

Faculty Senate April 9, 2025

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Senate speaker, and now enabled by the microphone, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. We're going to start with the land acknowledgement and then a brief announcement, a message from the dean of faculty before going to the minutes. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogóhó:nq, the Cayuga Nation. The Gayogóhó:nq 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 Gayogóhó:nq dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogóhó:nq people past and present to these lands and waters. And now a brief message from our dean of faculty, Eve De Rosa.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Thanks. Hi, everyone. I just wanted to take a moment before we move forward with our business of the day, that we do have faculty members who are directly affected by these stop orders. And the government stopping people from their work is a direct assault on the integrity of academic freedom. And I want us all to sit with that. We're going to continue doing our business, but I just did not want to start this meeting without acknowledging the harm that's happening to some of our faculty. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: The meeting is officially called to order. Our first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from March 12th, 2025. These minutes have been posted and distributed online in the form of a verbatim transcript. Since it's a verbatim transcript, there shouldn't be any corrections except minor typos. If you have such things, please bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty's Office. So, by unanimous consent, unless I hear an objection we approve the minutes as posted. Our first order of business is pending resolution to adopt a unified transfer credit policy for undergraduate transfer students. I believe that vice provost for undergraduate education, Lisa Nishii, is online. If you're there, please unmute, and you'll have 10 minutes, and then another 10 minutes for Q&A.

>> LISA NIISHI: Great. Thank you. Can you see my slides?

>> FEMALE SPEAKER ONE: Yes.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yep.

>> LISA NIISHI: Yes. Excellent. I'd like to provide some background on a proposed resolution to support a Cornell University-level transfer credit policy for undergraduate students. So, I'd like to begin by just describing a little bit about our current context, that is our current approaches for awarding transfer credits. Our outreach and review of current approaches revealed that colleges and schools, and even departments within a single college or school use different approaches for determining course equivalencies. The college and schools have different

administrative policies and processes in place as well, many of which are quite laborious and require significant repetition. For example, the evaluation process often requires the exchange of many emails and repeated manual data entry across multiple systems. And the same course ends up being evaluated multiple times. And also colleges and schools have different systems for recording equivalency decisions, including written notes. And some colleges do not currently have a mechanism in place for documenting equivalency decisions. And as a result of all of these things a unit often ends up reinventing the wheel each academic year, rather than relying on records of previously completed evaluations, and this is, of course, more likely when there are changes in personnel. And this leads to inconsistent evaluations and delays for students. I'll say a little bit about this in a minute. Overall, both faculty and staff, we consulted as part of this process, uniformly said that changes are desperately needed. So in the absence of records from prior credit evaluations, and in the absence of shared guidelines to facilitate consistency an identical external course can be evaluated differently across evaluators and across time. And as I said before, this variability is evident both across colleges and schools, and within the same college or school that is across departments. Also, quarter system courses from other institutions are converted in different ways to semester credits. And we also see that online courses and courses taught at community colleges are treated differently across evaluators. Although most colleges and schools recognize these credits, some reject all online and all community college credits even if the content is equivalent to a Cornell course. So, about the delays for students, what we see is that oftentimes these transfer credit evaluations are not delivered to students until after the deposit deadline, that is after they've matriculated. And despite our best efforts, oftentimes colleges and schools miss deadlines that are promised to students. And as you can imagine, this really causes a lot of anxiety for students as they're trying to decide whether or not to transfer to Cornell. At many other institutions transfer students can easily obtain information about transfer credits before the deposit deadline, and sometimes even at the time of application. Given these differences, it's possible that we may be losing promising transfer students to other institutions that are doing a better job. I think it's worth noting that there are special problems that external transfers face if they internally transfer within Cornell or change majors after matriculating here. So if the college into which they originally transferred in from another institution provides equivalency credit that would help them fulfill distribution or major requirements. But then once they internally transfer to another college, it's possible that the same course would be evaluated differently, and they lose those distribution or major requirements and might only receive elective credit for the same course that was evaluated differently by another Cornell College. And when this happens, it really is bumpy for transfer students, they can fall behind in their progress to degree. The same problems can accrue to students who change majors within a college due to different standards in place across departments. So the main argument here is that equitable standards are necessary to fulfill Cornell's mission and also to comply with requirements of middle states. Some of you may know that transfer students have been part of Cornell from our founding. In fact, in our very first class in 1868, about 20% of incoming students transferred in with credits from another institution. It's really part of our identity as an institution, or any person, any study ethos. And we do admit more transfer students than our Ivy peers. So the proposed policy, which I'll talk about in just a second, addresses the need for a more standardized approach and one that meets these middle states requirements. So here are a few things from

middle states. We're required to have a written policy that's clearly articulated, consistent, and transparent, thereby reducing systemic inequities in higher education, policy that seeks to minimize the loss of credit for students wherever possible, policy that does that does not discriminate against institutional settings or modes of delivery, and one that facilitates timely and definitive credit evaluations. So before I jump into the details of our proposed policy, I just want to say that we consulted broadly with faculty and staff who are involved in transfer credit evaluation here at Cornell, and we also benchmark policies and practices at other institutions to inform these recommendations. So the proposal is that the university will adopt a university-wide set of standards and methods for assigning transfer credits, including standards for evaluating course equivalencies and calculating credits for the quarter term courses. And second, that the university will implement a university-wide database, the transfer evaluation system or tests. And this system would contain two important components. The first is data about transfer credit evaluations upon which colleges, schools, and departments, and majors would rely. And also a web-based portal for students to utilize that would allow them to quite easily determine whether or not courses they've taken elsewhere would be awarded credit, and if so, what kind of credit here at Cornell. And that would help them to determine how much time it might take them to complete their degree once they transfer into Cornell. As an aside, we did recently acquire tests, and this is a really well-known and used system currently in place at over 8,000 institutions. So the policy would defer to academic departments, their expertise in determining course equivalencies. And, of course, college admissions offices would still determine whether transfer applicants meet Cornell's high admissions thresholds. Equivalency evaluations would be performed by the academic department or major that owns the Cornell course to which an external course is being compared. This is now the case for some, but not all of our colleges and schools. For cross-listed courses, evaluation will be conducted by the parent department. By continuing to defer to faculty expertise, we ensure that the new approach would not compromise transfer students' preparedness for Cornell or diminish our high academic standards. So here are some of the core elements of the proposal. So, course equivalency will be determined based on a review of a course syllabus from the external institution, also a transcript that verifies that the student took the course and the grade that they earned in it to be deemed equivalent. And external course must be about 80% similar in scope content and learning outcomes to a Cornell course. If a course is deemed equivalent, additional requirements cannot be imposed for the external course unless the same requirements also apply to the equivalent Cornell course. So, for example, if a higher minimum grade is required for a Cornell course, the same could be true for an external course. In general, the policy states that a student must have earned a minimum grade of a C and consistent with prohibition set forth by middle states. Courses may not be rejected based on the type of institution, for example, community college, or mode of learning, that is if a course is taught online. The equivalency must be evaluated based on scope content and learning outcomes. A few more points, each Cornell, Cornell College, or program determines how equivalent courses, or actually I should say external courses without equivalency may be used to meet degree requirements, that is might it fulfill distribution requirements or just confer elective credits? The equivalency determinations in tests will be reviewed every three years. However, it's worth noting that if we see that a course that was deemed equivalent does not seem to adequately prepare students for a higher-level Cornell course, or its Cornell equivalent has substantially

