Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
May 7, 2025

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Good afternoon. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, emeritus professor and professor of architecture. We start with the land acknowledgement. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogo̱hó꞉nǫ people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, our meeting is called to order here in G10 biotechnology. We start with the approval of minutes from April 9th, 2025. These have been posted, distributed online as a verbatim transcript so there ought not be any corrections but if there are little typos, or other things like that please bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty, and hearing no objections, we will by unanimous consent approve the minutes. Our first agenda item is Policy 6.13 Updates. Katie King, Associate Vice President for Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX will have five minutes followed by five minutes for senate Q&A. Is Katie here? Great. You can either choose a microphone or come up here.

>>Katie King: Hi all, nice to see you. I'm Katie King. I'm the AVP for Institutional Equity and Title XI, and I started at Cornell about a year and a half ago so you probably -- many of you don't know me but it's nice to see you. Could I have the next slide, please? And here is contact information in case you need to get hold of me. Next slide, please. So, I just want to remind everyone today I'm here to talk about the accommodations policy but I just want to remind everyone the four things that our office does. So, we do all of the Title XI work here at Cornell. We do investigations into allegations of bias, discrimination, harassment that are not sexual misconduct. We do all of the affirmative action planning for the university and ensure compliance with equal employment opportunity and then we do all of the accommodations for employees, staff and faculty based on disability, religion and pregnancy related conditions. Next slide, please. So, Policy 6.13 has been the policy at Cornell regarding employee accommodation for a long time. We also had a secondary policy which was Policy 6.13.8 which covered religious accommodation. To streamline all of the accommodation opportunities that are available to employees at Cornell we recently updated the policy, so we now have one policy, Policy 6.13. This covers qualified individuals with disabilities who need accommodation. This covers individuals who are experiencing pregnancy or pregnancy related conditions. This is based on the law that was passed under the Biden Administration called the Pregnant Worker's Fairness Act so this is now include in our policy and then we will also provide accommodations for individuals who have a sincerely held religious belief. Next slide, please. So, folks often like to know what reasonable accommodation is. A reasonable accommodation is a modification or adjustment to a job, the work environment or the way things are usually done. So, it is kind of an exception to the way that we do things to enable a person who is otherwise qualified to do the essential functions of their job. Next slide, please. And you can request accommodations by calling our office. The number is here, by emailing accomodations@cornell.edu or by stopping into our office in Day Hall and the process is private. Any medical information that we would

receive is maintained confidentially in a separate system that is not tied to any employee's employment file, and I always like to remind employees is that you do not need to share with your supervisor, with anyone in HR what your – if it is related to a disability, what your disability is. It's really none of their business. You will have to share that information with our accommodation specialist whose name is Nina Drake, but no one that works in your college needs to know what's going on, just have you , have an accommodation, and what the accommodation is, and I think that is my whole presentation. Tried to keep it short. So, if anyone has questions, I'm happy to answer them on employee accommodations.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And if you're in Zoom land, raise your digital hand. I'll try to see them. If you're here and have a question just walk up to the other microphone.

>>Bill Katt: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. Could you just give us a feeling for how often people request accommodations that Cornell is not able to meet?

>>Katie King: Oh, I would say it's infrequent. When we look at whether an accommodation is reasonable, we are looking at Cornell as an employer as a whole so as an entire entity so, in terms of cost, it's like what is the cost to Cornell as a whole. There are some things like, for example, for faculty, it's my understanding there is an expectation that faculty provide in person teaching for the most part and so, sometimes, faculty will request all remote teaching. It is possible that we would not be able to grant that accommodation, but it is always an interactive process, so we work with the employee and their department to figure out what works. But, in terms of like the purchasing of things, things will get purchased. And, if a department or college can't – doesn't have something budgeted for we have something here at Cornell called the Central Accommodations Fund and so if it is like all of the sudden an employee needs –- oh, I don't even know – Dragon dictations off, or something like that the Central Accommodations Fund can pay half of the cost of that and the department would pay the other half or the college. But, to answer your question, it's infrequent that an accommodation is denied.

>>Phil Nicholson: Phil Nicholson, Astronomy. I was curious by one of the – one of the things you listed there. What is a seriously held religious belief and how do you decide whether it is or not?

>>Katie King: So --

>>Phil Nicholson: That sounds like it could be an opening for almost anything in some cases.

>>Katie King: So, we do not question whether or not an employee has a seriously held religious belief. We take an employee at their word. The issue is whether the accommodation that they are seeking is reasonable and so, for example, we just had a request for an employee based on their seriously held religious belief to be able to attend services on Sunday, and this is an employee that is scheduled to work some Sundays and so we provided that accommodation because it's reasonable for the university to do so. There is a test that the Supreme Court has articulated that you can look to determine whether a belief is seriously held but it doesn't need to be like, you know, Christianity or Judaism. It could be like any seriously held belief that is of religious significance to the person that's holding it, right? So, the test is – is very broad and I can't think

of a time that we've denied accommodation based on someone's religious belief. Go ahead.

>>Phil Nicholson: If I said I belong to an obscure religious cult that forbad the working on the mornings on Mondays through Thursdays or something like that I'd be out of a job, I think.

>>Katie King: Right, so I think the question is that reasonable, right? So we're not going to be questioning your seriously held belief. The question is, is it reasonable for Cornell as an employer to permit that? Yeah. Yeah.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Go ahead. Can you – yeah.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: All right. We can do this dance up and down, yeah. Hi Risa Lieberwitz, ILR on the Senate. So, I have a three-part question, but I think they're all related.

>>Katie King: Ok.

