

Faculty Senate Meeting

September 9, 2026

Minutes

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Please sign in whether here in person, either the sheets at the corners, or if you're on zoom by entering your name and department in the chat. Let's 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. Next slide, please. Just a brief reminder on sort of rules for engagement. If you come to speak, we plan on having just two minutes to pose a question or to make a statement. Please identify yourself and your department. We will alternate between folks on Zoom and folks in person. And we will do our best to alternate between folks who are speaking in favor and opposed to an issue when we wind up with situations where we have that. Thank you. Next slide. Sam, could you step up for a minute or so we can do this? So, our first order of business today is to appoint a speaker for the assignment. So, I'd like to nominate Sam Nelson. Sam is a senior lecturer in ILR and director of the Forensics program there. He's been a longtime director of the Cornell Speech and Debate Program, which benefits both undergraduates and graduate students here, as well as having summer programs and the like that brings folks in around the world. And Sam has previously served as the faculty speaker, most recently in 2019. So, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to appoint Sam as speaker of the Senate. Do I have a second? Second from Bill Cass. Any opposition? Okay, so moved. Congratulations to Sam, our new Senate Speaker.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. All right, I'd like to quickly go to the agenda and starting with the approval of the minutes from May 6, 2026. Do we have approval of those minutes? Do we have someone willing to approve that motion, the approval?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Move the approval.

SAM NELSON: Second. Great. Thank you very much. And then, the next thing that we have on here is upcoming university-wide lectures. Jenny Goldstein, are you here? Great.

JENNY GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. Hi, everyone. I'm Jenny Goldstein, Faculty of the Ashley School of Global Development and the Environment. I'm chair of the University Electors Committee. So, I just want to do a couple of things. I have a few slides, and we are hoping that you can share these slides with your prospective departments. So, I want to just say what the University Electors Committee does and share our process for nominating new speakers, and then also share some of our upcoming speakers for this fall. Next slide. So, we have two different series, and you can find pretty much everything I'm presenting today plus more on our website. A QR code at the end so you don't have to write this down. We have two forms of lectureship. The first one is a single lecture, where [indiscernible]. We also cover reception, dinner, and

accommodations to travel and all of that. And then, we have a second series where you can nominate a speaker for the messenger lecture where they give you three or six talks. It can be across multiple visits. And that's a \$10,000 or \$20,000 offer to the speaker plus all the extra costs also covered. And keep in mind that all of these speakers coming externally should be able to speak to a general campus audience. So, that's really what we're looking for is speakers who can kind of be both cross-disciplinary but also rise above the sort of means of their own research and details and appeal to multiple disciplines, multiple units, and also students. Next slide. So, to give you a taste of who is coming up and speakers that we have approved in the past. So, this semester and fall, we've got two university electric speakers. I'm not going to reiterate the details here, but you can see their-- their topics are pretty broad, and they're coming. You know, these are distinguished academics, both of them. Next slide, please. And then, we have two speakers in the messenger lecture series, both giving three talks over the course of the fall. And you can see the second one is still to be determined, but he's not an academic. So, this is all to say that the speakers to be nominated don't have to be academics. We actually love to see more non-academics, whether they're popular writers or even journalists, non-academic scientists, policymakers, anyone else. We're willing to consider a really broad range. Next slide. So, the process to nominee is coming up quickly, so I wanted to get this out there. We'd love to see a broader range of nominations coming. I think that's part of why we wanted to share these slides across campus. So, there's a two-step process. The first part is just sending an email to us with your own affiliation, a very brief description of who the speaker is that you want to nominate, some indication of what they might talk about and why it might be a good fit for coming to Cornell. This can just be a couple of sentences. And then, we meet as a committee shortly after, and then the speakers will let you know we're going to accept the full nomination package or if you have any sort of recommendations of things you might consider for your nomination package. And then, the nomination package is a bit more involved because it does require several letters of support from other faculty on campus. So, you as the nominator have to, you know, write your own sort of letters of support establishing why they should be nominated and why they make a good kind of general audience speaker. And then, you need, I think it's a minimum of three other letters from faculty and other units on campus. So, you do have to kind of coordinate that. And that's maybe the most involved part of this. And you propose the date. So, this can be good for up to two years into the future. Our series is pretty much booked for this academic year. So, if you propose anything, they're nominating this fall, starting next fall, or any time for two years up thereafter. Anything else I can mention? Yeah, slide please. Oh, I should say, you do need to talk to the speaker to make sure they want to come. That's a part of it. You can't nominate. I mean, I think people have done that, but we expect that if you're nominating someone, they have, you know, at least in principle, agreed they do want to come to Cornell and are available roughly at some time. So, you don't have to offer specific date at the time of nomination, but it does help if you can give us some sense of which semester or even which month they might be available to come so we don't have to chase that down later. So, there's more info here that you can share. Jill Short is our coordinator as well for all of this, so you'll be producing with her via email. And yeah, we will just return the nomination within a couple of weeks. After that, we also have a spring deadline, which will be February for the intent to nominate emails and have a full package due sometime in April. So, there's a kind of two-- yeah, two deadlines per year. I think that's it. Yeah, as I said, there's more info on our website, but we're hoping to just spread the word about the talks that we have coming up. We also have, I think, five different speakers lined up for spring, which are already on our website. I should also

say that we don't actually do most of the coordination once we approve the nominations. We give you the money or give it to your department. We do expect the host department to do most of the arranging in terms of booking the room and the travel, the accommodations, all of those things. But we're happy-- Because we want bigger audiences, we're happy to point you in the direction of which strengths on campus might be most appropriate or inappropriate. But we did help set that up. But it does fall into the departments too. So, yeah, we hope people take advantage. It's a lot of money, and it's a really great opportunity to bring really interesting, creative people to campus. We'd also love to see new ways for undergraduates to get involved. So, if you want to propose ways that they can have dinner with undergraduates or otherwise meet with them, it's also very welcome. So, I think that's it. Thank you so much.

SAM NELSON: Now I'd like to call, to speak about the AD White Professor at Large Selection Committee, Robert Weiss.

