CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you for coming. I know it's been a heavy Zoom day and whatever.

So are the usual etiquette rules that we follow and which have worked really well. We had these two electronic votes on two tenure-related resolutions, and they both passed. I just want to remind you that the tenure policy is not owned by any one group, so it's basically shared between the university faculty and the provost's office. Whenever changes are proposed, one has to sort of get approvals all around. Oftentimes, HR and university counsel is involved.

On these matters, the tenure pause was developed with the provost's office and our AFPSF Committee, so that's pretty much a done deal. It is up to the Law School how they carry forward their clinical tenure resolution.

But I'd like to say something about the turnout, which was not great. I know we're all extremely busy, but this is shared governance and, when we have a turnout like that, it says something. Busy, forgot or whatever, but it doesn't look good, and we have to do something about that. If any of you want to speak up about that right now or send me an email about how we can improve these kinds of things because, again, it doesn't send a positive message. We're very much in favor of shared governance, we talk about it all the time, and then we can't show up at the table with this.

Later today, we are going to talk about these calendar options for the next academic year, and we announced this to the senate on Friday. I guess students got wind of it, which is fine, over the weekend. And then on Memorial Day, it went crazy. We have now 600 postings
on it, most of them from undergraduates and parents, so it’s actually extremely valuable reading.

If you have some time and browse through that, it's very important to see how others think about this situation we're in. The down side, of course, is that the faculty postings got drowned out, but took some steps to pull some of those out and is now a separate place where faculty can post their comments. We never had this kind of an overrun on any of our topics.

Right now, the current plan is to have a June 10 meeting. That will be our last regularly planned meeting. But as we talked about earlier, we should be ready to meet on a need-to-meet basis all through the summer. As you know, the reopening committees, the two of them are going to produce their reports June 15. And probably within one or two weeks after that, there will be some very major decisions, so that might be a time we stage an impromptu meeting and so on.

Let me pause at this point. Any comments about these three items here in the announcements?

Okay, accreditation. We've all heard about it and, every so often, we have to do it. It's Middle States, and we have the two individuals who are leading that effort right now. And it would be good to get a brief overview of what they're up to, why we do accreditation and what's going to happen.

Marin, are you on the line?

MARIN CLARKBERG: I am.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Take it away.

MARIN CLARKBERG: Okay, we could go to the title slide, and I will take that as an opportunity to introduce myself. I used to work in Day Hall. Now I work from my living room and I serve as the Accreditation Liaison Officer for the university, so as Charlie introduced, this is
not a COVID-related topic. This is very much business as usual that was well underway before
the pandemic broke out. My co-chair is Mike Fontaine, who I think many of you know, and he's
on here as well.

University accreditation, there's also program accreditation, a lot of professional
programs have accreditation, the Medical School has accreditation with the medical agent, lots
of professional programs accreditation, but there's also university-level accreditation, and that is
a process of peer review. There's an agency, Middle States Commission on Higher Ed, that
coordinates this for us. It is very much run by colleagues and peers from other universities, and
those would be faculty and administrators from other schools that will ultimately come and visit
us sometime soon.

Accreditation is voluntary, but not voluntary at all. It is a voluntary peer review process
that is old and predates the rules that say that accreditation through one of these types of
agencies is required in order for us to receive federal dollars, so it is very much not a voluntary
activity anymore.

Covers the breadth of the university. All the professional programs that have their own
professional program accreditation, as well as our operations in New York City and around the
world. And accreditation is an old thing, goes back to 1921 for us at Cornell.

Accreditation is guided by a set of standards. The specific numbers of standards has
changed over time and sort of a thrust of them has changed over time. These particular
standards have only been around for three years, I think, but it's a different organization of what
used to be 14 different standards last time we went through the self-study process. The basic
thrust is we want to ensure the university's operating under clearly established mission and
goals, that it operates with ethics and integrity.
I think of the middle three standards as the meat of what we do. This is delivering our educational mission to students and assessing that we're doing it well. And then Standard 6 has to do with planning, budget processes and how do we plan for institutional improvement. And then finally, issues of governance, leadership and administration, so that covers sort of the president, the provost, the deans, how is that organized and assessed, shared governance with the senate and the assemblies, and then board of trustees, how are those people selected and so forth.

