with

Canvas so that once I do that rubric, I can just write a little code and tell it to go to Canvas for each student grade exactly like it did before. But right now, we don't have that capability, right? And is that something that's coming?

ROB VANDERLAN: So, two things. One is, I think you raised a question about faculty uses in their teaching practice and especially whether or how it's an appropriate tool to use grading. That's one of the issues that the council that Steve mentioned and showed the slide of is gonna take up.

LINDA CANINA: But isn't that up to the individual to check and see?

ROB VANDERLAN: I think, certainly, it's up to the faculty members for the validity of the final price. Yes. But we've not talked about any sort of integration with ChatGPT and Canvas, partially because we don't have a license with it. Canvas, the company that controls Canvas, is working on building similar interactions or integrations into the tool and will be assessing those as they are developed. We're a part of an early planning group.

LINDA CANINA: All right, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay.

STEVE JACKSON: I just wanted to amplify the AI and grading question is one of the top main topics that the education working group will be having discussions about this Fall. We would bring back any thoughts about that to Faculty Senate. Remember, when we talk about principles, the integrity of the faculty-student relation, that can be broken from either side, right? That is an important question for us to maintain on both sides. I don't know where we will land. I mean, there's probably some things there would be a disclosure in the same way that we expect students to disclose the use of AI. If we're using it, we're probably going to-- we should be disclosing it as well. And there may be some kind of a threshold, like you raised the human checking sort of a human in a loop threshold, which I think will almost certainly be part of this. So, I think that could be really good. There have been lawsuits brought against universities for the use of AI in

grading. And so, that's a thing that sort of is out on the horizon that we need to think about. But we will-- I suspect this is something we may have some thoughts coming out of the group, and we would come back to Senate maybe later this Fall to talk more about that. It's a really important question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Before you leave, there's a question of whether Katie King, the next agenda item presenter is around anywhere. OK, because in that case, you may go. And we'll go to our next agenda item, which is Cornell Office of Civil Rights updates. And we'll probably have to cut it a little bit to maybe nine minutes and nine minutes of Q&A.

KATIE KING: Are we-- I can do five, because that's all I've prepared for. So, hi, everyone. I presented to you in May, I think, at your last meeting. So, I'm back early. So, it's nice to see you all again. I'm Katie King. I'm the AVP for the Cornell Office of Civil Rights. When I presented to you earlier this year, our office was still named the Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX. At that point, I was talking with you all about recent updates to our policy 6.13, which is the employee accommodations policy for folks who need a reasonable accommodation because they have a disability, or because they have a sincerely held religious belief that needs to be accommodated, or because they're pregnant or have a pregnancy related condition. So, that's what I talked with you about last time. Today, I want to talk with you about the fact that I have a new name for my office. I might have hinted to this last time, but it has come to pass. So, in June of this year, our office was renamed the Cornell Office of Civil Rights. So, I'm kind of going around to all of the assemblies. I've reached out to all of the deans to offer to come and speak about why this happened and answer any questions about it. And also, I'm going to talk a little bit today about issues that I think are particularly relevant to faculty. But when I started here in late 2023, the office was named the Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX. And as I went around and met people, people would say to me, "Oh, yes, I'm familiar with the Title IX office," or, "Oh, yes, I need to refer an employee who needs an accommodation to the Title IX office." And as I hope everyone knows, Title IX, it is a big federal law, but it is limited in scope to sex discrimination in activities and programs that receive federal funding. So, we do so much more than just handle sexual misconduct work. As this slide shows, we do do sexual misconduct work. We also handle all other protected status, bias discrimination, and harassment complaints. Prior