ROBERT WEISS: Good afternoon. My name is Bob Weiss. I'm the co-chair in the AD White Professor at Large Selection Committee. As you all probably know, this is a program that brings in really distinguished scholars and artists to campus to engage with our community. The program has a roster of 18 professors at large. They're spread across all disciplines, and they're appointed for six year periods, during which they make two week long immersive visits to campus and have other engagements during our appointments. Back to the next slide. Just wanted to highlight some of our upcoming activities for this fall. So, the mainstay of this program are these week-long visits by AD white professors, and the three individuals noted in the middle are participating in such visits. So, Dawn Upshaw is an opera singer. She's a rare combination of a Grammy winner and a MacArthur Award winner, and she is not going to sing. She's retired from singing, but she's going to speak and engage with singers, student singers. P Sainath is a journalist, writer, and activist who explores rural India in terms of agriculture, labor, and rural life. And then, Ellen Rothenberg is a immunologist and genomics expert. So, those three are coming for week-long visits, and then they're kind of bookended here by two kind of special mechanisms that we've implemented in recent years. So, James Balog is coming back as a return visitor. This is a new program that we've just established. We're going to term these legacy visits. So, he just completed his term as an AD White professor at large, actually last year, so his name might be familiar to you. He's a photographer, filmmaker, who's focused on climate, climate change, and sustainability. And he's coming back to give a keynote lecture and also to open up an exhibit at the Cornell Library on Glacial Science. And at the bottom, we have a new appointee to the AD White program, Kotch Voraakhom, who is a landscape architect and urban designer focused on climate resilience. She's coming through a mechanism we call mini visit. This is something we established as the pandemic kind of disrupted our ability to bring in visitors and we had a backlog of visits. And so, there's an opportunity for appointed professors at large to come for these short visits, typically two to three days. I can have the next slide. This just highlights our nomination process and timeline, which we're about to kick off. We're probably going to launch the call for nominations next week. Similar to what you just heard, we also have a two-step process. The first step is a pre-proposal, which is a letter by a nominator that describes the individual and the CD of the individual is also required. The committee reviews these three proposals primarily on the grounds of stature as a distinguished individual that is appropriate for this program with a bit of an eye to our talk, and they engage broadly on campus, but really the main criterion is the stature of the individual. And then, we invite-- the committee will then

invite candidates to go forward to a full nomination. So, the pre-proposals are going to be due toward the end of November, just before Thanksgiving. Invited full nominations are due toward the end of February. That's a slightly more involved process that includes letters of support from across campus and describes a little bit of what a visit would entail in terms of events, performances, lectures, classroom participation, etc. The nominee does not need to be involved at the pre-proposal stage, but does need to be involved and indicate a commitment to participating as part of a full nomination. And then, the committee then reviews those full nominations, and they go forward for institutional approval. Since these are professorial appointments, they go through the university's president and then board of trustees for final appointments. So, the newcomers would start on July 1st. If individuals are interested in nominating somebody or have questions about the process, we're going to have a Zoom info session on October 16th, and details about our visits, the nomination process, the Zoom session, that's all available. It will be available on the website. Similar to what you just heard, I think this is a really terrific opportunity. These are fully supported visits, so there's a generous honorarium, full support for all the activities throughout the week, and administrative support to assist in hosting individuals and mapping out their activities. So, at a time when we have some challenges to have resources to bring in people, this is a really great opportunity. I'd be grateful for senators then to help advertise this opportunity as well as our ongoing events. And then, the last slide just has some contact information for myself. Cindy Greco is a really outstanding program administrator who supports all the activities and does a really terrific job working with hosts and our visiting faculty. And I'll end there. And we look forward to hopefully seeing you at some of our events and leading nominations as well. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. And the next thing on the agenda is the Cornell AI Initiative update. We have Thorsten Joachims and Steve Jackson, both are vice presidents.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Yeah, thanks for having us. My name is Thorsten Joachims, and Steve Jackson is traveling. He's joining via Zoom. So, we want to get your feedback on the draft of the mission statement that we set up for the AI Initiative and that we're circulating, and I think you've seen this already, tell you about some of the activities and our support for both leaning into the opportunities with AI, but also with dealing some of the disruptions and the programs that we have for that, and then get your feedback also on strategy that we have that we're developing for providing AI tools in a private and secure way to the campus. All right, so let me step back a little bit. AI has been, you know, part of our research as a subject and teaching for many faculty on campus for many decades already. But 2023 with AI becoming part of consumer tools that are now widely available, AI now impacts the university in a much broader way. So, if I think about research, it's now also the research methodology that is impacted through these AI tools. Students bring these AI tools in the classroom, often to much disruption. University administration and processes there now more and more think about using AI and also how we engage with the public, and our mission in informing the public around technology now more and more centers around AI. So, if you think about these four pillars, how the university is organized normally, then AI comes in both as a subject now but also as a tool that influences how we work in these pillars. Now AI also cuts across, right? It doesn't sit in any of these pillars. And so, that was part of the rationale for creating this vice provost AI strategy office. So, to own some of the functions that don't sit in any of these pillars, like external communication partnerships and some of the cross cutting resources, but also to help coordinate work between

the pillars because each of these pillars actually provides resources that can kind of amplify and support the other pillars. So, for example, our research expertise, where we're a world leading research university, can help inform how the other pillars interact with AI. Education provides a lot, but it also provides training, not just for our students, but for our staff, faculty, and for the general public. Operations now are ever more important for providing secure infrastructure for AI, and our engagement channels provide pathways of actually getting our vision for AI out into the world. So, to coordinate all of this, I put together this AI Strategy Council as three levels, a leadership level, directors that actually run programs that support the campus, and the liaisons that tie us into the colleges, into the units, and also into the decision bodies. And for the Faculty Center, Gordon Pennycook is the liaison. Thanks. Now, the leaders of these pillars for education, that's Steve Jackson. He's been doing this work in AI and education for many years already. For research is Natalie Bazarova and Fei Wang. Our CIOs kind of lead the operations pillar, Ben Maddox and Vinay Varughese. Deborah Estrin coordinates external engagement. And Mike Moyer leads fundraising. So, I want to start with actually giving you some overview of the programs and activities that we have. And for that, again, it comes in that AI is both a tool and it's a subject. So, if I think about research, then what we want to amplify is the scholarship that supports our vision of AI. So, a couple of tools that we have for that is, for example, our thought summits. These are three-day convenings where we can bring local faculty, external faculty, foundations to campus to create in these new areas for AI first mover advantages. We are the convener. And so, these are five that we are going to run during this year. So, it ranges all the way from how can we understand animal communication in new ways to AI, understanding workers' voice and workplace impact, all the way to human AI collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking. We also have seed grants to get our faculty kind of a leg up for these funding opportunities that we know are coming out. We did one last fall on AI sustainability with Pattinson. We're currently running one on AI and society, especially getting our social science and humanities faculty in positions for these foundations calls that we know are coming out over the next two years and give them a leg up, form teams, and be ready for these calls. Then there is AI as a tool. So, in many disciplines, people are using AI as part of the research methodology. And we want to guide that this supports research integrity in a constructive way. So, we start up a standing committee chaired by Mark Hurwitz that is the first thing actually drafted an interim AI research integrity policy. I think this is coming to the Senate actually in a couple of weeks for you to see. It's kind of a minimum floor policy that applies to all the disciplines of what is responsible conduct. But we also recognize that the disciplines engage with AI in very different ways. And so, we are also creating a communities of practice for AI and research so that the different disciplines can set their own norms and set their own best practices in AI. And that's something we're rolling out this fall as well. For education, we have a similar setting with AI as a subject and AI as a tool. And I'll let Steve speak to that.