Our last visit, last big visit accreditation activity was spring 2011. At that time, we were on a ten-year cycle. Durba Ghosh has said our accreditation over the last decade is sort of an accreditation between two global calamities. So in 2011, we were writing about the recession of 2009 and the structural deficit and all that we did at that time to sort of respond to the financial crisis.

There was a minor set of activities at the five-year mark. It used to be a ten-year cycle, which made it nice, we're talking about decennial accreditation. They switched to an eight-year cycle without a five-year visit, the eight-year cycle. So next time it's an eight-year cycle, our accreditation is up for renewal in spring 2021, but we opted two years ago that we would go for a fall 2020 visit and get this all over with, so that is our timeline. It will be affirmed in spring 2021. And all of that was established before the pandemic, of course.

The most recent activity that transpired is April 14 and 15, we were supposed to host our evaluation team chair on campus. That visit happened over and involved a lot of meetings over Zoom for the President of Penn State, Eric Barron. So Eric Barron spent a lot of time with us on Zoom, over a day and a half essentially, and he met with a number of people, including folks from the board of trustees, including the chair, president, provost and so forth.
He was terrific. He was really quite engaged, seems like a nice guy, very sane and very oriented to how to make this process useful for us at Cornell. He paid careful attention to the draft self-study that we have been working on with a committee structure that I think we talked about maybe a year ago when we were here last, and he provided wonderful feedback.

Next steps in the process is that we will have an evaluation team. It’s typically organized now with one person on each standards, so we have -- we’ll get six more. Those folks will come from peer universities. First pass of those, I’ve seen folks from -- of who's going to be on our team, Carnegie Mellon, Penn, I can't remember. It's not finalized yet.

Anyway, once we know who's going to be on the evaluation team, we will put it on our website, which I'll show you in a minute. We have a self-study draft. It will be finalized and mailed to the evaluation team by September 1, and then we have a visit scheduled October 11 through 14. It was, at the time we scheduled, corresponding to fall break. Who knows what it corresponds to now.

So what the heck? We did all this before there was a pandemic. We sort of stamped the draft of our self-study and sent it to the president of Penn State to read the day before the pandemic -- before Martha's first email about students not returning from fall break. We have had conversations.

The Middle States Commission -- we're not the only ones in this place. Middle States hasn't talked very much about how do they respond now that everything's changed at the university. And the thrust of it is, we are not going to rewrite the self-study to talk about how Cornell has responded to the pandemic. It is still very much a document that is about our enduring qualities and how we operate as a general thing, but we may draft an appendix to describe our response to the pandemic and how that aligns with the standards. But if we do that, it will be a very short thing.
Our visit date is staying intact as October 11 through 14. But of course, it's possible the visit could be a virtual one, and we will share more as we know more. We do have an accreditation website of our own, and Middle States has a website with more information about the standards.

If you go to our accreditation website, accreditation.cornell.edu, there are a few tabs across the top, one of which is the self-study. The draft of the self-study, if you push slide, please, is linked there from a little link at the bottom of that thing. That's like a big old document about 145 pages long, organized by standard.

Each standard had a working group. Each working group was chaired by a faculty member. And the steering committee, then, is the compilation of all those faculty members -- the chairs of the working groups and the handful of others who have experience in accreditation activities, like me, like Alan Mathios, who has served on the Middle States Commission and so forth.

I think that brings me to the end of our presentation. And I am happy to answer any questions, or Mike Fontaine may have additional comments.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any raised hands? Jill, anything on the chat line?

JILL: Nothing. No questions, no raised hands.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks an awful lot, Marin, and Michael as well. We're interested in seeing how this plays out in the coming months.

