

Faculty Senate
November 12, 2025
Meeting Minutes

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Senate Speaker, Emeritus Professor of Architecture. We start with the land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nq' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohó:nq' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohó:nq' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohó:nq' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, the meeting is officially called to order. We approve the minutes for the October 22nd special meeting. They have been posted, distributed online as a verbatim transcript. So, there are no obvious corrections through unanimous consent. We therefore approve the minutes unless I hear an objection. If you are harboring an objection that is sort of a spelling error or something like that, just contact the Dean of Faculty. Our first order of business is a kind of information only introduction to the future of American University. There are four co-chairs who will be presenting this afternoon, Ariel Avgar, Labor Relations, Law, and History, Pheobe Sengers, Information Science and Science and Technology Studies, Praveen Sethupathy, Biomedical Sciences, and Adam T. Smith, Anthropology. So, if you would come up to the neutral yellow mic, you'll have 10 minutes and no Q&A following.

ADAM SMITH: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Adam Smith. I'm in Anthropology, Archaeology, and the College of Arts and Sciences. Jonathan's already introduced my fellow co-chairs as well. We're here with you today to begin the engagement around our aspirationally titled committee, the Committee on the Future of the American University. We wanted to give you a sense of what we are, what we are not, where we're going, and then provide an invitation to you to join us in a faculty forum for a sustained discussion next week. So, if I could have the-- Oh, perfect. So, first of all, this QR code will lead you to a copy of the charge given to us by Provost Kavitha Bala. The membership of the committee includes 18 faculty drawn broadly from across campus that includes 10 different colleges or schools. We're very intrigued to make sure

that you know the difference between what we are and what we are not. We are not the same as the Task Force on Institutional Voice, which has already released its report and was discussed here. We are also not resilient Cornell in the sense that contemporary budget crises are not in our wheelhouse, nor are we the Cornell AI initiative, although we are thinking quite deeply about new technologies and what they mean for the next 25 to 50 years of Cornell and these universities in America writ large. Next slide, please. We want to emphasize our timeline on which we have been charged to think. We are not trying to resolve the contemporary crisis. We are trying to think about what comes 25 and even 50 years beyond. We are also trying to think geographically broadly. Next slide. We want to think outward from Cornell. Cornell has a particularly unique position in the landscape of American higher education, which I don't need to share with all of you. But we are particularly interested in thinking through what lessons we can learn from Cornell's experience and from Cornell's position as a land-grant university, both a public-oriented university and also an Ivy League college. One back, please. I just want to bracket that we are particularly concerned that our work have implications for private and public nonprofit organizations, but not so much for for-profit organizations. That's out of our wheelhouse. Next. We have convened already around three specific issues that seem to be shaping the contemporary crisis and have implications for the long-term health of the university in America. The first is an issue committee that I co-chaired on the loss of public trust. I don't need to rehearse for you the ways in which public trust in the university is both vital and also under extraordinary pressure today. The costs of the educational mission, accusations of ideological bias, repeated episodes of research misconduct have all shed considerable light on the operations of the university and the ways in which-- unfavorable light on the operations of the university and highlight ways in which we need to attend to ways forward. Now, I'll pass off to Praveen.

PRAVEEN SETHUPATHY: Thanks, Adam, and thanks again everybody for having us. So, the second subcommittee that we formed is, as is shown here, shifts in university government relations. And one of the key principles guiding our study in this subcommittee is not to either overreact or underreact to the current political moment. You saw Adam present on the time horizon. That is really our focus. So, we want to be thinking long term and big, but at the same time, obviously, the current moment is instructive about potential vulnerabilities and exposures

in the way that we relate to state and federal government as it stands today. So, we wanted to lay out what this sort of implicit social contract or arrangement that we've had for 70, 80 years between the university and government. Where do we find ourselves today? And how did we get there? So, we realized that if we want to understand the current moment and where we wanna go, we actually need to really do some study of how we got here. So, we spent a fair bit of time laying out the roots of the current model. What are these mutual expectations? What does the public expect universities to deliver? How has that evolved over time? And what do we expect from the government? And how has that evolved over time? And what are the core pressure points? Where are their cracks and fissures? And which ones are more recent, and which ones have been evolving? And then finally, what are the emerging principles for how we relate with the government? And the key questions that we ought to be thinking about as we move forward to think of solutions and reimagining this relationship to be more functional and to be buffered against the kinds of shocks that we're experiencing now.

PHEOBE SENGERS: The third issue that we're looking at is the rapid pace of technological change, including AI. We already have a robust AI initiative that's looking at the immediate impacts of AI on the university and how to work with those. But when we're thinking on this longer time horizon of decades, it's clear that AI is not going to be the last form of technological change that is coming. And so, one of the important things for us to do is to think about how to foster resilience in our students and in the institutions in the face of technological change that is producing, to some degree, unpredictable and unknowable futures. We also recognize that in thinking about technological change on this longer time horizon, we also need to recognize the ways in which the technological changes that have already happened are impacting us and our students. And in particular, a lot of people have noted that our digital first students are coming in with very different skills, experiences, mental health issues, different forms of cognition, problems with attention span, and so on, and that we have to grapple with those kinds of issues as a university. One thing that's going to be really important for us is to identify what are the core skills that we actually want to make sure that students have at the university and potentially new skills also that come with technological change, and to define those clearly because they're not necessarily being inculcated anymore at the high school level. And finally, to place the university in a position where we are not simply the passive recipient of change that happens to us, but can

drive the kinds of change that we might like to see. Next slide, please. So, our charge as a committee is to think about these three issues, but to think particularly about how they bear on the university's core missions, which for our committee are defined as undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research and scholarship, and public impact and community engagement. Next slide. And so, our goal as a committee is not to sit in a room and decide among ourselves what the future of the university is. We recognize we do not have the knowledge or experience to do that as a group, and we need to rely on the entire campus as a kind of brain trust to figure out how to orient to the future. And so, to do that, we understand our role as curating a community conversation of which this event is one part. So, what we have done to date is, as we've described, define the scope of what we're looking at. But what we will be doing over the next several months is defining together how these pressures are bearing on the university's mission through things like, next slide, community events. So, we are running town halls, having debates, and so on, a lot of different kinds of events where people can come and be part of the conversation and tell us what they see is going on. Next slide. We're putting together advisory panels who can advise our committee from different areas of the university on particular kinds of topics that have expertise, including RTE faculty, trustees, staff, and so on. Next slide. We're also producing a series of short form outputs. We had our first Cornell Daily Sun column this week and an article on the Chronicle. We'll continue to be trying to communicate what we're hearing from you, give it back to the community so that we can continue to have this conversation. Next slide. And finally, we're also reaching out to individual experts who have particular expertise on specific topics of the university for a one-on-one meeting so that we can incorporate that feedback into what we're doing as well. Next slide.

ARIEL AVGAR: Hello, everyone. As Phoebe notes, the quality of our report and our recommendations are only going to be as strong as the quality of our engagement and interactions with the Cornell community across the many stakeholders. You can see up on the board events that we've already had the November 4th debate style event and the upcoming events. Really important that if you can help us publicize these and make sure that we have good representation across the Cornell community. Note that we're holding a faculty forum next week, a week from today, and we'll be holding a faculty town hall on December 1st. We're also doing a staff town hall, and we'll be doing other town halls with other stakeholders. You can find

information about our activities on our website.