changed since the original equivalency evaluation, a new review could be triggered within that three-year period, that is before three years is up. Quarter credits will be converted to semester credits by multiplying the number of quarter credits by two-thirds. And finally, external transfer students will be permitted to transfer up to 60 credits. This is inclusive of credits by exams such as AP/IB and A levels taken in high school, or case exams. There's some exceptions for engineering and architecture because they require more credits overall for graduation. And all undergraduate students will continue to be required to complete a minimum of 60 credits at Cornell to graduate with an exception again, for architecture. So that's that's it. I'm going to pause here for Q&A.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So if you are online, raise your digital hand. If you are here, just come up to the microphone one at a time.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Before Jonathan would want to start with questions, I want to show feedback from this. So, the chair of the Education Policy Committee had to leave for a family emergency. So I just wanted to put up on this slide. And you can see that the vice provost of undergraduate education has already addressed many of their concerns, but I just wanted to take a moment so that you can see what the feedback was from the EPC, how they've responded to it, and the idea that there are in principles supportive of this proposal, and it will likely come back to the Senate as a motion for vote in May.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Go ahead, take two minutes, and identify yourself.

>> MICHAEL THOMPSON: Michael Thompson, material science and engineering. I acknowledge the goals of this proposal, but I think it is poorly facilitated to ensure the success of students and their transfer at Cornell. One is, I believe there is a significant pedagogical difference in courses between different colleges. I'm going to speak primarily about engineering where I have the experience, and particularly where the challenge in these courses and in transfer is to ensure proficiency in a topic and not just exposure to the topic. There are a few things that during the course, in the same course from the same institution isn't very common, so we almost have to evaluate every one of these courses on a one-by-one basis in any case. For engineering, that proficiency is a key element to ensure success because the subsequent courses in the curriculum depend critically on that kind of proficiency and capabilities that they exist. That proficiency normally is done looking both at the course, looking at the syllabus, and looking at the institution, as well as the rigor of the program that's given. The proposal, as it sets, says that evaluation is based solely on the syllabus, so that a course that copies my syllabus would be presumed to be equivalent because it did have the 80% coverage of the same topics, yet would not necessarily have the same rigor and the same level of preparation to ensure that students would be successful going further. We also have a problem with the concept that the C is the only grade that's being accepted. We do currently look at other colleges, and for instance, community colleges and core technical classes will be accepted, but the expectation is that you achieve excellence in a much higher grade in order to believe that they are prepared for continuing on in the courses at the Cornell level of rigor. And in fact, I'd be highly reluctant to accept a C from some of our peer institutions like Harvard, where grade

inflation is completely out of control. I think we underestimate the challenge of maintaining that kind of success for students and ensuring that they really are prepared to continue through the rest of the curriculum in the college and the programs that we have with the limitations imposed as it's written. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Come on.

>> HAROLD HODES: Harold Hodes, philosophy. Well, I also appreciate the motivation for these suggested revisions. But I have a question and a complaint. A question: what about courses which do not have a Cornell equivalent? As DUS in philosophy, I've approved or has called on to approve many transfer credit applications. I would say that between 15 and 20% of the time there is no Cornell equivalent course for courses that students have taken, even understanding equivalence very loosely, more loosely than the 80% that has been proposed. So that's my question, how to handle such courses? My complaint is automatically treating online courses the same as in-person courses when the syllabi coincide. One thing that me and my colleagues and my department have learned in the course of COVID is that at least for most philosophy courses an online course is in no way educationally as good as an in-person philosophy course. It just isn't. So I think it's very troubling that we would propose to automatically treat online courses as equivalent to in-person courses merely on the basis of the syllabi. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Online. Hadas Ritz, unmute and identify yourself.

>> HADAS RITZ: Hadas Ritz, mechanical and aerospace and engineering RTE. I'm going to echo the previous speaker's comment about online courses. If we are not able to evaluate or to consider steps taken to ensure academic integrity in online courses, I don't see how it makes sense to treat a grade in an online course where we have no idea what steps were taken to maintain academic integrity as equivalent to an in-person Cornell course. So that's my one big concern. I'm definitely supportive of there being a system and there being a record because I'm personally for sure in the situation of repeatedly trying to evaluate courses for transfer credit, so cutting that down would be great. A specific question I have is whether this system would support a situation where, for example, the combination of two external courses could transfer this 80% content coverage for a single Cornell course. Would something like that be supported in this system?

>> LISA NIISHI: It's an interesting question. We have not discussed explicitly. I'm trying to imagine why it would be that there are two courses.

>> HADAS RITZ: That's the most common thing that I'm considering. The course that I teach here happens to correspond to two courses at a lot of other places.

>> LISA NIISHI: I think that could get pretty complicated. And related to a prior question, if external course is not equivalent on its own to an existing Cornell course, then the student could receive elective credit, but not credit towards any Cornell- how do I say this? So if external course is deemed equivalent with a Cornell course, then essentially that external

course would fill the same requirements that that Cornell course fulfills. That's the point of this equivalency evaluation. If an external course is deemed to not be equivalent, then it doesn't fulfill specific requirements, it would come in as elective credit most likely. There is latitude here for colleges, schools, and programs to decide exactly what credit could be granted. For example, it might be possible for a course, even if it's not equivalent to a Cornell course, to generally satisfy a particular a distribution requirement, for example, but generally speaking, it's more likely they'd be elective credits. And probably in your very specific example, that would be the case. I'm going to phone a friend and ask Sarah Giroux who's here, if you would disagree with that about the two courses?

>> SARAH GIROUX: No. Thanks so much. I think that in this case, yeah, I would say if it's not really meeting that 80% threshold. We would probably just say they need to take your class. I think it'd be hard to say otherwise. I think we'd say they could bring it in as general credit, and maybe it counts. Because if you think about the things they can count for, it can count towards just the general 120 to graduate or 134 of your engineering. It could count towards a distribution requirement sometimes, so maybe a college distribution, or it can count towards like a major elective, that's another way that we handle it. And some majors will say, maybe in our plant sciences we don't have advanced organic agriculture, but somebody took it somewhere else, and we're going to count that as an elective in the plant science major. So I think in your particular case, it would be tricky to try to think about how we would parse that out in terms of a broad policy, and so I think it'd probably have to still come in under two separate credits.