MARIN CLARKBERG: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: On to the next thing. Bruce Lewenstein is wrapping up his four-year stint as faculty trustee. In that position, you think about big pictures and long-term things all the time, and Bruce wanted to say a few things about an effort that he wants to sort of lead into the fall. Bruce.
BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Thank you, Charlie. And thanks very much for giving me some brief time on the agenda. The is really just in the context of an announcement. I'm ending my four-year term. I had my last regular board meeting last weekend. Melissa Hines from Chemistry continues for two more years in her term, and Abby Cohn from Linguistics will be stepping into a new term beginning July 1.

As Charlie said, one of the things you do on the board is you have to think long-term. There was something in one of our presentations last week that talked about planning for perpetuity, and that led me to be thinking, even before COVID-19 -- this is another non-COVID issue -- that we needed to be thinking about what the university looks like.

We lost a slide. That's okay. The goal of this exercise is for us to think about what would a world-class research, teaching and public service university look like 20 to 40 years from now. Notice the assumption there; that we would still be a world-class research, teaching and public service university.

One of the things we have to think about is can we do all those things in a new world. And then how could we get from here to there. And I don't anticipate we're going to have answers. This is the beginning of a campus-wide conversation, where we would begin with a discussion among faculty. Staff also need to be involved. I think we want student input; but frankly, this isn't for the students. This is for us, and we are the core of the university.

And some of the people who are here now -- I'm not going to be here 20 to 40 years from now. I got a lot of gray hair here in my beard, but there are people who we have all recently met, we brought to campus, who will be here 20 to 40 years from now, and we need to be thinking now about what that university looks like and how we would get there.

What are some of the things that have triggered this? The fundamental one is that we currently have a financially unsustainable model. Tuition, we are extraordinarily proud of the
fact that five years ago for the first time in something like 40 years -- actually, the second time. There was one year, but basically for at least 40 years, we had not been able to keep our tuition increases below 4%. Now, for the last five years, we have been able to keep them down to 3.7%, 3.9%, but that's during a time when the inflation rate has been below 2%.

That's an unsustainable model. We just keep getting more and more expensive. For those of you who depend on research funding know that it's harder and harder, that pay lines are going down, that competition for funding. We know state funding will be more limited and so on.

We also know that a vision that many of us have about the value of education is not necessarily widely shared, and this is irrespective of political position. There are deep concerns about the affordability of education, about the value that is returned, about whether this is an appropriate investment. Obviously, some of those have been exacerbated by the current crisis, but that's the big long predated.

Here's another assumption: We are committed to high-quality, in-person, faculty-led teaching. That's an important part of our ethos. I think some of the work that we are very proud of the fact that we don't rely on contingent faculty in the same way that many other places do; and yet, as Charlie's work on RTE faculty has shown, depending on how you count, it might be over 40% of the people with teaching appointments of various kinds, lecturers, professors of the practice, clinical professors and so on, that's more than 40% of our overall teaching faculty. So we need to be honest with ourselves about how we are structuring our institution and who's doing the work.

We have to think about changing -- I should also say that at our last meeting, the discussions about the Law School, clinical professor, and about some of the issues at the Vet School, where we went in different directions because we needed to solve problems now. But
in the end, we have to have a university-wide discussion about what do we actually think tenure means and how does that -- are we content to have different standards across the university, do we wish to have a universal model. That's a discussion we have to have.

There are clearly changing modes of teaching, again, predating COVID. Many of us were moving some of our activities online, the Active Learning Initiative that has started to draw on the kind of research about pedagogy that is bringing evidence to how we think about how people learn in a variety of ways and how that varies across discipline and so on. We need to think about how we're going to integrate those.

I've put a question mark after overproduction of Ph.D.'s. In some fields, probably not. In other fields, perhaps yes. That involves us asking ourselves honest questions about just because people want a Ph.D., is it appropriate for us to accept them into our programs. Are we accepting students just because we need them as TAs, as part of our teaching structure? This has obviously implications for things like graduate student immunization and those kinds of issues about how we think about who our graduate students are and what their role is in that overall comprehensive university.

We have to think about definitions of scholarship. This goes back to that tenure discussion. 25 years ago, the former head of the Carnegie Foundation published a work on scholarship reconsidered, where he was talking about different categories of discovery and application and engagement and teaching as a form of scholarship. We need to think explicitly about that.

