Faculty Senate
October 11, 2023

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: My name is Jonathan Ochshorn. I'm the Senate speaker. Emeritus professor in the Department of Architecture. We start with the land acknowledgment. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̲hó:nǫ' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̲hó:nǫ' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogo̲hó:nǫ' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̲hó:nǫ' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, the meeting is called to order. We start with the approval of minutes from last September 13th, 2023. The minutes of the meeting have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript so any corrections would be sort of trivial by definition and you should bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty if you see any typos or other sorts of things. So, by unanimous consent the minutes are approved, subject to your feedback. The next item on the agenda is or senate announcements and updates. Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa, Chair of the University Faculty Committee, member of Psychology Department and Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean of Faculty, Chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee from Plant Biology. It'll be ten minutes and then another ten minutes for Q&A if necessary.

>> Chelsea Specht: Is this going? So, I just wanted to give a brief update. On the 19th will be the second meeting on the committee of nominations and elections. The NNA committee which I chair in my role as Associate Dean and I just wanted to say that the first -- what we're doing this year is we're taking each of the different committees that need people to be filling, to be filled and we're going through them one by one and kind of giving names from -- from the different groups that we represent. We try to represent all the colleges, small colleges, large colleges, different types of interest on the committee and make sure we've got a diverse group of people that we're nominating to serve. And so, I just want to let you all know which committees we're handling first and which positions we're looking at first because if you have any ideas of people that you think should be nominated to serve on these senate committees or to have roles in these senate advisory councils and groups, please -- you can please send me those names and I will

have the nominations and elections committee consider them. So, for this next week we'll be looking to fill a position as a faculty trustee. We'll be looking for three senators at large and we'll be looking for two new members of our University Faculty Committee. And you can go on the website to find out more information about what these people do and the impact that they have on the shared governance of this university and so these are names of people that, you're like, hey, I would like to do that. You're welcome to nominate yourself or I have a really good friend who I think would be awesome in that role and we would love to consider those people. So, these are positions -- in addition to those other positions we will also -- those are positions where we need to have multiple names, and then they will stand for election. These committees -- other committees that we considered are ones that we -- we get our list of names. We come up with a prioritized ask order and then we go out and ask people and then they can say yes. They don't have to run for it. They just automatically appointed to the committees and so the two committees we're going to be considering for appointment are the Faculty Advisory Committee on Athletics and Physical Education so if you know someone who likes to run or swim that's a good one, and then the faculty library board which has a huge impact on insuring that the libraries have an integral role in everything we do in our university. So, thank you very much.

>> Eve De Rosa: And I just want to share a few updates with the senate and then we'll open up the floor for questions online and here. And so, first RTE faculty and this is -- I can say this as a fact these were just sent to RTE faculty so we now have a list of your constituents so if you in the College of Human Ecology you now have a list of every RTE faculty member in the college and we're hoping that this is where you'll disseminate the work of the Senate and be able to bring it back to the Senate for topics that are meaningful to your constituents. We have our RTE working group and they are meeting with the provost and deputy provost this month and so, if there are RTE faculty who have questions that they want to hear directly from the provost, the deputy provost you can share those questions with the co-chairs, John -- I'm sorry. I forgot your surname, John. Starts with a C. Callister. Thank you. Thank you,   and Kim Kopko. and so those are the co-chairs if there are questions that you want answered that would be a nice way to access that and then we have great representation. We have every college and school also represented on the working group. The swim competency requirement. So it's no longer called the swim test and this is some of the work of the FACAPE, one of the committees that we need

faculty representation but FACAPE worked diligently last year to really do a deep dive into understanding the history of the swim test and what current standards are and whether there are barriers to students, particularly people of color and women who tend not to come into the university being able to pass the swim test. And, so, they have done a lot of hard work, and that resolution will be now shopped with a bunch of student groups and then we're doing that right now in coordinating with student campus life and then after we get student feedback, we'll bring this to the senate, likely in -- February. And -- today you're going to get a presentation about the research integrity council so academic misconduct by faculty used to be solely the purview of the Dean of Faculty and it was decided with the previous Dean of Faculty, Charlie Van Loan, and the administration to make it a broader council and so it was moved into the vice president of research and innovation office and we now have a chief integrity officer and so he is coming to share with the senate what he -- what infrastructure he has built. It has faculty representation from every college and school and the office of the Dean of Faculty is still very much involved as well as the vice president of research and innovation and so, he is going to present the new structure, how it works, and also give an audit of what's happened in the two years that this -- this infrastructure was built. So, next slide, please. And then I just wanted to share with everybody what's happened with the proposal for adding the teaching professor titles to our academic titles. So, we have done a few things. We have shared the proposals with multiple senate committees as you'll see. I'm going to use the acronyms cause the full names are up there. EPC, CAPP, the university faculty committee, and I believe, oh, AFPSF. And this is because it does have implications for the professional status of the faculty. So, I thought that would be another welcome sort of venue for faculty feedback so it's very consultative. This is also been presented to the academic Deans and we also have new data that will help support the proposal. We have credit hours, undergraduate credit hours, organized by level of -- of course and by college and so I am going to present these data to the academic Deans, make sure everything is accurate and so in November all of this consultative work and these numbers will come to the senate for us to have a robust discussion. I have been told that I really packed the agenda and so I'm going to work on that and so I'll try to make sure that we have enough space to really talk about this -- I think it's going to be an important addition to our academic titles. And I think that's it so I'm open and Chelsea is open for questions. If you have questions, come on up or raise your hand online.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I don't see any online hands nor people in the house coming up so perhaps we move to the next agenda item.

>> Eve De Rosa: Okay, I just want to say Jill would like me to remind everybody to sign in physically if you are here or to -- online in the Zoom chat. And, with that, if -- I believe Lisa is next? Is that right?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We'll move on to the report of the presidential task force on undergraduate admissions, 2022-2023. Co-chairs are Deputy Provost, Avery August --

>> Eve De Rosa: Avery's not online right now.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: He's online?

>>Eve De Rosa: No, he's not online.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Is he here?

>> Eve De Rosa: Nope. He's presenting the slides so --

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, well there's two others. Are any of them --.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So, shall we move this --

>> Eve De Rosa: Yes.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Then by unanimous consent then I will alter the agenda.

>> Eve De Rosa: Lisa is here.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We will move on to introducing a proposal in support of a resolution to eliminate a transcript notation for a grade of incomplete when the instructor has submitted another grade. Lisa Nishi, Professor ILR, and vice provost for undergraduate education will have ten minutes to present the proposal and then there will be a discussion for ten minutes and is Lisa here or online? Okay, go head, Lisa.

>> Lisa Nishi: Hi, Hello, I'm here. will I -- okay. Great. This is not the right --

>> Eve De Rosa: Give it another try.