STEVE JACKSON: Sure. Thanks, Thorsten. Can you all hear me okay? Okay, great. So, all of this work-- This is a super quick summary of a lot of work that many of you will know about and have been involved in. All this comes from the AI Education Working Group, which is composed of faculty, staff, and students from all colleges, which has been operating since fall '24. Among new or newish things on the left, some of you will be aware of our AI critical literacy training, which all entering undergraduates of the university are going through this fall have gone through or are going through this fall. That's building on a very successful pilot with 1300 students in the spring. There is a already existing and forthcoming set of undergraduate

minors in AI. So, the AI minor, which is a more technical flavor, has been operating since 2024. And there's two additional flavors coming online soon or in the medium term future. One is a minor in AI and society. Another one is a minor in applied AI. And all of these programs are in conjunction with a lot of faculty across a lot of different parts of the university. Finally, as part of our larger literacy efforts, we are offering for the first time this fall, free AI literacy training and sessions to all Cornell alumni. So, those workshops will be launched at the Cornell-- what they call now the Cornell Volunteer Summit, used to be called TCAM, in a live form in October, and then will be made available online in live online workshops starting after that. On the other side, using the AI as a tool framework, we've been doing a lot of work for a long time around academic integrity for AI and some parts of what's coming up next in the agenda today. We'll speak to that as well. We have a new and/or expanded set of fellows programs. So, we launched in small scale our undergraduate and AI fellows program this past spring. We've expanded it this fall with some additional gift support. This is both providing support at the class level, but also a very significant research function. So, the students are running some fairly large scale studies on AI and learning across the university. Many of you will know about our AI Experimenter Faculty Fellows Program. We have 33 fantastic folks from, again, from across the university. Our first meetings with those cohorts, two different cohorts, is starting next week. And again, this follows our balanced leaning in and leaning out approach. And we see both of these represented in the cohort set, which is great. A new thing that you will be hearing more about this fall is basically adding a fellows layer at the graduate postdoctoral level, what we're calling the summer teaching lab, which will be attached to experimental teaching and connected to school of continuing education offerings this coming summer, summer '27. And finally, we are in discussion with deans of all colleges around a series of college AI pilots, which looks a little bit in very short form like what you see described here. The idea is to take one core thing in teaching in your college that could be changed or perhaps is being challenged by the presence of AI in learning and work with a small cohort of faculty, three to five, some significant research support in the form of an embedded researcher who can help assess what's happening in that space, and use that as a pilot or a test to see what can be happening, what might be happening in your colleges in the future. All of this work has really been supported by gift funding that we've managed to secure over the past few months. Next slide, and back to Thorsten.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Yeah, thanks, Steve. We have similar programs also for operations and administration and for external engagement. I'll skip through those. We don't have enough time, but I'm happy to take questions on those and walk through those. And you'll find all of this also on our website. So, I think you already get the idea from the programs what we see as our mission, and we try to wind it up, and that's what we shared as a mission statement. Great to get your feedback to actually match the language. You get the idea that what we both want is we want to advance the scholarship in AI and actually define what it means to be ethical and human-centered in AI, and that's where we are really supporting you in your scholarship, but then also provide really practical programs and resources to meet the opportunities and challenges in AI and trying to keep the balance between those two. There's going to be feedback. I mean, I'm happy to take questions and feedback at the end. There's also email at the end where you can reach me directly and provide feedback. One place where we do want to get additional feedback is also our strategy for providing AI tools in a secure way to the campus. So, we've talked about these programs that really often actually use AI tools. So, how do we actually set up a technical infrastructure that provides these tools in a secure privacy preserving way and that also generates

equity to everybody? So, maybe we start with what's our current state of what we provide to the campus. So, we provide Microsoft Copilot, which is a chat tool. If you've tried it, it's good for some things, but let's say it has limited capabilities. We do, for pay, provide part code and co-work for a very secure mechanism. It's very privacy preserving, but it's also a complex setup. We've been able to offer that to a few hundred people, but that's about the way that we can scale this. Now, what people have done is they've gone around us, right? If you think about-- I mean, if you talk to your colleagues, students, and staff, they've been licensing tools around us, typically consumer licenses, And so, that creates uneven access. And also, we don't actually have a common platform that people can build upon. So, if you actually wanted to use it in a class, you would actually basically have to ask students to buy something and would come back as course. Equally big problem is that nobody will use these licenses carefully that now bring these AI tools onto campus, right? So, we don't know what the privacy guarantees are. We don't know whether we're leaking information and providing training data for these companies. And there's security vulnerabilities that comes with that. So, the current state actually leads to unequal access, limits visibility and our ability to govern, and also creates substantial risks for security, privacy, and compliance. So, our strategy is to actually try to bring everybody on a secure platform that we provide to the university. And to be able to do that, we actually have to provide attractive options, and we have to provide choice. So, we are exploring to actually offer multiple tools that people can pick from and make sure that they come under enterprise licenses that our lawyers have reviewed and that conform to our standards for privacy. To improve access, everybody would get a small token budget that they can use for experimentation. And we would give faculty and staff access first, and later to the students as well. By negotiating these enterprise licenses, we can actually get substantial discounts. So, no longer paying like the list price that people are currently paying to get the tool. It's also very important to us that we don't go with a single company. We want to create not this kind of vendor lock-in that two years from now, when the next price negotiations come up, we don't get the same discounts anymore. We're going to keep our options open and also hedge against uncertainty. It's a very volatile stage. We don't know how this is going to play out. But very importantly, we really want to get everybody on a governable platform that has our privacy, security, and compliance guarantee that we need. By doing that, we can also, for the first time, actually track usage. And that's very important for our sustainability. We can also require that people to get access to these tools. They actually have to go through a training, and I believe that's very important as well. And then, you know, there's additional training that we would also provide and actually have all of these programs that we've talked about before that can then build on these tools and really get to this point that we want to enable community-driven experimentation around all of this in research, education, and all of the other disciplines. With that, back to Steve.

