

A MEETING  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2021

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just a couple quickies here. Recall, last meeting we approved this freedom of speech text that will become the official University's position. It's a two-step process with the trustees.

Two weeks ago, it went to the Committee on Academic Affairs. There was some discussion, but we don't anticipate any issues. It will go to the full Board next month. That's where that is.

We are doing these several things that have to do with communication in the age of the Internet. And one feature, sort of a happy corner of that look, has to do with podcasts, so we made an attempt to try to figure out all the podcasts that are sponsored through either a colleague, faculty member or staff or department, and we assembled all those.

At some point, I think we want to talk about this communication venue and how -- what are the expectations there. But Step 1 is just to find out what's there.

I will show you the list. There are about 30 of them, and it's real interesting. I listened to a couple of these. They span all the areas. Some programs have them. Some involve graduate students. It's really good. It's a great venue.

I don't know how you feel about it, but if you are doing the dishes and want to turn that into an intellectual exercise, then just have one of these things going in the background.

I'm going to try to get university communications to maintain a list or something, but I think it's something we should all be aware of, and it's a really nice feature of the campus.

Just want to make this announcement because this missed the Monday message announcement. There's a really great talk tomorrow night -- or panel discussion revolving

around Frederick Douglass, so I just wanted to get that out there. Again, I wish we had put that on the Monday message, but I missed it. So tell your colleagues about that. It looks really interesting.

Heads up about the next meeting, which is in two weeks. We're going to have Peter Frazier come and just give us an update on what the modeling looks like now in the spring semester. Things have changed. A little bit of discussion about that.

Steve Jackson has been working with a group to develop this protocol for handling threatening communications that target faculty. And then we'll have some discussion of the antiracism proposals, but the shape of that will emerge in the next week or so.

We have two sense -- let me pause here. Any questions about announcements or anything you'd like me to go over? Any hands up there?

We have two sense of the senate things. One is a follow-up. This was spread over a couple of meetings. We had Jon Burdick, Vice Provost for enrollments, come and talk to us, and he suggested, and it resonated with us, that we have some kind of faculty presence in the admissions scene. We've worked to develop that, and now this is about what that presence looks like. It's about forming an advisory group.

We're talking about four people, two-year terms. We want to make sure that the group spans all the different colleges. The colleges do the admissions, and we want to make sure we have the right expertise there or people who can understand things from a certain perspective.

We have to have someone from Arts and Science, because it is so central and so large. We have to have someone who knows about contract colleges, we have to have someone who knows the issues that come up with small colleges. Those are sort of the rules.

Online is more details, and we want to get people to sign up. Here are some of the things that we'll do.

I should mention, this is low overhead. Vice President Burdick meets with the admissions heads from each college roughly every other week. We're talking about having this group sit in on maybe two meetings per semester, where issues might be discussed, and these individuals will be a channel to the senate so that we can just keep in touch better and have a nice channel into that process. All the usual things to be -- our topics, standardized tests, legacy admissions, first-generation outreach, what about the role of AP scores and, more generally, how important are extracurricular activities and how do we steer students to the right college.

There's tons of stuff to talk about there, and this affects our lives deeply because these are the students that we'll have in our classes for the next four years. A lot to do there; but again, it's low overhead.

Everybody is booked to the gills, and we have to make this easy for people to step forward. So I'm imploring those of you who have an interest in this or know of someone to just have them contact us, and we'll set up this four-person group.

Any discussion about the methodology, the idea? I think it's worth trying. If you go back enough, there were some real serious, heavy-duty oversight committees that have sort of faded away. Let's just see what we can do with this, run with it and see if we can't make sure it's a good thing.

Are there any questions, any hands up about this topic? We're going to just do the usual thing. Just use chat. Yes, no, abstain. Please, if you're interested, it's two-year terms, but we need a staggered start. Two of those will just be for one year. If you're worried about this commitment, you can sign up just for one year. We'll keep you informed about all this stuff as it unfolds.

A second sense of the senate vote is concerned with a joint program between the School of Hotel Administration and a unit within Peking University. These programs, it's a trend

to have these things. We send them to the Committee On Academic Programs and Policy for scrutiny, and we have to pay attention to this sort of stuff, but the committee, in this case, had no issues with it. Alex Susskind from the Hotel School will just say a few words about it. In particular, I asked him to explain why the school is interested in doing this.

Next slide, and Alex.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Thank you. This program will be a dual-degree program with Peking University. The students will earn our master's in management and hospitality and they'll also earn an MBA from Peking University. We'll, in effect, teach the MMH part of the degree, and the Guanhua School will teach the MBA half. That's kind of how the dual degree works.

We have access to, roughly, 60 students a year. The way applicants are selected, it's very competitive. So they're put into a pool, and we'll have an opportunity to really get top students out who are very interested in the dual degree for hospitality. They will be a separate cohort. We'll have to go to China to teach a couple of courses for them, then they'll come here and get a couple of courses here, but they'll be separate from our existing MMH program, so those students will not intermix.

It's modeled after the current program that the Johnson School has with Tsinghua University. We've been looking for a partner in China for a while, and the service sector, the hospitality and tourism side of the business over there is growing exponentially.

Coronavirus, obviously, has impacted a lot of things, but they're ahead of us in recovery, and this is a really great opportunity for us to be able to do that. The demand for education, hospitality education, is quite strong. We're very positive about this. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any questions for Alex?

Voting on the admissions group is over, and now the same thing here, just to register support for --

ERIC CHEYFITZ: Could I ask Alex one quick question?

Hi, Alex. Chris Schaffer from biomedical engineering here. You emphasized the separation between students participating through Peking University from the Cornell students and the management degree activities here at Cornell. I'd be interested to hear why there was a discussion to have separation, as opposed to trying to identify activities where there would be some intermixing of these student populations. They might have a lot to learn from each other.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Right. We don't have a problem getting students from China into our MMH program, so this is a specialized group of higher-level students than we would typically get into our MMH program, so these are mid-level executives. It's a completely different audience we're appealing to, so it's modeled after what they do over at Johnson with the Tsinghua program, which focuses on finance for them.

It's really driven by the needs of the students. The students don't really need to interact with us. We don't have to do anything with job placement or internships, so it's really just a relationship to provide them with their hospitality training at that mid-level executive point.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: Thank you, Alex. That's clarifying.

ALEX SUSSKIND: You're welcome.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Dave Delchamps, did you have a question?

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I did. But I think, Alex, you answered my question.

I was wondering: Are these students from China or are they also going to be our normal MMH students from the U.S. who happen to want to get an MBA in China mixed in with students from China who want to get an MMH from you?