>> Lisa Nishi: Great, thank you so much. Okay, so I'm here to talk about a proposal to eliminate a transcript notation for a grade of incomplete after the temporary incomplete has actually been completed and an instructor has submitted a grade. Next slide, please. Thank you. So, the -- this is a policy -- the grade of incomplete that actually dates back to 1965. Faculty senate's grading policy was adopted then. It's a policy that applies to undergraduate students, graduate students, and professional students, and from what we can see it doesn't appear that the policy has been reviewed in part or in whole since its inception. So first I'll share the core elements of the policy related to a grade of incomplete. The policy states that a grade of incomplete is appropriate only when two basic conditions have been met. One, the student has substantial equity at a passing level in the course with respect to the work completed so far, and two, the student has been prevented by circumstances beyond their control such as illness or a family emergency or omicron in the case of fall 2021, from completing the course requirements on time. The policy goes on to explain that a grade of incomplete may not be given merely because a student fails to complete all course requirements on time. The incomplete privilege is open to abuse by deferring completion of some major course requirement a student can gain advantage over his or her classmates by obtaining additional time to do superior job. This is not an option that can be elected at the student's own discretion. Right? So, that is not what an incomplete is for. These two conditions have to be met. Next, please. Under the current policy the consequences of failure to complete all course work within the time permitted depends on the college but if the -- the student fails to complete the course work in some colleges the incomplete converts to a grade of F and in some colleges, it remains permanently on the transcript as an

INC, incomplete. In either case the option to make up the work is lost. Furthermore, according to the policy, the symbol of incomplete becomes a permanent part of the student's transcript even when a grade has been submitted. This is done by placing an asterisk next to the grade that has replaced the INC, the temporary incomplete. Next, please. So, this -- this last part related to the transcript notation for a grade of incomplete that has been successfully completed and converted to a grade is the focus of this resolution. We propose that the transcript notation be eliminated when a student is successfully completes their course with expected timeframe. I would like to emphasize here, before I -- explain the rationale for the proposal that the current practice of converting an incomplete to an F or permanent incomplete for students who fail to complete their coursework is not being affected by this proposal. Next, please. So, there are a few reasons that we propose this -- this change. So, the first is by definition according to the criteria I described in the very beginning, a student is not at fault for needing a temporary incomplete according to our grading policy. The policy clearly indicates that an instructor can't issue a temporary incomplete unless it's necessitated by circumstances beyond a student's control and -- and therefore a faculty member feels that -- it is an acceptable, you know, thing to offer to the student. So, the student's not at fault for needing the temporary grade of incomplete and the argument here so they shouldn't be punished for a setback that is out of their control by having this permanent notation that could lead other people who are reading their transcript to have incorrect assumptions, make incorrect inferences about why the asterisk might be there, for instance, lack of conscientiousness too. The notation could put pressure on the student to disclose private information so the policy refers to circumstances beyond the student's control which -- which could involve private matters such as a serious illness or a pregnancy and a student shouldn't feel obliged or even pressured to reveal such information and by noting it with the asterisk, we're flagging the incomplete for the reader to question. Three, even after eliminating the asterisk a transcript reader will have all necessary information so if a student is unable to complete the work this will be evident on the transcript by virtue of a grade of F or a permanent INC but if a student has completed it on time, then the grade will be reflected for the work that they have completed for the course.   Fourth, we are an outlier, Cornell is the only Ivy that -- that notes this on the transcript. As a result, our students may be disadvantaged relative to students from other institutions, and I think it's also noteworthy that nowhere does the American Association of College Registrars and Admission Officers mention anything about transcript notations for an

incomplete in their best practice guidelines. And then last, the actual implementation of this is actually really difficult and it's inconsistent. This is because the notations have to be inputted manually by college registrar offices and we've learned from the university registrar that the process can't be automated even with more advanced technology so we've pulled data from 2018 to 2023, so five years' worth of data and found there's significant variability across colleges in the extent to which an asterisk is actually put on the transcript when an INC is converted to a grade. It ranges anywhere from 15% to 85% across colleges and in that five-year period, there were 8,404 grades that were converted from an incomplete to a grade and of those an asterisk followed only 5,120 of those changes. So given the implementation is very tedious and subject to human error, it's unrealistic to expect the implementation to improve sufficiently for this to become more consistent and therefore equitable across colleges. Next, please. Therefore, here is the -- the resolution being proposed. That the Cornell University grading system policy be revised by eliminating the clause that states the symbol INC becomes a permanent part of the student's transcript even when a grade is later submitted, and we substitute that text instead with the symbol INC becomes a permanent part of the student's transcript only when another grade is not later submitted. Thank you. So, I'll open it up for questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, once again if you have a question from the audience here just step up to the mic. Okay, I see some hands online. We'll start with Hadas Ritz. Unmute yourself and two minutes, please.

>> Hadas Ritz: One thing that that's happening to me --

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Sorry – please indicate your department.

>> Hadas Ritz: Yes, College of Engineering, RTE. Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. One thing that I'm noticing more often is students will kind of -- around the final exam say that they're overwhelmed and basically it's like kind of a mental illness crisis or reason that they want to take an incomplete and, you know, I don't feel like I'm really in a position to evaluate whether that's a valid kind of illness outside of the student's control and so I'm wondering whether -- whether having some sort of consequence to taking an incomplete will kind of -- or does

diminish those asks or I don't know if there's any kind of university device on how to handle those asks and just something to think about as to whether that's going to feed into the -- into this proposal.

>> Lisa Nishi: Yeah, I would -- I think the fact that it's happening even though there's an asterisk suggests that you know -- I can't remember how you worded your question but, you know I have received similar questions. I think related in that -- there -- sometimes it appears like there's a pattern of students who might -- like a serial incompleters, right? Like request incompletes often and will we lose our ability to see that and this really important for our student services professionals, right, who are reviewing students at the end of an academic semester for example, and I am happy to share that we have a new functionality in (inaudible) that was just implemented called grade audit that actually allows the historical grades to also be seen so you can see that in a particular class -- a student had an incomplete and -- but -- at a certain time and then later it was changed to a grade so you can actually -- there's a way for us to see that. I think, you know, to your question about guidance it's -- it's -- I think that one is difficult to answer. It is really -- you know for -- for faculty to make that judgment given the circumstances and -- and what they know. Right?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have another online comment or question, Paul Ginsparg.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Thank you. I have -- it's not the same question --

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Identity your affiliation.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Oh, I'm sorry. Paul Ginsparg from Information Science. I have what's sort of the flip side of this question of students who have come to me -- well -- first let me say I've given incompletes and I've been careful -- I've -- I was happy to hear you read the guidelines for giving it. You know, specifically, that was -- students were on track but something unexpected happened toward the end of the course and I adhered to that. I've had students come, you know, where when I look at it and -- you know they have requested an incomplete and I look at it and I say, but -- you have been behind basically since problem set 2 or 3 and so, you don't qualify for

this. I'm very happy that I have been familiar with the guidelines for incompletes so I'm not even tempted to consider that, and I can tell them. I did not know that there was an asterisk applied and I completely agree with the proposal to remove it, you know, provided that the original incomplete was given under the guidelines that you read and specified to us and so, given the pressure from students what I'm wondering is -- and I'm imagining the answer is we have no way of collecting the information but I'm wondering if we have any data on, you know, the faculty who say, we're not entirely apprised of, you know, the requirements for giving incomplete and have been giving, you know, these inappropriate incompletes and thereby giving students the advantage of having extra time to complete the course material because they -- they didn't comply with the requirements.

