A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2021

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Hello, everyone. I'm Jonathan Ochshorn, Speaker of the Faculty Senate. Before calling the meeting to order, I'd like to start with a 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.

The meeting is now called to order. And I understand, since this is a bit of an awkward format for doing such things, that there is a Point of Order. So, I'm going to encourage that Point of Order person to raise their hand and call on -- you know, it's supposed to be an interruption, but this is hard to do in Zoom. So, I'm going to just call on Courtney Ann Roby.

COURTNEY ANN ROBY: Thank you very much, Speaker Ochshorn. I would like to raise a Point of Order. Okay. So, specifically, I would like to raise the Point of Order that the removal of the chat from meetings of the Senate constitutes a major change in the way we conduct our meetings, and hence, must be approved by the Faculty Senate before it takes effect.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: According to Robert's Rule of Order, the Speaker can rule on such a Point of Order, and also provide a short explanation. I'm not -- I'm ruling against this Point of Order for the following reason. I'll try to make it short.

A Point of Order is about a breach of rules. And in my judgment, there is no rule that has been broken. There's nothing in the rules of the Faculty Senate that requires a chat session. In fact, it was a

kind of informal pragmatic response to the pandemic, and the time where there was a virtual requirement for virtual Zoom meetings, and this was implemented informally by the previous Dean of Faculty.

The current Dean of Faculty has no longer implemented virtual meetings. In fact, the meetings are now hybrid. And so, in the same informal way, has decided administratively that the chat function is no longer appropriate. Because it's not a rule, I don't think a Point of Order is appropriate, and therefore I rule against it.

COURTNEY ANN ROBY: I believe I have the right to reply. Is that correct?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No, you have the right to appeal. This is not debatable.

COURTNEY ANN ROBY: Okay. I would like to appeal the ruling of the Speaker and ask for a recorded vote.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. This appeal is debatable, and a vote can be taken. We're going to limit the debate, hopefully. If anyone wants to speak in favor of this -- of Professor Roby's request, take two minutes right now, and raise your hand. Or come to the front of the room if you're in person. Okay. I'll --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: -- call on S.E. Prior.

S.E. PRIOR: Yes, very briefly I think in the spirit of encouraging communication between the Senators, I see only upside to continuing to have Zoom chat be available.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Not seeing anyone in person. I'll go to Cora, and I can't see the full last name.

CORA: Yes. I am -- I agree with the need for chat. Especially because there is -- there are faculty who can assist, who can be present at Senate meetings, who are not Senators and don't have the power of vote, but they would like to -- they would like us to hear their voices, and they have expressed the need to have a chat. Especially as far as their need to be heard is concerned.

NEEMA KUDVA: Jonathan, there's somebody on the floor here.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Could you -- I can't see them. So, could you just --

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah, they're right in --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: -- instruct them to begin?

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. Please start.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And introduce themselves.

NEEMA KUDVA: Please, say your name.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, Jonathan. It's Richard, the Department of Government. I just wanted to regularize our proceedings just a bit. For an appeal there needs to be a second. So, I would second Courtney's appeal.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. That's my error.

WENDY WILCOX: This is Wendy Wilcox from the library. I had actually reached out to Richard when he sent this resolution. I don't see how you can have chat and have people in person. Otherwise, the people in person are missing out on a key component of communications. So, I don't see how chat affords any communication. All you have to do is raise your hand and speak. So, the chat is just a form of under-conversation or behind-the-scenes conversation. All we're saying is to be respectful of those who

are in person, and those who are in Zoom, raise your hand and offer your comments. So, I'm not in favor of reinstituting chat.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Paul Ginsparg.

PAUL GINSPARG: I'm strongly in favor of reinstituting it. I think it -- oh, I wanted to take my hand down. Sorry. I think it enormously enhanced the amount of communication we were able to have. It made it much more informative. And also, much more engaging. I'm hearing a lot of background noise.

Regarding this question of, you know, in person versus remote, we had a similar question at our info side faculty meetings, which are split between the Ithaca and Cornell Tech campuses. And we found last year that they were, as well, so enormously enhanced by the chat, we've continued the chat during our -- you know, now that we're back in person, and have found it still to be equally useful.

So, I just think it would be ignoring -- we've learned a lot of things in the pandemic, I've continued teaching in a mode, the same hybrid mode that I used with recordings, because I found them to be valuable to students, and I think having experienced the Faculty Senate without the chat, and seeing how enormously enhanced it is by the chat, I think we have to keep it working because it's been so useful. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: If there's no other in person speakers, I would suggest that we have maybe one more Zoom response, then the final word by Robert's Rule goes to the Dean of the Faculty, should she choose to respond. So, maybe Ken Birman?

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you. I think that it -- I appreciate this chance for us to debate the question. I represent Computer Science. I'm strongly in favor of making chat. I think it's been used in a civil and appropriate way over the past year and a half, and that it's fit easily into our processes. Beyond the points that Paul raised, yeah, I can think of many dozens -- I mean, many, many times when people have

requested clarification, and Senators have been able to help each other out. Those same Senators would've been puzzled and unable to get a simple answer unless there was an opportunity to go to the microphone.

So, I think the chat used inappropriately should be sanctioned, and the Speaker could keep an eye on chat and do so. But I think appropriate use of chat in a civil way greatly enhances our communication ability without being disrespectful in any sense whatsoever. And for people who are in the room, I accept Wendy's point as a matter of fact, I think there should be some form of display in which she, you know, she and others who are physically present could see any chat that's occurring. But of course, they could also use their iPhone for that purpose.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm seeing two more --

EVE De ROSA: I'm comfortable with those two speaking.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yeah. So, why -- maybe we could have first Abby and then Adam, and then go to the Dean of Faculty.

ABBY COHN: So, I just wanted to ask whether there wouldn't be some way to project the chat in the room, because I think that -- I think Wendy's point's well taken. But I think it would address that. And I think it also would then make sense for us to have, you know, we could all agree that the chat should be used for relevant, civil exchanges. Right? And I think by virtue of the fact that everyone can see it, that already imposes that. So, if we could come up with a mechanism whereby people attending in person could see the chat, I would be in favor of it.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Adam?

ADAM ANDERSON: Yeah. I, as a cognitive psychologist, it's an illusion that people can multitask. The idea that we can actually listen to a speaker, and monitor the chat at the same time, and saying

that's enhancing our ability to process information is just not shown true by science. It might feel that way.

So, I -- we would never have multiple speakers come up to microphones and speak at the same time. Like we understand that that is just not -- it's not -- beyond etiquette, it just cuts down on the ability to understand what people are saying. So, I'm in favor of having chat be asynchronous. We can use the chat, but then see it later after the session's over. Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: Thank you, everyone. I am going to just take a few minutes. I did make a slide. I wanted to share with the Senate my values. And the reason I'm doing this is because I was really surprised to receive messages from seasoned Senators saying why are you preventing people from speaking? That is not a value of mine.

I value transparency, I value, I put it up on the slide for myself to remember, representation. We are representative body, right? Openness, fairness, and faculty engagement. So, all of those things are very important to me. And so, one, I am not preventing anyone from coming to the Senate, anyone who's a faculty. And to be clear, it's a professorial faculty, RTE, Emerita, Emeriti, all of the faculty are here. We are representative. They should come, speak, and enjoy. I hope enjoy.