ALEX SUSSKIND: They would be in a different pool. The pool of students we would draw from, their primary choice would be to get an MBA degree with a specialization. That would be a completely different pool of students that would come over here to get their MBA

degree who would then want an MBA degree from Johnson. Those would be two different students, and they would be slightly younger, the ones that we would get for our MMH program, and these students are slightly older.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: But these students are from China?

ALEX SUSSKIND: Yes.

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie, there's a bunch of questions in the chat, as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yes. Harold, you have your hand up.

Neema, maybe after Harold, raise some points you see in the chat.

HAROLD HODES: I just wanted to know something about how the money flows. Will this cost Cornell anything? Will this make money for Cornell in any way?

ALEX SUSSKIND: Yeah, so this is actually quite profitable. I don't have the actual numbers in front of us, but we expect to net -- the first year, we'll probably bring in about \$400,000. Once we are done with the initial programming costs and setting up the marketing stuff that we need to do, it will net us around \$1 million a year. This is a very profitable venture for us.

We believe it will grow to potentially 80 to 100 students per year, as well. The first couple of cohorts will be around 60. It's the same model the Tsinghua program has used, and they're at about 120 students now after several years. It's very profitable for us.

HAROLD HODES: So that partially addressed my question. But when you say we are going to net, who's the "we"?

ALEX SUSSKIND: The College of Business, when I say we.

HAROLD HODES: And all of that stays within the College of Business or does some percentage go to the provost?

ALEX SUSSKIND: I actually don't know about that, to be frank. We're not operating as our own unit, so I'm sure we will pay our fair share to the University. I would assume so, but I don't know.

NEEMA KUDVA: Alex, there's a question in the chat about what consideration has been given to the whole question that has caused some to hesitate forging collaborations with Peking government institutions?

ALEX SUSSKIND: Again, that's a good question.

All along, we have been working with Central University to make sure they supported this initiative. We worked with the provost's office at international programs. At every turn, we've checked in to make sure that everything that we're doing meets the standards and expectations. We're not going forward on our own without approval. I believe it went to the provost's office already for endorsement.

NEEMA KUDVA: I guess a follow-up question to that is whether there are applications for faculty who participate in this program in terms of the new reporting requirements that we just heard about last week.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Right. We are going to continue to pay our faculty through Cornell. The arrangement is through the Ministry of Education in China, and they'll pay Cornell accordingly.

NEEMA KUDVA: So the Ministry pays Cornell. Okay. Then another question -- lots of questions in the chat -- is about who's conferring the degree. Is it Cornell or is it Peking University?

ALEX SUSSKIND: Cornell will confer the MMH degree and Peking University will confer the MBA degree.

NEEMA KUDVA: If people want to speak up with their questions, that's great. I will, otherwise, just keep on reading them. Are the faculty supportive of this, or is this driven by the administration's need for profit? It seems like this is more work for the faculty.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Yes. All of this was approved by our faculty, and we had been in discussions and debating this for a little more than a year now. Our graduate faculty members endorsed the program overwhelmingly and are committed to do the work to do it, to make it happen.

We're not really creating any new courses to do this. We're teaching them the things that we're doing right now. We have some condensed courses that we're offering that we typically don't offer, but it's the same content.

It's a fair amount of work to get the program launched, but that's an administrative function. At the moment, as social dean, I've been handling that, but our faculty will do the teaching when the program's launched.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thanks, Alex. Ken wants to ask a question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We could do maybe five more minutes on this.

KEN BIRMAN: Since it's a joint program, I take it that we're not doing all of the teaching. And the concern I want to raise, it echoes something in the chat.

When I talk to my colleagues at Peking University, there's a dean and then there's a political officer. These two individuals oversee any given faculty member. The political officer can step in and express opinions about what you're teaching and how your own views are coming through in that. He's an American citizen teaching over there, so that's an experience our faculty might have as well if we were teaching there and, certainly, anyone employed by that university would routinely have.



I'm wondering how we maintain Cornell's independence and freedom of bias and our standards in a situation where a political officer might order a person teaching on our behalf to express -- like the Uyghurs question that was just raised, to express an opinion other than what we would want to hear expressed.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Right. Clearly, China has a slightly different government system than we do. Based on what they have done with the Tsinghua program, is that our faculty control our part of the curriculum. It's managed by us and they agree to what it is that they're doing.

We share the syllabi with them. We share the course content. We will have to talk with them more specifically about particular elements, but our freedom to deliver the courses in the way that we want to deliver them will not be inhibited in any significant way, but we will have conversations with them. They're already our partners.

KEN BIRMAN: I'm usually very supportive of proposals, but I'm skeptical about that. I really am.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Yeah, we haven't seen a concern from the Tsinghua program, and they've been doing that, I want to say, for eight years now. None of these issues have been a problem. It's because they want this training. And because they want this training, they make concessions that they might not make in other ways.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think a good follow-up thing here, because we get at least one or two of these things a year, I think we ought to work with CAPP on this, whether we should sort of crystallize the kinds of questions we want to have answered in the review.

These are all excellent questions. There's a long form that's online, but it's like 20 pages long. The State wants to know all kind of things. Maybe some kind of short form that cuts to the chase. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Just to speak to the point Ken was making. For example, Alex, does the memorandum of understanding that Cornell would sign with Peking University have asserted stipulations about how academic freedom will be protected for Cornell participants, academic freedom as we define it? A statement like that, for example, I believe became a core element of a similar kind of proposal that was approved by the senate last year.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Right. And it's my understanding that's part of how this process works, that they know exactly what they're getting from us and we know exactly what we're doing for them.

Again, because we've done a similar program like this already, we understand the concerns, but we don't see them as being overwhelmingly significant.

KEN BIRMAN: Charlie, can I move that this be tabled? Not reject it, but just tabled? I'm not comfortable personally voting on it. I don't know how others feel. It just seems very sudden to do a sense of the senate vote on something that we've just heard about and don't have a chance to study these kinds of agreement documents yet. We could in a month. Could we postpone voting until we know more about exactly what those agreements say?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I would like to second that, to see in writing what the agreement on academic freedom is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would second that, too.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. We'll do that. We meet in two weeks. It's an easy thing to translate that. I confess here, I kind of violated the sense of the senate thing, although this was posted last week. Usually, it's A, then B, separate meetings. So I apologize for that little SNAFU. We'll clarify the questions that we'd like to have the school answer, then we'll return to this. That sounds fine. We'll talk at the next meeting, which is in two weeks.

ALEX SUSSKIND: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Alex.

We have two main agenda items. The first one now concerns Policy 1.2, which is titled Academic Misconduct. It's one of the most important policies we have there. Misconduct cases do come up. In my tenure as DOF, maybe two or three a year, this kind of thing. And they're very serious, very complicated.