to June of this year, we only handled complaints against employees. We realized that there was kind of a misalignment with where that work was prior to June. If you were a student and you had to complain about another student for harassing you based on any protected status other than your sex, you were directed to the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards. And while that office does have trained investigators, they were not necessarily trained in civil rights investigations. The folks in my office are trained to do civil rights investigations. And we really wanted to have all civil rights work on our campus housed in one office, which is my office, the Cornell Office of Civil Rights. So, when I found out that we were going to, in fact, be able to take that work, I really wanted to use that as an opportunity to update our office name to reflect all of the work that we do, which is all of the civil rights work on campus for the most part. So, we also do handle consensual relationships. We still do equal employment opportunity work. So, that means we do all of the affirmative action planning for the university, even though federal executive orders have prohibited and required us to no longer do affirmative action planning for women and minorities moving forward. We still must and will do affirmative action planning for individuals with disabilities and protected veterans. Those laws are still in place. We will still do that. We will still be meeting with the deans of all of your colleges this fall to talk with them about those affirmative action plans. And then, we also do a lot of education and training. We also do what's not on this slide, a lot of data analysis in our office. And so, we're really hoping that within the next year, we'll move from having annual reports to having an interactive dashboard that will be available on our website so folks can look and see where are their cases, what kind of cases are there, what are the resolutions look like, and use that to potentially inform decisions. We use that information to inform our outreach and inform training that we provide. May I have the next slide, please? So, I think I showed this last time. I always show the slide. It's really important that I always remind everyone, what are all of the protected statuses in New York State? So, they're on this slide. I believe you'll get this deck. Anything that has an asterisk is something where we may be able to provide an accommodation. So, in New York State, in addition to disability, religion, and pregnancy, we also offer accommodations for those who are victims of domestic violence in terms of if you need time away from work, etc. I believe I touched on that in May. And may I have the next slide, please? So, for this particular group, I also wanted to make a reminder about designated reporters. I often field questions about whether folks are or are not designated reporters, and faculty, generally speaking, are not designated

reporters. So, that is really important for you to know. But what does this mean? So, at Cornell, designated reporters must report incidents of sexual harassment involving students. So, if it's anything other than sexual harassment involving students, designated reporters do not need to report that to our office. You are encouraged to do so. But if you are a designated reporter and you learn of sexual harassment involving students, you do have to report it to our office. Some of you might, and I heard during the first presentation, talk of student organization advisors. If you advise a student organization, you are a designated reporter for purposes of that student organization. And so, if students in that org come to you and disclose sexual misconduct or sexual harassment involving themselves or other students, you do have to disclose that. Also, our West Campus house deans and assistant deans are also designated reporters, and then all of the deans are. Even if you're not a designated reporter, I really encourage reporting. We do a lot of consultation in really kind of just talking about facts, not talking about specific people, to give advice and feedback to faculty members, senior associate deans, human resources individuals, just to provide, these are the next steps that I would recommend. Even if you're not a designated reporter, even if it doesn't involve sexual misconduct, these are the steps that I would recommend to make sure that we are promoting a culture and an environment that is free from bias, discrimination, and harassment. I don't have this on a slide, but I think we are all aware that Title VI has really been in the news a lot. We're hearing a lot about-- So, for example, New York State just passed a law, the governor passed a law that every college in New York state is going to have to designate a Title VI coordinator in about one year. So, next Fall, we will have a designated Title VI coordinator here at Cornell, if we don't have one sooner than that. Title VI is a federal law that protects individuals from discrimination, or differential treatment, or harassment based on their race, their color, or their national origin, which the federal government interprets to also meet your shared ancestry. And so, it's just a kind of a limited scope as well, but it's really been in the news a lot. A lot of these, you know, the things that are happening at Harvard, the things that are happening here at Cornell, the allegations are related to Title VI and those protected statuses. I bring this up in the context of designated reporters because it is important for us to know that while Title IX, which covers sexual misconduct, has very specific regulations that we have to follow, and that tell us that we can have designated reporters, and who they should be, Title VI does not have those same types of regulations, right? So, we are all kind of doing the best we can in a world without Title VI regulations that are clear. What I can

tell you is if the university as a whole, the entire university, right, knows or should have known that there was misconduct happening or that there was a hostile environment happening because of Title VI protected statuses, the university can be held liable for that. And so, while we are not-- we have no designated reporter framework yet for Title VI or for other protected statuses, I strongly, strongly encourage reporting if you know about something so that it is in the hands of the folks that are tasked with looking into these concerns and doing those investigations or providing feedback so that it doesn't fall back on US faculty, or on your department or college, or on Cornell. And I'm happy to consult in like an anonymous way. You don't have to share names, but it's really important that we know what's going on so that we can provide that kind of advice. And that is my whole presentation, but I'm happy to take any questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Again, if you have questions in-house, step up to one of the two microphones, or if you're online, raise your digital hand. And we'll wait just a few more seconds. Could you hold on a minute? We generally let other people who haven't talked talk first, but you will get a shot. Come on, and then identify yourself.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Hi, Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. So, I remember from a few years ago that if an individual is accused of bias, harassment, or stalking, things like that, and it was under a gender class, it was due to gender, that would be handled with one set of procedures, one set of standards. And if it was a different protected class, there was a different set of procedures and different set of standards. I guess I have several questions. One, is that still true? Two, if so, should it stay that way or should they be harmonized? And if they should be harmonized, what do you think of in terms of a process to get there?