>>Risa Lieberwitz: One is, who determines what the essential duties are of a job and the second one is given all of the technological developments that have occurred, you know, over time, how much is that affecting what a reasonable accommodation is? That's the second, and then third, when does – who determines and how is it determined what becomes an undue burden on the employer given that there is this expansion of the ability to use technology and other kinds of developments to create accommodations?

>>Katie King: Sure, absolutely. So, to your first question, the first – one of the first steps in our process is to request the job description for each employee from their supervisor/manager. So, for faculty it's a little bit different obviously, but we will connect with the department chair or a senior associate dean to determine in this particular college, what are faculty required to do? How many courses are they supposed to be teaching, either per semester or annually? What's their research commitment like? So, we get that information from the college. We typically we'll kind of confirm that with the employee. We will share with the employee what our understanding of the essential functions are because, as we all know, there are things in our job descriptions that are not essential to the work that we do and so, sometimes a manager will say, well, this is essential, and the employee will say this is not essential. And, so, it's a conversation. If that is up for debate, we will sometimes bring in Counsel's Office for their opinion. At the end of the day the decision lies with my office as to what we've determined in consultation with the department and the employee is always a part of that conversation. In terms of technological updates, it's amazing. I mean, you can have things that assist people for communication, for mobility that weren't available, weren't invented ten, 20 years ago. And, so, we utilize different resources that are available to us such as JAN – the Job Access Network – I think I'm getting that wrong. We have our own group of folks here at Cornell that do this work, so Wendy Strobel Gower. She works with – really works with disability access so we work with them to figure out what is the most up to date thing. So, I mentioned Dragon before. Actually, that's not recommended anymore because it's outdated and there are better products for people to use that just kind of – that was around when I was younger. So, it's – it's really – it's really great and every day there are more things coming out and it's less expensive for the university actually and, really, more helpful for the employee. To the final question, who decides what's an undue burden? So, the

ultimate decision lies with me. The ultimate decision lies with me as to what is an undue burden and, as I said, I – we try to facilitate the process where we can approve accommodations and we have to do so equitably and so that means we have to make sure that we are collecting – and this is why the process is centralized as well – collecting the same types of information from employees across Cornell so someone over here is not getting an accommodation that's denied to someone over here because the type of information that's collected is different or the decision making is different. So ultimately, I'm the one who makes the decision and if an employee has a concern they can always reach out and talk to me. There are some things that fall outside the scope of what we can do, and a lot of that has to do with physical accessibilities. So, we can ensure that we are meeting our requirements under the law, but we work closely with Andrea Hamblen (inaudible), for example, who works a lot with physical accessibility issues to the campus, but the short answer is me. I'm the person who makes the decision. Yeah. Yep.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, our ten minutes is up --

>>Katie King: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And we're going to move onto the next agenda item which is a motion that has been moved and endorsed, and it is a vote on a revised proposed resolution to adopt a unified transfer credit policy for undergraduate transfer students. Lisa Nishii, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Industrial and Labor Relations will have ten minutes followed by ten minutes for faculty Q&A. Is Lisa online?

>>Lisa Nishii: I am, do you see my screen or no? I mean, my – my slides.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: You do?

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: Okay. Great. Then – thanks. I was having some trouble earlier so I'm glad it's working. Good afternoon, everyone, I am here to present some revisions that we made to the university transfer credit policy that I presented to you in April. The revisions are based on some really valuable input that we got from the EPC and also based on questions that we got from senators in April. So, just as a quick reminder, the impetus for this policy is a need for a more standardized approach across academic units in the way that we evaluate and award transfer credit. We need a written policy that's clear and meets Middle State requirements and addresses known inconsistencies, inequities and delays that are experienced by students. I should say that the summary of the revisions I'm presenting today, and the revised policy are available on the faculty – (inaudible) faculty website, pending matters page. Okay. So, the first – I'm going to first go over some things that we added to the policy. The first one here is in response to the concern that (inaudible) by me sometimes but, hopefully, not often not have quite the information that the departments feel they need in order to evaluate equivalency in terms of scope, content and learning outcomes. And, so, in that case we want to make sure that department knows that they can ask the students for more detailed information about the course