We are all set up now to get input on the proposed revision and we've done side-by-side comparisons, so there's a whole web setup there.

Today, main thing is to have Mark Hurwitz from the research office talk through rationale for these changes. Unit Counsel Madelyn Wessel is in the audience and is very familiar with all this stuff, and we can certainly pose questions.

With that, Mark, let's hear why this -- these changes are necessary.

MARK HURWITZ: Thanks, Charlie. Charlie's introduced me and said what this is, so the main thing is that we want to make some significant improvements in the current policy. We need to more fully align it with federal requirements. And I'll go into that a little bit more later on.

We have a very broad definition of what academic misconduct is. We'd like to replace that with research-related misconduct, that's to make it more clear that we are talking about misconduct related to research. It's not a big change in scope, but it, at least, brings in other policies that may be more relevant to some of the kinds of cases that show up.

We also are collaborating more and more with Weil Cornell Medicine, and we'd like to be more aligned with their policy. The dean of faculty in the current policy is a major player, and it's a big workload on him, much of which could be handed off to staff. I'll show how that works. And we'd like to kind of tighten up the confidentiality mechanisms.

Federal regulations absolutely require that we have some sort of policy. I've just put up a few of them, but the Office of Science and Technology policy has an umbrella research misconduct policy, and all the others kind of follow that either with more detail or less, but we need to align with those policies a bit better.

First, we need much better clarity in the roles and responsibilities that researchers have, which will help reduce misconduct and the large financial penalties that can come from that, as we've seen news articles about that sort of thing.

We've added in a preliminary assessment stage so that we don't immediately dive into an academic misconduct investigation, when possibly there are other policies under which it's better handled. And we need to have more clarity in the roles and responsibilities for conducting cases, determining sanctions, and conducting appeals. I'll spell that out a little bit more.

First of all, if you're not fully aware, this is a good opportunity to bring this up; research misconduct is defined by the federal agencies, and the focus of sponsoring agencies consists of three possibilities: Fabrication of data, falsification of data, and plagiarism.

Plagiarism, obviously, is not just copying other people's words, but anything related to taking credit for what they've done. In our policy, we have a very broad definition of academic misconduct, which is quoted here: "Any act that violates the standards of integrity in the conduct of scholarly and scientific research and communication." That brings a lot of things into the pipeline for academic misconduct.

We're not changing that as much as we are pointing out that there are other policies that may be more appropriate. For example, for animal welfare and care situations, the IACUC policies kick in. For human research, the IRB policies and others, but we bring those out as specific examples.

Talking about this makes everybody nervous, so I want to tone it down a little bit. It's very, very clear that this conduct is intentional. Everybody makes mistakes. There are many interpretations that happen; people get into situations. It's not necessarily misconduct. Just wanted to take the opportunity to say that.

The policy provides safeguards for complainants, the people who are making the allegations; safeguards for respondents, the people against whom the allegations are made; and reasonable time limits.

The federal agencies' policies, there's an inquiry that has to happen in 60 days. There's an investigation, if it follows, that has to happen within 120 days. There are often renewals on these. Sometimes it's very difficult to meet that time limit, but having the time limit makes it easier to push things along.

In all cases, the identities of respondents, complainants, research subjects, whatever, are only passed on to those who have an absolute need to know as part of the process.

Now, I'm just going to go through some flow diagrams to give you an idea of what the current stages of the policy are and then what the improvements are.

Right now, the dean of faculty receives an allegation from somebody for some reason. The next step is to do an inquiry, where the dean of faculty gathers up the information, conducts interviews, decides whether the allegation is academic misconduct and if there is substantive evidence.

If the answer to either one of those is no, we close out the case. If it's under another policy, well, maybe it gets passed on. Hard to say. If the answer is yes, then it goes to the dean of the relevant college, who appoints a faculty committee to do the same sort of thing, but in much more depth, to determine what happened. Did misconduct occur; and if so, to recommend appropriate sanctions. If there's no misconduct, the case closes. If there is

misconduct or if the committee decides there's misconduct, then the dean of faculty reviews the report and determines the sanctions.

It got a little cut off there, but I think it's okay.

Then we go into the sanctions are imposed, and our current policy says, by applicable University procedures. And then the respondent may appeal, using applicable grievance procedures, and the case is closed.

As you can see, this often leads to quite a muddle. Once the dean of faculty determined what should happen, having it happen can become complicated.

Let's go on to look at the proposed new procedure. Now, the allegations will be received by the research integrity officer, rather than the dean of faculty. Then, instead of putting the dean of faculty in the middle of everything, the research integrity officer, which, for the time being, is me, will work with the deciding official who is the most senior research official, and that is right now Emmanuel Giannelis, the Vice President for Research and Innovation.

Between the two, we do an assessment. Is the allegation specific and credible? Can we actually do anything with it? Is the allegation research misconduct, if it's true, or research-related misconduct? If the answer is no, the case is closed. It will go back to the complainant, but it will get closed on one of those bases.

If, in fact, it does seem specific and credible and it is research or research-related misconduct, then the deciding official, in consultation with the dean of faculty, appoints a faculty inquiry committee to do the basic process that's being done now.

Now, all it is is gather evidence, conduct interviews to determine if the evidence is substantive. If it's not substantive, there's nothing there, then close the case. If it is substantive, then the deciding official, in consultation with the dean of faculty, appoints another

faculty investigation committee, which can have members from the inquiry committee, but is generally larger.

Then, that committee performs the same process of gathering evidence, conducting interviews, determining if misconduct occurred, and recommending sanctions. Now, instead of going off into limbo, we have -- the deciding official reviews the report, determines the sanctions in consultation with the dean of faculty, and implements those sanctions.

Before the imposition of sanctions, the respondent can appeal to the provost. The provost makes the final decision, and then the sanctions, if any, are imposed by the dean of faculty.

Sanctions can vary from anything from a reprimand or a requirement that some education happen, to dismissal. It can be very serious business, but it has a very definite process now. Once we get this approved, that will go through a much more coherent manner than we're able to now. That's it.

Paul Soloway has a question here. Research integrity, is there an appeal process for the complainant? That's interesting.

MADELYN WESSEL: Mark, you and I can handle some of these together.

MARK HURWITZ: Please, go ahead.

MADELYN WESSEL: There isn't a formal appeal process for the complainant. These rules are basically crafted to be very much in alignment with NIH, NSF, the federal research misconduct procedures. But there is engagement with the complainant and, in fact, the reports that are drafted are subject to transparent review by both the parties.

If there's a complainant, and an inquiry or investigation committee is not finding cause to move forward, the complainant does have an opportunity to weigh in with the committee; and respondents, very importantly, do as well.