>> LISA NIISHI: So, I just got a little ping from Rhonda Kitch, who's on the line, our university registrar, who said that tests could be programmed so that two courses from a particular institution map onto one here at Cornell. So it would just be it presumably. Anyway, we'd have to think through the very specific things. It would have to be from that institution, those two courses exactly. If a student only had one, what credit would they get? We'd work through that and can program it. So this is to say the test is pretty awesome, it's pretty sophisticated and will allow us to customize things. Thanks, Rhonda.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Lisa, I'm afraid we have to move on.

>> LISA NIISHI: Okay.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a lot on the agenda, and we're not permitted to stay late today.

>> LISA NIISHI: Okay. Thank you, everybody.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: You're encouraged, those who didn't get to speak, to email the dean of faculty's office with your comments since this is still under discussion, and your comments will be considered and are valuable. So we unfortunately do need to move on. We have a few speakers dealing with the teacher professor's proposals. They will have 10 minutes

each, after which there'll be a 15-minute Q&A. Mark Milstein of the academic policy committee is here, if necessary, to answer questions. So, we'll start with Larry Blume, associate dean for Academic Affairs for Bowers, CIS, Information Science and Economics. Sure. Do you want a mic?

>> LARRY BLUME: Yeah, I guess I should have a mic. And I have a slide pack. There's the first slide.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Stay close to the mic.

>> LARRY BLUME: Right. Thank you very much. Thank you for taking this up. It's exciting to bring our teaching professor proposals to the Senate. I'm going to start very briefly just by reminding you that you have been considering this for some time. You passed enabling legislation. You, the Faculty Senate, passed enabling legislation that allowed the colleges to go out and start developing proposals. Associate deans from all of the colleges started doing this over the spring and summer. And now we have, today the first group of proposals, but there are more on the way coming from other colleges that I guess you will be considering in the fall. The justification for these proposals for having teaching professors has already been debated in the room, so I'm not going to go into it. It is obvious, I think. One thing I should have added on the slide that I didn't is to say that having teaching professors makes a statement about the importance of teaching at the university to the rest of the world. And for that, that's another attribute, a positive attribute. So next slide, please. So who is going to be eligible to become a teaching professor? First off, there is a terminal degree requirement in the Bowers College. Different colleges have different needs in this regard. But for the Bowers College, our teaching faculty, our teaching professors are all going to have PhDs. We also, of course, do bring industry folk into the college, but we would hire them, bring them on board as professors of practice rather than as teaching professors. We are also going to have teaching faculty who are not teaching professors. These would be people who teach for us part-time, or come to Cornell for a very short period of time. And so we are going to keep lecturer positions available for those people. Next slide. Ranks. We expect a teaching professor to develop in a way over the course of a career which is parallel to the way the tenure track faculty evolve. We hire people who we think have great potential. We then assess them to see if they are on a path to excellence, and that brings us to associate professors. And then finally, we make a determination of what has been achieved over a reasonably long period of time. And those are the people who passed that bar become full professors. And we imagine a similar process for our teaching faculty. At the very top level, we expect our teaching full professors to take on leadership roles in the college. This might include, and already does include for our teaching faculty running master's programs teaching professors. We don't at the moment have any teaching faculty who are DUSs, but that's certainly possible. And we could even imagine having RTE associate deans. So all of these leadership positions, we would expect to be open to full teaching professors, we would expect them to take them on if asked just as we expect this of tenure track faculty. Aside from excellence in teaching and leadership, we also expect our faculty to be very active in curriculum, and innovative with respect to curriculum development. Next slide. Appointment process. How are the appointment process going to work? Searches. First of all, how will we search for new faculty? Let me start with new faculty. Searches will be national. They already

are national in scope, or even international in scope. Evaluation. As it is now for lecturers is dossier-based. We're going to ask for CVs, external letters, teaching evaluations, if they're available. Cornell requires an inclusivity statement, and we will of course ask for that should that requirement remain. The decision whether or not to hire will be determined by a vote of the faculty. And so this is all a process which is very parallel to the tenure track process. And this is true, I think, for all of the colleges, that these processes are very parallel. I can go into more detail if asked later on. Reappointments. How are reappointments going to work? Assistant professors will be hired into a three-year contract just as tenure track assistant professors are. The expectation is there will be a second three-year renewal, again, parallel with assistant tenure track faculty members. And after that associate and full teaching professors will live on five-year contracts. Contracts are renewable by five years. This is a university policy. For associate professors, we expect them to have a full dossier-based review every five years. It is possible, by the way, for a teaching faculty to remain an associate teaching professor for a long period of time. In particular, that might be a preferred outcome for someone who doesn't want to take on the leadership roles that we think a full teaching professor should be willing to take on. And finally, for full teaching professors, we will review them every five years, but only every second term will we do a dossier-based review. And we'll have a lighter review in the intervening five-year periods. Next slide. Transitions. How are we going to move the current faculty into teaching professor lines? First off, people who are interested in taking on one of these lines have to opt in. We're not moving people in bulk. People will have to apply. This is a requirement, by the way, a university requirement. Our first transitions will be lateral, which is to say that lecturers will become assistant teaching professors. First-term senior lecturers will become associate teaching professors. And people who are in a second or further on a senior lecturer position, which we call a senior lecturer plus position in the Bowers College, they will move into full professor positions. And the review again, is dossier-based. The decision in this case will be made by the dean in consultation with the department chair. Next slide, please. Limitations. This is one of the requirements that we were asked to address in the enabling legislation. Our current ratio of RTE to RTE plus TT faculty is on the order of 17%. We will not let that ratio drift above 30%. We had worried a lot about this at the outset, but some of you probably know that after a lot of negotiations this year, the Bowers College is in some sense capping its growth, capping the size of its undergraduate programs, and so we're not expecting to double our faculty in the short run or anything like this. I did mention that we are going to already retain lecturer positions for those people for whom they might be appropriate. The next slide, please. This, I think, is my last slide. I want to thank actually CAP for taking a good critical look at our proposal. Noticing one thing that managed to fall out from one draft to the next which is that we will be, in the draft which you may have seen, we dropped the phrase that said that dossiers need to have random letters solicited from former students. We will be adding that back in. We should also be clear we want to require external letters in our dossier, but external means external to the college, not necessarily external to the university, although for those faculty members who are being engaged in curricular development have developed a class that's being used elsewhere or other textbooks that would be appropriate. The last question that CAP raised is a question about equity across colleges. If you look at all the different proposals, people are being asked to do different things in the college. I have a lot to say about that. I don't have the time to say it here.