if it's available to inform their evaluation. For example, perhaps an annotated syllabus or course outline. In those unusual -- we hope they are unusual, instances when it's not feasible to assess equivalency based on the available information then the course would be treated as a course without equivalency and as a reminder and this is related to another question we got from a senator. For courses without equivalency each college or school would determine how the course may be used to meet degree requirements. Okay. This second edition we have in here -- in response to a question we received from a senator in April. We're confirming that as is currently the case for engineering and perhaps other courses that two or more external courses can be combined to provide equivalency to a single Cornell course and that the transfer evaluation system software and database can accommodate such configurations. Here, you will see clarification that we added in the form of a footnote based on comments from the EPC that there are some courses at Cornell, for example, Advanced Narrative Writing, that students may take more than once because the content changes across administrations of the course. Therefore, external course that's considered equivalent to such a course should be treated similarly. Okay? Here is one change -- no, actually we added some flexible here based on input from the EPC. We added language that would provide flexibility in terms of approving transfer credits that were taken for courses taken seven or more years earlier, or ago. As the EPC noted in some disciplines a course content might remain the same or very similar over a long period of time, therefore, it should be up to the individual department to determine if a course is too outdated to qualify as a [Inaudible] and again for courses deemed nonequivalent it would be up to the college or school whether to grant any type of transfer credit. Here is one change that we made to the policy. We heard when we visited last month that some majors may want a more stringent standard for courses that apply toward the major compared to courses that might satisfy general distribution requirements. And in a follow up conversation to the April meeting we also learned about a concern that with the low threshold of a C grade currently matriculated Cornell students might seek to take difficult major requirements at institutions that they perceive to be easier, therefore, we introduced this change to say that a major may require a grade up to a B for an external course that a student applies toward their major whether it's a specific course that's required for the major or course that satisfies elective credits for the major. Regardless of whether the same minimum grade requirement applies to an equivalent for an [Inaudible] course. And then, upon further reflection we decided to make three deletions, right? We deleted these three clauses. The first clause we deleted because it's unnecessarily restrictive. A student may need a course for graduation that's not offered at Cornell but is offered elsewhere and so, we would allow that as long as the student continues to abide by the transfer credit limits that are in the policy and they satisfy Cornell course credit requirements for graduation. And then the second and third clauses we deleted both -- because both of those types of courses should be accepted or rejected for credit based on equivalency just like any other external course. Finally, two senators raised concerns about academic integrity problems in online courses and our inability to assess whether transfer students may have cheated in their online courses and we recognize this concern. Unfortunately, however, the reality is that concerns about academic integrity apply to all settings and all modes of delivery including here at Cornell and the unconditional denial of equivalency credits for courses simply because they were taught online is prohibited by Middle States. It's also worth noting, I think this is a really important point, that if a student applies to Cornell from an online program that does not adequately prepare them for Cornell, they are unlikely to be admitted to Cornell and this point may be moot. So, to sum up, be it therefore resolved that the university adopt a revised Cornell university transfer credit policy for undergraduate students.

Again, this is posted on the website. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. Are there any comments? If you are in house, come up to a microphone or raise your digital hand. I don't see any Zoom people so why don't you start identifying yourself?

>>Hadas Ritz: This is Hadas Ritz, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I have two questions for you. What is the difference between scope and content and then I have kind of a more specific comment or question which is the same question that I raised last time about kind of online courses and so, for example, I just approved transfer credit for a student for an online course because the syllabus specifically said that the exams had to be proctored in person. That they had to find a person to proctor the exams. So that made me feel comfortable approving that online course. So, I didn't reject it just because it's an online course but if there were no proctored assessments I would not have wanted to accept. I wouldn't have accepted it in fact. So I'm wondering whether that is prohibited behavior on my part under this new policy or it's not that I'm rejecting it because it's online. I'm rejecting because it doesn't have sufficient integrity standards I guess.

>>Lisa Nishii: Well, We don't get to that level of detail in the policy about it being based on a specific, you know, mode of assessment. But, yes, in principle, right, it would not be appropriate to reject it because of the modality of the course or the assessments. Your first question was about scope and content. Content is what's covered and I guess scope is the extent, right, of the -- of the content that's -- that's covered. It could be how deep it goes and how -- or how broadly certain concepts are applied. We put both in there and -- recognizing that people might interpret it a little bit differently but to get at the fact that, you know, there are multiple ways to think about equivalency and learning outcomes are -- the third one I think are really important.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, in house again?

>>David Delchamps: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Hi. Lisa, you answered a question I posed on the comment page about the fact that the agnosticism with respect to delivery mode came from Middle States and I really don't like that rule and I'm just curious. Did Middle States ever present a rationale for that? I mean I totally -- I totally agree with the community college thing because I handle transfer admissions for my department and, you know, we see amazing students from community college but as far as online delivery, that's really inferior in my opinion -- so --

>>Lisa Nishii: So, we have something that Rhonda just put in -- our university registrar. The online course -- we need to accept it as credit -- Rhonda, I don't quite understand the first part of your comment.

>>Rhonda Kitch: Sure, this goes back to the prior question related to -- from an online course standpoint of would -- would it be accepted and -- with the new revised policy change it would be accepted as credit. It's a matter of determination does it -- does it still equate to an equivalency -- course equivalency here or not I think is probably the greater question. So, that's really to the first question. David, regarding your question, the Middle States regulation has been in place for

nearly two years. It started on July 1st of 2023. We -- we learned about it -- I -- our office learned about it after the fact while we just -- it was pointed out to us by another colleague in the state. So, I -- our office is not the Middle States representative so I -- I'm -- for the institution I'm not able to give in any additional information. If we had an opportunity to provide feedback at that time but it's been a Middle States regulation for almost two years.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: We have an online question or comment from Danielle. Identify yourself.

>>Danyel Wierson: Danyel Wierson. I am the Employee Assembly Liaison for the Faculty Senate. Question for Lisa and Rhonda, hi. In the policy reading it said that we can't implement anything for these outside classes, for online or community college classes that we would not implement for Cornell classes. So, what I'm wondering is if in our policy our exams are stated as needing to be in person for Cornell courses because our exams are in person, at least all of ours for our class -- or my department. So I'm wondering if that is our stipulation would we then per the policy be able to require that for these transfer credits.

>>Lisa Nishii: Sarah, go head.