There's a constant iterative process, but formal appeal by the complainant is not baked into these procedures and is not a part of the driving federal procedures that we're now finally at Cornell aligning with more fully.

MARK HURWITZ: And having the complainant, as well as the respondent, review the report of both the inquiry and the investigation committee is part of the current process; it's not in addition. That's why I didn't highlight it.

Other questions?

MADELYN WESSEL: I saw one question that came in, which is: What happens if a complainant is from outside the university? The answer is: It's the same process. More and more, we're actually seeing, I would say, the majority of these cases are cases that have been brought by an external complainant. There's now so much web-based sort of review, review of images and papers that's automated that we're seeing complaints come in to sites like PubPeer and other sites that are dedicated to ferreting out what they deem to be research misconduct.

A lot of the complaints at our university and really all others are now addressing can be even anonymous complaints that come in; but if they raise serious issues about a publication's integrity, a unit does have an obligation to look into them.

In fact, the policy, for those who end up reading it carefully, does have some nuancing as far as anonymous complainants not having the same full panoply of access about rights as identified complainant, which I think is important for protection of our faculty.

It is easy to throw dirt at a faculty member anonymously, and it was thought very important in working with Mark and Charlie here to make sure we have some integrity in those accusations and protections for faculty in the process when there is no identified complainant.

MARK HURWITZ: Yeah. And I would like to add briefly to that. The trend of increasing allegations, I believe, is not going away. One, we have federal agencies who are scrutinizing



things more than they have in the past. And as Madelyn said, the Internet is making it a social activity to search for parts of journal articles that might be subject to federal research misconduct.

JILL: There are two hands up, Charles Walcott and then Bruce Lewenstein.

CHARLES WALCOTT: I'd like to comment, having been through this dreadful process when I was dean of the faculty back in the Carboniferous Era. I think this is a vast improvement over what was there. The one thing I wonder a little about -- my recollection was that the process at one point involved the dean of the college getting involved to, I think, appoint a committee within the college. I just wondered if anybody had chatted with the college deans, see how they feel about this proposed process. To me, it makes a great deal more sense than the previous arrangement.

MARK HURWITZ: I went through it quickly, Charlie. But in the previous process, the deans were the ones that set up the investigation committee, and that has led to some real tangles and complications, that putting it on the VPRI now kind of isolates it, the process from the community of the respondent. I think it's a big improvement.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Thanks for this presentation. I really appreciate the policy is designed, in part, because of some regulatory requirements and trying to align things with rules, but most of those rules develop in the natural sciences and the funding streams for the natural sciences.

I'm concerned -- and there's a discussion on the dean of faculty's website just calling attention to that discussion that several of us posted -- that the definition of research is quite limited for and feels as though it does not apply to a lot of the humanistic or interpretive social sciences. The definition of research is having testable hypotheses and so forth.

I'm wondering if there's a way that policy can be -- while meeting the needs of the regulatory regime that we're in, can also acknowledge there's a much broader understanding of what research is, including, in particular, one of the comments calls attention to the humanities in particular. Plagiarism is one of the bigger issues, as well. I'm just trying to figure out how could that be integrated.

MARK HURWITZ: I'm sure Madelyn will want to jump in, too, but I would like to say the definition of research that we are following is that the information is generalizable.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: I don't want to get into --

MARK HURWITZ: Yeah. There's also some things that the University is responsible for and needs to get involved in. There are other things that are between scholars and their publishers. But we have had a gray line, a broad line has come up that we've had situations that were from the humanities as well as from the STEM areas.

Madelyn, I'm sure you have more useful things to say than I do about that.

MADELYN WESSEL: I would certainly say the revised definitions, including the intentional separation of federal research misconduct from research-related misconduct, that is also included and might be worth looking at because it includes a lot of the issues that could come up in the humanities or arts situation.

So I would recommend taking a good look at the research-related misconduct definition to see whether you think it is broad enough to address research and scholarly integrity outside of the pure scientific disciplines.

If it isn't, we can certainly look at whether it ought to be broadened; although, it would be interesting to have faculty making the case to broaden a discipline require policy. But, as counsel, I'm always on board with faculty deciding to do that or recommending to do that.

I do think the definition, as it stands, is pretty broad, actually. What it is doing, it is making a change to narrow the breadth of the policy a little bit.

Mark got at it at the beginning, which is the current policy is, frankly, just fuzzy. As a lawyer for the University, I've always been troubled by the fact that it's hard for faculty to know really what is appropriate under the current policy because it's sort of an anything-goes broad definition. In that sense, this is a little bit more limited than Policy 1.2 and really focused on research-related activities.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: I think the challenge is going to be this creates a formal definition of research. It says this is what research is, and there are significant numbers of faculty who would disagree with that definition of research. And that has, then, carryover issues down the line, if there's funding questions about what counts as research funding outside of this policy. That's where I start getting concerned. It's a more detailed conversation.

MARK HURWITZ: Yeah, and it's a good one to have. I would just like to reiterate that the first step is: Does the allegation fall under the research-related misconduct or research misconduct? If not -- I might not have said this clearly, but if not, there's an obligation on the DO and the RIO to check, does it fall under some other policy and to move it to whoever's responsible for that policy. The Code of Academic Conduct may come into play for some of the fuzzier areas, for example.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thomas, and then Ken.

THOMAS BJORKMAN: I wanted to hit the harking issue, when does it become research misconduct. The hypothesizing after the results are known is far and away the most common form of research misconduct. Everybody starts off doing it. It can be a nice learning experience for a student to learn how to do science properly. It can be something that brings down an illustrious career, the full range.

As you mentioned, there are people out there searching through publicly -- published data sets to sniff out whether somebody's been doing this, then go after them through their blogs. It's a hot area, hot, hot, and a huge range. When does that fall into this process?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Over the course of almost 40 years now, my career, I've seen some really hair-raising misbehavior on program committees, even NSF panelists in Washington, where I felt that things were utterly inappropriate were occurring. People blatantly turning down papers were arguing against proposals being funded because they didn't like the individual or didn't like their politics, didn't like the country they came from. Sometimes people who are highly biased don't even understand they are so highly biased.

Right now, we don't have a statement by Cornell that that is not appropriate and not acceptable. And secondly, we don't have a process. This could be the place for such a statement, such a process. But if we're narrowing the definitions, we have to make sure we narrow them in such a way this is included and it's explicit, so that it's understood if you are a faculty member and you use your personal biases to try to harm someone else's career over some personal matter, that is grounds for serious sanction against you.