We should be looking at other models of other places, places that are, say, graduate-only, whether it's someplace like Rockefeller, which has a graduate school, or a Salk Institute, which does not have its own program, but is tied to UCSD. We should look at the Olin College of Engineering, which is an engineering-only new undergraduate school. We should look at
Station1, which is the program created by Christine Ortiz from MIT, trying to reimagine what education looks like. We need to have all of these different models and we need to have an open discussion about them.

Today, what I'm primarily doing is announcing we need to have this conversation. I hope to convene a faculty forum sometime in the fall. Would be lovely if we could do it in person. It may well be virtual, some kind of webinar thing, but I would be glad to hear from anyone who is concerned about these issues.

Since it appeared on the agenda, Brian Chabot has sent me information about the history of curriculum changes across the university over time, but I'd be glad to hear about topics we should be considering, readings that you think are really useful that you think we should have on some kind of comprehensive reading list, speakers, either here on campus or off-campus, who you think ought to be part of this conversation. I'm glad to take any questions now; but primarily, this was to begin a much longer conversation. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mark.

MARK: Bruce, I was wondering, in terms of framing some of the questions about your comment here, especially your second bullet up there, affordability, value, what is, do you think, the future role the university is going to play? Is it going to be sort of a university that is more for a job market training or is it going to be a university for more of the pedagogy of just pure thought?

Because my concern is if we look at majors, as the pay scale for some of the majors kept with inflation, if we're charging a lot of tuition and yet their pay is not keeping with that, are we doing a disservice to some of the students who could probably come out with the same major, but let's face it, at another institution, which does not have such a steep or high tuition. So I'm wondering if we think about this.
BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Those are absolutely the questions that I think need to be part of a conversation, and I don't think a particular senate meeting is the right place. That's why I would like to have a bigger forum. But one of the geniuses of Cornell is that we have both the public side and the private side. And these represent two of the great traditions in American education.

The traditional liberal arts, it's all about learning. And the professional education, it's all about preparing for a particular field with that expertise. I think the thing that makes Cornell such a wonderful place is that we have creative tension between those models, but then that starts running up against a practical world, where people are feeling squeezed, where this tuition issue doesn't keep up, where faculty are -- I know many of us complain about our pay; but compared to many other fields, we're not poorly paid.

And one of the issues is that our salaries go up, but our, quote, productivity does not. This is a standard problem in a number of fields, the creative arts and so on -- it's called Baumol's disease -- and how do we address that problem. I think the kind of issue you raise is precisely the kind of issue we need to have on the table.

MARK: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's move on, then. Thank you, Bruce. And thank you for four years of service as one of our faculty trustees.

BRUCE LEWENSTEIN: Thank you. You'll be hearing from me again.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, let's go on to the reopening committee updates and reports. As you recall, there are three of them. The Research and Supporting Operation Committee has already done their report. There's been actions on it. Provost just got done running a one-hour webinar on it. And Chris Schaffer is the senate's representative in that scene.
And Chris, I wonder if you can just give us a brief overview of the report, the high points, things that may be confusing or controversial, whatever. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFER: Hi. It's Chris Schaffer from Biomedical Engineering Department. I'm sure most folks were on the big town hall that Provost Kotlikoff just hosted, announcing the reactivation of campus and answering questions, so I'll try to be very brief.

The sort of core tenet of this report and the approach to reactivating research activities on campus is the recognition that faculty and senate directors and other scholars are going to know best what kinds of on-campus resources they need, by whom and on what kinds of time scales, what types of schedules in order to get their scholarship done.

So the report puts the onus on individual faculty members to propose plans to their departments and senate directors that need to be evaluated and looked at and commented on at the department level, as well as the college level. And these plans need to articulate several key things: One, what are the on-campus resources that are needed for the research that's being reactivated. This isn't just an opportunity to come back to campus for things that would be easier to do on campus. It needs to be research that requires the use of on-campus resources.