I want to also let you know that the choice to go hybrid was about engagement. So, we actually are agreeing, and we're supposed to be in person. But I learned that having a hybrid format would allow more people to attend. And so, this is about expanding the Senate. And if we make the chat visible, then the people who are in the room, if you are physically here in the Senate with us, can't respond. It just isn't -- I mean, this chat was made available as an emergency measure when people couldn't be together. And we're here together.

And the idea that -- it's the administrator -- if you want a resource that you want to share through the chat, it's going to be publicly available immediately after the meeting.

And I agree with Adam's assessment that the idea that we would have three mikes going, and three people speaking at the same time, that would never happen. And so, let's give the speaker on the floor the respect to listen to them for two minutes, and then you just raise your hand, and you can contribute.

And most importantly, I want us to start using the website as a public forum. We should be having open conversation. Going away thinking, getting our faculty to think about what we're thinking about, and contribute. And so, I would love it if that's the place where people start to speak with each other and converse.

And so, those are the -- and the last thing, this -- I'm new to this position, and it was -- it's in the bylaws that anybody who is not a faculty member has to tell our office that they're coming. And that's all it is. I'm not preventing anyone from coming. I just want to know that they're here, if they're press, who they're representing. Okay?

So, that's -- I'm ready for the next slide. That's okay. So, I just -- reminder of some formatting things that we're here in hybrid. There's a live transcription for those who need it. You have two minutes to speak. We've prioritized the Zoom as only where we start. So, it's equal treatment. If there's somebody here in person who wants to speak, just come up to the mike. And it's just really about having someone speak while the next person queues up. And so, no one -- no population is going to be favored over the other.

And then, we started recording. So, we're going to have an update from the Title IX office. So, LaDreena, you could speak now.

LADREENA WALTON: Hi, everyone. I'm not sure if I should share my screen, or if my --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Excuse me. I think I have to interrupt, because I believe we had an appeal that is subject to a vote. And I think we can continue with this once the vote has been taken.

EVE DE ROSA: Oh, thank you for that reminder.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And the votes are complicated. I think one of the administrative staff should probably inform everyone how the vote takes place.

NEEMA KUDVA: So, we're going to launch your poll for those of you in Zoomland, and we will take a show of hands in the space.

SENATOR: Do I support what?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Can I clarify? I'm assuming that this means that you support the appeal that would allow or recover chat as a function of the faculty meetings. If you support the chat function, I believe you should vote yes.

EVE DE ROSA: That is correct.

NEEMA KUDVA: All the yes, put your hands up. Okay. Nays?

NEEMA KUDVA: No, that you don't want chat. 1, 2, 3 -- 8, 9, 10, 11. And then you and I.

EVE DE ROSA: And then there was abstains.

NEEMA KUDVA: No abstains? Any abstains? One abstain. Two abstains? Two abstains.

EVA DE ROSA: All right. So, we have 30 yes online.

[multiple speakers].

NEEMA KUDVA: You have to be a Senator to vote. Sorry. So, did you vote on yes, Robert?

ROBERT: I voted no.

NEEMA KUDVA: Oh, you voted no. Okay. Remove your vote. So, one less on the no.

[multiple speakers].

Robert. So, you can imagine what happens on Zoom.

EVE DE ROSA: Okay. So, the appeal was supported, and we will consider this appeal for the next meeting.

RICHARD BENSEL: I raise a Point of Order.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Could someone say -- since I have difficulty seeing who is raising the Point of Order.

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard. It's Richard. I think, Courtney, you might want to do this. But I can do it. What do you think?

COURTNEY ANN ROBY: Well, I mean, I wouldn't mind adding some additional context about the history of --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No, this is not appropriate. A Point of Order is where a rule has been breached. You state what rule has been breached and ask that it be rectified. That's all. It's not debatable. It's not a time to lecture.

RICHARD BENSEL: So, on that point, Jonathan, the Point of Order that Courtney raised was that prohibition of the chat had to be voted on before the session begins. If you liberate the chat, then I'm fine with postponing the vote on the chat. But if you don't liberate the chat, the sense of the meeting is that the chat should be liberated for the rest of this session.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Can I interrupt you, please? The vote has already been taken.

RICHARD BENSEL: No, this is a Point of Order on the delay. We want the chat opened. So, a Point of Order is that we should have a vote on opening the chat, a recorded vote on opening the chat, now. That's the Point of Order.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I don't see that -- what rule are you referring to that has been broken?

RICHARD BENSEL: The rule that was broken, of course, is when the prohibition on the chat, which was a major change in the protocol in which we conduct our meetings, was announced by fiat before anyone could object to it. It should have come before this body for a vote before it was implemented. That was –

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Can I interrupt you? You're lecturing. This is not a rule. There was no rule that established the chat, nor was there a rule that revoked the chat. This was informally done administratively. There's no rule that was broken. I think we need to move on.

RICHARD BENSEL: Jonathan, I take it that you are denying the appeal, and upon -- I mean, denying the Point of Order, and upon that decision, I appeal the decision.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: It's not a Point of Order. There's nothing to appeal.

RICHARD BENSEL: Jonathan, it is a Point of Order. And the point is, you're not -- the presiding officer cannot rule on whether something is a Point of Order or not. What they can do is rule whether or not it can be denied. What you're trying to do is shut it down.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm going to bring this vote to the group, since there's some disagreement about interpretation here. My understanding is that you are appealing my decision that chat does not need to be implemented immediately in this meeting. Is that correct?

RICHARD BENSEL: It should be implemented because the original decision to prohibit the chat was illegitimate.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No, you don't need to give reasons. It's not debatable. You just want to state what the rule is --

RICHARD BENSEL: Look, have a vote on the appeal. That's what we should do. If this is an appeal that the chat -- and the practical effect of the appeal is that if it passes, then the chat would be opened immediately.

EVE DE ROSA: Jonathan, do I have a --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yeah.

EVE DE ROSA: -- a moment to -- before the -- we go to vote?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Who's talking?

EVE DE ROSA: It's Eve De Rosa.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes, Eve.

EVE DE ROSA: Hi. I just want to say that there was never a vote to bring the chat to the Senate. It was an informal emergency decision. I would love to move on with the agenda. I would love for the Senate to be constructive, meaningful. And so, if we can just move forward on the agenda, I will take this to the University Faculty Committee, I will speak to counsel to understand the bylaws and how it's affected by this, and I'd love for us to move on the agenda. Let's make the Senate constructive.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I think that is an appropriate rule, since there's no rules that were broken.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And we need clarification on what this means in appeal, too.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: No idea.

EVE DE ROSA: The appeal was that they want to open the chat immediately. And so, that's what you're voting on? Yes? How many yeses in the room? One, two, three, four, five. Yeah.

NEEMA KUDVA: One, two, three, four, five. Five.

EVE DE ROSA: Okay, five. And then how many noes?

NEEMA KUDVA: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven.

SENATOR: I'm sorry. We still need clarification on what it is we're voting on. Does a yes mean open the chat now?

EVE DE ROSA: Yes. Yes means open the chat right now.

SENATOR: Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: And then, how many abstains?

NEEMA KUDVA: Abstains? One.

EVE DE ROSA: One.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [indiscernible] I'm clarifying [indiscernible] any questions.

EVE DE ROSA: Yes.

[multiple speakers].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Staff that are attending?

EVE DE ROSA: Wendy just brought -- Wendy just brought -- Wilcox, the Senator for -- RTE Senator, just brought up a very important point. We can't verify the votes are from Senators at this point. So, we will take all of these votes in, and we'll correspond -- we'll correspond with the rest of the Senate.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: That being the case, I think we should proceed with the agenda.