I think we lack the clarity right now. I'm hoping that doesn't happen commonly at Cornell; but, frankly, I can't imagine that it's not a risk. If we define academic conduct too narrowly, it would seem to exclude these kind of utterly non-academic behaviors. I've seen them; I've been a victim of them; I've been present when other people have done things which have horrified me.

MARK HURWITZ: Yeah. They are included, Ken. The broad umbrella of any act that violates the standards of integrity in the conduct of scholarly research and communication still stands. We haven't replaced that with a narrower statement. What we are doing is saying that

there are other policies, that it is a broad umbrella, but it's not the only policy under which things can be --

KEN BIRMAN: My worry, though, if it's not explicit, people may feel they can continue to get away with it. For people who bring diversity in the field -- Computer Science, for example, has very few women, even fewer people of color. These kinds of things are the types of barriers people fear and, in fact, they exist.

I would argue that we should do what Peter Stein did years ago, where he had a general policy that was very broad. This was the conflict of interest policy. Then he had a booklet of scenarios where he said the general policy is instantiated as follows in this situation and in that situation. In this way, you had the generality of the legal wording, but you also took that extra step of spelling out that when so-and-so did this that was inappropriate, it falls under this section of the policy, and this is the sanction applicable.

MARK HURWITZ: Yeah. And that falls directly under the responsibility for responsible conduct of research education.

KEN BIRMAN: But having the two documents -- you could write a general policy and you could also instantiate it as examples and communicate, as you say, educate people.

MARK HURWITZ: We have some of that on the research support website, but it needs to be improved, and I fully intend to do that.

KEN BIRMAN: Great. Thank you very much. This is a great presentation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mark Lewis, then Risa, then we'll continue this discussion, and I'll have some things to say, but let's do the final two comments here. Mark.

MARK LEWIS: Thank you. Just very quickly, I think the reason that the college deans were involved is because they're closer to the faculty member that may be being investigated,

so they would know a bit more about people that are going to be part of the faculty investigation committee.

Now, most of the work is done above the college, at the provost level, so that's one comment I have.

The second thing I notice, there's no grievance policy that allows a faculty member who's being accused to appeal to anybody below the provost.

MADELYN WESSEL: Let me tackle both of these initially, Mark. Mark Hurwitz's comment that relying on deans to run this process for their own faculty is not at all the typical process we see in this space around the country, and it really did present problems, including very, very frequently deans not wanting to be involved in this process because the accusations involved a faculty member with whom they have a close research relationship or a friendship or other relationship.

What this proposal does is to bring the creation of the community into a central level, but it is entirely faculty. It's not like it's an administrative committee. It's going to then be the DO and the dean of the faculty, and I'm sure often in consultation with deans -- I see it all the time. Cornell Medicine had this kind of model for quite a long time, so it's not that deans are out of the picture as far as recommending experts who are knowledgeable in the field, which is really important in assessing the typical research misconduct case, but it is essentially taking them out of that immediate role of purporting to manage the actual process and centralizing and, in my opinion, also professionalizing it within a team that really knows this kind of work.

With respect to the grievance process, you are quite right to observe that it has been removed from this version of the policy. The reason for that is because so much process is baked into this policy, including multiple steps with the personal inquiry committee, then an investigation committee, then the DO reviews.

By the way, at every stage of that process, the respondent is having an opportunity to challenge, to engage. This is a hearings-based kind of process to challenge the committee's findings, then a draft report, then to take their position to the deciding official and argue for changes in any outcome, and then, finally, also to be in a position to mount a final appeal to the provost.

This is exactly what happens at Weil Cornell Medicine. So what I would say here is the empirical fact-finding is located early and often. It is run by faculty, and it is a process that baits in the kind of opportunities for challenge of decisions that are really important when a faculty member risks some kind of sanction or censure.

MARK WYSOCKI: Can I just respond very quickly?

If I understand what you're saying, I'm going to paraphrase, that there's more granular pieces than what I'm seeing on the slide that are happening.

MADLYN WESSEL: Of course, it is a very long and detailed policy, yeah. I think that Charlie has it posted.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, then we're going to come back to this, but let's have Risa, and then we have to move on. Please put your comments in the chat, if you want to do that.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. I had a process question, but it has to do with the way in which this was developed. Perhaps that was already said, and I just didn't hear it.

But has this proposal been developed with a faculty committee involved in it? I heard that Charlie was involved in the proposal. But is there some Faculty Senate Committee that should be involved in this, and have they been involved? And if not, is this the first sort of foray into getting faculty input into the process?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We don't have a standing committee on research. These revisions have been pretty much Madelyn, myself, and Mark. This is the first layout of it, and we're getting huge amounts of feedback here, which is very valuable.

I'm going to be talking to graduate students. I think it's really clear here that we should have a meeting with people in the humanities and arts and other areas where there's a lot of concern here that we're not being broad enough from a certain standpoint. We have to engage the chairs, the center directors, and so on. This is Step 1. Everything is out there, a lot of opportunity to comment, and this is the first step in the process.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: And then, ultimately, is that aiming towards a senate vote?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. It will be something like what we did -- yeah, a resolution, sort of like we did with the free-speech thing. It will be crystallized, then we'll package it up in a resolution that we vote on, but we have -- this is going to take probably a couple of meetings, and we're just starting it right now.

MARK HURWITZ: We are looking for comments from the senate on Charlie's website. We've got the finalized draft as clear as we can make it posted. It was a limited number of people involved in the sense of Charlie's faculty, Emmanuel Giannelis is faculty, Mike Kotlikoff is faculty. They all have a great deal of faculty experience, but it is all STEM experience, as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'll compensate for that. I received emails from some colleagues in the humanities about the questions that surfaced here in the chat and also in the meeting itself, and when we come back, we'll have a revision and address all these sorts of concerns.

Again, you can put comments on the web in many places. This is a joint effort by all of us and it touches all of us.

Let's move on to the next topic. This one is a two-year-old project, one year of which was in suspension because of the pandemic. It grew up in the Committee on Academic Freedom



and Professional Status of the faculty because part of their charge is to pay attention to everything that shows up along the tenure track.

This is a reminder: No one owns the processes here. It's joint ownership. That's why it's complicated. The faculty, deans, and chairs all sort of weigh in. We are going to the next phase now, where we want to hear from faculty and through the senate.

Here's the tenure track. When we say everything along tenure track, we mean from the moment you are being recruited to when it shows up at the trustees level. There are various phases.

To be clear at the start, we are not talking about standards or any kind of thing like that. We are talking about transparency and clarity, because a lot of angst -- sorry. There's a lot of angst that comes because of the fuzziness. And we also have this tension between colleges and the University. Colleges run the tenure show, but they do show up at the provost level. We have a mix of University mandates; you must do this, you must do that, but a lot is left to the colleges. We want to try to clear things up as much as possible. It's everything along that tenure track.