>> Lisa Nishi: Yeah, I -- I hear you and I think this is related to the first comment and I do understand that faculty can feel pressure, right, or compelled to grant an incomplete and so, we have been talking about the value of soliciting input from faculty to see whether or not there, you know, might be something to be gained by tightening up the policy a little bit, right, to clarify what a substantial -- I can't remember the words exactly, equity mean? Right? For example. And -- and -- circumstances beyond the student's control. To be really, really clear about that so that you're not in that position where you have to make those judgments. For example, substantial equity and a passing level. What does that -- what does that really mean, right? Like, should -- and -- and should it be 75% or all but the last project or exam, right, have been completed. Something that is really easy to point to and to implement so, but that would be separate. That's a different part of this, you know, grading policy that we could address together with input from faculty. This is just the part about the asterisk. What I'm hearing in the comments is there's another part of this that's very difficult for faculty. Right? But for now, if we could just kind of decouple the two and -- and plan on addressing these other issues.

>> Paul Ginsparg: Yeah, they are -- I understand you're just talking about the asterisk, but I was -- finding out that, you know, they are actually a little too tightly coupled and we might want to consider both simultaneously.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a question or comment in house. Go ahead] --

>> Tom Fox: Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics. I have a lot of experience with incompletes teaching a required biology course for many years. and, first of all I want to say that I completely support the idea of getting rid of the asterisk but to underline what Paul was saying -- I also am aware of professors who are pretty sloppy about giving incompletes and so, if the policy is going to be changed I think really that we should take advantage of this as a time to make sure everybody really reads the faculty handbook and understands what they are supposed to be doing. Because -- I think there are -- faculty who seem to think that this is just something students request, and it shouldn't be that and so it's an opportunity to raise the issue --.

>> Lisa Nishi: I think that's a great point, yes, thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Online. Kathryn Caggiano.

>>Kathryn Caggiano: Thank you. Kathryn Caggiano, RTE for Engineering. I guess I have a question about the asterisk actually potentially providing information on the behalf of a student down the road that may be beneficial if we're talking about an asterisk that is something -- and -- I realize this is a little bizarre right, but we're talking about a C asterisk, or a D asterisk or perhaps even an F asterisk that is because, for example, a student has received an incomplete, they are in the range of being, for example, able to pass, right, but due -- due to circumstances beyond their control they are -- not able for example, to finish one final deliverable but they would still be in a position to be able to let's say, pass with that final deliverable but let's say they never do it, right? So, I'm wondering if there is any just thought to a student who, you know, for whatever reason down the road, they may actually want the D asterisk on their transcript so that they can explain, look, you know, whatever, something was happening in my life. This was not a statement about the quality of the work I had done. I just never was able to finish everything and so it reverted to a D with the asterisk there. I know that's sort of an edge case but I'm wondering right -- I mean I have a student last semester who for example, decided to -- you know, change -- transfer programs, right, from Cornell to somewhere else and left with, you know, an incomplete on his transcript. And I -- I don't know what that is going to eventually end up being, but I don't know whether that student, for example, might prefer there to be an asterisk there so that there is

some -- you know, distinction by way of explanation. Just -- just a thought.

>> Lisa Nishi: You know -- I would say a student can always offer an explanation if they choose to and feel that that's warranted. I think with the asterisk, even when that's not the case, you're inviting speculation that may be -- you know -- unnecessary. Kind of take that choice away from students, right?

>> Kathryn Caggiano: Yeah, no, I see that side of it, But I also see a student's point of being able to say, look, it's a C asterisk and the C asterisk is because I simply, you know, could not actually complete everything. They -- I suppose they could offer that explanation anyway but this in some sense is substantiation of an explanation.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Are there any other questions or comments? Here or there? is the deputy provost available?

>> Eve De Rosa: Yes.

>> Jonathan Ochshorn: So maybe we'll -- again, by unanimous consent if there's no objection revert back to the other initial agenda item which is the presidential task force on undergraduate admissions report with deputy provost Avery August. Also, special counsel to the president Kelly Cunningham and Patrizia McBride, German Studies and I'm told that Avery August will do the presentation? Try to keep it to ten minutes and then we'll have some time for Q&A after that.

>> Avery August: Thank you, and I really appreciate the opportunity to represent my colleagues and presenting this update to you all on the presidential task force. I will add that I'm joined by my co-chair, Patrizia McBride, on Zoom, and the other co-chair, Kelly Cunningham, is not able to join us today. Next slide, please. So, first I would like to really point out and thank the membership of the task force here indicated with their pictures so you can recognize them but also their disciplinary expertise. this was a task force that was made up of a number of faculty across the institution with a wide range of disciplinary expertise as you see there. Next slide. Again, members of the task force that was part of the group. Next slide. So, this task force was

co-chaired by myself, Kelly Cunningham and Patrizia McBride. We had very, very capable management from Victoria White. I really like to point her out and highlight her contributions to our work here in managing a large number of people and multiple meetings over the last roughly year or so. Next slide. So, one of the things I wanted to start with is -- is the university's obligation to regularly review its admissions practices and that ensures that we can achieve the kind of diversity that produces beneficial educational outcomes. At the same time complying with current legal framework. So, that -- that's -- that was the premise in which the task force was formed. We had a particular charge, next slide. That charge was to conduct a thorough review of our undergraduate admissions process so what we're talking about here is the task force spent its time thinking about undergraduate admissions, and recommendations were to be informed by Cornell's founding mission of any person, any study and commitment to broad based and inclusive admissions practices. Next slide. The task force approached this -- it's work by subdividing into three subcommittees that largely took on the task of looking at various aspects of our charge. The first one was the applicant characteristics, that is what -- what -- what type of characteristics would we like to see in our applicant pool for our undergraduate student body. The second one is on recognizing the advances and machine learning to think about what are the appropriate uses of data analytics and machine learning technology to enhance our holistic and individualized review and the third is to think about our pipeline recruitment and retention of -- of students, undergraduate students to generate the maximum impact on both our student diversity as well as the educational benefit that may arrive from that. Next slide. So, our approach was we took these smaller subcommittees and met weekly, both as a larger group and in subgroups. We also spent a significant amount of time studying the literature. We consulted with national experts. We brought them in, and they made presentations to us, to the task force. We met with Cornell's admissions offices and staff from the financial aid office. We also surveyed the faculty. You have -- you received requests to -- to submit your -- your thoughts on understanding the characteristics and experiences of students that you wish to see in our student body. We surveyed students. We sent out requests to greater than 170 student organizations and we also had tabletop discussions with the board of trustees. All toward the goal of thinking about how we view admissions, undergraduate admissions here. Next slide. So -- so let me -- so I wanted to sort of set the frame for how we did this. So, the next set of slides I will go through the recommendations, and I encourage you to look at the report that's been published for more