ADAM SMITH: I just want to make one last note that the faculty forum next week on the 19th is just for members of the Faculty Senate. So, it's our chance to talk directly to you as representatives of the wider faculty. The town hall on December 1st will be open to the entire campus. So, we're hoping to be able to learn from you and then bring some of those questions to the full faculty as well on the 1st. So, thank you for being there.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Our next order of business are motions to vote on teacher-professor proposals. The actual voting will be via Qualtrics later in the week. We have three presentations, five minutes each. Hold your questions or comments until after all three presentations. Then, we'll have 10 minutes for faculty discussion. We start with Derk Pereboom, Senior Associate Dean for Arts and Sciences, Philosophy, who is here, and--

ADRIENNE CLAY: Adrian Clay.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And Adrian Clay. Choose any microphone you'd like.

DERK PEREBOOM: So, we're here to present the Arts and Sciences Teaching Professor Proposal, and it was very enthusiastically received by the faculty in the college. The highest participation rate of RT faculty and tenure stream faculty had any vote since 2006 when the current system was set up. And of RT teaching faculty, 97% voted in favor. Of tenure stream faculty, 87% voted in favor. So, there's very strong and broad support. I personally held meetings with the majority of the lecturers currently eligible for receiving this title are language education. Last December, I had a special meeting with language educators in which they expressed a lot of enthusiasm about the TP proposals. And not only that, they gave me a lot of feedback on what was in a draft of this proposal, and we made some substantial changes in response to that feedback. This proposal was prepared with serious engagement with the teaching faculty who are eligible for this title. How many are there? The answer is there are 137 RTE teaching faculty in the college. Of those, maybe about four professors at the practice. About six have FTE less than 0.5. So, we have about 120 faculty who are eligible to receive this title. Now, there were a

number of issues, a couple of issues that the CAP review flagged in the proposal. First is one that concerns the degree requirement. So, I know some of the other TP proposals require the PhD for a TP professor. It doesn't really work for two of our biggest sectors. One is the performance faculty in the Department of Performing and Media Arts, and in music, and the other group of the language lectures. Now, the typical highest degree for faculty in performance is the master's degree. Often, it's a master's in fine arts. There are DFA's, doctors in fine arts, but I think maybe only Yale offers the DFA, at least in certain areas. And then, the language lectures. So, I want to single out the Department of Asian Studies. So, since the Second World War, Cornell has received, up until now, recently stopped, funding for teaching of a number of Asian languages, many of them Southeast Asian languages. And these are lesser taught languages. We really have one lecturer in each of these languages. And there's no PhD available in the world for, let's say, in Burmese instruction or in Khmer instruction. Not even an MA. And so, we thought that given this kind of diversity among our eligible lecturers, the lecturers eligible for receiving the teaching professor, that we wouldn't specify the PhD as a requirement for this title. Rather, we're going to leave it up to the Dean. It's going to be different in different departments. So, I said in music and performed media arts, we have a lot of MFAs who are lecturers. In the language teaching departments, it varies. Quite a number of the language teachers in the Department of Romance Studies have PhDs, but less so in the Department of Asian Studies. And then, besides that, we also have more traditional lecturers, for example, in the departments of economics and psychology.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: One minute.

ADRIENNE CLAY: One minute. So, the faculty voted last spring between April 29th and May 5th. As Derk said, overwhelming support and highest turnout that we have seen. Our tenure stream faculty did not quite reach the two-thirds turnout that was set forward in the expectations. Following the overwhelming support, the ratification was done at a departmental chair's meeting, following college bylaws, and that was a unanimous ratification and enforcement of this result.

DERK PEREBOOM: Right. And the final thing I want to say is that some other units have very specific requirements for promotion. There's so much diversity in our electors across

departments that we're leaving those specifications up to the departmental rules.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Next, we have Nancy Wells, Senior Associate Dean for Cornell Human Ecology, Human Centered Design. I think she's online.

NANCY WELLS: I'm here. Yep. Thank you. Great. I'll be brief. Thanks for your time. Next slide. So, just want to say a little bit about our aims, which are kind of parallel to other colleges in this endeavor of taking on the teaching professor title. So, recognizing the contributions of our RTE teaching faculty. Also, as others have noted, to recruit and retain the best possible non-tenure track teaching faculty, as a lot of our peer institutions have these kinds of titles, and also to address the perceived disparity between the current titles of lecturer and senior lecturer versus research professor and professor of practice. Next slide. So, our use of the titles is centered around teaching, obviously, and mostly at the undergraduate level, but we do expect these folks to also have a broader impact contributing to the mission of the college and the mission of the units. And some of these roles might include things like career advising or various kinds of pedagogical innovation. And then, service also related to teaching, and that might include things like curriculum development and also the potential to manage degree programs. We specified our numbers are sort of capped at 30%, so in terms of this ratio of the RTE teaching faculty in the numerator and the total RTE teaching faculty and tenure track in the denominator, a max of 30%. Next slide. So, this is just a little snapshot of our process or our timeline. So, we drafted the proposal in the late spring and through the summer, and this involved discussions with leadership and engagement throughout the college, sharing with the department chairs for review. And I might mention that one of our senior lecturers was on the initial teaching professor committee that developed the proposal initially and put it through the faculty senate. We then had a comment period in September, and we just received very few comments actually during that time. Just some minor clarifications. And then, we voted in October for about two weeks. Next slide. So, here are voting results. Our RTE teaching faculty, we had 13 out of the 14 voted. And among our tenure track faculty, we had 50 out of 66 voted. In both cases, we had strongly in favor. We had more than-- First of all, more than two-thirds voted in both cases, and well beyond 50% voted in favor. So 92% of the RTE voted in favor and 80% of the tenure track faculty voted in favor. Just a quick note related to some of Derk's comments, we also have some units that may

not always have PhDs as the terminal degree. Our language is similar in that we require a graduate degree at the appropriate level for a given field. I think I'll leave it there. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And the third presenter is Dan Fletcher from the College of Veterinary Medicine, College General Committee.

DAN FLETCHER: Hi, everyone. Dan Fletcher here from the College of Veterinary Medicine. Apologize for not being there in person. I managed to pick up COVID in Italy, so I'm trying to protect you all from myself. So, next slide, please. I think, similar to the other two presentations that have gone forward so far, there was a lot of discussion at the college level about this teaching professor title, and our major goals for putting this forward and for engaging faculty to discuss this were sort of three. One was to recruit and retain faculty with a primary focus in teaching, given that our other titles didn't have that specific focus. The college is currently undergoing a curricular revision, and we have a lot of constraints placed on us by our governing bodies like the American Veterinary Medical Association, and so we're I'm excited about the possibility of being able to recruit more folks with a real teaching focus using this title. And then, obviously focusing on enriching our student experiences and really importantly staying competitive with our peer institutions who do have some titles that are probably a little bit more appropriate for folks in this line. Next slide, please. So, similar to the other colleges that have been discussed here in terms of the function of these folks coming in, it would have to be a high level of professional expertise in the field that they're representing, substantial contributions to the educational mission of the college, and then at higher ranks, an expectation of pedagogical innovation, curricular development, and then leadership and management of our educational programs within the college. Next slide, please. Within the college, we do have other RTE titles, similar to many other colleges. We have clinical professorial titles, and these are targeted at folks who see patients in our hospitals or work in a diagnostic capacity. Our research professors focused on discovery. Professors of practice are folks who have experience in their individual fields and potentially ongoing work in their individual fields who then come to Cornell to teach. The teaching professor line is really meant to be targeted at people who are long-term focused on teaching within our curriculum. And then, we do have lecturer and senior lecturer titles like many other colleges. These people can have a heavy teaching load, but may not be full-time or

long-term. And there's a recognition within the college that those titles probably don't accurately reflect what people do. And so, bringing in an actual professorial title focused on teaching seemed like a very attractive proposition to the faculty in our college. Similar to other colleges, we have a formula that we use, and the sum of all of our RTE positions have to equal less than or equal to 45% of all faculty positions in the college, so 55% at a minimum tenure track. Next slide, please. So, these are the results of our vote. We had 142 eligible tenure track faculty. Of those, 94 voted in favor. So, as a percent of total tenure track faculty, 66.2% voted in favor with the threshold for adoption being 50%. And then, of the total tenure track faculty with voting privileges in the college, 87.9%. I'm sorry, the percent of the total tenure track faculty who voted, 87.9% were in favor, and we had a two-thirds threshold. And then, RTE faculty, we had a total of 120. Of those, 93 voted. 77.5% of total RTE faculty voted in favor with a threshold of 50%. And of the RTE faculty who cast a vote, 97.9% were in favor. So, we have broad support for passing this new professorial title. And that's what I have.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have some time for comments or questions. If you're in-house, come up to any of the microphones. And if you're online, raise your hand. We'll start in-house. Identify yourself, and short and sweet.