The idea now is to improve what's in the faculty handbook, more detail, clarity, and so on. Here's the flow of what goes into that. On our side there, we spent a lot of time with the AFPSF. They have produced a giant FAQ, which I'll talk about in a second, but we had multiple meetings on that. We consulted with John Siliciano in the provost's office about that.

On the other side, of course, there are deans and chairs and so on. That's sort of the flow of events here. We're over here now, trying to get the senate now to weigh in on the many recommendations that have shown up in the AFPSF work that has been done.

There's 70 items there. A lot of them are no-brainers. It's a very dangerous thing to say, here's a suggestion, here's a piece of advice and everyone will be on board; but, by and large,

there's a real mix. There's some real serious things in there, procedures that the committee would like to recommend become University mandates and then there are other things that are advice and whatever.

Don't be alarmed about the volume of this. On the one hand, yes, it is a lot of stuff here to digest, and I'm trying to spread it over multiple meetings, make it easy for you to register your thoughts and so on. But here's the big reminder; this is our most central process. It's working, in a way, but we can really make it much better.

If you think about the freedom of speech thing we had, it was 50 years old or 60 years old. Stuff just sort of sits around, gets added to and whatever. I think we really owe it to our younger colleagues to really set a better stage for them, because they have enough concerns as it is right now. That's where we are and why we are showing up right now in the senate.

There's 70 things to discuss and to weigh in on. Again, lots of them are pretty routine. We've broken it into eight different sections, just to make it easier to digest. We like the FAQ format because we want to pose these things as questions and not come across as know-it-all and whatever. It's just a handy way to break things down. Each of those links there will take you to the FAQ questions with that topic.

Let's look at one of these, so you get a sense. Let's look at issues that come up associated with the launch of the tenure review. In that section, here are eleven things to think about. For example, what about an early review? What about delaying the review? What about discouraging it? The candidate has to produce some kind of teaching statement. What should it look like? What should be on the C.V.? We do want to have, for some of these, real guidelines.

Let's look at this one, for example. What are the attributes of a good research statement? We've come off this discussion about what is research. This would be broadening

your thinking about use of the word "research" here. But anyway, a two-pager, the candidate writes up what they've done. Let's look at what the committee recommends.

This is a sample thing that we want people to weigh in on. Here are some guidelines. This is under the heading of advice. Write in plain English, write for non-experts. Highlight your most important work and relate it to the major themes in your field. Tell a story. Remember, the tenure review is about trajectory and tell a story that feeds into that.

Here's a sample sort of concrete thing: Maybe you have an unfunded proposal. Well, that could be a positive. You don't want to think just because I didn't get this approved, that's somehow a negative on your résumé. Again, this is advice.

Let's look at what's in the current faculty handbook on this topic. Typically, the candidate is asked to submit statements of goals and achievements in research. Again, that's okay, but we want to get more detail. We want to help chairs give good advice to the young professor that comes in and says, what does my research statement have to look at? It is just providing guidelines. A lot of these items have to do with just fleshing out details.

Let's go back one slide. If you look at this, maybe you have trouble with that. Maybe you might say, what do you mean, write for non-experts? That might be a point of contention. But the committee sort of feels that we have to learn, as faculty, who work in narrow little areas, how to talk about what we do.

You have to remember who's reading your dossier. As it climbs the ladder, those individuals would get further and further away from your area, but you may contest that. You may say, why do that? Any of these items are up for grabs. You might say, it's irrelevant. You might say, it's harmless and okay to put in the faculty handbook, or you might say don't put it in because it's misleading. That's the kind of scrutiny that we're looking for from the senate and the faculty, more generally.

Here's what we did. There's eight sections. You can go into our website in the usual way and post comments. However, to make it easier for you, we've set up Qualtrics surveys for each of those sections, and all it does is pose a simple question after each entry, basically, some kind of yes/no question.

This one here is: Do you support the inclusion of this advice in the faculty handbook? If you visit these Qualtrics surveys -- and it's public, anyone can comment. We are looking for good ideas. It is not like some kind of vote, that if it's 51 to 49, we are going to do that. We are looking for reactions and better ideas. Every one of them has a yes/no sort of question. The questions vary. Sometimes it's advice or a definition and so on. But in any case, very simple question and the opportunity for you to comment. This is one of the several ways we hope to solicit, in a low overhead way, information from you on this.

Just to go back to some higher-level challenges here, the general subject of what's left to the colleges is tricky. We have to admit that right at the start. Here's a sample thing, sort of out of the blue, to illustrate that. If you have a laissez-faire approach, you say the tenure track faculty vote and then leave it to the colleges to figure it out. Or -- and now you start getting a little more prescriptive -- the Center might say the vote has to be my secret ballot and the tally must be shared with the voters.

This is just an out-of-blue comparison to illustrate this sort of tension, that you want to give advice, you want to give guidance to the colleges, but you don't want to give too much. A lot of these entities that we're asking you to weigh in on, keep that in mind. The colleges are different, and this should always be at the front of our thinking here, just something we should just leave to the colleges.

Here are all the different levels, just to expand on that: You can mandate stuff from the University level, you can use really strong bully pulpit, you can phrase things as best practices, or you can just shut up about it.

There's this sort of spectrum here about how much we want to say in the faculty handbook. Every college has their own documentation. And I'll say something about that, but we have to keep this in mind.

We'll talk about these incoming meetings. But just to pick three things that the committee spent a lot of time about, and they're recommending things at the University level, which would require us to weigh in on. I'm guessing that down the road, we're going to have individual resolutions about these sorts of things.

One of them is about the selection process. I won't go into details, but there's different ways you can do that. The way they propose has an element of fairness to it and prevents gamesmanship, if you sort of know what I might mean there. The no contact list, does the candidate have a right to give you a list and say, do not contact these people because. For example, I had a run-in with them at some point or there are issues.

Some colleges allow that, some don't. The committee sort of feels the candidate should have a no-contact list; but also, the department has the right to ask those people. But if they do that, there has to be a letter in the dossier about that. You went to that list, explain. That's sort of a transparency kind of thing. More on this later.

I must say, on Number 3 there, I grew up in computer science, and we did things a certain way. I was sort of shocked at the variance across the University in terms of how this one particular thing is handled. The Chair writes a letter to the dean. To me, it was a no-brainer, the tenured faculty should see that letter to make sure that it's an accurate representation of the deliberations. That's how the AFPS feels. But there's variation across that.

I was shocked to learn that you don't even see that letter in some units. In some units, you don't know who the external reviewers are. I was shocked out of my mind at some of the stuff that's out there. We'll get to these things, but just wanted to highlight the kinds of things, among these 70 items, that are more serious and are going to require some real deliberation amongst ourselves here.