This is probably not the place. But I do think that this is not a question that you should push onto a gaggle of associate deans to solve in Zoom meetings. I think that's something that should be taken up by this body. Last thing I'll say is that should these proposals all pass, I think that you have more work to do. There's going to be, I think, a lot of required revision of the faculty handbook to talk about the teaching, to adjust it for teaching professor roles. We're going to need appeals processes for teaching of professors. Right now, teaching faculty don't go through the regular tenure track faculty appeals processes. If there's an issue about promotions and stuff, they go to the academic grievance processes. We have to decide whether that's appropriate or not. So, there will be a lot of work left to be done. I'm talking too fast. Thank you very much for your attention and time.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And we'll take the questions at the very end. So right now, Jeff Niederdeppe.

>> JEFF NIEDERDEPPE: Great. You got it.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I got it. Great. Senior associate dean for Brooks School of Public Policy. 10 minutes.

>> JEFF NIEDERDEPPE: Hello, everyone. Can everyone hear me? So, I am not going to repeat a whole lot on this first slide because Larry provided a very helpful overview of process, but I will point out a couple of things. One is that the task force that produced the enabling legislation, which you voted on in May 2024, we kept the ban together to continue to collaborate on finding common ground in developing our college-level proposals together. And I want to thank Larry in particular for being our ringleader in that process. And so we met regularly as we were developing our proposals. The other thing I'll add is in spring 2005 several of us had draft proposals that we shared with the provost and underwent another level of review with the provost office, with HR, and with legal to identify common places where commonality would be insisted upon, and places where central administration was happy for there to be college level variability. And you'll see a little bit of that college-level variability here. And then after those revisions were made in response to those comments, the Brooks School voted on this proposal in two different polities. And I'll talk about the results of that vote in a moment. Next slide. Sorry. So similar justification to Bowers, we want to recognize the critical roles that are played by our lecturers and senior lecturers in all elements of teaching a central mission of this university. We also have new degree programs in public policy and public administration. We're in growth mode. Despite all of the challenges we're facing in higher ed, we're still building new programs in the Brooks School and need to meet curricular needs for those. And as Larry pointed out, these positions open up a pathway for a promotion. Currently, there are only two ranks for lecturers, lecturer and senior lecturer. And this opens up a third tier of promotion from assistant to associate to full teaching professor. Next slide. So much like the Bowers proposal, our proposal would only be eligible these titles for long-term non-tenure track and benefits eligible, again, 50% or greater full-time equivalent appointment for faculty members whose efforts are devoted primarily to the teaching mission of the school. We do have in Brooks some folks who teach one or two classes for some of our professional programs, they

will remain as lecturers. They don't meet that 50% threshold. We are proposing to make use of these titles for both external recruitments or internal title changes. And we do anticipate that the vast majority of use of these will be actually full-time teaching faculty, not at that of 50, 60% threshold, although we do have a case or two with that equivalent. And then degree requirement. Generally, we will have a PhD requirement, although we're proposing some exceptions to that rule in the context of our proposal. I know another set of colleges are proposing similar, or different kinds, I should say, of exceptions, but those will be taken up when those colleges present. Regardless though we are holding that all instructors with teaching professor titles will hold a graduate degree that is appropriate for the level and field of instruction to be provided. That is to say, someone with a master's of public administration won't be teaching PhD students for instance. Next slide. In terms of the limitations, if you look at our current tenure to tenure track faculty and teaching faculty who are benefits eligible and professors of practice, senior extension associates, we would be at 21% now of our RTE faculty, would be to our total faculty count. And so we're proposing a cap of 35%, which gives us room for growth, but is also cap, I think. Most of the colleges are somewhere between 30 and 40% in their draft proposals, at least that I've seen. We are proposing automated title transfers for current lecturers and senior lecturers to those who are interested in those positions. I have it on good authority from each one of our eligible faculty that they're excited about these possible title transfers. Our lecturers would transfer into assistant teaching professor titles. Our senior lecturers would transfer into associate teaching professor titles. And we would go through a formal promotion process for full teaching professors in part because we haven't had the third level of promotion before, and our faculty desire to be involved in that process, so that would be a dossier-based review. Next slide. In terms of the requirements for the position for assistant teaching professors, we're looking for promise of, or evidence of high-teaching, and for all of our positions, commitment to fostering learning and service in a diverse community. For associate teaching professors, again, parallel to the six-year timeline for promotion with tenure to associate professor, we're looking at six years of full-time teaching experience at undergrad and or professional levels. We're looking for evidence of sustained and high-quality teaching and advising and mentoring. We're looking for evidence of pedagogical innovation and curriculum development. We're looking for promise of leadership potential, but not necessarily evidence of having fulfilled those roles yet. And again, evidence of fostering learning in a diverse community. Next slide. And for our full teaching professors, we're looking for 12 years of full-time teaching experience. We're looking for leadership experience, that is having taken on some of the same roles that Larry spoke of before running a degree program director of undergraduate studies for instance, and a sustained commitment demonstrated with evidence to fostering learning and service in a diverse community. Next slide, please. So, what is different? What would be different with these title transfers for our current faculty? Titles would change for 11 lecturers, and senior lecturers who would be eligible for these positions. It would provide an additional promotional pathway from associate to full and would provide increased voting eligibility, and really invited us to formalize those voting rules and processes within our college, which was quite helpful. But what stays the same, there's no changes to job descriptions, reappointment or promotion processes, except for the addition to full teaching professor. What you saw for assistant associate teaching professors is basically equivalent to what we do already for senior lecturers. There's no change to current

appointment lengths, so people who are in the middle of an appointment would remain at the same timeline in the middle of their appointment. And there's no change to compensation or processes of annual performance review or grievances, which we have policies in place for already. Next slide. Our faculty are enthusiastic about this. We had two voting polities, our tenured and tenure track faculty, and our teaching RTE faculty who are benefits eligible. And in both cases, 91% or greater of those polities voted yes to this proposal. Next slide. And I want to take just a moment to respond to a couple things that came up in the CAP review comments. And one, Larry touched on, and that is variability in teaching loads. Instead, to that, I would say a couple of things. One, a course is not a standardized unit. At Cornell, there are four credit courses, there are three credit courses, there are courses that have labs, there are courses that don't have labs, there are courses that serve a thousand students, and there are courses that serve five students. And so one of our sources of variability around this university is there of different expectations for those different kinds of courses. And I think that's reflected in some of the proposals you see. For us, we tethered our proposal to our teaching load for our tenured and tenure-track faculty. The standard teaching load at a 50% teaching appointment, it's three courses. These are 100% teaching appointments. You multiply three by two, you get to six courses. That's fully consistent with our existing policies and procedures for our lectures and senior lecturers as well. And finally, I'll say a couple of words about the exceptions to the PhD requirements. We are proposing to have opportunities for existing senior lecturers who have MPAs or MPPs to be eligible for teaching professor titles. This would apply to three faculty, or are currently on our faculty who have nine or more years of teaching experience and excellence at largely in our professional program in the master's of public administration but also through undergraduate programs. I will note that the PhD in public policy is a research degree. We're training people to be researchers with that degree. These positions and in the enabling legislation is very clear that these are not research positions, these are teaching positions. So requiring a research degree in public policy did not strike us as a central criterion here. And you might ask, why aren't these professors of practice? And the Brooks School I presented to you two years ago for our professor of practice title, our parameters for that requires 15 years of high-level applied professional experience. Our excellent senior lecturers who we are proposing to be eligible for this role are teaching applied and engaged courses in public administration, and have a decade of experience doing this important work through Cornell and through teaching and establishing teaching excellence, and so we think it appropriate for them to be eligible for this title. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Our final speaker is Alan Zehnder, associate dean for undergraduate programs for Cornell Engineering, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