ELLIOT SHAPIRO: Sure. Trying to reduce the height of the microphone a little. Elliot Shapiro from the Knight Institute for Writing the Disciplines, also an RTE senator in Arts and Sciences, and my colleague Michelle who could say all those same things pretty much. So, I have been-- First of all, I'm in favor as the sign indicates. I've been a lecturer here at Cornell since 1997, a senior lecturer since 2003. I've been grateful to build a career here. It's not possible to do that in this kind of work everywhere. And I'm certainly grateful for recent moves to recognize the role of non-tenure track faculty, RTE faculty as faculty. I've seen a lot of developments in my time here. I think this is a really important moment in that regard. I'm speaking specifically as an arts and sciences faculty member, but I obviously support the same votes in human ecology, and veterinary medicine, and all the other colleges that are doing this. Once, I assume, our college starts appointing teaching professors next year, I hope, many lecturers and senior lecturers are expected to be reappointed with the new title. Those of us who teach language or writing, which is a lot of us in arts and sciences, one thing is the title will be more accurate. As a writing

teacher, I don't actually lecture very much, but I've been called a lecturer for 28 years. A lot of stuff will remain the same. Probably most things will remain the same, do the same work, still be retained and promoted based on our teaching. But I just want to point out, and I think Nancy said this nicely in her comments, in human ecology, and certainly it applies to us in arts and sciences, titles do signify status and respect. I'll give you a few examples. Every fall in arts and sciences, there's a meet the new faculty article that we can read that includes tenure stream faculty and it includes professors of the practice. It does not include lectures and senior lectures. Enough said about that. I also occasionally will see opportunities, grant or research opportunities available to tenure stream faculty and professors of the practice. And when that happens, I always write to them and say, "Hey, why no lecturers?" And in a few occasions, they've said, "You're right, you're right. You can apply." And in other cases, they've actually said, "There's an outside agency that's providing funding, and the outside agency says only people with professor in the title." So, these are fairly clear examples of cases where both inside and outside Cornell, a change in title will actually matter. So, I want to thank everyone who made this happen, who was bringing these proposals to us, and I urge you to vote yes on all three.

MICHELLE CROWE: Hello, I'm Michelle Crowe. I direct the English Language Support Office, which is actually centrally funded by the Provost Office. We're under the auspices of the Knight Institute, which is in the College of Arts and Sciences. I am very much for this proposal, but I have something that I would really like the university to consider after all these proposals are approved, a big, big change. I would strongly urge the university to consider making these positions tenure track. And the reason for that is because teaching-focused faculty deserve to have our positions protected and our academic freedom protected, just like faculty who focus on research. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. [Applause] Are there any other comments or questions? We have one more. Identify yourself.

MENGYI WANG: Hi, everyone. My name is Mengyi. So, I am a teaching associate in the Chinese language program in the department of Asian studies. And I am really thankful to the meeting. So, my question is, I wonder how the evaluation of the teaching professor, how does it

work, because I teach the language mentoring. And will the intercultural competence and trust, emotional safety be taken account into the evaluation of the teaching professor? Yeah, I just want to ask that. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Does Derk want to respond?

DERK PEREBOOM: So, there are different points at which there will be evaluation. So, there'll be an opportunity in the spring, we hope to start this in January or February, for all lecturers who are eligible for the TP title to be evaluated for this title. And I know that some other units have a kind of batch transition without this step. But we thought it was important, especially because the teaching professor title involves engagement, and we want the lecturers to explain to us how they plan to be engaged in accordance with the TPE legislation. But, yeah. So, we don't want the evaluation here to be any more stringent, say, than the evaluation for lecturers. So, I don't envision these valuations changing in the way that you expressed concern about, either at this point or more generally throughout the academic year.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have another question or comment. Come on ahead.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I wanted to emphasize the point that Michelle Crowe had just made about the need for, at the essence of tenure, if it's tenure track, whatever we call it, at the essence of that, the need is for job security. And so, our RTE faculty do not have job security that is either exactly like tenure or at least looks like tenure. And so, the AAUP's principles, American Association of University Professors principles, have been since its founding that academic freedom must be protected by job security so that it can be truly exercised. And I've been saying this ever since these new titles came up. I agree that titles make a difference, but whether those titles are backed up with the rights that all faculty should have, I think, is the essential question. And I hope that we can really address that seriously. And if anybody thinks that anyone who teaches doesn't need academic freedom these days, you haven't been reading the newspaper. So, thank you. [Applause]

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Any other comments or questions? We still have time.

NOAH TOMARKIN: Hello. Noah Tomarkin, Anthropology. This is actually just a quick question that I think could probably have a very fast answer. There's been a lot of mention of eligible lecturers. Could somebody clarify who is and is not eligible and how one becomes eligible? Thanks.

DERK PEREBOOM: So, anyone who's a lecturer or a senior lecturer is eligible for a TP title. Over .5 FTE. So, if you're below .5 FTE, you're not eligible. And I just checked today. So, in Arts and Sciences, there are six faculty who are in lecturer appointments who have appointments at less than .5 FTE. So, everyone else, all the other lecturers will be eligible.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Anyone else? OK, we're going to move on then. The next item is a task force for institutional voice. And I have listed here Avery August, Deputy Provost, Immunology, and Jens Ohlin, Dean of the Law School I'm not sure where they are. Ah, Avery is here. So, I guess you can have the neutral mic. I think this one works. It's kind of neutral.