KATIE KING: Thank you. Yeah, so Title IX is very specific in what it defines as, first of all, sex. So, right now, under the current presidential administration, sex is defined as male or female. So, that is Title IX, the federal law. New York State human rights law has broader protections for gender, gender identity, the status of being transgender, et cetera. And so, Chris, you're right. Our current procedures, we have a set of procedures for Title IX misconduct, which is sexual misconduct. We are currently in the process of reviewing those procedures. So, we are going to carve out what we are going to call Title IX sexual harassment, and then we are going to

have a category of conduct called, and I don't have like the final yet, but non-Title IX sexual harassment to make sure that we are covering everything, and regardless of who you are, how you identify based on your gender, it will be covered. Title IX itself requires a live hearing and also requires cross-examination. Any process here at Cornell involving students specifically, student respondents, and individuals in Title IX, regardless of who you are, are entitled to a hearing process. And so, we will maintain that. For our employee matters, non-Title IX matters, we don't have a hearing. We never have, including for faculty. And that will continue. But in terms of updating our procedures, we're in the processes of finalizing our internal updates, and then we will be seeking community feedback on that. So, if you're interested in me reaching out to you, I'm happy to do so, but we'll be reaching out to-- I'm probably coming back here at some point to talk those through and talk about why we're making those changes. I hope that answers your question. Okay.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thanks for coming, Katie. I have a two-part question. One is with regard to the last thing you talked about, hearings. I would encourage us as a community to look to see whether the due process protections, including hearings, should be expanded to everybody. There's nothing that says we cannot have hearings, it's just Cornell has chosen not to for faculty. And that's something that I've raised over the years, and I hope we can really think about having a full due process for everybody if they choose to go to a hearing. So, that's number one. Number two is I also would like to know really what your office is doing to make sure that people understand the difference between things like dear colleague letters and FAQs that the Office for Civil Rights and the Department of Education may put out, which are not enforceable as law. You know, the idea of male versus female, that is the current Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Education at the federal level. That's their interpretation. There is nothing in Title IX that says that. And over the years, gender identity has simply been accepted. So, it seems to me very important for people not to believe that because DCL, if your colleague letter says something, that that's something that's enforceable by law. And also for Title VI, there's been an injunction against the enforcement that OCR, Office of Civil Rights, at the federal level would like to do with regard to DEI issues, but they've been enjoined, and the federal government now even says they're not going to implement them. I think it's really important for people to know that because there's so much fear and there are also affirmative

action programs that are lawful. Even if the federal government doesn't like them, under Title VII, they're lawful. So, I wonder if you could address that. Thanks.

KATIE KING: Absolutely. Yes, I'll address your first question first, which is in terms of having hearings for everyone, I really appreciate the comment. I'll just say one of the issues that we currently have, even with the current student hearings that we have is our hearing panels are comprised of three individuals, all employees. And so, these are voluntary positions that folks have. And we like to seek to have at least one faculty member on each of our hearing panels, and that is always the hardest position to fill and actually has caused, unfortunately, some delay in some of our hearings because we cannot find faculty hearing panelists. So, I will just use this opportunity as a plug to please, if you're interested in volunteering as a faculty hearing panelist, please reach out to our office. We only ask you to do about one hearing a year. And so, that would be, in my mind, a barrier because we have a hard time as it is. But I'm definitely open to continuing that conversation. With respect to federal guidance, you're absolutely correct. This current administration has issued multiple FAQs and dear colleague letters that have been overturned by the courts already. I have been considering ways to publicize that information on our website as news, and in an ever-changing environment, I struggle to know whether my office is the right place to be making commentary about that. We absolutely can and should do a better job of like at least putting out the information, and we can do that. We have a news section on our website So, I'll talk with folks in my office about looking to do that. But if anybody ever has any questions about that, you're more than welcome to reach out to me. It really is a day-to-day, like things are changing. But I appreciate that. And it is an issue.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We just have a minute or two, so if we could keep it short.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Electrical Medicine. So, if somebody feels that they are being harassed for an issue that is not related to a protected class, what would be their best next step?