STEVE JACKSON: Just very quickly, I wanted to mention an event coming up next week, which you've been seeing some email about and hopefully signage around campus. This is our first ever Cornell Unplugged event. You can see the idea. A week in September, we invite students, faculty, and staff to go offline, off-screen, off-tech to the fullest extent possible. And the fullest extent is within the realm of personal possibility. So, there's a variety of reasons behind this. One is known effects between tech use and overuse, social isolation, disconnection, and challenges to well-being. One is effects on teaching and learning, in particular, concerns around distraction in the classroom, where tech is what we have come to describe as the secondhand screen problem, where tech is acting as a distraction to students and students'

neighbors. And then, finally, the environmental impact of tech and AI and increasing awareness and fluency around these questions. This work is coming out of the new Sustainable Computing Working Group, which you can see here, and some other partners, Sustainable Cornell, Campus Nature RX, and the Center for Teaching Innovation. Next slide, please. So, here's how you can engage this process. One is we have this thing calling the unplugged pledge. It's basically just a survey. It says what you are thinking that you might do or are interested to do, your goals and intentions for tech reduction that week. That could be an hour. It could be a night. It could be a day. We'll be looking at those pledge data to see what people have claimed. We're also going to look at campus Wi-Fi traffic data to see if we've moved the needle on that at all. You can think about teaching in your classroom that week and whether alternate teaching arrangements would make sense, either as a mode of delivery or as topical questions. Consider and communicate alternate work arrangements. So, if you've emailed me recently, you'll have seen this auto reply, which is also a sneaky way of advertising Cornell Unplugged. Of course, partake in events. Enjoy this yourself. And then finally, maybe the most important part is just talk with people about this. This is meant to foster a conversation around campus. It's meant to foster conversations between faculty and students, and between students and students, and between faculty and faculty. So, one of the most important things we can be doing right now is talking with each other and talking with our students around questions of tech and AI use in our teaching, in our research, and in our general lives. So, please do lean into this if you would like. And with that, why don't we wrap things up and take some questions, Thorsten?

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Yeah, this is just a thank you to lots of people involved in making these programs happen. And this is also contact information here. There's the website that has more information about everything that I talked about. And also emails, how we can reach us, either Steve and me directly or the AI Initiative as a group. Thank you.

SAM NELSON: Are there any questions from the audience? And please state your name and your department.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Thank you for the presentation. It's impressive just how thoughtful it is. I really appreciate that. I also appreciate the emphasis on ethical questions that really should come out of the university. The question I have has to do with, I believe, some of the operations about strategic partnerships. And my question and concern has to do with partnerships with for-profit corporations and the kind of conflict of interest that can occur with that. It's not a new issue. It's been an issue for many years with biotechnology and those kind of strategic partnerships with corporations, patenting, licensing, etc. And so, I'd also like to couple that with the plan that the Trump administration has now put out to shift federal funding to for-profit corporations, and particularly with regard to AI and not to give as much federal funding or maybe any to universities. And so, it seems to me that the potential for the conflict of interest here is very great with partnerships with for-profit corporations, particularly as they end up having the power to control the money. So, I appreciate some thoughts on that.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Yeah, no, I think this is a great point. I think this is very complex evolving situations, both our relationship with the government and our relationship with industry. Yeah, I mean, in the past, we've had these relationships and, you know, in biotechnology and computing, you know, companies have been our customer. We've been customers of these

companies like Google, Microsoft for a long time. They provide some of-- Amazon AWS provides much of our infrastructure. So, in a sense, it's not new. Maybe the scale and the fluidity of the situation is new. You know, finding also how industry rearranges around us is right now not clear. I fully agree with the concerns. I think we really have to lean into how we've managed some of these relationships in the past and not create like direct dependencies, let's say, for our research. Our research mission has to stay independent. And I think part of the strategy here, also not locking us into a particular company, is that we have the ability to walk away. And I think we always have to keep that ability. We actually have a credible threat that we can walk away if we are not locked up.

SAM NELSON: Come on down.

PAUL GINSBURG: [Indiscernible] So, you know, seeing the models of last November or game changers, there was another set of game changers in July of what we see, but what's in the pipeline is something else. You know, the rate of development is accelerating. So, I'm just wondering-- I don't mean this as an unfair question because it's something that we're all concerned about. To what extent are you worried that you're dealing with such a moving target? And to what extent do you think you can base your policies on general principles? I don't mean that disparagingly. And to what extent do you have members of your committee constantly on task looking at what follow-through capabilities are?

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: We do. And so, I think part of the principles of the strategy is really to lean into the community-driven experimentation. It's nothing-- I mean, it's really-- It's a very fast moving field. It moves in different places at different speeds also. So, you know, came out over the last few days in terms of the improving, right, and new developments. I think the best-- So, the current, the best strategy that we can have, and that's what we're following, is to have this bottom up approach that we actually really engage with the community and help us kind of be nimble and adapt. I think, you know, creating a three-year strategy is just impossible, right? It's actually potentially easier to create a 20-year strategy, and that's what the Future of the American University is doing, really think about the long-term perspective. But I would argue this place that we're currently in with AI, we just have to be nimble. We have to be adaptive. We have to be quick in rolling out programs, right? And creating the structures for doing that, that's kind of what we're trying to do.

SAM NELSON: Great. Right here.

JANE WANG: Very helpful. Thank you. My question is kind of related to--

SAM NELSON: Excuse me. Could you state your name and--

JANE WANG: My name is Jane Wang, Physics. I'm super curious about this rapid progress, especially given the news we all heard yesterday about [Indiscernible] solution. As a faculty, I find that our students are much more adaptive to the fast, rapid tools, whereas faculty are very sluggish. I'm speaking for myself.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Present company excluded.

JANE WANG: And here, you have this fantastic AI institute, and I was wondering what efforts you can make to educate faculty just so that we are informed. And perhaps I was thinking maybe I'll open the courseware like MIT open course, and I have the material always available when we need. I would love to get training on this, but I'm not sure if there is a central access.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: There is actually quite a lot of material available already through eCornell, and I think we just need to make it visible and provide more guidance for that. The other thing, I think actually really leaning into the PhD students. So, we were just talking about how to set up that Communities of Practice program. I think it's going to be the PhD students who are going to be the ones that are actually taking some of the leadership roles in developing norms and best practices around this. I think they have the most hands-on experience with this. And I would hope that the PhD students then also engage with the faculty in these conversations, where faculty have the experience and the kind of big picture for where the field is going and what are kind of acceptable academic integrity policies for that particular discipline. And the PhD students can be the ones who are actually, you know, on a day-to-day basis engaging with AI tools and can be the drivers from that perspective. So, we're trying to bring these two perspectives together.