VERY AUGUST: Hi, everyone. Thank you. So, thanks for the opportunity to follow up on the work of the task force with this group. Jens Ohlin, who's the co-chair of the task force, was not able to join. Well, he could join, but he's on the bus to New York City. I'm not sure it'll be a good experience for you all. So, I'm here representing both of us. And so, as you know, the task force was charged earlier this year to really address the question of whether the institution should be exercising its voice, and then particular questions around that, under what conditions, what are the implications of this, and then to make recommendations. And I want to make sure we stress this point, that these are guidelines or recommendations and not policy as, for example, the expressive activity, which is a policy, and then, recommending nations for best practices, and then describing this process. Next slide, please. So, just to share, my colleagues on the task force, we had representation across the university, including, well, Cornell and Cornell Tech. And next slide will show just those individuals. I want to make sure they get the recognition. A really fantastic group of faculty to work with from across the university. Next slide. So, the task force did its work over the last semester, largely where we really engaged across the university, across the various constituents, faculty, staff, and students. We had engagements with over 150

individuals in our community. We also had listening sessions. We had input via email, as well as a Qualtrics survey that we devised. And we integrated and read all of those responses. We looked at peer institutions, policies, in many cases, as well as the sort of "quintessential document" that many refer to the Calvin Report from the University of Chicago. We also consulted with external experts who think about and work in this area and write about in this area. We developed draft recommendations that were released, and I hope you all have had a chance to look at those draft recommendations, and we're now going through the process of getting feedback on those recommendations, speaking with the various assemblies and groups across the university. We continue to receive feedback. There's an email that you can send feedback to us. And we're continuing to already identify areas where the recommendations will evolve to its final form. So, what I want to do in the next few slides is really-- Hopefully, you read the report so I won't go through in detail. But I want to highlight some principles around this. Next slide, please. So, this is the executive summary. If you read nothing else, take a look at this. In essence, what the report recommends is institutional restraint. We debated quite a bit what institutional neutrality means and institutional restraint, and we can talk about that. We heard a lot from the community that ranged the gamut from the institution should speak in every way and under any circumstances to the institution should never speak at all, ever. And so, we came down to these recommendations that the university should really speak at times when it's germane to its core mission. And we really focused on the formal definition of our core mission, and values, and functions that we carry out as an institution. The president and provost are tasked to speak in this case. Other leaders within the institution can speak if delegated to speak, for example, vice president for university relations. And deans and chairs speak not for the university or for the institution, but in the times when they speak, subject to the recommendations for their college or school. Next slide. So, I want to spend a little bit of time on this because we spend a lot of time thinking about under what conditions the institution should speak. And here, you know, highlighting our mission at Cornell to discover and preserve and disseminate knowledge, you can see the rest there, and to enhance the lives and livelihoods of the students and the people of the state of New York and around the world. So, that's our mission that we have here at Cornell. We weren't sort of creating a new language on this. We relied on that language. If we go to the next slide, we talk about the values of the institution as well that would guide whether the institution actually uses its voice. Specifically, and these are just excerpts from the report, it is not the place of the

university leaders to speak about matters not germane to Cornell's mission. Cornell's mission was front and center in terms of how the task force recommends that the institution speak. Particularly, and I want to make sure this is important because at the time, we were gathering and speaking with various members of the community. We were under significant pressure nationally, and there was a sense as well coming out of last year's expressive activity policy release that we were clear that these guidelines do not address individual voices within the institution. So, we were not making any recommendations or even speaking on whether individual voices, you all in the room, other members of the university community would speak. Those individuals are free to speak. This is solely within the context of whether an institution as an entity and the leaders of the institution should speak under what conditions. And so, that last paragraph that we felt was important. Next slide. So, again, this concept of institutional restraint, we spent time debating this. We heard quite a bit from both across the university's constituents, the Calvin Report, which calls for institution neutrality, but we wanted to point out that even that report, which many point to as a potential model, and other institutions have also released their own approaches that we looked at, that it still allows for the institution to speak when its mission is threatened. And so, the Calvin Report does not necessarily say that institutions should never speak, but it phrases those words within the context of neutrality. If you read the report, we specifically comment on neutrality versus restraint, and we came and recommended restraint within the context that's laid out in the report. Next slide. And so, these are the specific criteria for when we would recommend that the institution exercise its voice. Either of these particular conditions can apply. Again, whether the issue directly affects the university's core mission values or functions in a way that's easily communicated to the university community. Or, so this is not an and, it's an or, the issue directly affects the background conditions that make it possible for the academic enterprise at Cornell to actually be carried out. And you can see the language there. And so, it provides some framework for the president and the provost to speak on issues that directly impact the university's work, but also provide some framework for when that would happen. Next slide. So, this just lays out what I just said earlier in the executive summary. You will notice there's a star next to the provost, and there we have a provost of medical affairs, as well as the provost here in the Ithaca campus. We want to provide some ability for the Provost of Medical Affairs to also speak as appropriate, guided by these principles. And also, a point about the chairs of the Board of Trustees who speak for the Board of Trustees, not for the university,

and allow them to do that as well or recommend that they can follow these guidance as well. Next slide. As we go down into the leadership that includes the vice provosts, those in the provost office, the vice presidents, they are not tasked with speaking for the university and also exercise restraint. When it comes to the deans, we had a debate about whether deans would, in their capacity as deans, should be able to speak. And there again, deans, for example, the dean of the medical school might speak specifically on issues that affect medical care, but not necessarily for the university. So, they're speaking for their school. The deans we hire, excellent deans who have strong scholarship, they might speak on their own scholarship, and sometimes that may be conflated as to whether they're speaking for the school. When they do speak, we recommend that it's clear that they're speaking in their capacity as scholars or in their capacity as leaders of the school. Next slide. We spend quite a bit more time on departments. We again recognize that there may be conditions, again, through these two criteria where the departments might feel that they can speak. And there's a process that I encourage you to take a look at that we recommend that the departments take and determine when they speak and, like the Faculty Senate, report out in that process so that it's clear to everyone what the conditions of that speech is. So, I'll stop there. I really want to encourage you to send your comments on the report. We've already been receiving quite a number of comments. That's the website there. If you don't remember it, reach out to me or Jens, and we can follow up. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have about 10 minutes for questions, comments. If you're in the audience, come up to one of the microphones. And if you're online, raise your hand. And identify yourself and keep it to two minutes.

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. Thank you for the presentation. And so, I think the task force was in part a response, probably not totally, but in part a response to debates that we had over-- I'm going to try to keep this as neutral as possible. There was an event at the Hillel Center, and I believe the vice president for academic or university relations was there, and met with a group of parents, and made comments pertaining to certain professors. And I'm wondering, under the current guidance, would that be considered an appropriate use of university voice, either the event itself or the specific comments that were made?

AVERY AUGUST: Great question. And we've been asked variations of that question as we've been meeting with others. So, first, university leaders meet with communities frequently, and there are statements that are made in those meetings that may or may not be intended for public consumption. Well, we recognize, particularly the president and provost, the vice president of university relations, that distinction sometimes is lost, whether those comments were meant for public consumption. Not endorsing or not any comment. And so, certainly, you know, it's hard to say whether that would be considered a formal university statement, but in the way of these guidelines, that would not be considered a formal university statement. But we recognize that the president, whenever the president speaks, whether formally or informally, can be viewed as a particular statement. So this is also advice and guidance for the president and provost as to when they speak.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Go ahead and identify yourself.

MATTHEW EVANGELISTA: Thank you. Matthew Evangelista, Department of Government, former faculty senator. I imagine as you discussed these issues, you came up with hypothetical situations that you would discuss among yourselves to come up with your conclusions. And one hypothetical one that has been on my mind a lot is if the presidential administration declares that only US citizens are suitable for serving as faculty members at universities and only US citizens as students, would that be understood to challenge the university's purpose to educate global citizens? And would the committee then recommend restraint or speaking out? Thank you.

AVERY AUGUST: Yeah, it's a great question. We've again gotten a number of questions around hypotheticals. You know, I'm not sure I want to address the question directly. What I will say is that we have been asked about statements that were made in the past and asked whether they would meet this criteria. And we can certainly say that there are some statements that were made in the past that would not meet the criteria for university speech. I think the president and provost would have to take that example and determine whether it fits those criteria about impacting the university's core mission. I have my personal view, but I can't speak on behalf of the task force on whether there would be a yes or a no.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We'll go online to Hadas Ritz.

HADAS RITZ: Hi. Hadas Ritz, College of Engineering RTE. So, you just mentioned, Avery, looking at past statements and kind of talking about whether they would or wouldn't fall under these guidelines, is that kind of analysis of past statements? Is that something that you could share with the Faculty Senate? I'd be very interested to see that. And the other question I had is it's come up in past Senate discussions about, for example, a department chair sending an email to all the faculty and students in a department, for example, about a political event or something like that. Would these guidelines address that sort of department level listserv use at all?