KATIE KING: So, I think going to human resources would be a great step. And we're also-- I'm always happy to consult on that, right? Like the other option is the ombuds office. So, the ombuds is an excellent resource that we have here on campus, and they are confidential and they

know all the offices, right? So, you go to the ombuds, you ask for their recommendation, and they'll hook you up with whoever the right person is. So, I would go ombuds, and then maybe HR.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Wait till you get to the mic and then identify yourself.

LINDA CANINA: Yeah. I'm Linda Canina. I'm at the College of Business at Nolan Hotel School. I am a bit disturbed because I see quite a few students of different religious groups that are hiding their religious identity because they don't feel comfortable here at Cornell. And I'm wondering what's being done about that. I mean, for the students not to feel safe here is a pretty bad situation.

KATIE KING: I agree. That's a big concern. I would recommend, if you're seeing that, you could do multiple things. One thing you could do is you could reach out to our office directly, share which students are impacted so that we can connect with them. One thing we always want to make sure we're doing is getting information into the impacted party's hands. And so, if they need information about resources that are available to them on campus, I'd be curious why they feel uncomfortable. And that's going to be individual to each person. So, you could reach out directly, or you could provide our office as a resource. There's also Cornell University's religious works office and Joel Harder. Excellent resource here on campus if it is for practicing their religion, et cetera. But we need to be able to know about what's going on to be able to take any action or do anything. I think, and I really appreciate that. And I would hate to make assumptions without making sure that you're connecting, at least telling the students where they can go so that they can talk with someone in my office at the very least. We are happy to talk with them at any time. I can understand that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, I think we have to bring this agenda item to a close, and it's now time for announcements and updates. Eve DeRosa, Dean of Faculty. Adam Smith, Associate Dean of Faculty. Welcome.

ADAM SMITH: Hi, everybody. My name's Adam Smith. I am your newly elected Associate

Dean of Faculty. I'm a member of the Anthropology Department and also Director of the Cornell Institute of Archeology and Material Studies. And I'm here with an early in the semester request that you all begin to think about faculty governance and the way that you can help the nominations and elections committee bring forward new voices and passionate voices into the roles of faculty governance. The nominations and elections committee, as you probably are all aware, is what we might think of as the sharp sword of faculty governance. It's where all the committees get populated, or at least most of the committees get populated. And we are eager and looking out for new voices to bring into the committees that require new positions to be filled. We are working on both elected committees. You can see in this slide a sense of the positions that need to be filled beginning next year. I will highlight, of course, Dean of Faculty position. Our current extraordinary Dean of Faculty, Eve, is going to have to step down at the end of her term, and we're going to need to find someone to fill her shoes. Faculty trustee, we are going to need one as well, which of course is a critically important opportunity for faculty voices to get into the trustees' conversations. We also have positions that are appointed positions. Jill, you wanna give me the next slide? These are positions that need to be filled for next year. We have a lot of them potentially across a wide range of committees that deal with an extraordinary breadth of activities on campus, ranging from ROTC relations to academic freedom. So, I ask you to take a look at these. If you have a sense of your own passions or your own interests, please feel free to send me a note expressing your interest. If you know someone else, feel free to volunteer them. I promise that I won't divulge who volunteered them, if necessary. And if you are in a conversation, please raise it with your colleagues. It's really important at this time more than perhaps any other time for faculty to be active and participatory in the future of the university. So, I encourage you to reach out to me with any ideas, and suggestions, and nominations. Is there another slide, Jill? No, I think that that's it. All right, so please keep me in mind. Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: Hi, everyone. I just want to say thank you to all of the new committee members that we have. We had that first slide that was in super tiny writing, but all of your names are there for all the new senators, but also all of the faculty who contribute to our 13 Faculty Senate committees. As you saw, there's a wide breadth. But as Adam just mentioned, we are at a critical juncture. We have a federal government that-- What's the euphemism? Is there a euphemism?