>>Sarah Giroux: Yeah, thanks. I'm Sarah Giroux in CALS. I think -- I hear a lot of what folks are saying and I think I -- I fundamentally agree with you, you know, online course delivery, not ideal. We all agree with that, but the reality is that for some students at community colleges, like that's what they have. Right? That's -- that's how it's being offered for them. That's the opportunity they have and what we are seeing here, you know, we are not saying that Cornell should offer classes online. We explicitly say we don't do that, right but we are just giving them the opportunity to get here, to transfer the credits in and get here and I think it's -- to some ways it's the same as the exam, right? You know, if a student took a test that was proctored, you know, not effectually, right, because it could be online and actually better proctored than some of our courses, you know. We have scenarios that have popped up in class where students are taking a test and cheat, right. So, I don't want to say that everything that's online is going to be cheating, one, and then, two, again, all this is doing is letting the students come here, right. If they can't hack it. If they cheated their way through their community college degree they aren't going to do well when they get here and so I think it's important to sort of separate out those two different items, right. What we want to do here -- what we are doing here we have lots of control over that. But this is really about making sure that students -- and especially students who come from backgrounds where maybe they are working have to take a night class, like they still have an opportunity to get here. And so, I think -- in my mind it's like in that spirit that I think we want to be looking at some of these -- these rules.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, we have a couple of comments, questions, in-house. Go head. Identify yourself and try to keep it brief.

>>Michael Thompson: Michael Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering. First, thank you, Lisa, for addressing a lot of concerns raised last time. I have two remaining ones. One is the symmetry of one of the requirements. It's written in and proposed that two or more courses from an external entity may be applied as a single course at Cornell but these symmetric cases also a probability. I just finished doing -- looking through transcripts of transfer students and there are

cases where they have two courses that have the same content as two of our courses, but they split them differently between the courses. So, I don't see any reason why this should be a restriction that it be only a single course at Cornell. The second is a question -- is that it explicitly states that the grade option of a B or better is limited to departments. Does that exclude colleges from making the same requirement for common curriculum classes and again I raise this not because of any concern about community colleges but the distinction between transfer credit that's applied for matriculating students and transfer credit for matriculated students and we don't seem to distinguish between those when there really is a very big difference in how they are applied with in our programs. Thank you.

>>Lisa Nishii: So, I -- just to clarify, with the what about the B if it says for core required courses, right, for a major or specific courses -- core courses required for college then --

>>Michael Thompson: It does say college. Ok, I didn't see that.

>>Lisa Nishii: Oh, but -- but that -- that's what you want?

>>Michael Thompson: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: Okay, thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn. Okay, we have a little bit more time. Keep it brief, please.

>>Unknown Speaker: (inaudible) Johnson School. I would like to remind everybody that we have several online programs at Cornell. Mostly, run in collaboration with e Cornell. The one that I'm familiar with -- the Masters of Science and Business Analytics is a very successful program, and I would say that the quality of teaching and learning in that program is higher than in almost all the other programs that we run in our school. And -- so that the exams in those online programs are done remotely. So, we do have such programs, and I would definitely like to correct the idea that -- that online learning is necessarily bad.

>>Lisa Nishii: Thank you. I was going to say that actually in response to David's comment and I wholeheartedly agree. I think if someone has just recorded a 75 minute lecture and, I think, sometimes that may have been the case during the pandemic, that's a very difficult to follow but there are so many ways to teach effectively online and to assume all online courses, by definition, are inferior, right, and all in person courses are of higher quality and reliably so -- is just -- it's problematic and so what we're trying to do here is provide the tools needed for departments to make that assessment and to, you know, higher grade of a B for courses that are required, being able to request additional resources, our hope is that will help make very specific evaluations rather than blanket determinations based on modality or institution. Thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn. Okay. In house?

>>Tara Holm: Thanks. Tara Holm, Mathematics. I have a -- two questions. One is -- was eluded to earlier but I didn't hear an answer. Can we have -- I -- my department is fully aware of and in support of handling -- transfer credit for transfer students but it feels very different when a

student has failed Math [Inaudible] 1910 twice at Cornell and wants to go take it in the easiest way possible over the summer. I'm supportive of -- providing them a pathway to success at Cornell but it feels like they are trying to find an easy pathway and we are trying -- we -- an engineering degree is meant to be an engineering degree so I'm just trying to understand how -- whether we can treat those two cases differently. My other question is for -- a solution that has arisen in among my colleagues and I want to know if this is allowed, for -- for -- already matriculated Cornell students can we use the case, the Cornell Advanced Standing Exam as a means of awarding credit without having to handle the transfer credit? So I'm curious about your thoughts on this.

>>Lisa Nishii: The first one Is about the student who failed 1910 twice, can they take a course elsewhere. The policy is that students who are matriculated need to receive permission, right, approval for course that they want to take elsewhere before doing that, right, because otherwise they might not get credit for it so there is a mechanism in there that would allow for both a conversation and, right, a -- a no, you have to --

>>Tara Holm: Can -- can -- can departments or colleges just not allow that permission in any case or does there have to be a -- I mean because my department is drowning -- I cannot tell you how many man hours it is taking to process those requests for am I allowed to take this class or how about -- why don't you evaluate all 15 of these classes and tell me which one I can enroll in?

>>Lisa Nisha: I mean, if it's a course that's been deemed equivalent through some evaluation previously before students coming in as external transfers. It would be difficult to make the case that students here can't take that course. Rhonda, Sarah, would you agree?

>>Tara Holm: I disagree.

>>Unknown Speaker: (inaudible).

>>Tara Holm: Yeah.

>>Unknown Speaker: That's why we require (inaudible).

>>Lisa Nishii: I normally would agree think the -- I'm thinking of this from a veteran's benefits lens. I'm thinking of this from a financial aid lens. If we provided funds in some of the cases for an incoming student in those situations but wouldn't if they were applying otherwise. I'm trying to untangle and think through the complexities there but, yeah, I think that would be A harder piece to navigate.

>>Tara Holm: I agree it's complex and I -- I appreciate -- I would like to think about it more and have faculty have more input on this.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Okay, we're out of time. Do we need Any more time on this item, or can we move on?