RICHARD BENSEL: Jonathan, I raise the second Point of Order, which all the Senators are aware of, and you are aware of as well, and that is quoting from the faculty handbook, "any decision of the University Faculty Committee concerning a particular meeting that it would be closed may be appealed by a motion properly made and seconded at the meeting in question." That is this meeting, and I make the Point of Order that we should have a vote of the Senators on whether or not meetings should be closed to members of the Cornell community who are graduate students, undergraduates, and staff. There should not be a screening in which you have to request permission before you can attend the meeting.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I don't think that this is a Point of Order. The rules in the governing document, the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's a bylaw.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: -- organization and procedures of the university faculty, distinguish between faculty and visitors, and outline a procedure by where the UFC determines whether a meeting is open to visitors or not.

RICHARD BENSEL: I appeal the -- again, let me read it. "The decision of the University Faculty Committee concerning a -- closing a particular meeting may be appealed by a motion properly made and seconded at the meeting in question." That is this meeting. So, I appeal --

EVE DE ROSA: This meeting is not closed to anybody.

RICHARD BENSEL: I appeal --

EVE DE ROSA: Anyone from Cornell's community --

RICHARD BENSEL: -- the decision --

EVE DE ROSA: -- can speak.

RICHARD BENSEL: -- of the Speaker and request a recorded vote.

EVE DE ROSA: So, just --

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Again --

EVE DE ROSA: I just want to make clear, if you don't mind me just making clear that this is not a closed session. Anyone from the Cornell community can attend. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Richard, I don't understand what it is that you're objecting to. But this is an open meeting.

RICHARD BENSEL: I'm objecting -- I am calling a Point of Order that the decision of the University Faculty Committee to require permission of the Dean of Faculty of graduate students, undergraduates, the Cornell Sun, before they attend this meeting. That requires a vote upon -- eh, anyone can raise it. I've raised the point.

EVE DE ROSA: Can I say, Richard, that's a misrepresentation. There is no such thing.

RICHARD BENSEL: What are you talking about?

EVE DE ROSA: So, all they have to do is email that they're coming. That's it. No one's screening anybody. No one's closing this except -- this is an open --

RICHARD BENSEL: And if they do not email you, they don't have permission. Is that correct?

EVE DE ROSA: They can come to the door, and I can give them permission. I just need to know that they're here.

RICHARD BENSEL: Then what is the point -- then what is the point of -- that was not clear in your announcement.

EVE DE ROSA: It's in the bylaws. It's in the bylaws. I am following the rules of the bylaws.

RICHARD BENSEL: I'm following the rules of the faculty handbook.

EVE DE ROSA: And you're misrepresenting that this is a closed session. We want to be constructive. We want to talk about policy, academia. We don't want to talk about these procedures. Can we -- can we -- because it's first of all, it's a misrepresentation. This is an open meeting. Anyone from the Cornell community is welcome. Any faculty member is welcome. Any faculty member can come up to a microphone and speak. You are misrepresenting what I have done. I haven't done anything. Nothing has changed. Nothing.

RICHARD BENSEL: That -- wait --

EVE DE ROSA: Nothing.

RICHARD BENSEL: If we're quoting -- well, I can't --

[multiple speakers].

EVE DE ROSA: I really think it's important that we move onto the business of the Senate, and you can write a resolution.

RICHARD BENSEL: Until the appeal is ruled.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah, but you can't --

EVE DE ROSA: It's a misrepresentation, Richard. It's not fact.

NEEMA KUDVA [indiscernible] deeply problematic. And you're also --

RICHARD BENSEL: It's not --

NEEMA KUDVA: -- insulting.

RICHARD BENSEL: I am not --

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes, you are. Because you're not listening to what the Speaker is telling you.

EVE DE ROSA: I'm telling you it's a misrepresentation. It is not real. It's not factual.

NEEMA KUDVA: You can't hold up an entire Senate meeting.

RICHARD BENSEL: It's not holding up -- all you have to do is vote on --

EVE DE ROSA: It's been 30 minutes.

RICHARD BENSEL: -- that decision.

NEEMA KUDVA: We've been spending 30 minutes on something that is in the bylaws. You have spoken about it. We've talked about it. Nobody is going to do anything that's really wrong and misguided here. We have a Speaker who's asking you to move on. We will take the vote and bring it back to the Senate next time. We have so many important things in terms of policy stuff to do, which we would like to move ahead with. We would love it.

RICHARD BENSEL: All you had to do was bring --

NEEMA KUDVA: And vote in your favor?

RICHARD: It was -- look. You can read it as well as I can.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. And I've read the bylaws, and you're misrepresenting things.

RICHARD: No, I'm not. Read it again. "The decision of the University --

WENDY WILCOX: [indiscernible] may be admitted to meetings [indiscernible].

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. So --

WENDY WILCOX: May.

NEEMA KUDVA: So, Wendy is reading out from the bylaws right now.

WENDY WILCOX: The decision [indiscernible].

RICHARD BENSEL: May be appealed. I am appealed.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. And so, it's -- we've done the [indiscernible].

RICHARD BENSEL: So, let's do it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's over.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [indiscernible] meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It really is. It's open. It's right here. 30 minutes wasted.

RICHARD BENSEL: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was just going to ask a question, a Point of Order apparently is that a

rule has been broken. Is that correct?

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Has anybody been denied the right to attend the meeting?

EVE DE ROSA: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Then I don't see that anything's been broken.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I mean, that's the ruling from the Speaker that there is no rule violated, therefore the Point of Order was denied, or it's not even really a Point of Order. It's a -- in a sense, an abuse of the Point of Order rule in order to enact -- try to enact some sort of legislation, rather than introducing a motion or a resolution or a change in the bylaws. But the bylaws are pretty clear about the relationship of visitors and faculty, and the this is, as was stated, already an open meeting. So, no one is being excluded.

I think we should move on. The Points of Order are not debatable, and I don't think we should be debating this. This was the ruling.

EVE DE ROSA: Okay, LaDreena, we're happy to have you present to the Faculty Senate.

LADREENA WALTON: Hi, everyone. I'm not sure what happened. I'm unable to start the video. But thank you so much for allowing me an opportunity to present to you today.

EVE DE ROSA: Excuse me, LaDreena, we have your slides here. So, they're being broadcast.

LADREENA WALTON: Can you hear me?

EVE DE ROSA: We can hear you, and we see your slides. We're presenting them here in the Senate.

LADREENA WALTON: Oh, okay. Thanks very much.

So, my name is LaDreena Walton. I'm assistant director of Institutional Equity, and also an investigator in the Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX. And I wanted to just say thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to talk about the update to Policy 6.3, the Consensual Relationships Policy.

Next slide please, thank you. And so, the change has occurred since August 2nd, and I'm sure that you are familiar with it. Romantic or sexual relationships between staff members and

undergraduate students are prohibited, regardless of work unit or location of either party. So, this same prohibition has existed for faculty members, and the idea is that we want to protect the integrity of the undergraduate experience from conflicts of interest, and that staff are considered role models and professionals above all else.

And so, we are -- next slide please -- currently undergoing a stakeholder review. And so, Courtney Roby is your representative for the Faculty Senate, and we are collecting feedback from each of these groups in order to prepare a report of information that we've gathered, and have it -- present it to Mary Opperman and leadership. And so, right now the policy is interim, and we are hoping that we can gather feedback and prepare the report and have the policy be complete by the beginning of next year, February.