>> ALAN ZAHNDER: Thank you. I'm afraid this is going to look like a movie where three people tell the same story in their own different ways. Anyway, I wanted mostly to say what Larry said, so this will look a little redundant. Anyway, next slide. Thought I'd start with the process. We have engineering policy committee. I got them together. It's got somebody from every department. We put together a draft. We shared it with the college leadership directors and chairs, the other associate deans. And then we circulated a draft to the faculty, got some written feedback, and we also had, as Larry mentioned, some feedback from Day Hall through

Avery August and Stephanie Beery. And that's where we landed. We had a vote right before the deadline there. We had about 90% of both the RT faculty and the tenure track faculty vote in favor. Next slide. The rationale is pretty much what you just heard, so I won't repeat it in detail. But I did hear from the lecturers, senior lecturers, and professors of practice in the college how much they appreciated the effort that we're putting into this, and how they really feel like the teaching professor title will more accurately reflect the role that they actually have in teaching in our classrooms. So I'm really looking forward to getting this in place. And I think it will be very helpful for us to recruiting and retention, and also just respect for our colleagues as well. So next slide. So, a little bit on the criteria for appointment at each rank. For assistant teaching professors, we don't expect people to have years of experience. Of course, it'd be fine if they do have some years of experience, but to have the potential to develop into outstanding instructors, contribute to the department, developing new courses, service faculty advisors, and so forth. This is just a brief version. Associate teaching professors are expected to contribute beyond the level of assistant professor, come up with novel and effective teaching activities, contribute to curricular development and assessment, maybe develop a new course, service to the department in areas of importance to the department leadership and things like that. A lot of this, by the way, is taken from what we already have in place for our lecturer and senior lecturer titles in the College of Engineering. And as in the previous proposals, it would require six years of full-time teaching with the exception of people who are already senior lecturers who were appointed right into senior lecturer positions. We have a few of those. And with their five-year appointed period, that would be reduced to five years to align the promotion, let's say, to associate teaching professor with their reappointment. Full teaching professors, we expect Lynden Archer, a dean wanted to have a pretty high bar for this. So he wanted really high performance and impact beyond their individual course or individual departments, showing leadership, maybe serving as director of undergraduate studies, or maybe writing a textbook, or editing a journal, things like that. So external impact, at least beyond their department, let's say. And a phrase which we have in our proposal is we expect across all of these ranks for people to exhibit sustained excellence in teaching, so really to always be working to improve their teaching no matter what their rank. And also something which isn't in the proposal, but I think captures the spirit of this well, is that these faculty members would perform in the teaching realm on par with their counterparts in the tenure track, at least that. Next slide. So, new appointments. They have to have a search. PhD would be required. You have to meet their criteria for appointment as well. That'd be a vote by the department. And then appointments would be three years for assistant teaching professors and five years for associate and full teaching professors. Next slide. Promotions would require review in a faculty vote. And I put together here a long-winded version of the dossier. Again, this is quite drawn from what we already do for our lecture promotions, but a CV, it's statement of contributions to teaching, letters of evaluation, teaching materials, things like that. In all cases, the dean will have the final call on the promotions. Very similar, pretty much what we already do. Next slide. Reappointments. This is actually quite similar to what Larry described for Bowers CIS. So assistant teaching professors, let's say someone's hired in and at the three-year mark they're reappointed, it's going to be reviewed inside the department and voted on by the department faculty based on a review of their teaching and service relative to the criteria. So documentation will be at the discussion of the department, but typically a CV, teaching and

research statement, student evaluations of teaching, and a peer review of teaching as well. And the associate and full-teaching professors will be reviewed for reappointment every five years with a more extensive dossier-based review every other period. So pretty much what you heard from Larry on Bower's CIS. And so for the non-dossier-based review cycles, the decision can be made internally through the department based on a continuing review of course evaluations, annual reports, curricular needs, resources, things like that. And again, the dean will have the final decision. Next slide. Transition to new titles. We put this as opt-in for all of the titles. But I expect most of our lecturers to want to transition to the new titles. Some exceptions will be a few people who don't have the PhD, but that's a very small number. So basically, for moving into the assistant or associate teaching professor, faculty member writes to their department chair, says, hey, I'm interested in this title change, here's my CV, here's why I think I meet the criteria. The department chair says I agree with you. That comes to the Dean's Office, presumably to me, and we make a decision based on that. I don't expect much hullabaloo or controversy on that. We are going to ask for full teaching professor, though that it basically be treated as a promotion. So it'd be a dossier put together, a vote by the department, and then a recommendation to the college based on that dossier. And as with the other proposals, the appointment periods and so forth would remain the same with the exception of the transition to full teaching professor, whether it's a dossier and everything, or reset the clock. So whether we're not coming back like in two years in redoing this. Next slide. We doing it on time.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Got three minutes.

>> ALAN ZAHNDER: Okay. I got all the time in the world. Percent limitation. We voted to have a 30% limitation. Right now we're at about 21%. Turns out it's hard to count depending if you use the internal college numbers or you use the RRP numbers, you come up with slightly different numbers, but they're within a couple percent of each other. Right now we don't actually have any limitation except 25% limitation on professors of practice, which we're nowhere near close to. So this actually does put a CAP on that, which we don't currently have. And was expressed in the written feedback I got from my colleagues, there was some concern that, hey, does this mean we're going to get rid of the tenure track and everybody's going to be a non-tenure track teaching faculty? And the answer is no. And then last slide, I think just address the concerns raised by the CAP review. So one was on the teaching law, which you heard from Jeff about. Initially, I had not put that in the proposal at all because it's so hard to capture, but Day Hall pretty much insisted that we put that in. So I took a stab at it and put it as a nominal teaching load of two courses per semester, which similar to what Jeff said, is roughly half of what the nominal teaching load for the tenure track faculty is. That said, I know there's going to be a lot of variability because some of our existing senior lectures, for example, are running programs, are running our image program or running our master's of engineering program in makeey for one of my colleagues, for example, or running other types of programs. So the amount of teaching that people do versus service that they're doing is really variable, and we're not going to try to lock that down. And then there was a concern about title modifiers. So I think I'll just take out of the proposal that the titles may be modified with acting courtesy or visiting and just fall back on the faculty handbook, which already has that. And as Larry mentioned, the faculty handbook does need to be updated to reflect these new titles, not just these new titles, but