Here's a prescriptor recommendation, and this is something that drove me crazy, which is this: Among our ten colleges, only two of them put all their stuff online, visible. A lot of it is locked up behind intranets, some even the night before your thing, you will get a PDF on your door about what the rules are. I think it is absolutely essential that every single college put all their rules and procedures online for everyone to see. Let me give you five reasons why.

First of all, it helps demystify the process. This is our most central thing. Why hide it? We should be proud of this. It promotes best practices across colleges. It's surprising one college might learn how another college does the same thing, and wow, I never thought of that. This is a little bit about we're decentralized, but why don't we learn from one another at this level.

Then you have the missteps kind of thing. Chairs are extremely busy. I want the rules out there, public, for everyone to see. The chairs have to be surrounded by colleagues and staff who know what's up and how to do things. Make it easy to see what the rules are.

This sounds silly, but often you have versions. Here's a PDF that was written five years ago, and I just updated it. Half the people in the department are using the old PDF. If you have one place online, then there's no ambiguity. That is the current version.

Finally, it fosters clarity, which this is a big theme in this project, which is this: If you are just writing for yourself, you have a small group of faculty who have been in the department for 20 years, they have always done thing the same way; whereas, if you know your stuff is going to

be online, you will take extra steps to make sure it's clear because everyone's going to look at it. That's an example of something that I feel we should prescribe.

Here's the process, which we'll break this into parts, and the idea is to get discussions. There will be feedback on the web, we'll be talking to the provost, the deans and others. It will be going around, much like we did with the free speech thing. It was interactions between the senate and Madelyn's office, and we merged with something that everyone is sort of happy with. That's kind of the plan.

Just as a note, the AFPSF is going to look at the appeals procedures, and that's going to show up later on in the semester. If you notice, that wasn't mentioned in any of those eight different steps.

Just to illustrate -- I know we are running out of time here, but as I mentioned, some of these talking points are more complicated than others, so I just picked four of them here, just to go through them and sort of think out loud, so that you can see how you might want to respond to some of these things. These are concerned -- let's just look at them in turn; it will be self-explanatory.

Mentoring has become a very big deal, formal, and it's really for the good. But now, here's sort of a question: Does the mentor share the discussions that come up with the individual? That's kind of tricky. Is the mentor going to run back to the chair's office and say X, Y and Z? We don't think that should be the case. It should be like a lawyer-client relationship.

If the mentee gives permission, yeah, please share this with my chair; I'm having difficulties with this other professor, feel free to talk about that with others. Just a little bit of how do we run the mentor-mentee scene.

The red there, that's a hard-nosed policy that you can't just do that without the mentee's consent. I look at that and say, do I agree with this? You take it apart and think out loud, what do we want achieve here?

Annual reviews, very important. How should they be structured? There's quite a bit of variation across the colleges, but the committee sort of felt here are four attributes that an annual review should have. There should be sort of set questions that the candidate is asked to respond to. The chair and the candidate or a chair or a designate -- we have large departments; it has to be designates -- who discuss the written synopsis. The chair provides feedback, and the candidate can respond to that. All that stuff goes in the dossier, and all that stuff shows up is there at the time of the review.

There's a real important information-gathering point along the tenure track that's going to happen five times before you come up for tenure, but we want to make sure it's fair and that you're -- and transparent and maximizing information flow, whatever that might mean.

You might have thoughts about that. What are they? Then please tell us.

Here's something that comes up, which is about discouraging or denying a review. First of all, the dean has to approve a review. But let's talk about the discouraging thing, the writing-on-the-wall thing. It should be the case the chair does talk to the candidate in broad strokes about the process and somehow communicate a sense of how things are going.

But, remember, if you have those five annual reviews in the dossier, there should be sort of no surprises. What you don't want to have happen is where the candidate is really discouraged, is made to feel the chances are very small, because you have to remember how incomplete the snapshot is before the tenure review. There's language about that, some guidance to chairs.



Remember, most chairs are in the position for maybe three years, and they've certainly hung around tenure decisions, but have never had the chance to really be in the chair position. And you have to help chairs with these sorts of things or at least give some guidance.

Last example, this has to do with how do we think about the candidate's contribution and commitment to diversity and inclusion. This is tricky. And several other offices on campus have ideas about this, so here's sort of a fork in the road. You have teaching, research and outreach, just to name the kinds of statements that already exist there.

Should there be a fourth one that deals with this? You can certainly go that route. But another strategy is simply to talk about your commitment in those other venues. You're talking about your teaching and, in that setting, you can talk about how your commitment to diversity and inclusion takes effect, or in research or if you happen to be an extension. This is a very important component. It's part of our job description, and somehow it has to show up in some form in the dossier. What do you think about that and how should it be done?

That's it, I think. Let's go to full screen. I wanted to lay out the process here. I hope you feel it's all important. I know we're totally swamped. Just want to stress that we've tried to arrange this so that we get the feedback, we do the editing in as low overhead way as possible. It's worth doing this, in a nutshell.

We started this over two years ago, and there's a lot of work there, so I'm kind of anxious to have it play out. Just shoot from the hip comments on the process, whatever, anything. The idea is we're going to collect things. A, B, C are the sections I would like you to sort of look at now, and we'll collect thoughts about this. Some will be no-brainers, but others will be controversial, and we'll come back and talk about them. That's sort of the plan. I'm hoping that we can do this. There must be some questions out there.

JILL: Professor Dubreuil.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Charlie, first thing I would say is good luck with that. It looks a little bit like rebuilding your house from scratch, so interesting experience. We'll see how it goes. I'm certainly in favor of the idea of having transparency about the processes that colleges or departments at least would publish what they use in terms of guidelines.

I need to register my -- this is about anything that could resemble standardization across the disciplines, the colleges and the departments. Not only will it be very difficult to see it working, but it seems really wrong to me. I believe you have processes on one hand and you have document content on the other hand. So what weight should you give to a third-year review, for instance, is more a process question. But how should a statement look like, I believe, should not be touched upon at that central level. If it's just elements of advice, why not? But then it's not very clear that we need that.

It seems to me that you have two very different ideas there. The fear I have, based on my 15 years in this university, the fear I have is the increase of bureaucratization, and it seems to me that what this description could end up with is a kind of very fine-grained bureaucratic process. Even though that would not be the goal, that might be a problem.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Again, remember, some things are advice and, as you said, why not? A lot of this is advice, but there's a real fairness thing there. From my position, you get to see things that are very suboptimal. And you take, like, the no-contact list. All that is is just transparency and giving people a chance. A department can still go to the no-contact list, but if they do that, they have to sort of justify it. The idea is, in that particular example I'm using, is just transparency.