EVE DE ROSA: Thank you, LaDreena.

LADREENA WALTON: Thank you. And so, if you guys would like to provide feedback, we're happy to hear from you. You can provide it to me directly at this email, or of course, through Courtney. Thank you very much for your time.

EVE DE ROSA: So, next slide. So, I have red squares around the do not votes. A third of the Senators did not vote on the resolutions that we just presented in the last meeting, and that's a little disheartening. And I will work and make my best effort to make this a community where people want to invest their time and think about these things. And so, with that, I'll move on to the Finance Committee and their presentation. Ravi's online. Ravi, are you still there?

RAVI KANBUR: I'm here. Yes.

EVE DE ROSA: Oh, wonderful.

RAVI KANBUR: Thank you.

EVE DE ROSA: Thank you.

RAVI KANBUR: Thank you very much indeed. Thank you. Well, friends, thank you, and my thanks to the Dean of Faculty for this invitation to present essentially the program of the Financial Policies Committee for this year. But just some background. The Financial Policies Committee meets once a month in term time. So, basically, we have five meetings, roughly speaking, a semester. Two of these meetings per semester are with the provost and the vice president for Budget. And I'll tell you what those meetings are going to be. And then the other three meetings are the issues that come up over the year.

So, this semester, in August, we did a meeting, actually a full meeting, to meeting with the new vice president of Budget, Laura Syer, to sort of meet and greet, but also to exchange perspectives and views. Then the September meeting was an internal meeting to actually -- to agree on the agenda for the year.

The October meeting, which is tomorrow actually, is going to be a meeting with the vice -- with the provost and the vice president of Budget to discuss the 10-year budget model, their 10-year planning assumptions. And in particular, we've asked that we discuss the issue of a contingency fund during this -- during this meeting.

And you'll recall that when the -- financial crisis hit and so on, the issue came up of, why don't we have a contingency fund to address these things? Well, you know, having $50 million set aside is easier said than done, because you have to actually put that money aside, and it has to come from somewhere. And then, what are the rules of access? And so on and so forth. So, we'd like to start that sort of discussion, and we believe the administration is itself thinking about these issues. So, that'll be a part of the meeting, the October meeting, which will be held tomorrow.

In November, we're having a second meeting, our second meeting with the vice president of Budget, and provost, and this'll be on the annual budget, not the 10-year thing, but the annual budget.

And then, in December, we're having a meeting with the director for Institutional Research, and also with Avery August, the vice provost, on the issue of competitiveness and equity of salaries, which is an issue that we've been -- we've been talking about for the last -- if you look at the annual report, which we were talking about last year as well. And in particular, our focus is on equity issues this time around. So, we're going to be asking various questions on that.

So, that said, this [indiscernible] semester. Next semester, again, we'll have our two meetings with the -- with the provost and the vice president on the capital budget, and also the end of fiscal year matters.

But the three meetings which we're also going to have, which might be of interest, and these are flagged during the annual report presentation, as issues that we might take up in the coming year. And these are proposals where, you know, we have to approach people and solve them.

One is continuing discussion on the research costs issue. You'll recall from the annual report that the FPC made a proposal to the administration in terms of count -- what counts as being off-campus and in-campus, on-campus research. But the research costs subcommittee of the FPC identified a number of other issues, which again, are talked about in the annual report, and we want to take these up. A bit of lead time is going to be required, so this will be a meeting next semester.

Another issue that we want to take up, and again, this was flagged in the annual report, is the issue of debt, and debt allocation, let's say, between different campuses. We might think that the -- we might think that the Ithaca campus and say the Cornell [indiscernible] are sort of tubs on their own bottoms, so to speak, and in some flow sense they are. Expenditures and revenues and so on. But debt is a very unforgiving thing, because the outside world sees the total debt of Cornell and the allocation of

this debt capacity, cost to -- from parts of the university, is of course, a policy [indiscernible]. There are technical financial issues in terms of debt capacity and financial engineering type issues, but allocation of debt [indiscernible] is a policy issue, and we want to raise that question, hopefully with Joanne DeStefano, the senior vice president.

And then finally, and we see that Wendy -- Wendy is here. We'd like to take up the question of the financial aspects of international programs, and we'll be writing to Wendy in due course to invite her to meet us next semester sometime.

So, that's the program, and all of it really flows from the issues that were raised in the annual report, which we presented to the Senate in June.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you.

RAVI KANBUR: Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We need to move on to the Educational Policy Committee and David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Set? Okay. My name is David Delchamps. I'm the current chair of the Educational Policy Committee. And Eve asked me to give you an update on something we're looking at right now, something that's of concern to us and -- okay, thank you. And we also plan to have periodic updates over the course of the semester about what the Educational Policy Committee is thinking about, taking about, whatever. We meet mostly on an ad hoc basis. We do a lot of our business over email. And anyway.

Okay. So, today is about credit hours, and why we should be concerned with what's kind of happening with credit hours right now at the university. So, first of all, what is a credit hour? I didn't know until about 15 years ago, and I've been here for almost 40 years on the faculty, that Cornell

actually has a definition of a credit hour, and it's published in the Courses of Study. It's a pretty standard definition. It's kind of like, you know, one credit hour means 50 minutes a week of contact, like lecture, recitation, whatever, plus about 2 hours a week of additional work. So, that's kind of what one credit means. And it's written in that kind of offhand way.

All right. Now, the thing is, many courses at Cornell don't comply with the definition of the credit hour. And that's never good to have a published policy that you're not complying with. Something has to give. Either the policy or the credit hour designations for the various courses. And regarding our policy, it's about -- it's approximately equal to, but not as kind of rigidly detailed as the policies -- and these are roughly isomorphic policies between these three entities, the State Department of Education; the U.S. Education Department, which is a federal agency; and Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which comes around periodically to accredit the university.

And I can give you a little anecdote. Last time Middle States came through, the EPC worked with some folks from Institutional Research and Planning, especially Marin Clarkberg, on dealing with this credit hour definition, and making sure it passed Middle States muster. And we did kind of an unsatisfactory job of patching it together. Essentially, we said okay, hey, our credit hour definition are 50 minutes for one credit plus 2 hours outside work. That pretty much agrees with Middle States, and university wide our policy is the following, everyone has to adhere to that, and if you don't, you have to be able to defend your nonadherence. And they grudgingly accepted that at the time.

So, the idea was -- and by the way, the courses that violate the guidelines are not uniformly distributed across the university. If you look, say, in certain colleges, you see anomalies like we had a cross [indiscernible] between ILR and the Hotel School that was, say, 4 credits for Hotel students and 3 credits for ILR students. I forget whether it was that way or the other way around. We also have lots of

courses in the Arts College mostly, especially the Arts and Sciences College, that seem to have fewer contact hours than required to have the number of credits they have.

But anyway, I mean, there are -- different colleges have levels of compliance. And after the Middle States thing, the word went out to associate deans, undergraduate associate deans, to get their colleges into compliance as best they could. Some associate deans were more energetic than others. I know in Engineering, Mike Thompson, the associate dean at the time, really put his foot -- as the pedal to the metal. He got all the departments, you know, revise your credit hours so they match these guidelines. And people have been pretty good about that. So, Engineering I think is pretty in compliance.