JANE WANG: [Indiscernible].

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Yeah, absolutely. And some of the things like, you know, if you wanted to get access to one of these agenda tools, you will have to go through that in the training.

CSABA CSAKI: Hello, my name is Csaba Csaki. I'm in physics, and I was very happy to hear all the efforts about trying to get this conference into big companies because over the last few months, those of us in company and in research are feeling that without those tools, we are actually getting left behind. So, it's no longer a choice, it's a must. And essentially, what is happening is that everybody is buying his or her own access to Claude or ChatGPT, and it will be really wonderful. It will provide some sort of organized access to some of the best models. Of course, it's not going to be free, but if they want to have some sort of a platform where they know that they always get the best.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: So, that's the plan. But I would say that it may be a must in some disciplines, but it's not a must in others.

CSABA CSAKI: Our discipline in physics, we can feel-- A year ago, it may not be a must, but now I see that it is a must.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: We want to give the option to everybody to engage and the option to take advantage of these tools. But we're also very careful to recognize that some disciplines engage with AI in a very different way. So, it's really just providing a platform with options.

CSABA CSAKI: Do you have an advice?

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: For providing these tools?

CSABA CSAKI: Yes.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Tomorrow, ideally. [Laughter]

SAM NELSON: Thank you. I don't see any further questions, and I think we should move on to the next agenda. Thank you.

THORSTEN JOACHIMS: Oh, let me maybe add I'm staying also afterwards here if you want to talk to me afterwards. And feel free to also distribute the slides in the departments.

SAM NELSON: Thank you. Okay. Great. So, the next agenda item is on academic integrity. I'd like to ask Liz Karns to come forward and talk about academic integrity initiatives.

LIZ KARNS: OK. Let's see, which one of these-- I'm here to talk about the other AI. I have some updates and also a request to view the senators. We'll go to the next slide. So, last May, this body passed the resolution to update the Academic Integrity Code. It was the first major overhaul in several decades maybe. And these are the four big things that changed. You can look through the code to find a lot more detail. But the first one is that we updated the examples to include tech in the classroom. That's a really big piece that we wanted to make sure was included, our new first time violator warning and workshop option. I'll talk about that in a moment. The new tool for central reporting, which replaces the old, sometimes email, sometimes paper trails that were shared with recorders. And also, we specifically include graduate students in some of the different aspects of the academic integrity code, while other parts of graduate students are excluded. Next slide. Okay, the accepting responsibility initiative is our warning and workshop, right? It's only for first time violators. This means that they come to-- they're given this choice of either coming to the workshop or attending a primary hearing. Students do choose to do a primary hearing sometimes. It is not that uncommon. We've run this for the last two years, and we've had a great recidivism rate, about 1% in the pilot. And we found that instructors like it, students like it. It seems to be an overall win for the university. One of the things that's really delightful is that when we're in these workshops, which are very small, six to eight people, students come in and they're really shut down. They're like, "I don't want to meet anybody's eyes." And by the end of the hour, they're all talking, they're sharing information, they're laughing, they're interacting with the facilitators. They don't feel ashamed of being there. I wouldn't say it's a point of pride yet, but it is certainly something where we're seeing growth among the students. It's a good thing. It's now going to be available for all students on the Ithaca and Cornell Tech campuses, not for online courses though. So, we have facilitators specifically for each of these groups. We know that the masters and PhD students are very different than the undergrads. So, the masters students-- We talk a lot about workplace, right? What are workplace ethics? How do your choices that you make right now impact your habits for work later on? Similar for the PhD students. We talk more about research and publishing choices that they make there. And I think this is another one of the important parts of the program is that we're talking to them about their future lives. Academic integrity is a blip in their life. College is a blip, right? But the habits that they create here will last. So, this is our opportunity to get in there and sort of change some of those habits. Next slide, please. Here's my request for you. I would like you to

go to the departments, to your constituents, and review a slideshow that we've prepared. It's a narrated slideshow. Runs like an old-fashioned film strip, right? So, somebody can say beep if they want. You click the button and it rolls. And then, it pauses so that you can discuss that slide and move on forward. The idea is to have faculty figure out what are the norms within their department for academic integrity. This really matters for what we call minor violations. What is eligible for accepting responsibility? So, for instance, unauthorized use of AI. About half, maybe, of our cases are about that, but actually half are also old fashioned cheating. And what might be considered an egregious problem in one department, maybe is a minor problem in another department. It's fine to have variation across departments, but within departments, we'd like to see some consistency, right? So, that's a discussion we'd like to have you bring to the department, get them talking about it, and get them to participate in this really big shift, right? It's a pretty big change that we're asking the faculty to make. And it's not going to work unless the faculty actually take the initiative and start making the reports. We also have our new academic integrity registry violation reporting tool. And you could walk through that with them. We have lots of materials prepared for you that you can use in this setting or you can direct people to. They're on the Dean of Faculty website. And you can always, you know, ask me also to help you find stuff. Next slide. These are the resources I want you to know that might be different. All of them are on the Dean of Faculty website. What is the updated code? What does it look like? We asked our students to read it. I urge you all to read it too. Advice for instructors. This includes both assessing and accepting responsibility type of case, as well as how to do the preliminary investigation prior to a primary hearing. How do you gather that evidence? What is the standard of evidence? How do I assess it? And then finally, these are all linkable, the academic integrity reporting tool itself. Okay, I think we have lots of time for questions if anybody has them. Oh, and I want to say that we have our first two cases, right? So, one came on September 1st, first report, and the second one a few days after that. So, it's working.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering, with a long history of working with academic integrity hearing board, chairing the EPC, working on the code, etc. Okay, I have a question and a comment. The question is-- And you can wait until after my comment to answer the question. The question is, where did these facilitators come from for the workshops, and how did they learn how to facilitate? Okay, who are they? Second is a comment. Okay, you asked for uniformity inside a department. You're not going to see that. You're going to see uniformity in instructors actions, instructor standards, and in an individual course. I know examples. For example, in computer science where two versions of the intro programming course had different rules. The fall version had one set of rules, spring version had another set of rules, and that caused an awful lot of confusion with students who, say, dropped the fall version halfway through, thought they were working under the fall rules in the spring, but they weren't. You know, that kind of thing. So, I'm just cautioning you that you're not going to see uniformity across the inside of the department. It's going to be course level.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I think that's a really good point. The course level is important. And the issue of-- I'm not looking for uniformity. I'm looking for at least [Indiscernible] consistency, not really these are our rules. How do we find our facilitators? And how do we train them? Great question. We now have nine facilitators, including one at Cornell Tech. We started out by reaching out to the philosophy department, where they train students in ethics. And we found several really good facilitators there. And then, we've added on a few people since then. Right