details. These are highlights of the report. I tried to capture -- we tried to capture those items that we felt was important to share with you at a high level. So, the first recommendation came from charge number one. What are the applicant characteristics or indicators that we should prioritize as part of our admissions process that would craft a class that furthers our mission and yields the educational benefits of a diverse student body? And so, the -- the task force came up with a number of recommendations around these lines. So, we -- we proposed that the university identity and recruit students who show attributes of life experiences that we identified as enriching the educational experience in the classroom. And those -- attributes and life experiences include of course academic achievement as a start but also -- significant achievement in other areas. Inquiry -- rigor, passion, curiosity; distance traveled, we spent a lot of time thinking about how students present to us when they apply to Cornell and what distance they traveled to get there and what that means for that student in terms of being part of our student body so overcoming barriers, experiences working part time, overcoming feelings of isolation and dispowerment, head winds, struggles, and related to that persistence. Does the applicant provide evidence of persistence in terms of grit, resilience, perseverance and focus. Community orientation given our land grant mission we felt this was really important for us to think about identifying students who had those particular characteristics. Leadership qualities and a knowledge and appreciation of Cornell's unique history and mission. We are very proud of our unique history and mission, and we attract students who appreciate that and so we felt that was important to identity students who come to us with those characteristics. Next slide. The second part of the charge of identity applicant characteristics is to implement specific changes in the application form that would facilitate identification and recruitment of academically talented students from a broad range of backgrounds and I apologize for the formatting error there but -- this is -- these are questions -- more fine grain questions about parent or primary care taker, college degree attainment beyond the -- the simple whether one has a degree or not. Graduate degree or professional degree or jobs or occupations and we also recommended that the university -- in submissions process ask applicants for three most extracurricular activities to emphasize quality over quantity and encourage students to be very -- more thoughtful about the essay prompts about the number of extracurricular activities and also to reduce stress in the application process so students don't feel as if they need to do a lot of things in order to be competitive here at Cornell. And then, finally for this particular charge, we -- proposed adding a

question that asked applicants about how they would contribute to our core mission and core values. Next slide. So, the task force recommended a new university wide essay question. I won't read the whole thing. I will encourage you to take a look at it but in essence it's rooted in our founding of I -- founded institution where any person can find instruction in any study and asking students to reflect on what that means and thinking about the community and their experiences that they can present as a potential member of our academic community. Next slide. So, the second charge was to ask what if our appropriate uses of data analytics and machine learning technology as a tool. Purely as a tool to enhance the holistic and individualized review of all applications. And so the task force came up with a number of proposals that -- I mentioned two there again, apologies for the formatting errors but the number of proposals for responsible ways of using machine learning tools and data science that would support and optimize recruitment, admissions and retention, that allows us to be able to manage the volume of information that we have but also using that information in ways that benefit our students. We propose that a particular specialist would be hired to form a permanent data science research and operations team whose mission would be to support, development and implement data-driven solutions to further admissions and enrollment mission. As well as create a Cornell advisory board for educational data that would be tasked with overseeing and advising on implementation of data-driven evaluation techniques. I want to emphasize here that this is using the tool but not making decisions on who gets admitted to Cornell. Next slide. The third charge, the last one is which pipeline recruitment and retention program should we prioritize for the admitting units to generate the maximum impact on the grad unit student body diversity, and the educational benefits that we derive from that? And so, there are large numbers of recommendations that came from the task force that are highlighted in summary here and largely around developing and nurturing collaborative structures for decision making across our admissions offices, you know, each college does its own admissions. We felt that we could -- we could emphasize and enhance our functionality in terms of ensuring that we are using our recruitment strategies to the best effect. Ensuring data-informed decision-making again alongside using the data that we have available and that can build as well as -- structural things like enhancing our ability to use slate which is a program that's adopted by the university to manage all aspects of recruitment. We felt we could significantly increase our ability to use the features of that particular software. And in financial aid packages and decision timing was something that we identified that could be

optimized by the institution and then finally improving communications to students, families and High School counselors around our affordability, the Ivy plus matching policy and tracking students progression through the financial aid process to improve the yield of the students that we seek to -- to have here at Cornell as well as exploring alternative structures that can manage those processes. We found that process could be enhanced. Next slide. The second part of this charge was how do we optimally recruit students that we -- that we seek to identify with those applicant characteristics in charge number one? And there -- using again data mining tools target non-feeder schools. There were a large number -- there are small number of schools that are so-called feeder schools to Cornell University as -- undergraduate student applicants and there are a larger number of schools that could be identified and targeted that would attract a broad diversity of applicants to our campus. Partner with organizations, building strategic partnerships with community college including enhancing the ones that the contract colleges have with the state, New York state community colleges, developing cross college regional expert groups that -- would enhance our ability to identity and recruit students and building and further enhancing our ability to use pipeline programs that target younger students, not just seniors as well as thinking about the unique political status of indigenous students as members of and enrolled sovereign nations and how we can best identity and enhance the recruitment of those students here to Cornell. Messaging prospective students that are identified through these mechanisms and then facilitating the readiness of those students for success at Cornell to include precollege summer programs, using programs that eCornell has that can enhance facilitating readiness for those students and then using faculty lead instruction in High Schools that would again enhance readiness for students who are applying to Cornell. And then in the next step is successfully yielding those prospective students so once we have these students apply how do we -- and we want to admit them, how do we successfully yield them so that they actually come to Cornell and then finally again using a data-driven approach, assessing our interventions to ensure that they are having the effect that we would like them to have. Next slide. So, so those are the recommendations in a sort of overview from the task force. I wanted to add a few more slides to tell you a bit more about how these are now being taken up by the administration and being administered for the class entering this fall or next fall, sorry, of 2024 and beyond. So, the first thing we want to emphasize that all changes will be implemented in a legally compliant fashion. And, and that -- there -- the legal landscape has changed with the Supreme Court decision in the