So what's the work and why does it require on-campus resources? Who would be the people that would do that work? How has the work space been laid out and arranged in ways where individuals can remain socially distanced from each other and be able to avoid transmitting the virus? How will use of the work space be scheduled? How will that scheduling be coordinated among other facilities or research labs that are on the same wing or the same floor or within the same building?

What kinds of disinfection procedures would be used to clean your way into, clean the work space and clean your way back out? So the report basically outlines these as the key
things that faculty need to address for their work spaces and for their research environment.

Some colleges have already moved forward with plans for these applications to be submitted and approved. Other colleges, I think they're forthcoming very soon.

Just a couple of quick comments, because I know these were things that were points of tension as we were developing this report, and I thought I would just address them right at the beginning. The first is, it is true that this initial reactivation is limited to certain classes of STEM-based research.

This was not a decision that Cornell is making. This is a decision from the State of New York. The Cornell University is reactivating all work that we are permitted to, by the State of New York. It is anticipated, and my understanding is that the higher levels of the administration are actively negotiating for now, but it's anticipating there will be a relaxation of what classes of research count for this reactivation.

The other thing I'll say, I know there was a lot of concerns about locality to Ithaca being required to be able to get access to on-campus resources. At least until widespread testing and contact tracing and other mitigation strategies are in place, the requirement is that anyone who wants to use on-campus resources needs to have been in the local Ithaca area, which is currently defined as about 50 miles from Ithaca, but you need to have been in the local Ithaca area for the last two weeks and no one in your household could have gone out of the local Ithaca area in the last two weeks, if you are going to come on campus and use on-campus resources.

Those were just, I know, a couple of things that had come up while we were putting the report together, and I thought I'd head those off before there's any other questions, but I'd be happy at this point to take any other questions, comments or suggestions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Questions for Chris?
Okay, very good. And thanks a lot, Chris, for serving on this committee. I note it's been a pretty intense two or three weeks there, and it's very nice to see forward motion like this. Even though it has to be slow and very careful, it's a very optimistic development to see us moving in this direction.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: It's been my pleasure to serve on the committee.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Let's go on to the other two committees that are still in full operation. One is concerned with looking at a possibly online semester and making it as good as possible, and the other one is let's look at a semester where there's an on-campus presence and make that as good as possible.

And Shorna and Courtney are representatives on those two committees, and I asked them to give maybe a brief overview of what's been going on the last few meetings and weeks. I know last week, we had a webinar, a town hall on personal risk that was very interesting, so maybe Shorna, if you'd like to start giving us a brief synopsis of what's going on in the TRO setting. Is Shorna here?

Let's switch to Courtney. Courtney, are you here?

COURTNEY ROBY: I am.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah, so we just got off of an hour-and-a-half academic integrity discussion, all relative to online instruction. Maybe talk a little bit about that, Courtney, what we're going to be doing and any other thing that comes to mind in your setting.

COURTNEY ROBY: Yeah, so just to start, I will try to be brief, to leave room for questions, which is probably the best use of our time, but just a reminder of how C-POT is cooperating from my perspective. So I'm a faculty representative on C-POT, which has several subcommittees. There's a subcommittee on technology issues surrounding online delivery, a
subcommittee on student engagement issues, a subcommittee on international students, a subcommittee allegedly on finance issues, though they remain mysterious to me.

And finally, the subcommittee on substantive curriculum and online delivery issues, which is pretty much everything in the classroom, except for the technology side. So I'm on several of these subcommittees, but I'm also working with a group of faculty who are, themselves, working with further focus groups, so we're trying very hard to capture kind of a maximal tranche of faculty concerns and suggestions.

So yeah, academic integrity issues have obviously been -- I don't want to say the core, because I don't really think that we're in a state yet where the most important part of our work is catching cheaters in classes. I think we've got more going on in our teaching than that, but academic integrity is a huge issue right now.

There are numerous scandals being prosecuted in various colleges, a lot of them having to do with resources that have become newly useful to students like Chegg and Course Hero, which have -- a lot of people post their homework there and get the answers to homeworks, but typically have not been able to use it for exams, because exams have been in-person and proctored. Now that exams are not in-person or proctored, students are posting entire exams to Chegg, getting the answers there, and that's obviously an unsupportable situation.