now, we opened it up to a broader group, sort of by referral. So, that's how we got the rest of the folks. Two of them are staff members because we wanted to have people who could do facilitating, facilitate workshops when it was the crunch time and the students weren't available. And how do we train them? Another great question. Actually, I will be skipping out of here pretty soon because I'm going to our first facilitator discussion group. If they're not doing workshops, we are doing essentially a journal club where we read different articles and talk about moral development and cheating as a discipline, right? We also do-- We train them through both, you know, going through the procedures. They observe one workshop. Then they lead a workshop with another person there, another facilitator there. And we'll see how it goes. I mean, certainly as we grow the program, we'll get all sorts of things. More questions? We have any online?

SAM NELSON: I didn't see any. Let me double check.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Okay, but this is a serious request for you. I would like it if you were all on the faculty meeting agendas this semester, right? I will be checking.

SAM NELSON: I think we're all set. Thank you very much. Thank you. All right, now on to the next agenda item, Proposed Faculty Senate Procedure for Committee Referral. Chris Schaefer, 10 minutes.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Okay, next slide. So, good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to propose kind of a change in a broad approach of how the Senate handles business that comes to it. The goal of this is to really allow for more substantive nuance and preparation before the Senate starts to consider debating and making actions. So, the idea would be to have everything that comes before the Senate first be referred to a committee. The committee, Senate committees, these are folks who have expressed interest in some particular topic, the jurisdiction of the committee. The committee has time to gather evidence, to interview people, to consider possible policy implementations and alternatives. And the idea is that the committee would bring that in-depth work back to the Senate, which would allow the Senate to have more depth, more nuance, more facts when it starts to consider an issue. This isn't meant to be constraining either to the sponsor of an issue or to the committee. The committee would act independently. So, if the committee and the sponsor were on board, they could collaboratively mark the issue up to try to just make it better. If the sponsor and the committee were really on opposite sides of an issue, it could be very healthy in the sense that then the sponsor would come to the Senate with the issue. The committee would come with an opposite perspective on the issue, and we would have the substantive ground for a healthy debate to decide the right path forward. And then, the hope is that this limits real Senate debate on clear, substantive choices where we're not sort of having to say, "Have we checked this? Do we know these facts?" Those issues can be resolved at the committee level. So, next slide. So, this is how we sort of envisioned it coming. When something is brought to the Senate, it would come to the Dean of Faculty. And then, the university faculty committee would look at the issue and try to make a judgment about which committee or committees would make the most sense to view it. We would then send the issue to that committee, and materials would be posted. So, the sponsor materials, as well as the routing decision by the UFC would all be posted on the pending matters website. Critically, Dean of Faculty and the chair of the referral committee would agree on a timeline, where we would look

at both timeliness of the issue and the complexity of the issue to try to create a reasonable timeline for review. The committee would then gather input and develop its analysis or response. And I want to emphasize here that the committee acts independently, so it could really do anything. With the sponsor's permission, this could be a collaborative markup with the committee. If the sponsor wasn't interested in this, but the committee was aligned, the committee could just produce a report making recommendations. If the committee was really opposed, the committee could tee up its own resolution. That was, as I said, an opposition. Once the committee finishes the report, that would come back to the UFC, final materials would be posted, and we would schedule the issue at the next available Senate meeting. And then, at the Senate meeting, the sponsor would present the issue, the committee would then add analysis, and then that's where we would begin Senate debate and deliberations. Next slide. So, there's several things that can be concerning about this kind of referral to committee procedure. So, one is that it can create unreasonable delays in timeline percent of action. So, this will create a little bit of a delay of that committee taking time to look at it, fixed time. But I think, critically, we'll agree on a timeline at the time of referral. And that agreed upon timeline would be some negotiation to balance the urgency and the complexity of the issue. Critically, neither the Dean of Faculty, the UFC, or the committee can use this process as a pocket veto. So, if a deadline is missed, then the matter moves forward without those materials. As it's written, the UFC can approve a limited time extension. I would envision that meeting in agreement between the UFC sponsor and the committee. So, everybody agrees we're going to take just a little bit more time. In the absence of that agreement, the matter would move forward with the materials available at the next meeting if a deadline is missed. The other place where this referral to committee procedure can cause problems is when there are urgent moving things that the Senate needs to consider more quickly. So, we would build in some flexibility for urgent matters. The UFC would be able to advance a matter directly to the Senate. If it chose to do that, then the justification for skipping committee referral and bringing things straight to the Senate would be explicit and transparent and posted. And then, the other thing I think that helps this process avoid some of the major concerns is we'll try to maximize transparency. So, we'll post materials, the proposals, referral rationale, sponsor and committee reports, and we will welcome comments from the Cornell community. And I would, for example, direct the committee to look at those comments in preparing those reports. So, that's sort of the idea. Jill, if we could go back to the previous slide just to kind of have the flow up here. And I'd be very interested to hear if anyone has questions, concerns, or comments.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government. We're a deliberative democratic body. We have very little influence over the agenda of the things that we discuss. One of the few, very few, routes that we have for opening the agenda, the faculty said it concerns the faculty senate resolutions. And I think anything that further reduces that by-- and it's been reduced over the years. It's been compromised, it's been biased. Anything that further reduces that, I think is-- we should examine carefully. Now, I welcome Chris's point, his observation, this amendment, that nothing in this proposal is intended to constrain the right and ability of faculty senators and faculty at large, because they can also sponsor faculty senate resolutions to do that. In that spirit of recognizing no constraint, I'd like to offer an amendment to the procedure. This would be a new section, section six, and it reads like this, "Provided that nothing in this proposal shall prevent a faculty-sponsored resolution from being considered at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate following its submission." All that does is guarantee the resolution to be sponsored by the faculty will be put on the agenda regardless of the other procedures that Chris has outlined. So,

that's the proposed amendment to this proposal. Thank you.

HADAS RITZ: Sorry, are we going back and forth between Zoom and in-person? [Crosstalk] I apologize. Can we go to the Zoom?