VERY AUGUST: Yeah. So, thanks for the question, Hadas. On the first question, we did not rigorously look at all of the past statements that were made and ask whether they met the criteria. But because we have been asked, as we've been talking about the recommendations, about that question, and so certainly there are statements that have been made about events that happened perhaps outside the country that did not impact our mission, maybe we had some students from the region, and so there was a sense that a statement needed to be made, and certainly that would be an example of one that if we had these recommendations or policies in place would not result in a statement. So, just to give you a specific example. On the second question, this again does not address listservs. I know there have been faculty-centered deliberations around the use of listservs. Those are internal communications. This addresses questions as to whether a department decides, for example, my department, microbiology, immunology, we work on vaccines, whether a department faculty might decide they want to make a comment on the state of vaccinations. Then, there's a process for determining whether that department should do that.

DAVID BATEMAN: Thank you very much. I'm David Bateman. I'm in the government department. I'm not a senator. So, I very much endorse the restraint principle, and I also very much endorse rather than neutrality. I think that's a great way to go. I also very much endorse the principle that it should be binding at the top, and should be relatively constricting at the top, and that below that, speech should proliferate widely. And I'd add that widespread speech by units and assemblies is actually necessary for the president and provost to exercise the judgment required of mapping on the core values and missions to any particular question. So, I think that

we should encourage much, much more speech by everyone other than at the top. My question is that if institutional voice and the two criteria that were laid out are exclusively about when and who can speak on behalf of the university. It's not the only guideline appropriate for departments, a policy that says departments don't speak for the university.

AVERY AUGUST: I'm sorry, can you repeat the last part again?

DAVID BATEMAN: If institutional voice and the two criteria you lay out are only about who can speak on behalf of the university and when the university can speak, then is not the only guidelines or recommendations to departments that would be relevant and appropriate in a report like this simply a policy that says departments do not speak on behalf of the university?

AVERY AUGUST: Thank you. Yes, that's a great question, and we also, as a task force, sort of had some conversations around this. There are other institutions that actually have policies, BP policies on faculty and department speech. The main reason that we deliberated and made those recommendations is because we had to wind this balance between external sort of interpretation of what comes out of the university versus internal understanding of what comes out of the university. So, for example, a department speaks on a particular topic, the external interpretation of that is that department is speaking for the university. So, first, we wanted to sort of just lay out and say, that is not the case. And as we did that, we also wanted to sort of make some recommendations. Again, it's not policy on how a department can actually do that.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have time for one more comment if anyone wants to make one. Richard?

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bense, Government. Thank you. Thank you, Avery. I wonder under these guidelines whether it would ever be appropriate for the president to comment on a faculty member's speech outside the university in a private capacity. And if you think so, if you say yes, give us an example.

AVERY AUGUST: Thanks for the question, Richard. Certainly, if one were to filter those

through to criteria, my sense it would be highly unlikely that a president or a provost would make a comment or at least a public statement on behalf of the university on a faculty member's private speech. Maybe I'll just leave it there.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we're going to move on to our next agenda item. This is a proposed resolution concerning overuse of temporary suspensions. The presenters will have 10 minutes, and that will be followed by 10 minutes of Senate discussion. And so, we have Tracy McNulty and possibly Chris Schaffer.

TRACY MCNULTY: Yes, absolutely.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead.

TRACY MCNULTY: All right. Can you put up the first slide? Yes, thank you. Hello, everyone. My name is Tracy McNulty. I'm a senator representing the Department of Romance Studies and a co-sponsor of the resolution. Next slide, please. As you know, the student code of conduct procedures allow temporary suspensions only when immediate action is necessary to protect the complainant or the university community. It further stipulates that they may be imposed only when available less restricted measures are reasonably deemed insufficient. This is because the underlying allegation of prohibited conduct has not yet been adjudicated, which means that there has been no investigation and no finding of responsibility. The key terms in our resolution are overuse and violations of due process. Since the CAP committee recommended that we offer quantitative data in support of both points, we reached out to Calder Lewis, a graduate of Cornell Law School, who kindly agreed to collect and organize that data for us. Lewis served as a respondent's code counselor in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards until May of 2025. Along with two other counselors, he worked with almost all of the suspended students, receiving all their conduct documents and attending dozens of meetings between them and OSCCS. Lewis had hoped to be here to present the data and take your questions himself. Since he was not allowed to join us, I will instead present his slides and notes. Next slide, please. Temporary suspensions were practically unheard of until recently. In the first two years of the current code of conduct, OSCCS imposed no temporary suspensions on individual students. As

you can see, it handed out many more in each of the last two years. "As the RCC office witnessed firsthand," Lewis writes, "OSCCS and the central administration have unfortunately misapplied Cornell's temporary suspension policy over the past two years and deprived innocent students of whole semesters' worth of education." Next slide. Now, imagine that you are the typical temporarily suspended student. The odds are great that OSCCS did not charge you with violent or destructive conduct, around 80% in fact. Instead, you probably have charges like disruption of university activities, disorderly conduct, or collusion. President Kotlikoff has shared his view that temporary suspensions may be justified, even for conduct that is not violent or destructive if a student engages in repeated code violations. However, the overwhelming majority of suspended students, around 95%, had no previous record of code violations. If you face a full temporary suspension, your life just turned upside down. You can't go to class, work a job, or attend a religious service on campus. CUPD will arrest you if you try to do so. If you're not a US citizen, disenrollment from class places your student visa status in jeopardy. You may have to return to your home country, as three Cornell students have already done. If you're on a non-academic temporary suspension, you will be allowed to attend classes, but not much more. Slide. At this point, you'd probably like to appeal. You go read the six factors the procedures tell OSCC to consider before issuing a temporary suspension. There's language about violence, weapons, repeat offenders, and threats to health and safety. If you're a typical case, you're probably thinking, "Great, they don't apply to me at all." You draft your appeals and send them off to the vice president of student and campus life and the provost. Next slide. However, a typical appeal fails. The provost might tell the student that the six factors listed in the procedures basically don't matter. Or on one occasion, this is what is shown in the photo on the upper right-hand side, VP Lombardi reviewed a temporary suspension appeal for a case that he himself had reported to the OSCCS. He sent a screenshot of a student's private Instagram story to the CUPD chief and the OSCCS director so that they could fully investigate. OSCCS temporarily suspended the student shortly after. When the student appealed to Lombardi, he rejected the appeal without mentioning that he himself had been involved in the case. It was not until six weeks later that the student learned from the pre-hearing investigative record that Lombardi was the person who reported them, a clear conflict of interest that undermines the independence of the appeals process. Next slide, please. After all this, many students will do anything to get their normal college life back, so they sign a document accepting responsibility and promising to steer clear of