But in any event, what's wrong with our policy right now is that the New York State Department of Education has deemed it insufficiently detailed in the sense that it weasel words around to non-compliant courses. It says well, you know, if you have more credits than this, you have to be able to defend it, but it doesn't really say how. Whereas the detailed policies of those agencies does say how. You know? You have to refer to paragraph whatever, and defend this aspect of it, defend that aspect of it. We also don't have any detailed account of how, say, labs are counted. For example, like, does an hour of lab count for, like, one third of an hour of lecture? You know, they want that kind of level of detail.

And so, a committee was formed, and this committee was pure administrators. All right? No -- essentially no faculty input. Essentially no -- some faculty input, but very little. Okay? And I had on my original slide, I had a list of places where the few people from this committee came from, and along with a comment that it was -- that they came up with recommendations with minimal faculty input, which I thought was a problem.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's [indiscernible].

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Okay. Actually, the whole thing is collapsed onto one slide with a lot of missing information. So, I'm trying to reconstruct it from memory.

JILL SHORT: I'm sorry.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Jill. But anyway, we, on the EPC, we're not happy about how fast this thing got put together without faculty input. And by the way, it made its way into the 2021-2022 Courses of Study without ever, you know, being vetted by, say, the EPC for example. Like the Associate Deans Group that works with the VPUE saw it, but they didn't really talk about it that much. And essentially, the Registrar's Office and others said we have to get this in the -- in Courses of Study right now, and they kind of rammed it through, and EPC was not happy about that. And I don't think we should be happy about that, because -- you know, as Senators.

So, but anyway, the bottom line is the deed is done. And by the way, it's not a huge, catastrophic change to our policy. All it does, essentially, is it pins Cornell policy to the policies -- the isomorphic policies of these three agencies up there. And that's what it does, and that's what Cornell had sort of intended to do all along, without the sufficient level of detail, but now it has to be implemented.

And so, what's going to happen in the 2021-22 academic year is a group working with substantial faculty representation from across the university, including the EPC, and this is based in -- right now, it's based in the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education's office, Lisa Nishii, and along with her group of associate undergraduate deans. And I hope it stays there, because really, we need a lot of faculty insight when pursuing the implementation of this new policy.

And if you want to read about the revised policy, click on that link. It's also in the Call to the Meeting. I noticed that Eve clicked -- it's in the Courses of Study. And you'll see that it's really not that different from the one we have now, except it's got more detail to it, and I anticipate that some colleges

are going to have a much easier time than others getting into compliance based on where they are now, in terms of their credit hours.

And I don't know whether I've used up my whole five minutes. If I haven't, then you can ask me a question.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Yes, you have.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Okay. Sorry, Jonathan.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We should turn the floor back to Dean of Faculty for the next presentation.

EVE DE ROSA: And we should have a short mike and a not so short mike. I am not going to take my whole amount of time, and I think I'll move this to the next Senate meeting, so our invited guests can present. But I just want to make an announcement that I am creating a task force to look into what we're calling for now, RTE issues. And it's really about the climate across the university for RTE to give a uniform application of policy for RTE in terms of titles, ranks, how to move and progress through the ranks.

And so, this committee will make sure that it has all the different flavors of RTE. So, the librarians and archivists, the clinical faculty and the law school and the vet school, just we have all forms of RTE. And so, the committee will have good representation.

Anyone who cares and wants to contribute, please let me know. I'll be working on this for the next few weeks, and then I'll update you in the next Senate meeting, so that we can go to the Global Hubs. Thank you.

Oh, so, actually, Wendy, why don't you come up? So, we do have -- it is open to discussion. Actually, I'll do that, Wendy. I'll open it up for discussion. And come on down.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm seeing Thomas Bjorkman with a hand up. Is this relevant to the current discussion?

THOMAS BJORKMAN: Yes, very brief.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Sure.

THOMAS BJORKMAN: The Dean of Faculty created an RTE task force a couple of years ago that was working. Is this the same committee, or has that one been dissolved, and this is a new one being established?

EVE DE ROSA: I am going to try my best to get as many of those members as possible, but I'm also going to expand it because there were certain colleges and disciplines that weren't represented. So, I hope to expand that.

THOMAS BJORKMAN: Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Oh, yeah. Thanks. I'm really glad that there's going to be a task force on these issues. I have just a couple of questions. One is, how will the decision be made about who's on the task force? Is it anybody who would like to be on there? Is it -- you know, how would that be done?

And then, secondly, in terms of the scope of what the committee can do, just a quick glance at what was up -- you know, I don't know if that slide can be put back up again. It seems to me that one thing that'd be really great to include, and perhaps this is under number three, but I'd like to know, I think it's really important to think about the issues of job security and, you know, relating to the discussions that we've had earlier, for example, with regard to clinical faculty and the law school, to enable this committee to actually address the question of whether to move towards greater job

security. Either tenure as job security or something that is basically de facto, the same as tenure, which exists at some other universities.

EVE DE ROSA: Yes. The answer's yes.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: The answer's yes to the last question?

EVE DE ROSA: The answer's yes to looking at job security and reappointment and potentially tenure. And, Jonathan, I just wanted to let you know that Wendy Wilcox has been waiting here patiently on the floor.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Great. So, we --

WENDY WILCOX: But there was a question from Risa about the appointment of the committee.

EVE DE ROSA: Oh, yes. Sorry, Risa. I forgot about the first part of your question. So, at this moment, I'm trying to bring back as many faculty members in RTE that were on the initial committee. I am taking names from whomever would like to contribute. And my -- I guess in terms of selection, I just want to make sure that it's not cumbersome, and that it's representative of all of RTE on campus.

WENDY WILCOX: Hi. A lot of my library colleagues are watching, so I do need to take a moment and sort of give some background on this. A lot of this was brought to the attention of the Dean of Faculty, both last semester and this semester, but we have seen a few kind of fallouts from the reclassification of librarians and archivists as RTE faculty.

One of them being is that we've had a number of librarians who have come in with master's degrees and pursued both the employee degree program for PhD programs, as well as courses, taking courses for credit. And it was kind of mentioned this year that any RTE faculty who retain voting rights can no longer participate in this. This is kind of a drastic response. We had a librarian, I hope -- that was

accepted into the employee degree program for a PhD, and we had to work furiously over the summer to try to get them to allow this person to continue.

So, while I appreciate all of this, this issues -- the breadth of topics that this group will act on, I do feel a sense of urgency because there's an immediate impact on the librarians and the archivists that we would really like clarification on. So, I'm kind of putting that forth because I think it was a not known element of what happened with the RTE. We actually did go back to the previous committee. The member from the library assured us that the committee was assured that there would be no loss of benefits. So, we do need the Faculty Senate to take this up as a consideration. So, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: I'm looking to see if there are any other speakers before moving on.

EVE DE ROSA: Not on the floor.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Okay. Then perhaps we should move on to the Global Hubs presentation. Wendy Wolford and two others. Hopefully coordinated with each other.

WENDY WOLFORD: Yes. We're here online. Thanks, Jonathan. And thank you, everybody. Thank you, Eve. Thank you to all of you for making time for us. We're looking forward to getting your feedback. We know that there won't be time to put out everything that we want to say, and to get all of your feedback, so we will put up emails so that you can get in touch with us if you want to afterwards.

I'll open briefly, and then turn it over to Rachel Riedl, and then Gustavo Flores-Macias after me.