HADAS RITZ: Yeah, thanks. Hadas Ritz, Duffield RTE Senator. I think that this-- I have had the feeling as a senator that kind of things come up at a faculty meeting, and suddenly we're voting, and I don't feel like I've had a lot of time to deliberate or understand the issue before me. So, I kind of welcome a process that would increase that kind of depth of the deliberation. I would like to make sure that when pending matters are posted that it's kind of well known that there's an issue that's going to be considered and discussed. So, for example, I don't know if the dean of faculty's office is going to continue with the Monday messages or something like that, but it would be nice if when matters enter this kind of pending, I don't, sorry, I don't remember the name of the process, but if it's kind of well advertised, not just to the Senate, but to the faculty at large that there's something that's about to be considered to give people time to kind of get up to speed on it. I think that would be beneficial to the process.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. Hadas, thank you. That's a wonderful suggestion. I think what we'll do is we'll work out what would be a standard flow of information about an idea. When it comes to us, what do we do? Yes, post it, notify senators, then we refer. You know, we'll work through a standard process like that. And then, we include early notification that this is something that's coming up and senators should inform themselves. Thank you.

PHILIP NICHOLSON: Phil Nicholson, Astronomy. Mostly just a point of information here. I like the policy as a whole, and I think it will make things clearer what we are going to be debating in the future and presumably give us some concrete facts to base that on. My point of information was, is this one or several standard commitments that you're envisioning that would be changed periodically? Or is it a completely ad hoc committee process where, depending on the motion that's made, you look at the people that said they might be interested in you put together on the spot and ad hoc committee discuss that particular issue.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Great. Thank you, Phil, for the question. Again, Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. So, I think we would first look at the existing standing committees in the Senate, like the Educational Policy Committee, the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee. I can rattle that off now. Been in the job long enough. So, we would first look to see if an existing standing committee had the appropriate expertise in order to be able to review the issue because I think that would tend to strengthen the Senate committees. In a case where we have something really unusual, yes, the UFC could stand up an ad hoc committee. But my preference would really be for us to undergo a review of existing Senate committees, assessing their jurisdiction and areas of coverage, and looking to see if we have appropriate standing committees to be able to handle the diversity of issues that come before the Senate as a bit of a preview of initial aspects of that discussion. And this is just my opinion at this point, but looking at existing Senate committees, I could see a need for a new Senate committee on research and scholarship that focused on infrastructure and other kinds of issues that support our academic work. I could also envision a committee on-- a faculty committee on student life that assess

things like the North and West campus programs, faculty input on campus code, and issues like that. So, I think the broad goal would be to establish a committee structure in the Senate that was a well-oiled machine for being able to receive these referrals, handle them in a thoughtful and timely manner, and return their work product to the Senate.

PHILIP NICHOLSON: Sounds sensible.

SAM NELSON: Looking just to make sure to see. Okay. Oh yes, go ahead, Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Thank you. Laurent Dubreuil, Senator for Comparative Literature. There are few motivations that I could agree with, I think, behind the proposal that is presented to us. I mean, more transparency would be good since the UFC has a large discretion about what is going to be discussed in the Senate meeting. The desire to, let's say, give a bit more voice or representation to the standing committees and the wish to have an informed decision when we vote. I mean, all of that, I think, is not really controversial. But given that we are already in a strange situation, calling ourselves a Senate, not being able to even set up the agenda of what we discuss, because the UFC is the body that in fact determines what is worth discussing, what is not worth discussing, even if there is a large support behind a resolution, or because the UFC can delay, which happens all the time, the discussion of something so that it would not be handled timely, it seems to me that having another review by another committee is not in fact a way to enhance, strengthen, or liberate the process of discussion, but it's really an additional hurdle that will inevitably, despite all the best intentions in the world, that will inevitably lead to smaller entries in terms of resolutions. And I know that some people would like the faculty senate to be less active in what the senate wants to discuss, that we would mainly be there to receive the words being sent to us, for instance, by the whole, and then we would see what is best and what is not good. It seems to me that we are really moving, continuing to move away from the democratic structure that maybe is no longer really something that exists, but that still constitutes a horizon, let's say.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. Laurent, thank you so much for those comments. I guess I will say, no intention of this being a mechanism that would prevent any issue from coming before the Senate. And when an issue is timely, we would-- You know, when there is time pressure on an issue, we would aim to bring it before the Senate as quickly and as timely as possible. The goal here is really to add more information and more analysis to things before the Senate starts to act on them so that when we are dealing, especially with a controversial issue where we have views that are-- the Senate has views that are not aligned with the administration, that that perspective is now grounded and backed by deep substantive analysis and nuance, which I hope will enable us to be more effective in driving our agenda. I heard you comment about this being a way to potentially pivot the Senate to being more of a listening and distribution body and avoiding controversy. To be clear, I don't think shared governance is the avoidance of controversy at all. I think this is the body where we should be talking about controversial things. I'm simply suggesting that when it's controversial, it's even more important for us to slow down, take the time to get the substantive details and the nuance right. And that's the vision.

OMAR BA: Thank you. Oumar Ba, Senator from the Government Department. I do appreciate

the effort at the transparency, the efficiency as well. My worry, because some of the concern that's been expressed, is that this room must remain a deliberative space. This is where the voice of the faculty must be heard, and we get to deliberate, discuss, and vote. I wonder if these extras there will weaken that role that we must have, especially because some committee members will have to decide, ultimately, what we get to have the opportunity to debate, discuss, and vote on. So, this is my concern. Thank you.

RAYNA KALAS: Rayna Kalas, Literatures and English. I appreciate the spirit of the proposal and see both arguments for and against doing this. One concern I want to raise is that having chaired a faculty committee in the past, I'm worried that this would put those committees a little on the back foot to things that are happening in the Senate rather than having the capacity to be doing their own work, which in the case of the committee I was on, the Financial Policies Committee, ended up being a lot of investigative work and information gathering work that, had we been responding to the Senate a lot, we would have been prevented from doing. So, I'd like to suggest that you open up the possibility of having a standing committee that would be an option for research, should the Senate request further information or consultation.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer, Dean of Faculty. Thank you for that comment. I will say one thing. I was similarly concerned about potential workload for the committees. I've met with all the committee chairs and socialized the ideas with them, and there is broad enthusiasm across the current slate of committee chair.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Again, you know, I think there's wide agreement that we want well-informed discussions and that transparency is good. I also like the idea of some of our committees being very active in Senate and governance generally. But, you know, I think that the concerns that are being raised about things getting bogged down and, you know, even less control over the agendas, you know, I think those are very real concerns. So, it seems to me that, you know, one thing that we could do there is to pick up on some of the pieces we've heard, like Richard's idea of course, basically is giving the sponsors of the resolution a choice about putting it right on the agenda or sending it to a committee. So, that would be one way to do it. The other thing would be to think about having relevant Senate committees weigh in, but not before the full Senate sees a resolution, right? You can put the resolution on the agenda, you know, right away, and then I'm assuming we're still going to have the same process of two meetings before something is voted on. And so, then the Senate could see the resolution to begin with, have a discussion. It might be that people say this, and somebody noted we'd like some more information on this. Are there committees who might weigh in? And then the committees, it doesn't have to be just one, it could be the committees, any that see this as relevant could weigh in, put this information. Hadas said, "Let's make sure everybody knows the information is there well before a meeting so that, you know, notice to go out, please read this." And then, you know, I think that could actually address some of the concerns. It's just changing the place where some Senate committees come in. And I'd also just note that we're often in a position where, because there is so little transparency in how the university is running out of Day Hall, whether it's about the agreement with the Trump administration or other kinds of issues that we're really concerned with, because especially right now, you know, this kind of process that the Dean of Faculty is proposing, I think could work better if we had more openness and time to address things. But oftentimes we find things out at the last minute, so we really do have