summer, so all of these changes are being implemented in the legal compliant fashion. We've also implemented other changes in the application around fee waivers, I mentioned the changes in the questions that we ask around parental education level and of course targeting for recruiting specifically indigenous students who come from federally recognized tribes. There's also a decision to enroll a smaller proportion of the class near early decision as many of you know there's a significant proportion of the class that's admitted to Cornell early in -- early late in the fall to early decision. The decision was made to reduce that proportion and increase regular decision admissions processes and that started -- that is starting this fall 23. And then we will continue to evaluate the test-optional experiment that's going on between the various colleges to determine what decisions we will make around the use of standardized testing as part of our admissions process. Next slide. And -- and the second part of the changes is the -- the university question that I mentioned earlier so the admissions colleagues looked at that question and made a few changes to make it more easy to understand for potential students and their families and you can see here the final question that's now put on the application for all applicants to Cornell University which again, focuses -- it takes the same sort of form, focuses on our founding of any person, any study but changes the language a bit to make it easier to understand what we're actually looking for potential applicants. I'll let that sit for a bit but, again, I encourage you to look at the report and then finally enhancing our financial aid packaging process as I mentioned earlier. That process has started and continue to make good use of our -- the president's affordability campaign including revising the family income bans for low ceilings and ensuring that any student who would like to come to Cornell is not inhibited from applying because of cost. Next slide. And so with that I would like to again really, really thank members of the task force in this slide and the next slide there was a lot of work that went into this report and really appreciate the thoughtful way in which the task force members went about their work and thank again my co-chairs Patrizia McBride and Kelly Cunningham, and the next slide, with special thanks to Victoria White from the president's office. I hope I -- my time and look forward to your questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: If you have questions and you are in-house just walk up to the microphone. If you are online -- I, see one digital hand-up. We'll start with David Lee. Identify your department.

>> David Lee: David Lee. Dyson School JCB and faculty trustee. Thank you, Avery, for that summary. Reading the report which I have in detail, it's really -- I think you did an outstanding job and put together just -- not only a strong set of recommendations but one at least I -- I agree with the overwhelming majority of them. So, again, kudos to you and your colleagues for the job you did in an area where there's a lot of -- as you know a lot of -- lot going on in the last few months in this whole area across the -- across the country. I did have one minor -- one -- to pick on one minor detail which is I -- I think you made a strong statement about the use of the SAT in admissions, but I think -- I wish it had been stronger. The reason being that as -- as you -- as you outlined with the movement toward all of these qualitative -- and one might say subjective in many cases measures and metrics for admission it's important to retain in so far as is possible some quantitative and some -- some harder data. In fact, you know, we're a science-based institution. It is very hard, I think, to make the argument that we -- we shouldn't be using data so I would -- I -- I wish that a little stronger statement had been made on that -- on that case but -- in that area -- but by and large I think you really did an outstanding job. I did have one question and that was cost. If you look across the looking for common threads across your recommendations, increasing financial aid perhaps substantially, increasing perhaps substantially recruiting costs. Creating this new data analysis unit which I -- as you may remember I conveyed to the committee my own opinion that I think that's an area that -- that we really could make a lot of advances in as an institution and centralizing and using data as you said not to make decisions but to support decisions that we make. But creating that new unit and then admissions. Just -- just the movement toward more qualitative types of information for admissions means presumably a lot more bodies or a lot more computers if we're using AI to analyze that information so do you -- can you give us some notion of what the -- the scope of the increased cost would be? Not to say that I don't agree with incurring those costs but I'm just wondering if that figured in your thinking at all.

>> Avery August: Thanks, David. I'll try to answer The sort of first question and then the second question and thank you for your -- your feedback on the report. On the issue of standardized testing we, as you mentioned, we're a data-driven institution. We -- we looked at what limited data we have right now for Cornell, and we did the -- the task force did not feel they could make

a decision and felt we needed to study that process a bit more and get additional data before making a final -- administration making a final recommendation on the use of standardized testing. And then your second question, remind me again, I'm sorry.

>> David Lee: On the -- the aggregate cost of all of the --

>> Avery August: Oh, the aggregate cost, yes, thank you. you know, it was something that the task force, you know, we -- we did -- have on mind but, at the same time we did not determine what this would cost. We asked a question what would improve our admission processes to enhance our goal and we made recommendations accordingly. So, I'm not aware of what that cost will be, but I can say that the -- the president and the provost have received the recommendations and appreciate the recommendations.

>> David Lee: Okay, thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have a question from Buz Barstow.

>> Buz Barstow: Thank you very -- I froze there for a second. Thank you very much. Buz Barstow, Biological and Environmental Engineering. Avery, I want to thank you again for all the work you put into this report, especially, you know, pivoting so quickly to respond to the Supreme Court's decision and also your -- that you touched upon affordability as well of colleges. So -- top pick -- you know, near and dear to my heart. I wanted to follow up on the question about sort of qualitative metrics so the personal statements in the application -- in the application process. I think your -- my -- maybe suspicion of them. In the worst case I feel that, you know, that they can encourage people to perhaps feel -- you know paint themselves as victims, you know, nurture grievances and this can actually be very destructive. I can -- you know -- I remember someone once saying, you know, I never felt oppressed until I went to the Ivy league and something I feel myself some days objectively, probably one of the luckiest humans alive but, you know, subjectively some days I'm like, gosh, you know, the worlds against me. I think that's very bad for me. It's probably very bad for people around me. How do we prevent this, you know, how do we prevent this seed from being planted in the admissions

process? I don't need an answer right now. It's just a thought I wanted to put out there.

>> Avery August: Buz, it's a great question, and certainly one that as the committee deliberated was on our minds. I will say, you know, the admissions process is a holistic one and includes both quantitative -- I mean, I know we're focusing on some of the other parameters but there is a significant quantitative component and that is academic rigor and so, it's -- it's part of the holistic process of how we evaluate who we admit but also thinking about, you know; you know the thing that -- the committee thought about a lot with regards to your question, the distance traveled, you know. Ones accomplishments is somewhat tied to how far you -- what you have been able to do to get to those accomplishments and so, you know, all of those going to characteristics that we really look for in a student. We want students who have persistence, who really are going to be leaders So, yeah, that -- that's what I can say at this point. But I really appreciate the thought and we have thought about it.

>> Buz Barstow: I appreciate your answer as well.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an in-house question, comment. Risa Lieberwitz. Identity your school.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: Thank you. I'm on the -- I'm a senator from the ILR school. So, I want to add my thanks to everybody who worked on this. It was obviously a huge -- a huge amount of work and I really appreciate the thoroughness of the report and the recommendations so thank you for that. I have a couple questions. One is whether the committee considered the question of legacy admissions, that's very much, you know, in consideration now and I would like to hear if there was any consideration about whether to make recommendations about legacy admissions, and then the second question was about retention issues because retention is referred to in the report and I think some of the recommendations perhaps in directly address retention but I'm wondering whether the committee felt that they were able to really address how do you retain students who come here. What the nature of the environment we can create to do that and if you weren't able to do as much as you would like is that something that will be followed up on? So, thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We'll go -- oh, is there a response?