So, you have the report. That report has a lot of detail, and I really appreciate how closely people have been reading it. I don't want to repeat all of that today, of course. I just want to highlight a few key things. The first thing to highlight is that we really want to stress that we're creating the Global Hubs in order to support student and faculty research. Research, teaching, engaging abroad, and to

bring a diverse group of students to Cornell, students who wouldn't normally have the opportunity necessarily to come to Cornell under our current model.

The Global Hubs are not the only way that we're going to support international work. We all do a lot of international work, most of us do. Our students certainly do. And the Global Hubs will only be one of the ways that we will support that work. The hope is that with this piece of our support, we can be coordinated and strategic in a handful of locations, and we hope that that will make it easier for students and faculty to be able to study and engage in those sites.

I think I've already mentioned this before during the Faculty Town Hall earlier this year, but as engaged internationally as we are as a university, we send significantly fewer students overseas to do either semester-long study, or experiential opportunities than our peers, than our land grant peers or our IB Plus peers. And so, this is one additional sort of leg to our support to try to get students, and then also to support faculty abroad.

One common objection that I hear, that we hear, about the Hubs is that we're not creating them in the right location, or that a Hub in another location would be desirable, more desirable, or equally desirable, as the locations that we've selected. And I just want to say that I totally understand that. That I understand that there are many places in the world that would be really important to be engaging with, and it's hard to select a handful of places. At the same time, we can't support every partner or every location in this way of the Hubs. We can do that, of course, with individual research, with the travel funding, with research grants, et cetera, memorandum of understanding, that are more specific, but we can't do this sort of level of coordinated support with every location.

And so, we really did bring in a number of pieces of data to decide on the Hub locations. I'll just go through it really briefly. We met with each college and school and their leadership, and we surveyed them on the locations. We had spreadsheets that we asked them to fill out, and asked them where their

key programs were. Because each Hub is expected to have cross-college programming in appeal. So, to be a university wide Hub, it would have to have multiple colleges interested in engaging.

Then we also drew on quantitative data that we have. We have data on faculty publications, co-publications abroad, of course, memoranda of agreement and past collaborations with these institutions, and then travel. We looked at student demand and the quality of the peer institution abroad. We had some other factors as well, but there was some quantitative data we could access.

And then we considered a more qualitative set of characteristics, and this included everything from a desire to support students doing Study Abroad at a diverse set of locations geographically. And I already -- you know, in the report, you can see sort of where our locations tended to be in the past, and so we're hoping that by providing more support, particularly in a handful of places in Latin America and Africa and in Asia, that we can provide students with a sense of being supported by Cornell when they might be choosing these places.

Then we met again with college and school leadership. So, with the deans, with senior associate deans, and in some cases, with the internationally engaged faculty in that university, depending on what the leadership chose, and we discussed those locations again. We also discussed the Hubs in the International Council, and with area programs in Einaudi Center, and in a town hall open to staff and faculty.

This summer, we formed subcommittees of staff and faculty, college advisors who work with students in particular who do study abroad, and faculty who either we knew were engaged in these locations, or work internationally, or who filled out the survey that Mike and I sent out at the beginning of the summer to ask about international collaborations.

So, we had subcommittees of staff and faculty to discuss each location and each partnership. They met internally, and they met with the partners. These were somewhat variable, so not all of the

committees were able to have the full set of meetings. So, we're continuing with those throughout the academic year. And that's how we came up with the current locations. As these locations are launched, we're establishing a mechanism to allow faculty and college leaders, deans and senior leaders, to be able to suggest new Hub locations.

We understand that faculty are nervous about the changes that we're making, the Study Abroad in particular. And so, we just want to emphasis a few things. The first one is, as you can hopefully see in the report, there will still be many options for Study Abroad in the regular portfolio from the Office of Global Learning. So, you can see there are about 52 in the Office of Global Learning, and then also many colleges have a set of exchange programs that they run or that they have built that the Office of Global Learning, in some cases, organizes or manage for them.

There will also be a petition process for students who want to go somewhere that is important to them, but not on the list, and we will work to make that petition process as seamless and easy as possible. So, we will be moving towards exchanges with these Hub partners. And I think you probably all know this, but the university has been doing exchanges for almost 70 years, I think. Gustavo's going to talk about Monterrey Tech, and I think that was our first 70 years ago.

So, we have a number of very productive exchanges at the moment, and we're building on that model with the Hubs. We'll work very closely with our partners and with college advisors and leadership to ensure that the sending and receiving is smooth, that no single college receives more students than they're sending out, and what is great about the university wide exchanges is that we can smooth that out by having just economies of scale.

We really believe that exchanges offer this immersive opportunity for our students abroad, so you're really sitting side-by-side with students from the local university, and it has the benefit of allowing students from the Hub partners to spend time here. So, still, like I said, there will be Study

Abroad opportunities that are the other -- that are third party programs, but Hubs will provide this option of being able to be enrolled in the university alongside local students.

I know that faculty advising is a concern, and that faculty are worried that they will need to advise incoming students. And so, I'll just say two things. First, the total number of new exchange students we expect to see per year, once we get up to full speed, is about 150. So, that's on top of the exchange students we have currently. I think we have about 100 per year. So, they will -- though that 150 will take the place of 150 of our students who go abroad.

And I know that, of course, we still advise our students when they go abroad, but the incoming students will be heavily supported by the Office of Global Learning, that will provide orientation, pre-orientation, and then orientation once they come to campus. And they'll provide assistance while they're here.

So, the students won't have a faculty advisor, they'll have a college advisor, and we hope that these will be students, you know, coming from places like our partners in Latin America, in Africa, Asia, who might then find connections to faculty that faculty would appreciate. And as that happens, then I hope that that will be something that faculty will want to build on perhaps through thinking about potential graduate students. If these students seem like they would be appropriate for continuation in the program.

So, before I turn it over to Rachel, I just want to say that the Hubs, of course, are intended to be dynamic. We're not investing in bricks and mortar. We're investing in relationships. And relationships, of course, take a lot of work. So, I'm not diminishing that, but they're more nimble than permanent programs. So, we're expecting that we will be able to adapt to changing political conditions, and that means that there will be turnover, that -- that Hubs will come and go. And so, we do want to have your sense as well about new locations that should be brought on.

So, now I'll turn it over to Rachel Riedl to talk about some of the research themes.

RACHEL RIEDL: Thanks so much, Wendy, and hello to everyone. As Wendy said, I'm Rachel Riedl. I'm the director of the Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies, and I'm a faculty member in the Government Department. I just wanted to build on one of the elements of the Global Hubs that I think is really exciting. It's exciting for faculty research, and it's exciting for our student's ability to get engaged in international research agendas, and that is that we are planning of series of research themes that will cut across the Hubs and cut across all of Cornell's colleges and schools to integrate areas that are already recognized as great domains of strength for the university based on deep faculty expertise and across multiple colleges.

So, the initial themes that we have identified, I'll just list them out here. There are seven. One is future cities and thinking about innovations and technologies. Another is sustainable food systems. We also have new energy infrastructures, and democratic challenges and change. Migration and mobilities. AI and Big Data. And One Health.

Now, these are all obviously areas that you can see as deeply rooted in Cornell's disciplinary strongholds, but they are also areas that, across the preliminary conversations that we've had with our international partners over the last year, resonate both as areas of complementary and distinct strengths in those universities. And areas where we have a shared understanding of the need for collaboration, to address global questions of critical importance, that impact humanity in a universal sense, and where progress is inhibited by a unilateral approach.