>>Unknown Speaker: Please, please, can they answer the case question? Please. (inaudible).

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Let's take one minute and then move on.

>>Unknown Speaker: One minute?

>>Lisa Nishii: The question is whether --

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: The question was asked.

>>Lisa Nishii: -- whether we can provide credit based on the case exam?

>>Unknown Speaker: Yes.

>>Unknown Speaker: Yes.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Yes.

>>Lisa Nishii: We're not currently changing existing policies related to credit provided based on exams. Right? Whether it's AP, BI -- we specifically -- there's a lot there and decided we needed to tackle that set of credits separately. So, no change to existing policy at the moment.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I'm afraid we have to move onto our next agenda item which --

>>Chris Schaffer: A floor motion, please? This is Chris Schaffer, Biomedical Engineering. To me this issue seems like there is far more discussion that needs to happen among the faculty before we agree to anything. I propose a motion from the floor to table this pending further discussion. Ask for a second.

>>Tara Holm: I second.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So, we're not used to these kinds of points of -- do we have ability to take a vote on this, Jill? Since it requires a vote unless we go with unanimous consent. Are there any objections to tabling this and having further discussion? If you have objections raise your hand on Zoom or speak up. Seeing no objections then the motion --

>>Ken Birman: (inaudible) I'm trying to object, it just took a moment to push the button. if we table this in the last meeting of the year -- this is Ken Birman, Computer Science. I do have an objection to this proposal and it's simply that if we table something in the last meeting of the year it's actually off the agenda and we have to restart everything in the fall. I -- I don't necessarily object to people recognizing that that's the consequence of this and that therefore we are going to have to re-introduce and restart this discussion, but I don't think we should just quickly vote because I'm afraid some people might vote without appreciating the consequences.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: I have to interrupt. These are our voteable but not debatable motions according to Roberts Rule so --

>>Eve De Rosa: I'm going to make a plea.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: A plea --

>>Eve De Rosa: I'm going to make a plea. The APC gave this deep thought, and the vice provost office was very responsive. Then they came to the senate, and they were responsive yet again. I would like us to consider this but please go speak to your faculty. You can vote it down so let's make this democratic, vote -- it may not get approved. If it doesn't get approved, then we just continue to work on it. But -- I mean for us to consider this, vote on it, we get the democratic result. If it fails it fails and it needs more work. Thank you.

>>Unknown Speaker: Sorry but there's apparently a motion on the floor (inaudible).

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: But -- my question to -- to Jill is do we have the capability of taking a vote?

>>Unknown Speaker (Jill?): Yes.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So, are you ready for me to --

>>Unknown Speaker: The vote would be to table this proposed resolution.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So those in favor are in favor Of tabling the resolution and those opposed want to proceed with the voting [Inaudible] so, those in favor of tabling in house and -- in house raise your hand. In Zoom , is there a poll that goes out? It's gone out. So, in Zoom take the poll. Have you counted? Okay, those opposed to this tabling. Okay. And then -- we'll include -- those numbers with the Zoom numbers.

>>Unknown Speaker: So, nine approve of tabling and 16 disapprove of tabling it. Plus, those on Zoom.

>>Unknown Speaker: What about abstain?

>>Unknown Speaker: Oh, we didn't do abstentions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: are there abstentions? Four.

>>Unknown Speaker: So, Jill, we had nine who want to table it, 16 who don't and 4 who abstain. 9, 16, 4. Motion to table, yes, 31. No, 36. Abstentions, 13.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: So, it looks like The motion to table has not succeeded. We will move on. You will see this in Qualtrics through your emails. The next item of business is a Generative AI update. Steve Jackson will have five minutes. Vice-Provost for Academic Innovation, Information Science Followed by five minutes for faculty comments. Would you like to use this?

>>Steven Jackson: Sure, yep, sounds good. So, this is just an update item. There's not a decision item but I wanted to fill you in a little bit on some of the work we have been doing in the Generative AI. The education working group for the Generative AI advisory council. So there's some -- and there's a timely thing that I want people to be aware of. How do I make this go down? There we go. I figured it out. Okay. So, the two starred items are things I will actually talk a little bit more about today and then -- for additional awareness things that the council is working on, the education working group. We are beginning work on an AI literacy program which we plan to make available to incoming students for fall, 2025. This -- this is meant as a set of resources that could also be drawn into college level or department level activities that you might have going on in this space. And then the other one which I won't share information on today because it's very much work in progress -- this -- this group will be working on input to the faculty senate's larger academic integrity efforts and we have been asked to kind of come up with some groundwork on the AI, plus AI problem. The academic integrity plus artificial intelligence problem. That of course feeds back in to the faculty senate process. We have been doing a lot of comparative analysis with other institutions. There's some things we are working on. That will come back. I'm not exactly sure of the path. It may go through EPC and then senate -- we will work with Eve and the senate to figure that out, but we are hoping to get some -- some more guidance or steps forward on that. I can say from our comparative analysis so far, it's pretty clear that there's no other institution that has figured out the AI plus AI problem. Just spoiler alert. Soy think we're actually not behind. In fact, I would say we're ahead in some ways or soon will be. If you want more resources, including a list of the people who are involved in this that's the first link and of course as we have shared before teaching resources relevant to generative AI and teaching from CTI. Okay. So, one thing I want to share with you today is some very drafty language that we are working on as a committee that tries to ground some sense of values and principles that should be guiding Cornell's response to generative AI in the teaching and learning space. Everything I say today is specific to that. It's not about research and it's not about administration. This is what we have arrived at so far. Remains draft. We will be meeting again as a committee next week and reviewing this. But you will see some of the values that we think are important that should condition our choices in a generative AI space and when I say choices that could be around tools we support or don't support. It could be around policies that we endorse or don't endorse and this is meant to arrive at what we think is a balanced perspective on generative AI at Cornell and one that is also tuned to what we believe to be important at Cornell institutional values. So, I'm not going to talk through these. I think -- I hope everybody in the room can read them. We are happy to take feedback on that and you are welcome to send me an email. We will be bringing this again to our education working group next week and we would becoming back with possibly revised depending on the feedback we get version of this. I believe to faculty, senate, probably early in the fall if we can get on the schedule. Okay, the announcement item. This is really the announcement part. Okay. So, this is the thing I want everybody to be aware of. We currently have a very widespread generative AI uses and perspectives survey that is out in the hands of students now. It went out on May 1st . It's live. It remains live until May 11th . This has gone to all students on -- under grad, masters and PHD level on the Ithaca and Cornell tech campuses minus 5000 who we took out, randomly selected to take an alternative survey through the institutional research and planning group. This is all conducted by IRP which does all of our surveying students and maintains conditions of confidentiality of students et cetera. So far, we have had more than 700 responses, and I have had a lot of other emails with students sending me papers that they have written on this topic so it's