Federal government that's scrutinizing, hire it, I found it. And so, at this time, I think faculty have an important role in bringing our experiences, our voices to the conversations. I can say that we have a new provost who really wants to hear from us. So, over the late spring and the summer, I held and Adam held and Chelsea held listening sessions where faculty came and provided solutions to some of the challenges that are coming from the federal government. And a lot of those things are starting to have impact at the center, and I would love to continue to hear from faculty about those things. So, I just want to mention that. We started in the late Spring, talking about what the new sort of community agreements could be for the Senate. And so, right now, it's Jonathan, myself, and Nate, Senator Mattias, and Senator Sykes, who are just thinking through how to bring Robert's rules to our current culture here of the Senate and just making sure because there's some inconsistencies in what has been posted over the years, and so we're just trying to clean that up. Thank you. Next slide, please. One of the things that came out of the faculty sessions that I mentioned before was faculty expressing a desire to really get the public to understand the impact of their work, so the sort of looking at impact. And so, I worked with the vice president of communications. Unfortunately, she couldn't be here today. Actually, she's Interim Vice president of University Relations right now. But she could not come today at the last minute. But I just wanted to mention she will bring a whole series of opportunities for faculty to get media training. So, they have new studios. They will make everybody look good, sound good. And we're thinking about potentially setting up just sessions for people to get training, and then immediately be able to make a two minute, one minute video about their scholarship and the impact of their scholarship on our local community, the state, the federal government, the nation, and worldwide. So, please look forward for those things. I will mention them to you, and also we might launch them somehow another way. And so, that came out of the session. I think the other thing I wanted to share with you is our faculty soup is going to go on the road this year. Jill and I have been talking about this since the very beginning of my position, and it's really striking how not straightforward it is to be able to pull this off, but we're pulling it off this year. And it's really just we find that a lot of people who are local to the Statler or just in the surrounding vicinity are the ones who really get to benefit from the faculty soup. And this is supposed to be an opportunity for everyone to get together, colleagues, to just cross-fertilize ideas and work together. And so, we're going to go to some of the farthest reaches of our Ithaca campus. So, we're going to go up to the vet school, Cornell Engineering, and the last one is the

new Atkinson Hall. And so, with that, I will open it up for questions.

BILL KATT: Me again, Bill Kat, Veterinary Medicine. Eve, with these on the road faculty soups, will the faculty soup coupons be available from a nearby diner or will people still have to schlep down to the current areas.

EVE DE ROSA: So, the other part that I didn't share, whoops, it's free for the first 50 people. So, no need for tickets or anything like that. We really just want to build our community and really give opportunity for people who don't usually get to come down to the Statler.

MARK LEWIS: Glad someone's told me to put this up. Mark Lewis from ORIE. I'm just curious if it's even possible to do this, but is there any chance that there's an ad hoc committee standing up to help the president and the provost decide what are, say, the top five things the university faculty would like them to consider as they consider these coming budget cuts?

EVE DE ROSA: So, we have multiple opportunities for the Senate and faculty to be involved in this. And I can also send out a system-wide questionnaire or survey for people to sort of give their top five picks and get some data on this. But that's what those faculty sessions have been, where people are talking about budget priorities. We have a financial policies committee, one of our Senate committees that actually meets with the provost, the president, the chief financial officer, budget and planning, the endowment. So, that's one faculty group that we can take information in from the faculty and give it to them, and they have these monthly conversations with people who are thinking about the budget and the trustees as well as the vice presidents, and president, and provost. And then, also the university faculty committee is another opportunity. So, I'll be holding more of the faculty listening sessions, and so we could make one that's just specifically about the budget and give everyone an opportunity. And the Qualtrics that I sent out earlier, I can resend it out again, but people have been bringing in information through that, and I've been sharing it to the appropriate offices as needed.

MARK LEWIS: Just for clarity, I'm not talking about impact on of the budget, I'm talking about impact of the people that budget cuts will affect. So, that's what I want to know.