future disruption, a term that is interpreted so broadly as to restrict considerably the student's expressive activity. This is why 90% of temporary suspension cases never lead to a full investigation, a hearing, or even, in fact, an interview with the respondent. Next slide. What's the alternative to an alternate resolution? An average of 246 days of temporary suspension for students who choose to complete the investigation and go to a hearing. That's over eight months. So, the student is faced with a hard choice. Sign away their free speech rights or wait a year to get a hearing and be exonerated. Next slide. Finally, a sad irony, students who endure temporary suspensions the longest are usually found innocent. No independent hearing panel has ever found a temporarily suspended student responsible for violent conduct. Only one has even been found to have violated the code at all. So, when you vote on the resolution, please keep in mind that the truly typical temporarily suspended student is a nonviolent first-time respondent who, if willing to sacrifice months of their education, is typically found innocent. Thank you.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Next slide, please. Good afternoon, folks. Chris Schaffer, Faculty Senator from Biomedical Engineering. Earlier this semester, an original version of this resolution came forward, and there was a floor motion led by the UFC that sent it back for revisions and other committee reviews. And I want to really commend the authors of this resolution for how seriously they took that charge and the quality and thoughtfulness that went into the revisions of this resolution. This resolution now asks for basically four things. It calls for a reform to the student code of conduct. It asks that the current reform process that is underway be paused. That process is underway with an administration selected committee. It asks that shared governance bodies nominate faculty, student, and employee members to a new committee, and then it encourages that committee to focus on a few things, including the use and, importantly, the purpose of temporary sanctions, the independence of the adjudication and appeal processes from the university administration, and to consider things like increased use of restorative justice. Next slide. Folks, we have been here before. A couple of years ago, the university administration released an interim expressive activities policy, and there was widespread concerns across campus, including from this body. Led by Lisa Lieberwitz, the faculty senate passed resolution 194, which called for the same thing, a pause in this administration selected committee, the creation of a new committee with shared governance bodies weighing in and who is on that committee. That led to the administration responding with the Cornell Committee on Expressive

Activity. I was the Senate nominated individual who served on that committee. I just want to quickly remind folks. So, this committee had about 20 people with nominations from shared governance bodies. We met weekly or biweekly for most of an academic year. We engaged in a lot of campus listening sessions and topical meetings. We reviewed hundreds of pages of solicited feedback. We presented the report to the Cornell Sherwood governance bodies and got feedback. So, this was a committee that went deep into the substance, worked hard to build legitimacy, and sought to get broad feedback before making recommendations. This committee is now, or the policy adopted, the policy recommended by this committee is now university policy and how we're acting. I think this committee is in many ways a model for what this resolution is calling for, a similar kind of careful process. Next slide, please. I think also, there's another reason this committee is important. The Cornell Committee on Expressive Activity actually touched substantively on this issue in the report. This is a direct quote from some slides on it, but the committee recommended that these procedures be modified to narrow the use of temporary suspensions. In particular, clarifying that the purpose of a temporary suspension should not be to punish. The purpose of a temporary suspension is just to protect the rest of the Cornell community or to protect that individual from themselves. I'm not saying that that doesn't mean student contact should not be punished. It should be punished through due process and through procedures, not through these temporary measures. It also recommended narrowing when temporary suspensions are used, more transparency in processes, and clarifying what the appeals process is and assuring greater independence in the adjudication and review of cases. So, based on all this, I really encourage folks to vote in favor of this resolution. This is a way for us to move forward collaboratively together with the administration to help set policy around a critical issue that impacts many members of our community and to avoid having another administration-led policy that is pushed down at us, and we are having to scramble, and respond, and fight. I think we can work together to come to a good solution, and passing this resolution is step one.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. We have 10 minutes to discuss this, and I would like to alternate between those opposed and those in favor, starting with someone opposed at the red microphone. And keep it short to two minutes, please.

YUVAL GROSSMAN: Yuval Grossman, Physics. And I argue all of you to vote no for this resolution. The main point I would like to remind everybody is that Cornell has failed to protect Israelis on this campus. I talked about it before, and last time I talked about it, people had laughed as if I'm making things up. I want to be very clear, I'm not making things up. This is-- all what I'm saying, things really happened. Cornell did fail us, and they did fail us very badly. Yes, Israeli students had been physically assaulted. Don't laugh, it's real. A private Israeli event was intercepted by people [indiscernible] in the event in order to blow it up. And they did. Shouting and harassment inside libraries and other buildings have had serious consequences. We've seen students going back home for four weeks, cannot come back to here because of those people. Students missed exams because after these events in the library, they could not go to the exam. And what the Cornell administration did? Almost nothing. The resolution, unfortunately, reversed the role of victim and aggressor. Those students who got temporary suspension did things. We need to call on the administration to do more, not less, to protect all of us. For those reasons, I hope we all vote no for this resolution.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Julia, online, are you in favor or opposed?

JULIA MIZUTANI: I'm in favor.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, take two minutes then.

JULIA MIZUTANI: Okay. Hi, my name is Julia Mizutani, law librarian, RTE faculty. I've advised and supported a good number of students in the disciplinary process. So, I'll explain the disciplinary process based on my personal experience supporting numerous students, all of whom were disciplined for speech. Some were temporarily suspended, and some were not. So, the process often starts when Cornell Police or CUPD shows up at a demonstration and asks for a student's ID. If a student doesn't provide it immediately, they're referred to the disciplinary office for failure to comply, which is in the student code. I've helped a student who is disciplined simply for not retrieving their ID from their backpack quickly enough. She did so, but not fast enough, apparently. If CUPD doesn't get the ID on site, they'll use surveillance systems, so things like cameras and Wi-Fi tracking to identify the students. At this point, CUPD can file a

complaint with the disciplinary office and or pursue criminal charges like trespassing. They might pursue both. When criminal charges are involved, CUPD may call and email students repeatedly to meet them at Barton Hall, often threatening them with disciplinary action for, again, failure to comply if they don't show up. What students are not told is that they'll likely be arrested at Barton Hall and possibly questioned without an attorney present. This is a big deal for me since I am a lawyer. In the disciplinary process, formal complaints go on a student's permanent record, even if they're found not responsible and with no evidence. This usually has to be reported for applications for law school and medical school. I've advised students temporarily suspended with no evidence simply for being loud and disrupting activities, though no violence was involved. Despite multiple requests, they've never received any evidence of the allegations, and the investigation never began. Their appeal to Ryan Lombardi was denied with no mention of any of the factors that should be considered according to the code of conduct. They were suspended for six months, when they felt they had no choice but to sign an alternate resolution, which is essentially a plea deal. I've seen this system applied unevenly and consistently. Some students receive an email randomly saying their suspension has been lifted without an explanation, while others who are at the same protest remain suspended for months and were not allowed on campus, while students who have committed acts of violence at parties were not suspended at all and continue to roam campus unimpeded. A report, unlike a formal complaint, does not appear on a student's permanent record, but it's still held within the disciplinary system. So, even without a formal complaint and without a temporary suspension, students are often pressured into a plea deal to avoid a lengthy investigation or a formal charge on their record. This is a case even for students who, by any stretch of the imagination, have not violated the student code of conduct, like the student who took too long to retrieve their ID from their backpack, or another student I advise who joined a demonstration by simply laying down. This process often forces students to take the deal.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Wrap it up please

JULIA MIZUTANI: OK.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Is there anyone who wants to speak against this motion

or has a neutral comment? OK, why don't you go then?

BILL KATT: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. First, I want to sincerely thank the sponsors for what was really a very deep modification of the resolution. I think this is a much more productive way to be moving forward in general. I do have two questions I want to ask though. One, you showed data showing that over the last two years, there's been a tremendous increase in the number of temporary suspensions. Is it a reasonable reading that this has correlated with a tremendous increase in protest activity in general related to honestly horrific events across the globe? And two, we've had administrators previously explain to us that they are also not happy with how long some of these due processes are taking and that the major reason for that is just because there's been so much more protest activity, and there aren't enough people in the relevant offices to consider all these cases. Does your research bear that out? And if it does, as many of us are probably aware, there are staff and faculty across campus being told that their contracts aren't being renewed in the current budget crisis. How many people is it worth hiring for the relevant civil rights offices to review these when other people are being told that there isn't money to sustain them anymore? Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Go ahead for an answer.