>> Avery August: Yes. Thank you for the question. Just quickly and I also want to invite my co-chair, Patrizia McBride, if she would like to provide some answers as well. So -- on the -- I'll take the latter first and then the issue of legacy. Yes, Riza we did think about retention. We did not spend as much time on retention because most of our work was focused on increasing pipeline and thinking about attracting a broader diversity of applicants but we recognize fully as you say that the nature of the students that we admit we need to especially sure that the institution is prepared to support and retain those students and so, while it did -- it may not have received as -- as much depth in the report it was a very much on the mind of the task force. On the issue of legacy, you know, the -- the committee -- the task force was focused really on issues that we felt were more central to achieving the goals of our -- of -- you know -- recruiting a diversity student body and we wanted to make sure that we had really data driven, actionable recommendations that would advise the administration. As we were completing our report this summer the -- the issue of legacy -- came to a head with the department of education's investigation so we -- we really -- there's also pending New York state legislation -- legislation that would ban legacy preferences at all institutions of higher ed in the state and so there are a number of changes that were happening at the time that both the task force and administration felt that they weren't yet ready to make a decision on the issue of legacy but I anticipate -- but it's still being very heavily considered and being thought about going forward.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We'll go hth3, a.k.a. Harold Hodes.

>> Harold Hodes: Yes, Harold Hodes, Philosophy Department. thank you again for this helpful presentation summarizing what I gather is a very complicated report. I originally was going to ask about legacies also but there's another issue that I'm kind of wondering about and that is whether there will be any procedure to checking up on what students say in their applications about, for example, (inaudible) or about levels of parental education, for example, I would think that students -- and potential applicant would realize, hey, I get a leg up if my parents haven't completed college so I'm going to say my parents haven't completed college. Is there any way to

check on that sort of thing?

>> Avery August: Yeah.

>> Harold Hodes: Yes, so I'm wondering, whether this has been given any consideration.

>> Avery August: Thanks for the question. I will -- maybe ask Patrizia if she would like to --

>> Patrizia McBride: Yeah, this is -- this is a question that actually has come up a lot and the one thing that we learned from talking with the admissions staff of the eight undergraduate colleges at Cornell is that they will realize that we have a system that can be gamed by those who want to game the system and so, they really have over the years have developed a way of reading holistically applications that enables them to essentially cross reference a lot of information so that they can make exactly that determination. You know, is this person truly what -- who they say they are and so, obviously it's -- it's an art. It's not, you know -- they cannot always rely on quantitative measures but they're very well aware of the possibility of abuse and they -- and they have developed strategies and the other thing that we learned from this process is that they -- the admissions officers talk a lot, you know. There's a lot of information that is exchanged and this truly helps. There's a partnership that helps, you know, identifying so -- those who are kind of prone to abusing so -- yeah.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have time for one short comment and answer online from Allison.

>> Allison Chatrchyan: Hi. Thank you. I'll be quick. I just went through the --

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Identity yourself,I couldn't get your last name. I'm sorry.

>> Allison Chatrchyan: Oh, I'm sorry. Allison Chatrchyan, RTE at large. And I just went through the Cornell admissions with my son and my sense from the national media is that because we are not requiring the SAT any longer that the numbers of applicants has skyrocketed so I wonder -- and then there seems to be a huge preference at colleges for early decision applicants which

creates -- I think, a lot of inequities and problems so I'm wondering, do you -- did you see that or did you look at early decision carefully and also the number of applicants, how are you dealing with that?

>> Avery August: Patrizia, do you, uh, want to answer?

>> Patrizia McBride: Yeah, I could actually take the question about the number of applicants. This is something that is really been a great concern to admissions officers. You know that we have very capable teams but obviously we've not been -- you know -- they are often very stretched thin and the -- so -- one thing that was discussed particularly in the context of applications of machine learning tools is that those tools could be developed to actually help prepare this kind of increasing pools of applications so that -- and again, the final decisions are still made by the admissions officers. They are still made based on holistic review, individualized review of each application but that does (inaudible) could be prepared for that qualitative review using machine learning basically instruments and so those need to be developed but -- and so it's -- it's -- it is a little bit down the road so -- but that's the one -- I mean this is -- it's -- it's a promising essentially kind of outcome of the report and then I'm forgetting your -- your -- oh --

>> Avery August: Early decisions.

>> Patrizia McBride: Early decisions, yes. You want to (inaudible).

>> Avery August: Yeah, just to add to what Patrizia said. One of the things, Allison, that was noticed was that the common app significantly increased the number of applications because students can put one application that's sent to multiple institutions. Certainly the -- the fact of standardized testing increased the number but the large increase came from the use -- from -- you know the institutions using the common app on the issue of early decision, one of the recommendations -- and actually one of the things that's going to be implemented is reducing the number -- the proportion of our incoming class that come from early decisions towards the point that you make about inequities, such that there will be less students that will be admitted to early decision and more on regular decision.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I'm hoping we can do one more quick question from in house and then we'll move on.

>> Clyde Lederman: Hello. Thank you. I'm Clyde Lederman, non-voting faculty senator representing undergraduate students. I appreciate the report and your focus on feeder schools. One thing I was concerned with or just want to understand your consideration of was the use of guidance counsel -- High School guidance counsel recommendations in the admissions process. My (inaudible) a very significantly with schools with the size of classes and these sort of attentiveness of these counselors and can really be used to give sort of advantage and painting, especially with a holistic focus, a different portrait from those from sort of privileged backgrounds. I was just curious how this was considered and if the rest of -- if any recommendations -- I can't remember seeing some of -- highlighted particular with this -- with this issue. Thank you.

>> Avery August: Yeah, thank you for the question and, again, you know, it sounds like many of you Were part of the task force because you are bringing up questions that the task force actually deeply thought about. You know, one of the things that -- that touches on that in -- in the recommendations is one broadening the -- the High Schools that we work with but also increasing work with those High Schools to ensure that the counselors who do work in those High Schools understand what Cornell is looking for so they can best guide their students who are applying. Clearly, there are High Schools that have more resources, who understand more about the process and can help their own students but there are many, many High Schools that have equally successful students who may not be in -- in the similar (inaudible) so that's one of those areas where there would need to be significant investment in terms of outreach for those particular High Schools.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I think we're going to move on.