EVE DE ROSA: Definitely, that's coming up. And those are-- The small group conversations have been that specifically, where people are bringing their lived experience into the room. And I mean, we can continue. We are going to continue those. And otherwise, I'm not really sure what else you're thinking about. We can keep that conversation going.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Perhaps we should move on. We have one more item. This is something called Good of the Order. If you're new here, it's a five minute discussion by any of the members of the Senate on a topic that's not really up as a motion, but could be related to anything that is of concern at Cornell. And today, we have Richard Bensel, Government. So, five minutes.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, everybody. I'm Richard Bensel, Department of Government. I'm also representing the working group on the resolution, which I distributed to you earlier this morning. We are not able to present the resolution to you today. We now have 13 Senate sponsors and 18 faculty sponsors who are not senators. So, I will not discuss it more today, but I do want to bring up and make you aware of some of the reasons why this issue and this resolution is very important to the life and to the quality of experience in the Cornell community. And I'm gonna use as my example, a very brave master's student in ILR who came to me and described to me her experience with the interim suspension process. And I sent that, I distributed that to you as a narrative earlier today. I want to highlight some of the things, some of the elements in that experience that we should be considering both in the resolution and generally as we go forward. On March 10th, 2025, there was a ticketed event in Bailey Hall entitled Pathways to Peace. One of the speakers was Tzipi Livni, a former deputy prime minister of Israel. Dina Ginsburg, the masters students whose narrative I'm presenting to you and have presented to you, attended this event. When Tzipi Livni was speaking, Dina Ginsburg rose in a voice loud enough to be heard throughout the hall, said, Tzipi Livni, you're a Chillul Hashem, I don't speak Hebrew, I hope I didn't murder it too badly, Chillul Hashem, and Israel is the biggest Chillul Hashem in all of history. It's what? Hasham, okay. I take the lesson. There are 17 words there. 17 words. Her protest lasted about five seconds. It's on a body cam for one of the police officers who was there. And she left Bailey Hall voluntarily and unescorted. She had acted alone. On March 19th, nine

days after the event, Dina Ginsburg received a formal complaint, this is quote, "formal complaint initiated by Lieutenant Scott Grants of the Cornell University Police Department on behalf of Cornell University." I won't go through all of it because it took too much time, but in short, Lieutenant Grant said that Dina had violated the following sections of the Student Code of Conduct, and I only read part of the charge, to intentionally cause or recklessly create a risk of disruption to the university community or local community, including, but not limited to, violent or threatening behavior. These are charges made against Dina. Violent or threatening behavior, unreasonably loud or belligerent behavior, obstruction of vehicular or pedestrian traffic, and disruption of university activities. On March 19th, the very same day that Lieutenant Grants issued this complaint, very same day. Dina Ginsburg received a notification from Christina Lang, Director of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, acknowledging receipt of the complaint and imposing the following interim penalties. The very same day, receiving the complaint, imposing the penalties. Quote, this is only part of it. "You are permitted to be on the campus of Cornell University for the sole purpose of attending the classes in which you are enrolled. You may arrive on campus 15 minutes prior to the commencement of your first day of the class-- first class of the day, and you must leave campus immediately following your final class of the day. You may continue accessing campus dining and retail facilities if you need to purchase food or a beverage between classes. You are not permitted on campus on Saturdays, Sundays, or any other day that you do not have class." The charges alleged by Lieutenant Grants were, aside from the five second interruption of Livni's address, completely false. Nonetheless, Christina Lang imposed substantial penalties upon Dina Ginsburg without a hearing the very same day receiving the complaint, a hearing in which she could have defended herself against these charges. In fact, the Office of the Student Conduct and Community Standards put off their own investigation into the charges until May 29th, 2025, the end of the semester several months later. During that time, Dina Ginsburg was barred from campus, including use of the library, with the exception that she could go to the library to check out books. Now, I want to read to you from the website, the Student Code of Conduct. If you go to that website, the opening statement, there is an opening message from the director, Christina Lang, which reads in part, quote, "College is a time of exploration, experimentation, and self-discovery. It's natural to encounter challenges and have missteps along the way. The OSCCS, the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards, the OSCCS team believes that missteps are just opportunities to gain new

skills and to grow as a human. We help you do this through a restorative and educational student conduct process as outlined in the student code of conduct procedures. Cornell's student Conduct process focuses," again, Lang speaking, "focuses on principles of reflection and learning. The process incorporates restorative practices to build a culture of community and healing rather than a community that centers around judgment and punishment." Prosecutions-- That was the end of the quote. Prosecutions under the current code of conduct are emphatically not a restorative or educational process. Instead of honor, integrity, and honesty, they instill, and I know this from many conversations, they instill fear, hypocrisy, and cynicism. I and the co-sponsors of this resolution very much look forward to discussing ways in which the disciplinary process can be reformed to realize those latter goals and purposes, goals and purposes more consistent with the great university we should aspire to be.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. This meeting is now adjourned.