TRACY MCNULTY: Yeah, thank you very much for the question. I can respond to the first point. Again, the authority here is Calder Lewis, the person whose report I read earlier. But I asked him about this question of what percentage of the temporary suspensions were for protest activity. And he said about 85% during that period. So, by no means all of them. But I think the crucial point that we're trying to make with the resolution is not that there is never a reason to suspend a student. Clearly, there are cases that meet that level, but that they have been overused in cases where a clear and present danger is not involved.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: And if I could just make one more point here. One of the pushes of the resolution is to decrease the use of temporary suspensions. And if we decrease the use of temporary suspensions, then students who have been accused of violating code of conduct and protest activity or things like that, even if that adjudication process took some time, they

wouldn't be prevented from continuing to do their work, and move toward their degrees, and be a part of the Cornell community. So, I would be less worried about the long overhead for completing these investigations if there wasn't such aggressive use of these temporary measures, which put students in this disadvantaged situation. So, I think it's important to decouple the time from the overuse of the temporary suspensions.

SEEMA GOLESTANEH: Hi, everyone. I'm Seema Golestaneh from Near Eastern Studies. I'm not a senator, but I also was a member of the Cornell Committee for Expressive Activity. I'd like to take my time to make two points. One, to give a better sense of the cost of temporary suspensions to the students. And again, these are suspensions and the consequences before they are found guilty and while they're under investigation. One, if you are suspended and an international student, the State Department is informed. Students have been harassed at airports, scared to leave the country, to visit family and to do their work. Another point, the rescinding of a tenure track job offer. Again, this was for a student who was a first time offender and a nonviolent offense. The loss of work study jobs. The OSCCS does not require students to be let go, but they inform their employers that their employees have been temporarily suspended, and this has resulted in loss of work study jobs. So, it's clear it's not just campus life and their academic careers affected, but their very livelihoods and ability to support themselves. Tuition has also been lost. The second point I'd like to make is about the interim actions, which you saw at one of the slides as well. So, in spring 2025, after the Committee for Expressive Activity had submitted its recommendations and it had become policy, submitted its recommendations against the misuse of temporary suspensions, we saw an increase in the issuance of interim actions by the OSCCS. So, interim actions have always been on the books. They're not a new form of punishment. But what was very concerning was that these interim actions entailed was identical to what a temporary suspension entailed. I myself was a faculty representative for a student who was issued this interim action, and I was very surprised to see it was essentially a temporary suspension in all but name. And it's a sort of bad faith action that I find quite concerning and disheartening as a member of the Committee for Expressive Activity after all the hard work we put in, after all the collaborative work we did with everyone. And again, the idea is not that there should never be temporary suspensions, the problem is the misuse of them. And ultimately, the punishment must fit the violation. And moving forward, we need collaboration. We need

transparency. And so, we're worried about this campus, the reform for the campus code of conduct policy moving forward very quickly. And it's going to ultimately lead to an erosion of trust between administration, faculty, and students. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We're a little bit over time. I think we have time for just one more online comment. Hadas.

HADAS RITZ: Yeah, thank you. Hadas Ritz, College of Engineering RTE. Just a clarification question. Does this resolution at all address the use of temporary suspension in policy 6.4 or Title IX situations? I'm still not entirely clear on the relationship between those offices.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Is there anyone here who can answer that question?

TRACY MCNULTY: Yeah, well, this is about the student code of conduct and the temporary suspension provisions in the student code of conduct. So, it's whatever that covers. Did you have more?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Sorry. Chris Schaffer. Just to respond, though, there's nothing that's being proposed here that would prevent the Title IX office from temporarily suspending a student who had been credibly accused of violent action or something like that. The pushback is against the use of these in non-violent situations.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay, we're gonna allow these three comments, and that's it. And keep it short if you can.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I will keep it short. Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. - First, I want to point out that there is going to be a review of the student code of conduct and procedures. The university has already created a review committee to do that. And so, what we're saying here, and this goes back to Chris Schaffer's original presentation, what we're saying here is that we should have a more representative review committee to review the student code of conduct and procedures. And that's exactly what we did with regard to the committee on expressive activity policies. And

that's what we're calling for here. We're saying that for the committee on the expressive activity policy, that the more representative committee that was created after the faculty senate called for that was a more constructive, it was more inclusive, and it came up with a report that brought in the community, and that really was an interactive process. And it was a better process for it. And so, this resolution calls on the same kind of process to be done, that rather than having simply an administrative dominated committee to review the campus code of conduct and procedures, it should be inclusive of faculty governance, of governance bodies generally. And again, that could lead to a more constructive process, one that considers issues about temporary suspensions, but also considers other issues and reforms. And one of them that I wanted to emphasize here briefly is about alternate resolutions, alternate dispute resolution processes. The resolution lists that as one of the issues-- as one of the issues that the review committee should consider. And I would note that the Office of Student Code and Conduct does not really use much in the way of alternate dispute resolution processes, even though they claim to believe very much in restorative justice processes. We have lots of experts on campus, in ILR and elsewhere, who really know how to use restorative justice. And so, one of the things that could come out of this review committee is really a constructive process rather than a punitive one, which is what the Office of Student Code says they believe in. Thank you.

IRIS PACKMAN: Hi. I'm Iris Packman, faculty senator from ILR, RTE. I also wanted to speak in support. This resolution is about the need to revise the student code of conduct in a way that clarifies how we use this extraordinary measure of a temporary suspension, given the stories that we've heard about the real impacts that it has on students' lives, from every aspect of whether they can be in this country. Can they work? Can they finish their degree? Can they continue with their academic activities, and their clubs, and that kind of thing? So, I think that it's really important that what we've seen in the materials accompanying the resolution, which are linked in the resolution, I encourage folks to read those, including the excerpts from the committee on expressive activity, which shows that this has been used inconsistently and punitively. Temporary suspension was not designed to be a punishment. It was designed to temporarily hold someone out of a situation where they could be a threat. And so, instead, it has dragged on and been this sort of punitive measure. And while we have this option, there isn't a lot of clarity or consistency about how it should be applied. And so, the Committee on Expressive Activity

found, and this is a quote, "disturbing accounts of severe temporary suspension being issued to students for nonviolent conduct without due process," page 11. So, this is coming from a committee that did this research, right? So, there are recommendations about how this needs to be clarified. So, this resolution is simply saying we should pursue those recommendations. We should pursue a representative committee that reflects the faculty, and the students, and the staff who are going to be affected by this. And I just wanted to give this last anecdote about the real impacts this has on students that we teach and interact with. So, I was talking with a student today who is a research assistant for me and asked them about how this has affected them. And they had a friend who received this temporary suspension, persona non grata status. They were not allowed to leave their dorm room. They could go to the dorm room or the health center. So, they were stuck in their dorm room basically for weeks, and people would come and visit them and bring them food. They were just lying in their bed depressed. They couldn't go anywhere. They couldn't do anything. Eventually, they got evicted from student housing and were couch surfing. So, this is all before there's been an adjudication. I'm not saying whether or not the student did something wrong. I'm saying that the measures that were taken against them were pretty extreme, given they hadn't yet been found to have violated anything. And that is just one example. And the student that I work with had said this has really stifled student speech on campus. And that, I think, was the intended effect of how it's been used. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We're going to have one more speaker on this topic, and then I'm going to ask for an extension of 10 minutes.