And there's variation across the colleges. You can look at that two ways. You could say the colleges are all different and let them make up their own mind, but -- and it's a very small number. I would say four or five recommendations from the committee are asking for a certain

level of standardization, but there's a lot of flexibility in these things. Yes, being over-prescriptive is a danger, and every suggestion has to be weighed with that in mind.

I guess David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: It seems to me that even within a college, there's huge variation. You were just describing how you thought it was a no-brainer for the chair's letter to the dean to be visible to the faculty. We never see that letter in my department. In fact, the chair is not obliged to follow the vote, so to speak. There's no prescription that the chair recommend someone for tenure to the dean if the vote is this or that. There's customs and stuff. That's one thing.

Another thing is when I first arrived at Cornell, they told me that Computer Science voted and then, if they decided to recommend the person to the dean, then they changed the vote to unanimous, and that's how they communicated it to the dean. Then some dean came along, maybe it was Fuchs who said no, I want to see the vote too. So everybody had to show the vote, and that was a big change. Our department had always sent the votes.

Bottom line, it seems to me there's this huge difference between departments, even within one college. I'd be surprised if they were able to standardize even those kind of procedural things, like do you see the letter, whatever. That's just a comment.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I want to advise against the word "standardized." In your example about should you see the chair's letter, the chair can still do whatever they want. They can vote against the department. We're just saying it has to be visible. That's all we're saying.

Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you, Charlie. I think this is a really, really interesting presentation. I was long ago the chair of the real EPC. The one Dave Delchamps is on is a pretender to the EPC. It actually means Engineering Policy Committee, in my view.

Many years ago, they created the standards that Dave is referring to in engineering. We use them in CIS, as well. Charlie grew up with it, as he pointed out. It was a hard process, but I think we created very effective materials that have enough flexibility that the departments differ within the units, as Dave was just saying. But even so, the degree -- it is standardization, but it is a loose standardization, I think, has been extremely beneficial in CIS and engineering and now down at Tech, and I would encourage people not to be afraid of this process.

I think transparency is valuable. It's also fairness for the candidate to have some degree of knowledge of how the process will be conducted and to know that it's not going to be some idiosyncratic thing particular to a tiny little unit where some tyrannical senior person has always done it in such-and-such a way and wants to continue.

Opening up these kinds of processes is a protection for the young faculty that we're bringing in, and I'm strongly in favor of it, even though I remember how hard it was to do the engineering work. Fortunately, here, Charlie's working -- you look at practices across the units, many of which have policies like we did in engineering, so I am strongly in favor of this. I think it's a wonderful initiative.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mark Lewis.

MARK LEWIS: I don't agree that the letter from the chair should be public to everybody, but that's okay. I think the goal should be what you want to get from each of these steps. For example, although the director of the department might write a letter, the faculty has an ad hoc committee which will present what they think. The information is gleaned from what the faculty are thinking through that other letter, which is provided by the ad hoc committee. So I would posit we could probably come up with something which lays out what we want to get from this process without having to -- I'm sorry. I used that word "standardization."

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, again, being over-prescriptive. There's variation within a

college and so on, but transparency and fairness to the candidate, I really think that's an important thing. There's too many instances of screw-ups because there was lack of clarity. One screw-up can then suddenly turn into a gigantic appeal and things like that.

This has nothing to do about standards. It's to set things up to bring out the best of our young faculty, make sure they have a fair chance and the process is fair. They pour their lives into this and they deserve a process that's transparent and fair, all the usual things there.

Anything in the chat?

NEEMA KUDVA: Going back and forth about the transparency and the standardization question.

Charlie, coming from one of these units -- we talked about this before, but it might be worthwhile bringing it up. Coming from a unit still struggling with putting any sort of structure down, and it seems to change from person to person, when this FAQ comes out, I've always struggled with -- does it have, like, a legal standing, if you know what I mean, that everyone has to follow the rule?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I had a discussion with Madelyn on this, maybe a year ago, about best practices. Suppose you say here's a best practice for doing something, and now your unit uses the second-best practice. Are you vulnerable? So you have to be careful about that language. The idea is to give good advice, not just for the candidate, but for the chairs. It's tricky. I want to talk to Madelyn about that. When I say something is a no-brainer, we are just giving advice. You have to be careful about that, because if you don't follow that advice --

NEEMA KUDVA: There are multiple units, mine included, that doesn't do annual reviews even. I mean, start with that. I think the variation is so huge. We've talked about this, but I think it's worked all of us thinking through that part of it. I so agree about having a fair, transparent system that gives everybody access, that doesn't hide things. There's too many

people who've been hurt by not knowing the way the process works, and I completely agree with that, but I think the variation amongst our units is so huge, that bringing it into line is where a lot of the challenge will be.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Can I say something? I've had my hand up and just wanted to add something, if I could do that. I just wanted to put something out that I thought might be useful to think about conceptually in terms of writing this. I'm all on board with the transparency, and my particular concern is protecting candidates, because there's so much that's done in secrecy.

One way to think about this is: Are there certain minimum standards that we think everybody should be held to. It's a floor, as opposed to a ceiling; that is, is there a certain level of protection that everybody should get and what would that look like? Then, if a unit wishes to provide more transparency, more protection to a candidate, they can do that. I think that might be a helpful way to think about it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a good point, really good point. RTE faculty, we welcome your comments on this. In the end, if we do resolutions, it's going to be University faculty, but I like the idea of discussions where everyone is in the room. A lot of this stuff is relevant to RTEs; but also, it's education.

A lot of faculty don't fully understand all these RTE titles, and RTEs may not understand - I just want to say that everyone here, whether you are RTE or not, is welcome to contribute to this. I think it's really important.

My own worry here is we are overloaded. As much as you can, try to weigh in on this so we can begin to shape things and figure out what we really got to talk about. Between now and the next time, if you -- it only would take you like 15 minutes to go through A, B and C, and you'll spot some things you want to weigh in on, then just sort of the say what you think, then we can move this along.

I don't have to say it again. It's awfully important. Anything else in the chat there?

Anyone want to say any --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You had a nice timeline there, but you didn't actually have years.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah. Let's just see what we can do. It's out there now. There's 70 items. Maybe there's a 71st; but basically, it's out there. We broke down in these tiny steps every possible little thing that comes up and can cause an issue. It's out there. If it takes a year, then so be it. But I think we have to pay attention to this, our most central policy, and try to set a better stage and stuff.

Thanks. We are going to go into our hallway chat, and thank you for coming. I know there's another senate that you're more interested in than this one.