also professor practice titles and things like that. And then there was a concern with external letters and promotion and renewal processes. We asked that one of the letters be external to the department in the arm's length. And I'll just clarify in the proposal that we would be providing the dossier material to the person providing that external letter so they have something to go by. And then there was a question of whether observations of teaching are done by faculty, internal or external to the department. And I'll edit the proposal as well to make it clear that the peer teaching observations will be by colleagues inside the department, which I think only makes sense. And I have 21 seconds left. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We now open the floor for questions and comments in general or for any of the specific proposals. And as I said, Mark Millstein from CAPP is here if needed, if appropriate. Go ahead.

>> ELLIOT SHAPIRO: That one's set a little lower. So I'll go here. Thank you. Elliot Shapiro. Knight Institute and Arts and Sciences, RTE. First, thank you to everyone at the university level and in the various colleges who've put these proposals together. I know it's been a lot of work. As an RTE faculty member for a long time, I'm grateful for that work. And I look forward to seeing my own college represented up here, hopefully really soon. So I have a couple questions, which are general. There's a lot of parallel between the three proposals, and so you can choose to handle them as you like. The first has to do with what happens to existing titles. It looks like the expectation is that everyone currently in a continuing lecturer, senior lecturer will move over to a parallel appointment, but there seem to be some gaps there. So I'd be interested if you ultimately see that the senior lecture will essentially wither away apart from part-time appointments or short-term appointments. And then also clarification about what professor the practice will mean going forward. I know each college does that a little bit differently, and two of you said something about that, but I'd be curious to hear some clarification there. Again, we don't need to hear it from all of you, just some sense of how that will interact with the new rank. And then finally, one of you only mentioned compensation, and you said there would be no change. I'm wondering if this is something we can expect that they're all going to be compensation-neutral if you will. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: You want to respond?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Well, I'm not quite sure. Mark, is that something you can respond to, or any of the three presenters have any insight into the question raised?

>> ALAN ZEHNDER: Together?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

>> ALAN ZEHNDER: I'm not sure if I speak for everybody, but I do expect that the lecturer and senior lecturer titles would over time wither away. I don't address this specifically in our proposal. But we have people in those titles who will stay in there for a while. For us, professors of practice, I think we haven't always used those titles consistent with what they were meant to

be. So I'm hoping also availability of the teaching professor title will let us move people who our in professor of practice titles, but maybe don't have all the industrial, or government, or other experience that really those titles are meant for into a title that better reflects what they're actually doing and what their qualifications are. So we had to wrestle a little bit with Day Hall on being able to have a one-time transition over a short period of time, which may be like a year or whatever of professors of practice into teaching professor titles. I don't know if you guys know that.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think we've covered that well.

>> ALAN ZEHNDER: Maybe Jeff.

>> JEFF NIEDERDEPPE: I'll just add two last things. We're proposing to use lecturer pretty much only for part-time as a differentiator for our part-time faculty and benefits eligible full-time faculty. I'll just follow up on the compensation question. I think a promotion to a different rank would carry with it an expectation of compensation change. There's obviously SIP annual processes, but what I meant to say by that is that there's no automatic, you get a raise because we're transferring this title right now as we're transferring this title. The last thing I'll say is professor of practice for us is completely independent. We have two professors of practice. Nobody's switching on those titles in our college.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think we're going to go online first to Noah Tarmakin. Identify yourself in two minutes.

>> NOAH TARMAKIN: Hi. Thanks. I won't be two minutes. Just super briefly. At one point it was mentioned that the standard teaching load then would be three, three. But it was also discussed that people in these positions would be expected to do service. And so I was wondering about these calculations of 50%, 100%. Service has to be part of the calculation somewhere. And I wonder if we want to maybe consider advocating for our colleagues in these positions to not have a three, three, which leaves it almost impossible to do service or any intellectual engagement at all, and to bring it down to at least a two, three or something, so that, one, because of the service expectation that we would have, and then two, because I imagine many people in these positions are still doing some research, even if it's not their primary focus, and I wouldn't want to cut off avenues for that. I would like to make these positions still attractive, get people to want to do them. Thank you.

>> ????: So, I want to address two issues quickly. Let me start actually with the teaching load because I didn't mention that when I was up here earlier. I think we have all basically used the same formula, which is to say that in most of the colleges, the teaching requirement is 50% of what we do, and then the other 50% is basically research. We really do want our teaching faculty to be primarily teachers. And consequently, we just doubled the teaching load for our teaching faculty. I'll get that in a minute. That's the way that we got to a two, two load because our current tenure track load is to a year. And I think all the other colleges did the same thing. Compensation. One thing I can't say, it's not like there's another pot of money that we can now

dive into. But it certainly is the case that having three levels is now going to enable us to distinguish people more. And particular roles that people take on might be highlighted. So there might be more opportunities for individuals, even though in some sense, this is a zero-sum game.

>> STANILAV VOGULSHEV: Stanislav Volgushev JGSM. My question is why do we put so much importance on having a PhD or any degree as a hard requirement? If somebody can do a great job, why would we prevent them from being a teacher, professor? Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Anybody interested in responding to that of the three presenters? If not, while you're thinking about it, maybe why don't we go online to, is it Rajesh? Tell me your name.

>> RAJESH BHASKARAN: It's Rajesh Bhaskaran, mechanical and aerospace engineering, RTE faculty. And first of all, I wanted to add my gratitude to the people who have worked a lot to make this happen. Alan and the dean, and the policy committee. So the recognition for teaching is much appreciated as somebody who's been doing it for 25 years. I had a clarification on the teaching load because it's quite variable, and I think Alan did allude to that. But just a clarification that the nominal is two, two, but with the recognition that there is a lot of variability within that. I, for instance, work with lots of different courses to support the use of simulation. So I was looking for clarification on that. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you.

>> JEFF NIEDERDEPPE: I can't speak for all of the proposals, but I can say we have a standardized load of three, three, but there are various, I want to say exceptions or parameters that can shift that. If there's an engaged course, we credit those differently. If there's big courses and people are taking on also TAA management of labs, we credit those differently. So we put in a proposal standard math accounting but there's variability as Alan and Larry said. The other thing I'll just say, I think, is a broader question for other colleges. 50, 50 is a pretty common breakdown research teaching where service in that, whereas advising in that. Different colleges do that differently. I'm also a member of CALS who's voting on whether to formalize service as a proportion of time. So I think that's a larger university and faculty discussion, how service is credited. But we stuck with our traditional 50, 50, multiply the 50 by two, I think in all of our cases to operationalize this in this moment.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a few minutes if there's any more comments or questions. I don't see anything online. One more.

>> ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Still Elliot Shapiro. Is this one on?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yep. One second. Thank you.

>> ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Thanks. Still Elliot Shapiro. Still RTE. I actually wanted to address Noah's question, and this may be something for both the proposing colleges and other colleges to consider. I know that in arts and sciences, the standard load for lectures is three, three currently. There are opportunities where other administrative work can sometimes be treated as a course equivalent. I don't believe those are always handed out equitably. I'm the beneficiary of this, so I like that system. And I would certainly encourage colleges to consider that particularly for people who are taking on significant administrative roles, like running a program or being a DUS, or something like that. I've talked to Tamara about the fact that this isn't always consistent. But anyway, thank you.

>> TARA HOLM: Hi. I have a question that is a general question.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Identify yourself.

>> TARA HOLM: Sorry. Hi. I'm Tara Holm. I'm the senator for mathematics or a senator for mathematics. I have a question that is not specific to these colleges, but in general is a question about these positions. My understanding is that with the title of lecturer or senior lecturer, you're eligible to part-time study, and you can enroll in classes and not have to pay tuition. But I believe that benefit does not extend to employees who have the word professor in their title.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I had that in my notes, so thank you, Tara and Chelsea. So lecturers do not have university voting rights, even though they're represented by the faculty senate. So only senate senior lecturers are a part of the faculty senate in terms of having university voting rights. And so in the bylaws from the board of trustees, if you have university voting rights, then you can have persuasion and impact on the education policies at the university, and for that reason, you do not get the employee degree benefit. And so that means that anybody who takes on goes from lecturer to assistant teaching professor, they would actually have university voting rights in the senate, and they would not have access to the employee degree benefit.

>> TARA HOLM: I can't take any classes for free?

>> EVE DE ROSA: Not for free.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Eve, maybe just stay here. We're pretty much at the end of that period, and I see no more questions. So why don't we move on to announcements and updates? Eve De Rosa, dean of faculty, Chelsea Specht, associate dean of faculty.

>> EVE DE ROSA: And actually, I just want to thank the T4 working group, senate working group that worked on this policy. And what I love is that those associate deans and the senior associate deans that worked on the enabling resolution that we voted on last spring stay together to continue to work on these so that there's uniformity across the university. They did a lot of consultation with faculty, with the senate committees, with central administration, academic HR, and so very thoughtful, very thorough. And so I hope that that is reflected in the senate response at this moment, this was just for discussion. We will make a motion, presumably if they respond well to the revisions to vote on this in May. So I just wanted to say

thank you for this group and the larger group that have continued to work together to make this happen for our lecturers and senior lecturers. The other little note that I have to myself is that I saw that there were at least three or four people who wanted to continue to talk about the transfer option, and I wanted to just remind you that you can write to the dean of faculty office, and I will forward your, your comments to the Education Policy Committee, but also to the vice provost of Undergraduate Education. And we also have online a place for people to continue the conversation. So know that those are available to you so that we get that feedback and that feedback will go back to the EPC. Very cool music over there. And I just wanted to make that available to whomever didn't get the chance to continue their comments. And I guess here we are. Next slide, please. So I would say that there's a clear misunderstanding about the impact of our work from the federal government and our new administration. And there does seem to be, as I mentioned before, an assault on the integrity of academic freedom for our faculty. And these stop-work orders are really directly impacting our ability to work. And I think that we need ideas. I think we need ideas to be able to communicate the worth of higher education, the worth of our faculty beyond our border. So I think internally, we're pretty clear that we have value, but maybe not outside. And so I wanted to take time today for all of you who are online, who are here to start sharing ideas. And we will find a venue and a forum for whomever wants to have this conversation. We need a faculty think tank for how to get the message out about how valuable this work is, what we do as scholars, what we do as teachers. And so with that if you have colleagues that you think are fantastic communicators, the Carl Sagan of our current faculty in your department, let us know and we will have them out here communicating the worth of Cornell faculty. And I also wanted to ask if we should have an imagining session about what it is that we can do to really get the communications out there. So use today to start sharing ideas, but also I will create a space for that. So I just wanted to put that out there. And next slide, please. I wanted to remind everyone also that there are resources. I have concern for our faculty who are here on a visa, even some who are naturalized have concerns, I know. There's a vulnerability. There's a vulnerability in particular for those faculty who are on soft money positions, and for assistant professors. Everyone knowing that we are in a budget crisis, we have the risk, as you saw in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal of a very financial punitive action by the federal government. And so I just want you to know there are resources here to support you. And so these are them. And if you have students also who are concerned about their immigration status, then please send them to international services. The university has made resources, free legal consultations for people who are here international faculty, students, staff. And so I just want to remind everyone that that's the case. And I also wanted to remind you that our field trip is not a leisurely thing. We as a senate represent tech campus, the Agritech campus, and the Ithaca campus. And I say it all the time. And so I put my money where my mouth was. And so we went to the tech campus. That one was organized a little too short for people to really take advantage of it, but we have plenty of time for us to go visit the Agritech campus. We'll get a tour. But most importantly, and why we're going is to understand what it means to be faculty there. There's a different context. And I think especially at a time when extension faculty who are on soft money positions are probably feeling very vulnerable, I think we should all be going to their campus and hear from them directly. So I really hope that more of us will join us on the bus and go visit in two weeks on the Wednesday. So those are my updates. And I'm open for questions. And so is Chelsea.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We'll wait another few seconds come on. I see a question from the audience.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yeah. Actually not even questions, that was just the old slide. If people already have ideas about what we could be doing as a faculty, please come up to the mic and share those wonderful ideas. We have to harness the power of our intellect, our creativity, and this is the moment. And so I really want to hear those things starting today, and then we'll do something more formal as well.