>> Avery August: Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Our next agenda item which is research integrity council annual report from 2021 to 2023. Sounds like two years. Mark Hurwitz, Chief Research Compliance Officer and Research Integrity Officer and Conrad Wolan, Senior Associate General Counsel will have about ten minutes, and we'll probably have a little less than that for Q&A. Are they here or are they online? Online, so unmute yourself and--

>> Mark Hurwitz: Everybody, can you hear me?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>> Mark Hurwitz: Excellent. Okay. And I know Conrad is here and also online, sorry, it's been quite a day, and I didn't have a chance to come see you all in person. The point here is that policy 1.2, our research integrity policy requires that we report to the faculty senate on research integrity once a year. The policy is fairly new. It is a replacement for the academic misconduct policy that used to have the same number, and last year we forgot so this year we are reporting on both years to the faculty senate, and we'll be diligent in making the report annually here after. Could I have the next slide, please? Okay. So, in addition to the policy itself, we have established a research integrity council so that the original idea was we really needed a collection of senior faculty with a great deal of experience and research and a reasonable understanding of research integrity issues to be a cohort to supply the inquiry and investigation committees that come up from time to time when we have allegations of research misconduct or research related misconduct and I'll describe what those are in a couple of minutes. So, the membership of the council is senior faculty, nominated by the Deans. Members serve a three-year term but we're very happy to continue them if they choose to. The council meets quarterly to discuss research integrity concepts and topics so that we have everybody thinking about research integrity and the various issues involved on a reasonable basis. Sometimes, we have guest speakers and whenever we have an inquiry or investigation, we pick three members of the council to serve. I make a recommendation as the research integrity officer to the vice president for research and innovation who approves with the advice of the Dean of Faculty. My office and the general counsel's office staff the committees and the final research integrity council is not only composed of senior faculty, but it is co-chaired by senior faculty member and me. Next slide, please. Okay. So, we

call it the research integrity policy because we want to be positive and upbeat about these things. Our purpose is to promote integrity in research but, the federal sponsors generally talk about research misconduct, and they have -- they define research misconduct fairly narrowly. It is only fabrication of data, just making it up and recording -- reporting it even though it didn't occur. Falsification, manipulating materials, equipment or processes or changing numbers, omitting data or results so that we don't have our accurate record of the research and plagiarism. Plagiarism as I hope you all know is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit and I would like to emphasize it is not just copying other people's text. So, the federal sponsors are not really interested in other aspects of research misconduct that can arise from time to time. They really just want to focus on these three but, they ask institutions like Cornell to figure out how to deal with all the other stuff and so we have research related misconduct which is any act that violates the standards of integrity and the conduct of scholarly and scientific research and communication. which could be anything and everything, so we accept allegations that need to be investigated under another Cornell policy. For example, if there's a problem with animal welfare, with protocols for animal research or human subjects research then rather than a research misconduct or research related misconduct process we would go to the IACUC or IRB processes. Things like harassment go to the title 9 office and so on. So, it is a very broad brush but it's not so broad that it encroaches on other parts of the organization that are responsible for other things. Next slide, please. Okay. So, when an allegation shows up and it's only an allegation if someone brings it to -- essentially to my attention and that can come through many, many routes, so the first step is we assess whether or not the allegation is a research integrity issue. Does it fall under policy 1.2 and if it doesn't, we pass it onto the appropriate office for disposition and we close it. Sometimes it takes a while to figure out what the appropriate office is. Sometimes other offices bring allegations to us, saying it doesn't really belong with us but, you know, maybe it falls under research misconduct. If it is -- if it is a research integrity issue which generally means it clearly falls within our policy and it is a specific enough to be able to come up with an answer to what happened and credible enough that it needs to be at least cursory looked in to we move onto an inquiry, and this is where three faculty members are chosen, and we start looking at evidence. All we do is look at enough evidence to determine whether there's substance to the allegation and that is not a very precisely defined term but if it looks like, yep, we got to do something, we got

to figure out what's going on than we go into an investigation. The investigation is where we figure out whether misconduct occurred and recommend corrective actions or sanctions if any are needed. Ultimately, an appeal is possible to the provost and only for significant procedural errors and the provost decision is final. This may sound kind of Byzantine the three steps are -- we're following the three same steps that all the federal agencies use. The inquiry doesn't determine whether the allegation is true. It's really important to realize that when you are in the midst of an inquiry and you're trying to figure out did they do it or not, you're already in the investigation, stop the inquiry and move to the investigation. Next slide, please. Okay. So, since we were supposed to start this last year and we didn't but -- we have had cases under the academic misconduct policy going back for quite a ways. That policy -- the onus was on the Dean of Faculty to do what we are now calling an assessment and an inquiry, and a committee was only set up under circumstances where it was clear something had to be finally decided. It's hard to -- this is an odd table but it's -- it's hard to kind of get all the information together so what we have is -- is two tables. The numbers of cases and the types of allegations. So, the total numbers are -- well, this could be just statistical fluctuations but 2022 was quite a -- quite an uptick and -- and these are fiscal years so 2023 we came back down but not as far down as we had been before and some of these cases are still in progress which is why we don't necessarily have a -- a type for them yet. 2014, we got seven so far -- I'm sorry, 2024, we have seven so far and we are only halfway -- we are not even halfway through the year yet so, I believe that the -- numbers of cases are increasing. We tend to have a lot of plagiarism cases, not so much fabrication or falsification but we do get them on occasion. Next slide, please. Okay. So, I'd like to make sure that everybody understands that it is not misconduct to make a mistake. Misconduct needs to be intentional. The allegations need to be proven by a preponderance of the evidence which means more of the evidence indicates that it happened than indicates that it didn't happen which is a fairly low bar, but this is not a court of law. And there needs to be a significant departure from accepted practices so yes, it happened but, hey, it's kind of accepted that that's the way we do things. That's where judgment on the part of the committee is needed because it's -- you could fall into very mistaken conclusions if only a bunch of administrators were handling this, we really rely on the faculty committee for the research integrity council to use their best judgment in making these things come out properly. And, finally, it -- the misconduct had to be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly and intentional is -- they