So, these partnerships, in some senses, are already in place as global questions, and we hope that the Global Hubs will allow not only our faculty to connect across this university, but in a -- to a greater degree to be supported with our university partners.

What's coming up next for the research themes is that Global Cornell and the Einaudi Center together will be convening a series of salons this year, one on each topic, and all of our faculty are welcome across the colleges to participate in those. And so, please do reach out to me, to Wendy, to any of us if you're interested in these themes and have ideas about how you'd like to see them go forward.

I'll turn it over to Gustavo as well.

GUSTAVO FLORES-MACIAS: Thank you, Rachel. Hi, everyone. I'm Gustavo Flores-Macias. I'm on faculty in the Government Department in Earth and Sciences, and I'm also associate vice provost for International Affairs. And I'd like to just walk you through two Hubs in Latin America, the Hub in Ecuador and the other one in Mexico, to give you a sense of the possibilities and some of the exciting initiatives that we're developing with these partners.

The objective here with these Hubs, in general, is to encourage more engagement in the region, both from Cornell to Latin America, but also from the region to Cornell. And in both cases, Cornell is building on existing MOAs. We're not starting from scratch. In the case of Tec de Monterrey, Wendy mentioned that Cornell has engaged in exchanges for about 70 years. In the case of Ecuador's more recent [indiscernible] cases, we are building on agreements that have been in existence for some time.

The engagement that we envision is at all levels. This includes undergraduate student mobility, graduate student mobility, faculty exchange, alumni engagement, to name a few. So, I'll just share a few examples of what is possible in these countries, and maybe I'll start with Ecuador.

You know, in the case of Ecuador, we have a main partner, the one is Universidad San Francisco de Quito, and we've identified several faculty who have been working with Universidad San Francisco de Quito for some time, and are also interested in working with other partners in Ecuador. So, even though San Francisco de Quito could be sort of the main partner, there is room for engagement with other

partners. [indiscernible] as an example, or [indiscernible], Ecuador. That is sort of for the social sciences mostly.

And we've identified several thematic areas of interest and strength across partners. So, certainly environmental studies, natural resources, but also veterinary medicine, public health, ornithology, anthropology, city and regional planning, global development, government, to name a few. And we already have identified, as well, several opportunities for engaged learning. This has been a priority for us. In the case of Ecuador, we have identified potential internships and engaged learning opportunities in governments, in the administer of agriculture, the administer of the environment, in NGOs including [indiscernible], that is sort of an NGO whose mission is to fight global warming and protect the Amazon Forest from deforestation. Same -- there are several initiatives and NGO groups, including this agenda for transforming production of the Amazon for the National Institute for Agricultural Research, that they've already expressed interest in partnering with us.

We also have room for, let's say, someone from the Universidad San Francisco de Quito to come to Cornell and teach Kichwa. We've had quite a bit of demand, student demand, for Kichwa. We've been lucky now, this year for instance, to have an instructor come, but there is a real opportunity to make this a long-lasting partnership and be able to offer this language more sustainably.

Let me mention also a few examples from the case of Mexico and Tec de Monterrey. Tec de Monterrey has been a leader in teaching innovation. They've been very engaged in what is called a Collaborative Online International Learning. COIL is the acronym. This is, I think, you know, if I were to in brief say what this is, is they've been at -- a vanguard in terms of online instruction way, way before COVID, and engaging multiple partners, instructors from different countries, co-teaching and having students in different countries also engaging in co-instruction. They have some signature

entrepreneurship courses. They have a lot of strength in engineering and marketing and entrepreneurship on the business side as well, and the social sciences.

And the idea is to create curricular mapping. In other words, think about disciplinary pathways so that we can have seamless Study Abroad, which we've seen is one of the main barriers that students face in trying to go abroad, and then come back, and not knowing which courses count towards their majors here at Cornell. We can establish connections with a Latin American Caribbean studies program, including internships. And we know there's a lot of interest on that front.

You know, opportunities for research. There's a promise of joint seed funds. There are sabbatical opportunities that can become available. We envision Tec de Monterrey. They have 26 campuses throughout Mexico, and this can be just a wonderful home base for graduate students doing field research across disciplines in the country.

And we envision the Hub -- Wendy said it's not a brick and mortar's thing, it's not a Cornell setting up a building, but we envision the partner providing some important services, student support services, that have to do with language instruction, with cultural immersion, with student orientation when they first arrive.

Tec de Monterrey offers about 20% of its courses in English on a regular basis, and this is something that our students can take advantage of so that they can learn Spanish in country, and they don't have to wait for an advanced Spanish to get to Mexico.

But there I also want to point out, you know, some of the real benefits of the exchanges is also the two-way street. Right? So, bringing students from these countries, bringing a global vantage point, diversity to Cornell student body, and really making sure that we're contributing to them as well so that their students, their faculty, their staff are benefiting from the exchanges as much as we are here.

I'll stop there. I'll turn it back to Wendy. But if anybody has any questions, you know, send me an email or I don't know if we'll have time to answer, but I'm -- just let me know in some form. Wendy.

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, Rachel. Thanks, Gustavo. So, we'll just open up for questions. Or comments.

RICHARD BENSEL: Wendy, this is Richard Bensel, the Department of Government. My understanding is that there has been a China center established in 2016, and it's recently been converted to a Global Hub. First question is, is that true? And would you be willing to bring it before the Faculty Senate, since it's a change in education policy?

The second is, I listened carefully to all the presentations, and one of the concerns that I know many Faculty Senators share, is that human rights, academic freedom, intellectual liberty, that these things are very great concern to us. And we were very disappointed to see that the administration went forward with the Hotel School dual degree program, despite those questions.

So, one of the questions is, and I do know that you have said that you're monitoring human rights and academic freedom in China, could you give us a report on those things? You know, whether Peking University, the climate at Peking University, is improving in academic freedom? And secondly, whether human rights in China generally is improving? I think that dimension, which you did not mention, none of you mentioned in your reports, I think that dimension deserves more attention.

WENDY WOLFORD: Yes, thank you, Richard, for the question. So, there are a number of different things there in that question, and I'll start by saying every Hub is going to be unique, so they're going to look different. They won't all be the same. And the China Hub is probably a really good example of that. We started the China Center in 2016, that was before my time, but it was created then, and has kind of hung out there as a center on the sort of webpage of the vice provost of International Affairs. It's kind of out there on its own.

So, all we did with the China Center was to bring it in under the Hubs, and to sort of say we are not going to be building up or working on developing Hub partnerships or relationships in China. We have a China Center. Professor Ying Hua is doing great work. We have a couple of partnerships with universities in China. And so, the Hub work will not advance further than that. But the center now is being brought in under the rubric of the Hubs.

You asked about a changed educational policy, and I'm not sure that that is a change. It's a center, and what we've done really is to change the way that it's categorized on the website.

I think it's, of course, a really good question about having relationships or having students be, and faculty, in places where there are concerns about academic freedom, or concerns about human rights. And part of the reason, and I think I -- we put this into the report, part of the reason why we thought doing the Global Hubs was a good idea was because there are more and more situations abroad. It feels like. Maybe it felt like it was increasing, you know, 40 years ago, but it continues to feel like there are difficulties partnering abroad. And it's better to do so in a coordinated, strategic way where you have a relationship that you can talk to the person in charge of the university and say we're hearing this concern, or we are worried about our students in X, Y, or Z, and be able to get them immediately on the phone, get their attention, and be able to work on it.