quite -- I have got lots of reading ahead of me. The thing I want you all to be aware of is that we are planning a corresponding faculty version which we are refining, and we expect to go out possibly next week or the week after and our current expectation is that will be open from middle of May too early to middle part of June but you will see that -- you will get an announcement of that by email. I will show you just a very, very quickly and of course this goes to all faculty, tenure track, [Inaudible], Ithaca and Cornell tech so same distribution as the student side. Why isn't this -- oh, okay. So, I won't talk through it. I mean this is -- this is the student survey that is out there but to just kind of explain what it is, some of it is around current uses. What tools are you using? What are you using them for? Some of it is around their perspective. What they think this is doing for their teaching and learning and also the teaching and learning of other students. Some of it is around normative concerns or their sense of fairness around these things. What is fair, what is not fair in this space. And then some larger and -- some larger kind of perspectives and needs and next steps students see in this space at Cornell. The faculty survey will have some items that are constructed to be in parallel so we can see side by side what students saying and what faculty are saying. Then some things that are specific to faculty use that are distinct from students, so I really encourage you to encourage your colleagues to fill out this survey when it comes. It is a combination of like, you know, [Inaudible] type things but also lots of opportunity for textual entry and beyond that -- I will say that's the best way to feed all this into the larger process but beyond that I am always and -- many of you have done this which is great -- I'm also happy to meet with people separately so feel free to shoot me an email, SJJ54 or EPAI at Cornell.edu and we will be taking all of this -- it'll be informing some of the ongoing work of the working group and of course we'll be reporting results back to you all probably -- I would guess first meeting of the faculty senate in the fall or something like that.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. We have a few minutes for comments or questions. I have to look here to see if there's any hands being raised or if anyone wants to step up to the mic do it now and try to keep it brief since we are running behind time.

>>Tom Fox: So, with regard -- oh, Tom Fox, Molecular Biology and Genetics, this building. With respect to the textual comments you get are you going to use AI to summarize the results?

>>Steve Jackson: It's a good question. We may depending on the volume. We would do it through the -- the Microsoft copilot version that is specific to Cornell which means it's [Inaudible], right? We are not feeding it back into the open AI mother ship but if we -- if we use our own instance it's protected in that way. So, we will see the volume. I will also commit to reading them all but those of you who have read large texting -- sometimes even after you have read -- still need some help kind of parsing.

>>Bill Katt: Bill Katt, Molecular Medicine. Two quick questions. One, as the working group is talking about all these things are you considering the fairly substantial ecological impacts of these generative AI uses? And two, is there a reason that you didn't send surveys to post docs?

>>Steve Jackson: That is a really good question. On the post docs, I don't think we thought of it to be honest. That's a really good question. We could add that on if we think that would be an interesting and distinctive group. Good point. I will bring that back to the committee and, ecological impacts. I lead something called the computing on earth lab. This is my thing, this is

exactly what I do so, yes, we have thought about it. It doesn't show up super centrally in the survey itself but it is part of how we are thinking about things in general.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. I think we need to move On. We have announcements and updates from Dean of Faculty, Eve De Rosa and Chelsea Specht, Associate Dean and then, ten minutes for Q&A after 15 minutes but probably we should cut off maybe a couple of minutes from each of those.

>>Eve De Rosa: Next slide, please. Just, I want to remind people of the resources that the university is providing for those of you who are impacted by changes that are happening at the federal level. Some of our faculty as we know have lost funding for their -- their scholarship and some of our faculty are concerned about traveling to conferences if they are here on a visa so, just want to share resources with you. Next slide, please. I have had thus far -- actually we have had thus far -- sorry Chelsea two -- actually -- not listening sessions, two sessions where we are hoping faculty will come for peer to peer conversations about how to generate solutions for this time and so, they were thus far been quite small in terms of engagement and, yes, apologies for doing this at end of classes but those who have attended have been very passionate and creative and thinking through potential solutions so I would love to just remind people that there are three more sessions. We did arts, humanities, and we have life physical and social sciences still available. Next slide, please. I just have to make an announcement that there's some changes in the Department of Earth and Atmospheric Science. They are changing the major from that title to Earth and Climate Sciences and they Are adding a new major climate and geo systems engineering. All of this has been approved by the three colleges that offer these majors. Arts, and Sciences, CALS and Engineering and also Cap has approved these. Lastly, actually I'll have a Q&A, so you'll come up after that. Oh, there's a correction. Then come on, please.