PAUL ORTIZ: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Paul Ortiz. I'm a professor of labor history. I'm a faculty senator at the ILR School. I also serve on the ROTC University Relations Committee and the AD White Committee. I was one of the signatories. I want to speak in strong favor of the resolution. I want to talk just briefly about the students who you may think are not affected by the current university temporary suspension policy. Because I'm a US military veteran, I talk to a lot of students across the campus who approach me from very diverse political viewpoints. They're scared of making their voices heard in public forums, on campus, off campus, because of the excessive use of temporary suspensions. These are individuals all across the political spectrum. We don't want to silence our students. All

we've been talking about today is academic freedom, intellectual freedom. At Cornell, we want to promote intellectual freedom. The current university policy and the ways in which it's been implemented, whatever the original motivations for that, are stifling intellectual freedom of our students. They're making students scared to make their voices heard, again, from a broad diversity of opinions. So, again, I want to speak strongly in support of the resolution and encourage all of my fellow senators to do the same. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Without objection, I would like to extend the meeting for 10 minutes. This is the way of requesting unanimous consent. I see no objection. So, we're going to just have Dean of Faculty with announcements and updates, and then we have good of the order, and then we will be done.

EVE DE ROSA: OK. I can keep it very concise. Next slide, please. One, I just wanted to say thank you to the sponsors, Senator McNulty, and core sponsors. Thank you for being really responsive, and this has been a significantly revised resolution, so thank you for that. Just wanted to remind everyone who did not see that that's the outcome of our last vote. We still have a core 20 people who are not voting pretty consistently. If this is a technical issue, please reach out to our office, and we will correct that for you because we have four votes coming up. We have this one and the three teaching professors, and we'd love to see all 135 vote on that. We have an agreement, and that's just for connection for anybody who had not heard this. And so, please click on it, read about it, understand it. We have a pop-up faculty suit. And so, we're going to the Atkinson Center next Tuesday. These have been awesome. We've had one in the veterinary college, one in the engineering college. And these are free and are awesome in terms of community building. So, I hope to see you there. And lastly, I just wanted to remind everyone that the future of the American University is having a session exclusively for the Senate. We'll send out an RSVP invitation so we can have a good sense of the engagement. But I felt like it was important for our group to have an opportunity to sort of imagine our future and the university's future in the long term. And then, there'll be a general faculty session in early December. And that's it for me. And I think we have three good of the orders. And so, that's why I asked for the extra time. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: So we'll start with Ariana Kim online. And try to keep it between two and three minutes if you can.

ARIANA KIM: Yes, sure. Can you hear me clearly?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I can hear you, but maybe talk a little louder.

ARIANA KIM: Okay, sure. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for your time. I'm Arianna Kim, Faculty Senator and Associate Professor in the Department of Music. I'd like to put forth a potential resolution or perhaps a set of resolutions centered on improving the tenure review process. My ideas are threefold. The first is proposing making available a provost level appeal when there are positive recommendations from the unit and the college, but then a negative and therefore binding decision from the provost. Given that, according to our website, we offer a university level appeal. It seems that this would constitute a university level appeal. The second is proposing an attestation that would accompany all voting faculty members' letters to inspire more integrity and higher accountability. As faculty members, we sign attestations for conflict of interest reporting, nepotism, workplace locations, advisors of student organizations, and many more. And I would love to see that same level of importance put on honesty and accuracy in our tenure letters. The third idea is proposing better guardrails and protections for tenure candidates when unethical or incongruous actions are found to have been taken by their superiors. Included here could be discussions on how to make expectations for both the candidates and their reviewers clearer and more careful enforcement of the visibility of the chair's letter resolution that the Senate passed last year. I would be glad to hear from anyone. My email is ak932, or my name, arianakim@cornell.edu, who would be interested in looking into this with me. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Our next good of the order speaker is William Katt, Molecular Medicine. Who is here.

BILL KATT: Last time you'll see me again, or today, I promise. So, we had two good-of-the-orders last month, and one was this little vignette about two sports teams, fans hating each other, and the take-home message was that we're stronger when we work together. And the other told

us that there was an atmosphere of fear on campus and that we should fight the administration. And I didn't resonate with that one very much. Let me say, I work with somebody every day who was trained by Mike Kotlikoff in his lab. Provost Balow worked just down the hall from several people in this room. We are the administrators of this campus. They came from our body. Most of them were faculty members. They're not aliens who've been deposited to make our lives hard. They're just the people who have the unfortunate reality that the buck stops with them. And we brought up the expressive activities policy earlier, and I think that was a great example of how much they were willing to work with us, that we brought up our concerns, and the next time we heard from them, they'd done a lot of things to address our concerns, and they'd met us way more than halfway. You know, Eve showed the previous central motion failed. It didn't fail by a huge amount, but it did fail. And I just want to bring up a comment that one person who I think supported it made, that we did not get adequate responses from the administration. We did not get adequate answers from them. And I actually agree with this, but if you look at that last meeting we had, we had four different high-ranking members of the administration sitting in this room. We asked them maybe five questions. We yelled at them a lot, but we asked them maybe five questions, and they answered them professionally and concisely and told us what we want to know, but we didn't want to know very much. And so, I would, I would just encourage us all to remember that the administrators are part of us. They are also working for a better Cornell and that we are most powerful if we work together and make use of them to answer our questions and not just as a sounding board to be mad at.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And our final good of the order speaker is Nate Matias.

NATHAN MATIAS: Hello. Nathan Matias, Department of Communication and--

BRYAN SYKES: Brian Sykes, Public Policy.

NATHAN MATIAS: Thanks. So, our recent Senate debate over the Cheyfitz Resolution revealed a fair number of concerns and some distrust concerning Cornell's civil rights process, academic freedom procedures, and the ongoing risks of future strain on them in the coming years. Our concerns include many things, but including procedural conflicts and language

ambiguity that many people from multiple sides agreed should be resolved, some distrust in processes involving academic freedom and implementation of them, some uncertainty about the values of faculty for how we treat students. And we have more in this QR code.

BRYAN SYKES: And so, our goals with this resolution are to affirm each other in the wider campus community about the shared values that we have for our students, our colleagues, and for academic freedom, while also trying to attend to the procedural problems and language ambiguity observed in the last Faculty Senate meeting about Cornell policies. It also seeks to obtain independent advice on legal standards where experts disagree and to provide a pathway for the Senate to receive reliable, usable information on an ongoing basis about cases that involve academic freedom and civil rights violations. And in doing so, it would produce a policy report, but it would establish a review committee that could produce a policy report that would review these policies for ambiguous language and administrative discretion points and also to create an attestation tool that would allow various bodies to then attest to whether or not the process was actually followed in any of these investigations.

NATHAN MATIAS: So, we've already consulted with folks on multiple sides of the previous resolution debate and are grateful for some who've actually joined as signatories. We hope to bring it to a vote at the next meeting. Right now, we need signatories, suggestions, and expression of interest if you have ideas for committee members, and also notice about anything that would prevent you from supporting this so we can consider possible amendments. Thanks. And there's a QR code if you want to read more and fill out information for us.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thanks everyone for your cooperation in letting everybody speak.

EVE DE ROSA: Sorry, everyone. I forgot. There's one more thing I wanted to share. This was actually when the Future of the American University, when they spoke earlier. I want to let you know that Provost Bala spoke with the RTE faculty working group yesterday, and they will have the future of the American University. Obviously, we'll go to that advisory group. But also, the decision was made, especially because of the importance of public trust, that the extension faculty would have their own session with the Future of the American University. So, I just

wanted to make that very clear, that especially extension and its importance to not only Cornell, but New York, and also globally will have their own opportunities to imagine the future of the American University. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thanks, everyone. We're adjourned.