resolutions that come up that are really, you know, time sensitive. So, rather than saying, "Well, which ones are time sensitive and which ones aren't," we could give people the choice about whether to put things on the agenda, and then also allow for that time for the next meeting to have more input.

SAM NELSON: Okay, there's no more comments. I'd like to call Chris up for the next agenda item as well.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you all for that healthy debate. We will take this back to UFC and consider it. So, next slide. So, I think Adam is on Zoom, but just a huge word of thanks to Adam Smith, the chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee and the members of the Nominations and Elections Committee. These are the slate of folks who were nominated and agreed to serve across all of the various senate committees. Next slide. A few announcements. So, Senators, you've heard a couple of times today requests that you go and go back to your departments and provide information and get feedback. This is a serious request. So, Dean of Faculty's office, we want to help make you look really good in your department. We want to have you in front of your department talking about issues that have come up at the Senate on a basically monthly basis through the course of the academic year. So, we're going to try to make this really easy. We're going to make you look good. So, a few things that are going to happen. You will get a summary of this meeting that Jill and I will put together. I'm going to ask that you look through that summary editorialize it, add your opinions, add your notes about facts in here that you think are most relevant to your constituency and to your department, and then send that to everybody in your department. We will also be preparing a separate slide deck. It'll have, for example, this set of slides that Liz talked about that has her giving a talk on the academic integrity stuff. You can also just give the talk yourself. We'll have some slides on there about the upcoming university and messenger lectures. We could advertise those to your members in your department and talk with them about what upcoming deadlines are. So, we really want you just make it a habit, have a 15 minute slot scheduled in your faculty meeting shortly after each faculty senate meeting. And we will be sending information that we would like you to present. Of course, you're free to add anything else that you find from the Senate meeting that would be useful to your colleagues. And we'll occasionally be asking you to bring back information or direct your faculty to go do things. So, this is an exciting new role as a Faculty Senate. I hope everyone will embrace it with enthusiasm. So, this week, there'll be the upcoming university and messenger lectures, and encourage you to have exactly the lengthy debate that is recommended about the new accepting responsibility and the academic integrity reporting tools. In particular, trying to have a discussion with your department about when violations would be most appropriate for the accepting responsibility. Updates on a few issues that were brought to the Senate last year. So, towards the end of the spring semester, all of the assemblies passed a resolution encouraging a phase out of single-use plastics across the university. The president is standing up a committee to assess this. One of the things that I've been working hard on with in communications to the university administration is asking them to reach out to the Dean of Faculty's office when they are looking for faculty members to serve on these ad hoc committees that are stood up to deal with all kinds of different issues. So, in this case, the president's office has agreed, and the nominations and elections committee is currently looking at this and developing-- In fact, I think we just sent a list of faculty from the nominations and elections committee to the president's office for their consideration. I'm hoping to make this a standard

process for staffing committees.

SAM NELSON: There's someone with a question. Do you want to take that at the end or now?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: No, we can take the question now. That's fine. Go ahead.

LINDA CANINA: I'm assuming that's me. I have a suggestion. You were talking about having us bringing the discussion to our faculty, you know, write something up, putting our edits in, having a meeting with our faculty, getting their perspectives. I think then we should take it and send it to you. Or how do we incorporate their impressions into the discussion after the fact, if we don't send it in somewhere?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Thank you. Especially when we're directly looking for feedback on an issue, we will have a way for that feedback to be submitted. And short of that, anything that comes up, I would really appreciate folks to reach out to me directly, as that would be the best way for me to stay on top of them. Ryan LeVarney recently reached out, and we will be, through the nominations and elections committee, recommending faculty members for the campus codes committee that would be embarking on a review of campus code going forward. Extension professor track, which passed the Senate last spring is now on the agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting in October. Next slide. There was a resolution passed back in January, February, looking to establish a committee to review policy 6.4 and associated grievance policies. So, that committee was established over the summer and began its work then. You can see the committee members here. Avery shared with me that I could report that this committee has established the scope of things that they need to revise and are working through ideas about how to improve those processes now. Recommendations of that committee will come back to the Faculty Senate. Last thing, I'd like to remind folks about the faculty soup. So, this is every weekday in the first floor of the Statler around lunchtime. You can buy tickets down in the cafeteria, in the basement of the Statler. On Fridays, I hold a walk in office hours at the Dean of Faculty Soup. You'll see a baby bear with my little sign that says Dean of Faculty office hours. Please feel free to drop by and bring any issue you'd like to discuss. I'm there every Friday, unless they announce otherwise. And finally, an announcement, we'll have roughly monthly these pop-up soups. So, on those days, we won't have soup at the Statler, but instead we'll have a little event somewhere else on campus. Several of these this semester will also be coupled with tours of local things. So, on September 22nd, we'll have one in Mann Library that will be followed with a tour of the "From the Brink" exhibit that's examining biodiversity, impacts of climate change, and other things on biodiversity. We have some of these-- We'll have one in the Synchrotron, I believe in November, with a tour of the Synchrotron and a couple of others. One's going to be in Sage Hall and one's for us, I forgot. Next slide.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Quick question? You have to have tickets for those?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: There was a quick question about needing tickets for the pop-up soups. You do not need tickets for the pop-up soups. They are first-come, first-serve, true soup kitchen style. You walk up and get your soup. I think that's it. We have time for a couple of quick questions.

SAM NELSON: Any more questions? We're just about out of time. I don't think there's any online as well. So, I'd like to ask for someone to move to adjourn the meeting. Second. Great. Meeting adjourned. Thank you.