>>Unknown Speaker: The Engineering degree is only in Engineering.

>>Eve De Rosa: Oh, thank you for the --

>>Unknown Speaker: The other existing degree is in three colleges.

>>Eve De Rosa: And that's my fault. Jill Had is on above that and I was like, oh, must be the engineering too so thank you. Next slide, please. I wanted to let everybody know that there is a -- a senate working group who is working on -- this was initiated by the senate in the sense that people were hoping that we would work on community agreements that would improve the decorum in the senate and, so, this small working group is Jonathan, Bryan Sikes from the -- senator from Brooks and Nate Matias from Communication. the three of them are working with Chelsea and I to really think through how we can make Roberts Rules consistent with the culture here. Can we allow motions, can we allow new business and in a way that hasn't been available yet in terms of the -- at least the culture that I inherited. Can we consider using voting apps so that we don't have to do the hand count and all of those things and make everything digital? And, also, can we help build infrastructure in the office of the Dean of faculty so that if a new business is brought and sometimes it comes through the good of the order, sometimes we're hoping now through this -- the ability to bring new business that we will give infrastructure to help people go from ideas and build coalitions to resolution that can come for consideration. So, that work is

happening and we are going to continue meeting up until the end of May and then we will -- if we haven't come to our resolution we will just continue working on it and ultimately bring everything back to the senate for consideration. Next slide, please. I just wanted to update everybody on the faculty elections. I think Adam is here. There he is, so, Adam Smith is the new associate Dean of Faculty . Yes, please applaud. So, I wanted everybody to have an opportunity to speak with him. We have a reception afterwards so don't forget that, right out there waiting for us so we -- you know -- we won't belabor anything tonight. And these are all of the other positions and -- next slide please. We want to thank Chelsea. So, just Chelsea, it's been just a wonderful partnership and thank you for everything that -- the passion, the creativity, the thoughtfulness and conscientiousness. She has really been working hard for us and so thank you Chelsea. And, that link right there is a kudos board that people have already started to populate and so we will share that with you and keep populating it as you go. I was hiding from the [Inaudible] okay, next slide, and that's our field trip to Cornell Tech when the senate went to the Cornell Tech and so Tara Holm and Beth Milles, senators from PMA and math are going to come read the resolution. We sat down and talked about all the work you have done and working with you on UA and UFC and just working with you in the past few years has been pretty incredible and you're such a careful and thoughtful listener and caring person, so this is from the UFC. A resolution to honor Chelsea Specht for her service as associate Dean of the Faculty. You go first.

>>Tara Holm: Whereas, Professor Chelsea Specht has served with dedication for three years as Associate Dean of the Faculty; and --

>>Beth Milles: Whereas, the Office of the Dean of the Faculty supports thousands of faculty members across the University; and --

>>Tara Holm: Whereas, Professor Specht has represented the interests of the faculty with integrity and dedication, engaging thoughtfully with the administration, the Board of Trustees, and the broader University community while also providing steady support to faculty, students and others in navigating the challenges of the past three years; and --

>>Beth Milles: Whereas, she has led with compassion, thoughtful attention to faculty concerns, and a fearless commitment to Do the Greatest Good; and --

>>Tara Holm: Whereas, in her role as Chair of the Nominations and Elections Senate Committee, Professor Specht has enthusiastically invited nearly every faculty member at Cornell to serve on a Senate committee or run for elected office --

>>Beth Milles: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate, on behalf of the faculty, extends its sincere gratitude and heartfelt thanks to Professor Chelsea Specht for her valuable service and leadership during her three-year term as Associate Dean of the Faculty.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And by unanimous consent -- and I will not take any objections, this resolution is approved. Have you anything else? Are you done? Are we ready for Q&A?

>>Eve De Rosa: Yes, I'm ready for Q&A but I also Wanted to say with the transfer option

resolution, please go talk to your faculty. If it fails, please give full feedback so if -- if your faculty says no, because, XYZ, put it in with your vote and then leave the vice provost for under graduate education -- education policy committee will get all of that feedback and we'll go back to work. So, I just wanted to say that. Thanks. And I'm here if anyone has questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: And we do have about ten minutes For Q&A. I wait a minute to see if any hands pop up on Zoom. Seeing none, we will move onto our final -- well -- next to final item which is the -- motion that has been moved by the appropriate committees -- I believe it was cap to vote on the teaching professor proposals which we discussed previously. This will be through Qualtrics but at this point we have 15 minutes for questions, discussions, and the three -- sort of heads of the various departments who have proposed these motions are here to answer questions. So, we're going to go straight to discussion since you have already heard the discussion of the proposals at the last meeting. And I will wait a minute to see if any hands pop up on Zoom . We have a question or discussion point in house. Identity yourself.

>>Hadas Ritz: Hadas Ritz, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. I just Wanted to clarify whether there were any changes to any of these since they were brought to us or whether we're voting on them exactly as they were presented before. So -- perhaps -- we could be told the summary of the revisions? That would be helpful.

>>Eve De Rosa: Well, I gave them all to everyone Last Friday to review and all of that should be there, available, so, the idea was that you read the revised version. If you still had concerns that they weren't responsive than cap has seen it, the revised versions. CAP has voted on the revised versions and moved for a vote, so, if anyone has concerns from what they read please let us know. That's why they are here to answer those questions.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Seeing no questions or discussion points, we have a Good of the Order today and we'll move to that agenda item. Senators Chris Shaffer from Biomedical Engineering and also Emma Scales, and we'll have five minutes.