So, it's not a perfect solution. I think we have a lot of students who do want to travel and work in places where there might be concerns about being abroad or being in the country, and we want to be able to provide a reasonable assurance that we have them supported in that context. So, part of the thinking about Global Hubs is to provide that level of support.

You had another question. I think maybe that answers all of the questions.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a question from the Zoomland. Risa Lieberwitz.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Hi, thank you. So, in the report on the section that's -- I believe it's labeled -- headed Next Steps, the first item is to establish faculty governance regarding the Hubs. I wonder if you could say a bit more about that. I'm not sure if you said anything about it yet, Wendy, but I had a little trouble hearing you initially. So, if you could talk about that, that would be great.

WENDY WOLFORD: Okay, sure. Yeah. I'm sorry. I asked Jill if I was loud enough. So, I'll speak up. I apologize. In terms of faculty governance, we are working to determine a faculty lead for every site because those faculty, of course, will be the ones who might be partnering with people on site, or would be potentially spending a sabbatical on site. And so, we're going to bring all of the faculty who are engaged at that level in the Hubs, and work on coming up with a plan for meeting regularly, and being able to establish a governance process for the Hubs.

The Global Hubs, of course, will still be under discussion and regularly brought before the International Council. The International Council, I know we've talked about them before in this meeting, but they are made up of a senior associate dean from every college and school. And so, that committee will be able to also weigh in on what's happening in the Hubs. And I think that --

RISA LIEBERWITZ: If I could just quickly follow up. Where does the Senate fit into this, other than, you know, you're describing what's happening? Where is the Senate in all of this?

WENDY WOLFORD: So, we're excited to get the opportunity to talk with you today. We've met with the University Faculty Council, the UFC, and discussed it there as well. And you know, we're open to your suggestions for how it is that the Faculty Senate be engaged? I think I saw Rachel's hand up.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Well, is there an in-person speaker?

NEEMA KUDVA: Jonathan, there is -- there is a person on the floor.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: And then if Rachel's hand is up, we could go to her next.

NEEMA KUDVA: Just identify yourself, yes?

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Laurent Dubreuil, the Faculty Senator for Romance Studies. And I'm not going to oppose the idea of going abroad and studying abroad, and especially learning different languages.

But since I heard about Kichwa, for instance, just to take that [indiscernible] example. So, it's wonderful to be able to be in another part of America and learn Kichwa there. It used to be the case that we had an instructor of Kichwa in the College of Arts and Sciences.

And overall, the number of languages that have been taught at Cornell since I arrived here in 2005, I mean, that number has clearly diminished. And I was wondering if the Global Hubs was not seen as a way to outsource the necessary teaching of many languages, especially not the most commonly taught languages, to possibly [indiscernible] where they would be cheaper to teach. And I'm not sure it's a completely fair way to organize that.

I would also register the fact that at least from -- on the basis of the presentation we had, it's difficult not to think that we are seeing a very bureaucratic system with some faculty input down the line. But really down the line. And it's -- I heard Wendy's last response to Risa's comments, but I'm not completely convinced. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Rachel?

RACHEL RIEDL: I'll respond a little bit to the last comment, but Wendy can join me on that as well. Just to say that across the Einaudi Center, across all of Global Cornell, and in partnership with the language instruction departments, I feel quite strongly that the Global Hubs can increase appetite, enrollment, opportunities for language instruction at Cornell.

And so, I really see that as a kind of pathways to using language, increasing language opportunities, but Global Hubs will also create opportunities for students to do internships during the summer. And so, we would be able to work with language instruction to create applied language opportunities before internships. Students should have an increased interest in doing language after they get back. So, we really see it -- I personally see this as very symbiotic, and our commitment to less commonly taught languages has not diminished in any way.

And in fact, we see these kinds of partnerships, as Gustavo mentioned, as ways to increase flows to Cornell to demonstrate the need, the student demand, and then hopefully build upon that as well in terms of our curricular offerings, and to institutionalize them further.

I also just wanted to come back briefly to the question about the relationship to a complex and changing world, and where the Global Hubs are located. We know that our colleagues do research all over the world. Our colleagues across our departments that we're here representing do research in these countries that we have identified, and in many other places. And we would never dream of telling them not to do so. In fact, it's quite the opposite.

And because we are in a complex world, we felt particularly in the wake of COVID, and as we are likely to see more types of disruptions come our way, that it's important to give students in particular, but also faculty who might not yet be engaged with a global partner but might have an interest in doing so, to give them more support and lower barriers to entry. And in doing so, we're engaging in relationships of academic integration that support our colleagues abroad as well, in many cases, who are seeking academic freedoms.

And we have this conversation -- these would be our relationship in Turkey, for example. The strong desire among our colleagues who are doing research in Turkey to lend out that support, not to

engage necessarily with authoritarian regimes, but to give support to our colleagues across the world who are engaging in research and knowledge production, just as we are.

So, I just wanted to come back on that as well.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. Before we go on, we're approaching the end of the meeting. Gustavo, I would like, if you could have the last word on this subject, two minutes, and then perhaps reserve the last three minutes for the Good of the Order. We had one speaker who asked for that. And then we have two resolutions that presumably will be postponed to the next meeting.

So, Gustavo, maybe two minutes?

GUSTAVO FLORES-MACIAS: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, I think one helpful way to see the Hubs is an additional layer to what already exists at Cornell. The international infrastructure that colleges have, that individual faculty have, and so on, so that this isn't replacing existing engagement and collaborations, but it's adding.

And I think the case of Ecuador and Mexico are good examples in which we're bringing resources and we are hopefully sending more students to the region. The students that would traditionally go to Chile or Cuba or elsewhere, will continue to do so. But we didn't have students going to Mexico, or very few to Ecuador, and this will just increase those numbers. We are unfortunately doing poorly compared to our peers, both in the land grant side and the IV side in terms of international engagement and [indiscernible] abroad.

So, we could -- I think this is just a wonderful opportunity to recognize that and leverage that so that we can increase our engagement. So, thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: Thank you. And the final three minutes, Richard Bensel requested talking in the section called Good of the Order, or the Good and Welfare. So, Richard, if you're here.

RICHARD BENSEL: Then thank you. Just two things. There are two resolutions that have been before the University Faculty Committee now for over a month -- for a month. They have not been put on the agenda for this meeting or the meeting before. One of them concerns the Global Hubs, and would reaffirm Faculty Senate right to review, discuss these programs. I'm not certain from the conversation today that, Wendy's comments, that that is in their plans. But it should come before the Faculty Senate. And if we have to do it through a resolution, it should come that way, and the University Faculty Committee should report to and put it on the agenda.

The second is a resolution on the agenda as is prepared by the University Faculty Committee. We've had problems with that, and getting faculty sponsored resolutions before this body. And so, I think we should have a general discussion on the relationship between the University Faculty Committee and the Faculty Senate.

And just a note, that when Wendy talked about the formation of the China Center in 2016, that did not come before the Faculty Senate. So, the whole thing has been an evasion of Faculty Senate rights and responsibilities. Thank you.

JONATHAN OCHSHORN: We have a minute left. Let me just say that the Good and the Welfare is meant to engage conversations that are not necessarily Faculty Senate business. Not that it's a criticism of the prior speaker, but I just wanted to mention that it's an opportunity to broach other kinds of subjects of concern within the university, but not necessarily Faculty Senate business.

With that, I think we can adjourn, and I'll leave it to the Dean of Faculty to decide whether we need a special meeting to take up these other two resolutions. So long.