>> RISA LIEBOWITZ: It's a time for dramatic stuff, isn't it? Risa Liebowitz, ILR senator. It's good you said, doesn't have to be a question because I don't have a question. I think we all have lots of questions. But, of course, it's always a good idea to have the public understand of what we do. That's a good thing because we work for a public mission and it's easy for people not to pay attention to that when all they think about is- but you charge so much tuition. So I certainly don't disagree with that. But I think this is a time where that is certainly not going to be sufficient. And I think that if we think about this together, we should do a very solid political and strategic analysis of what it means to be the faculty senate, what it means to be representing our colleagues on the faculty, what it means to take care of the welfare of our students, what it means to have the welfare of staff in mind, and how do we create strategies so that we act collectively. This is not simply about going out and persuading the public that we do important things. Yes, that's important to do, but the Trump administration doesn't care that we do important things. Actually, they do care and they don't want us to do those important things. And so this is a time for real collective thinking, strategizing an action. And this is an area where the university administration should be on the same wavelength as we are. And if you're paying any attention at all you know that capitulation to the Trump administration gets you in a situation where you have \$400,000 of funds removed from Columbia, and you got 1 billion from Cornell. So Columbia's capitulation was simply the opening for the Trump administration to ramp this up and go after and pick off the Ivys, and then they're going to pick off other schools, and then they're going to pick off the public schools. And so capitulation to authoritarian dictates doesn't work. History tells us that. They just take more. And so I think that we need to come together and talk about this. There are lots of things we disagree on, but I don't think we disagree on the need for us to push back collectively. And the administration of this university and others should join together with us to do that. It's the only principled thing to do. And I think it's the only thing that might actually work. This is a popular front against fascism moment, set aside our differences, fight for what we believe in because otherwise we're just not going to survive. This is existential. It's not about just convincing people that we do good things. So I hope we do have forums that are devoted to that discussion. And there is a letter going around, and I hope that you've seen it. There's a petition. If you haven't seen it, perhaps it can be posted.

>> EVE DE ROSA: It's going to be. Begum is going to come and introduce it.

>> RISA LIEBOWITZ: Great. And so I will leave it at that because there's lots we can do where we can actually energize ourselves instead of just feeling depressed.

>> EVE DE ROSA: Yes, Begum is going to introduce the letter that's going around for the board of trustees in our good of the order. But I also wanted to share an invitation. So there's a regional faculty governance summit that's happening in Rochester. And so it's happening on Saturday from ten to four. I'm going, a few other people are going, but if you're interested, just email me and I'll let you know the details.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have time for one or two more comments or statements.

>> HAROLD HODES: Harold Hodes, philosophy. I'd like to know more about what the legal options for Cornell are. I understand that Cornell joined a group of 11 other universities and colleges in one suit against the federal government. But that was before these recent assaults. So I think it would really be important for the faculty to know about what Cornell's legal options for not caving in are. I hope that there'd be some way in which we could be provided. Presumably, the lawyers and the administration are working on this stuff, but I really hope that the faculty can be kept informed about this.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I can say that the administration are sharing anything that's happening with your deans and also with your chairs. And so the intent is for them that to go to the faculty I can say up until this point, it's not a billion dollars of grant dollars that have been either suspended or canceled, it's more like 200 million. And every single one of those is being contested where they can be. So the lawyers are already actively working on addressing each of one of those. And at this moment it's not clear why grant dollars have been suspended. We know what's in the news, but in terms of the letters that go directly to faculty and otherwise, and to OSP, it's not clear why those things have happened.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a minute or so if you can keep it short, come on. And then we'll move on to good of the order.

>> RISA LEIBOWITZ: Do you want to fiddle with the microphone?

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think it's okay.

>> RISA LEIBOWITZ: I'm Risa Liebowitz, ILR senator. On the legal issues, Harold, I think it's really important for us to know this because Columbia chose not to push back. The coercion on Columbia was obviously wrong, and it's the administration's fault, the Trump administration's. But Columbia could have pushed back through legal options because a lot of what's happening is, and this would be for Cornell too, an allegation that the university is not sufficiently addressing antisemitism and using Title VI of the Civil Rights Act to assess that. Now, it may be that they have specific things we don't know about, it'd be very nice if we were told. But that is one of those areas where one can push back because it is absolutely crystal clear that Title VI is not being followed, that this is an unlawful freeze or cut both procedurally and substantively. And there's lots that can be done. And I think that we should get that information and push for it. I'm done.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have five minutes for good of the order.

>> EVE DE ROSA: I also just wanted to say our president is going down to DC having conversations with Congress. Also, Cornell was the third university to file a lawsuit against these illegal actions for indirect costs on grants. So we do have administration, president and provost who are working for our faculty.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Just introduce yourself and your affiliation.

>> BEGUM ADALET: Sure. Begüm Adalet, senator, government. These are dark and difficult times. There's uncertainty everywhere. When I asked Eve if I could deliver the sense of the Senate last week, I plan to talk about our students. But in light of the 1 billion or 200 million dollar funding freeze that we learned about last night, I'll instead share this letter that was penned by faculty across different colleges at Cornell. I really hope you'll consider sharing it widely and signing it. Are we able to have the text on the screen? That's fine. I'll read it. I don't mind. The letter reads, "Dear members of the Cornell Board of Trustees, ongoing attacks on American universities threaten bedrock principles of a democratic society, including rights of free expression, association, and inquiry. In light of this unprecedented assault, we urge Cornell's leadership to do three things: one, continue to publicly condemn attacks on universities. Two, legally contest and refuse to comply with unlawful demands that threaten academic freedom and university self-governance. Freedom from political interference has allowed American universities to lead the world in scientific, medical, and artistic innovation, as well as humanistic and social scientific research from which our entire country benefits. Three, work with other universities and Cornell's own alumni networks to mount a coordinated opposition to these antidemocratic attacks. Signatories to this letter include professors of law, government, public policy, ecology and environmental biology, romance studies, biochemistry, electrical and computer engineering, American studies, industrial chemistry, physics, architecture, mechanical, and aerospace engineering" and the list goes on and on. So that's the end of the letter which is so powerful and important, and timely. And I really do hope that it will be shared and signed widely. And that's the link to the letter. And I really thank the writers of this letter for their courageous and principled words. But I do want to end with my own words. And I do hope that I'll get to deliver my original remarks that I intended for this session at a later date. But for now, we should remember that our community is under multiple threats, all of which require a collective response from each and every one of us together. This devastating and unlawful action that we learned about last night should not distract us from fighting these threats on multiple fronts. As we unite and stand up for our research together, I hope that we will also look out for and support the most vulnerable members of our community. This includes RTE faculty, graduate workers, staff, undocumented and international students and scholars. International students, scholars, and staff need immediate reassurances that in the event that they're subject to visa revocations, detention or deportation, that they can expect legal support, that they will remain enrolled, and will be allowed to continue their studies and research remotely. I have no doubt that we will unite in standing up for our research and scholarship. And it's my hope that we'll also unite in standing up for our students so that it's us as educators and not the Department of Homeland Security or ICE that decides

who belongs on our campus. So I hope you'll consider circulating and signing the letter. And one last thing to my colleagues on Zoom, I know that people have childcare needs and health concerns and other reasons for joining online, but I know for myself that coming here today, I wanted to be in community in this time of uncertainty. And I think it will be important for us to stand up together in community with each other for one another, for our students, for our staff in coming weeks and months and years. And so I hope we can begin to do that work in person, if possible, face-to-face in community collectively together. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Our meeting is adjourned.