>>Chris Schaffer: Great, I -- hello folks. I'm Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering. I wanted to talk with you about an initiative that's emerged from the Advancing Science and Policy Club. This is a graduate student oriented club for mostly STEM students who are interested in policy. This is the club that launched the vaccine conversations with scientists' initiative in the Covid pandemic which has now become a local nonprofit. So, this club -- in the goal of trying to improve communication of our scholarship and science that we do in academia to the broad public -- this goal -- this club is launching this thing that we are calling the McClintock Letters. so, I'm going to let Emma the Co-President of the Advancing Science and Policy Club -- this initiative.

>>Emma Scales: Yeah, so --

>>Chris Schaffer: Next slide, please.

>>Emma Scales: Thanks, Great, the animations didn't show up because there were a lot. No, that's good. There were too many. There were too many. So, the reason that we wanted to do this

initiative was mainly to give members of the American public who don't otherwise interact with the scientific community a chance to hear about ongoing federally funded research directly from the researchers. Specifically, those that have a personal tie to them. So that's why we are asking the researchers who sign up to please pick a local newspaper of a town that's important to them so this can be a hometown or a place that you spend a significant amount of time in or that you your research significantly benefits because we want the benefit to that local community to be directly communicated to them so that they can understand how science benefits their everyday life. And we are trying to get 1,000 articles. As of right now, last time I checked we are floating around 200 sign-ups so we're almost there and we've only been advertising for about a week and a half, so we have like four more weeks to go so it looks pretty good right now. We can do next slide. So, the origin of this was through asap. After the news broke about the federal cuts to the science budget we noticed a lot of misinformation in a meeting Chris, Izzy and I who is the co-president with me kind of expressed had our frustration that it seemed like people didn't really understand what we were doing. Like people weren't aware. So, we wanted to come up with something that would allow us to reach a large number of people but also people who don't otherwise engage with science so like the last slide said we don't want people who are already reading the New York times or listening to NPR on their way to work. We want the people who are reading local hometown papers. So, since that meeting, we have been joined by a science policy collective of over 20 national grad student led science policy organizations so really excited about that. They have really been helping us and as far as the scope of the initiative broadly we want to communicate why research is important as I have said but also what we are actually doing with taxpayers' money but as far as the individual pieces go, we are not looking for the same cookie cutter op ed published in large publications. We want researchers to directly communicate what they do, what their area of expertise is, why it's important and how it impacts people. So that plays into our objectives where we are trying to have this direct communication between the public and scientists. We're trying to increase public awareness of the research that's going on and we want to humanize scientists so we're not people holed up in labs just taking all your taxpayer money and doing weird things with it. Like, we're trying to benefit humanity. So hopefully with this we are starting to build the infrastructure to kind of move the needle on public perception of science and reestablish some of that trust. So -- next slide, yeah.

>>Chris Schaffer: Great, so you're probably wondering why we called it the McClintock Letters. It's because Barbara McClintock won a Nobel prize for work, she did during her PhD here at Cornell. The first United States woman to win a noble prize -- well -- I guess first woman from the United States to win a noble prize. Her work was very, very basic science throughout her career. She faced a number of obstacles in advancing in various positions through her career and getting recognition for her work but despite all of that she persevered , focused on her science. In other words, she was like a scientist. That was her identity. It's also the fact that her birthday was middle of June which sort of felt like a good timing for this event. So -- again the goal is lots of these letters in the post Podunk small town papers like where people grew up, where they went to High School, places like that published around the time of McClintock's birthday. The hope of course is -- there is a broad communication goal that could be achieved just from these letters and hopefully people doing TikTok's and all kinds of other things but -- a secondary goal here is to sort of generate a news event to have enough of these published that this is something that national scale news sort of pays attention to and then placing -- and then that being a -- something that can place people who are good at defending federal investments in research --

who are good at pushing back against current policies of the federal government, puts them as talking heads in fox news and things like that with the goal of their being electoral consequences for lawmakers to be anti-science, to be anti-federal investments in science. So that's kind of the, you know not as -- publicly advertised but a secondly goal of this. I have a major ask. The QR code will link you to an already live website where you can sign up. You search McLintock letters this will be the top thing that pops up. Please disseminate this to your research groups, to your departments to your colleagues at other universities, encourage them to get this out as broadly as possible. Remember, not every letter submitted is going to get published. If we want to get hundreds of these published, we need to have a thousand of them submitted and we need to get hundreds published in order for it to be enough of a news hook that news organizations need to pick -- will have to pay attention.

>>Emma Scales: Yeah, so that's the thing. We -- we haven't explicitly like mandated that people identity it as part of an initiative because, again, that might erode some of the trust building that we're trying to do but that's why we are asking people to sign up so that along with -- those of you [Inaudible] will notice we collect a little bit of information and contact information in the sign up form so that then we can track when they are published and then reach back out to people who wrote them. Yeah. And we also have like blurbs that are prewritten that describe this -- we think well. If people want that. I don't know if there's a means of distribution that we can get those to you. Yeah. Yeah. So, like links to examples but also like a brief description of the initiative and like embedded links to sign up so you don't have to do any work but forward the email, yeah.

>>Chris Schaffer: So, 75 new op eds, right? Please, sign up, thank you.

>>Jonathan Ochshorn: Thank you. We're done a little early. The people who are listening on Zoom have time to get here for this extraordinary reception in a biotechnology building which is in the middle of campus, literally. It's -- it's not on any street. It's just kind of in the middle. So, if you -- if you don't know where it is just kind of walk inland and you will find it somehow. Meeting is adjourned.