knew they were committing misconduct. Knowing, they knew that their actions were likely to be -- or -- intentionally is they were trying to commit misconduct, sorry. Knowingly is they knew it was misconduct and did it anyway and recklessly is a reckless disregard for the norms and for the potential bad results of acting the way that they do. Next slide, please. Okay. We strive for fairness and confidentiality. we want complainants to have the confidence that they can bring allegations in good faith without suffering retribution. we want the respondents -- the people who are accused to know that their rights are protected just because an allegation has been filed against them that will not be averse to them or damage their reputation. We also try to do things within reasonable time limits. Retaliation is strictly prohibited and is a type of misconduct of its own and conflicts that -- that the respondent, complainant have an opportunity to say that they think there's a conflict with the committee and the committee has to say whether they think there's a conflict with the respondent or complainant and I as the RIO will manage that by either deciding there isn't a conflict, that happens sometimes, or replacing a member of the committee to resolve the conflict. Next slide, please. Okay. So, I've kind of described this in a way. The faculty committee members review the evidence including interviews. We talk to people. We don't just, you know, look at data. We determine the facts and make recommendations for outcomes and sanctions. As the research integrity officer, I do not direct what the outcome or sanctions can be. I stand back and serve as staff. So, I and my staff, and Conrad Wolan in the general counsel's office -- we serve as staff for the meetings and the interviews. We assist in drafting the reports out of the -- the three stages. We ensure the process stays on track and try to keep things from drifting off to longer and longer times and we provide the communications with the funding agencies and other outside parties when they're needed. The deciding official which is currently the vice president for research and innovation approves the reports and does the final decision on sanctions. The committee suggests, recommends sanctions but the deciding official can change them. Council advises on process, fairness, confidentiality and compliance and keeps me on track because I'm not a lawyer. I'm a (inaudible) actually in my past life and it's really helpful to have someone that's well versed in the law and in litigation to keep us from making a silly mistake. Next slide, please. I think that's it. So, you -- I think you all have access to this presentation. The next three slides are a fairly simple flow chart of how the process works. There's a lot more detail if you look at policy 1.2, you'll see a lot more detail but it's -- it's -- it's really pretty straight forward. And that's it.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And we have about four minutes until the final agenda item. If there are any comments or questions. I think we have one from in house. Probably the final one. Identity yourself, please.

>> Chris Schaffer: Thank you, Mark. It's Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. there have been some national -- nationally there have been some high-profile misconduct cases recently. I'm thinking primarily of Stanford's president where the ultimate finding was not that Stanford's president directly engaged in falsification of data but rather administered a lab that was permissive or high pressure and thus encouraging subordinates to falsify or otherwise improperly manipulate data. I'm curious just in your experience on this committee and in the discussions has Cornell thought a bit about this and how cases like that might be handled?

>> Mark Hurwitz: Well, yes, we've thought about it and one of the reasons why we have responsible conduct of research training which we're trying to spread out from just the people that are under NIH grants to the whole campus is to try to engender a broader view of what the consequences of behaviors are. The days when the PI was king and the graduate students were serfs and I remember those days very well myself from being -- having been such a serf, are over. The -- so, we have a faculty committee that's trying to help us work out what's the best way to get more and more responsible conduct of research information out. The research integrity council is becoming more and more aware of these things as we debate them and I'm hoping that just their presence, there are about 30 members more or less so we would like to expand it, that we are trying to find ways to make the faculty more aware that how you manage things can lead to bad consequences. The bottom line is the research record is important not just to each of us as researchers but to the taxpayers who are paying for all of it, generally speaking. And, and we have an obligation outside of our own groups and outside of our -- the university to make things work right. I hope I didn't go off in a tangent there but that's -- that was what came to mind when you -- when you asked.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Dean of Faculty also has something to say.

>> Eve De Rosa: Yes, I actually wanted to also say, Chris, I attend these meetings and it's a very robust process as you have all now seen but also when cases are not actively being investigated Mark will bring these cases and we'll read about them and discuss them so it really is -- having the professional -- professionalization of looking at research misconduct but then there's also -- there's education portion that's really, really wonderful.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thanks. Our last agenda item is known as good of the order. We reserve about five minutes at the end of each meeting. If you have something to say that's of perhaps general interest but not necessarily an agenda item or a parliamentary motion this could be an appropriate thing to ask that --Eve about. Today we have Risa Lieberwitz, still at the school of ILR.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: Okay, thanks so much. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR School. I have two items and the first one is to urge you all to come to a very important public event where we will have a speaker on this coming Monday, the 16th at 4:30 p.m. in Ives 105 which is the ILR school 105 and the title of the talk is "The Battle to Preserve Academic Freedom in Florida and the Nation" and if you've been paying any attention   You know that there's a lot going on in Florida with attacks on academic freedom, K through 12 as well as in particular higher ed. And our speaker will be Dr. Sharon Wright Austin who is a professor of political science at the university of Florida, and she will -- she is working on a book on these issues of academic freedom. So, please come. I think it'll be really interesting. I know it'll be very interesting, and the ILR school is sponsoring it as well as the worker institute in the ILR school and we have several co-sponsors, and we really appreciate that. So, please come. You may have seen -- I don't know what people can see online there but the poster -- okay, so that's item one. Item two is a local matter which also relates to national issues and that has to do with the memorandum of understanding which is under consideration right now between the city of Ithaca and Cornell University. You may have heard about it. I'm sure you have heard about it. You may have read about it as well and what I wanted to do was to just give you a quick overview and update of where things are. I'm part of the faculty group of organizers that got together to create the faculty open letter on the MOU and hopefully you have had a chance to read it and sign it -- and consider signing it. If not, there's still time. We now have 270 faculty who have signed on and we have tried to get it out to all

faculty to give you a chance to take a look at it and consider signing it. The key points -- and you'll tell me when I have to stop, right?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Still have a few minutes.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: Okay, good. The key points are that, as you know, Cornell as an institution and nonprofit institution of higher education is exempt from taxes including property taxes under New York law and we point out that this is a public subsidy to the university in exchange for -- or you could say companied on the university serving the public interest, education for the common good could be one way to think about that. And so, the letter that the -- the open faculty letter stresses this and stresses that part of that acting in the public interest institutionally for Cornell is to fulfill a moral obligation, a social duty to be a good member of the communities in which we live, Ithaca and surrounding communities. Certainly, there are benefits to the city of Ithaca from having Cornell here but at the same time that's not the end of the story and there are significant, heavy financial and social costs that are imposed on the city and surrounding areas from Cornell's use of public benefits, the schools, the roads, the fire department, you know the many things that are costly to a city to provide and so our point in the open -- the faculty -- the open letter is that the mou, the memorandum of understanding is simply too low. It's four million dollars a year and the proposal is to do that for 21 years. Cornell has a $10 billion endowment and for this low amount, particularly low compared to other schools including Ivy's and what they pay their communities in lieu of taxes that the fair share for Cornell to contribute to the community should be higher and the contract should be shorter so those are two key points. So, the common counsel of the city of Ithaca is meeting tonight to consider the mou and to potentially make amendments to it but to consider it and to vote on it. So that's at 6:00 p.m. tonight and then when the mou is finalized from the city of Ithaca's side it'll go to the board of trustees for the final vote when they are here on campus the 19th to the 21st. Perfect. Perfect timing.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Perfect.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: All right. Thank you so much.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, thank you --

>> Risa Lieberwitz: And please let me know if you want to sign. I'm here.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We are adjourned.

[End of transcript]