At the town hall today, we heard from several of the Academic Hearing Board chairs and other faculty who are involved directly or indirectly with the issues. We talked about -- so Laura Brown is putting together a kind of guide book of information for faculty on the kinds of violations that we've been seeing, and we'll blend that in with some suggestions that we've developed on the town hall today for approaches to fight academic integrity violations, and I'd be glad to field some questions about that later on.
Beyond the integrity issues, of course, we’ve been thinking hard about the kinds of resources we can develop for faculty, both in terms of course design and assessment recommendations, including, of course, suggestions to fight academic integrity violations, addressing specialized software or supply needs, where possible, and mostly just trying to avoid reinventing the wheel for faculty who are already stressed about planning for the shift online, which is likely to affect lots and lots of us.

Beyond that, we’ve been thinking about strategies to mitigate the kind of sense of isolation that I think the sudden shift to remote delivery built up in many of our classrooms, so thinking about how we can rebuild our classrooms and our larger community relations, again, in the likely event that many of us are only in virtual contact in the fall, and talking about supporting co-curricular resources, identity centers, residential life activities, et cetera, and helping faculty integrate those services into their classroom.

I will stop there, but I’m glad to answer or attempt to answer questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any questions for Courtney?

Okay, very good, so we have two and a half weeks before these reports are done, and the major decisions will probably follow one or two weeks thereafter. So this is very, very important work. Got to make sure the faculty keeps track of this, so that we can contribute to the discussions. Thanks again, Courtney.

Jill, let's go to the calendar discussion.

JILL: Shorna is on.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Oh, great. Shorna.

SHORNA ALLRED: Sorry. I was jumping from one Zoom meeting to the next. I can give a quick update on the Committee for Teaching Reactivation Options. All of you faculty received
an email today about the procedures and policies that would be in place, should the campus reopen for some degree of in-person instruction in the fall.

So I just direct your attention to that, that the policies and procedures that would be in place, if there was a residential semester, would be mask-wearing, physical distancing, restricting nonessential travel, enhancing sanitation protocols, limiting in-person dining and food services, adhering to contact tracing and quarantine protocols, restricting access to campus facilities, dedensifying, all of those things.

Obviously, a really important concern through all of this that the committee has been grappling with is the concept of personal risk and personal safety and really not wanting to compromise anyone with regard to teaching obligations. And so that's something that was also critical to this, is that really safeguarding our Cornell community, safeguarding our local community, protecting vulnerable faculty, staff and students, while also mitigating overall public health risks are really a priority.

And so I think that communication was really meant to lay out some of those things that would be in place, and it also went over the teaching modalities, that it might be in-person instruction with remote access, completely online course, or perhaps a hybrid course or modality of instruction.

One of the things the committee has also been focusing on is really the considerations around our behavior, the behavior of our students and the significant role that we would all play in protection of the community from infections. And we’re engaging with behavioral scientists across Cornell to really look at what are effective communication strategies around social norms and compliance and motivation, particularly with undesirable kinds of behaviors and things like that.
So we've talked about really how to engage students as part of the solution, because we have a number of student leaders that would really be really key partners in this, whether it's Greek life, student organizations, et cetera. We really have to really engage students right now as part of the solution, if this is really going to be effective, and so that's what we're doing is working with those student leaders on campus, and also those leaders in student and campus life.

Also, one of the things that I wanted to mention is just that the students themselves can come up with really creative, out-of-the-box ideas as well. Human Ecology and both ILR are hosting kind of PAC-a-thons at the end of this month and beginning of next month around some of these kinds of solutions and what we might think about, so that we'll also inform the committee deliberations as well, really hearing directly from students. And a survey of students is also being planned to go out very soon.

I just wanted to mention those as a few updates as well that the committee has been focusing on, and happy to take questions.


RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thanks for these reports. They're really, really helpful. I wonder, Shorna, if you might discuss whether -- any discussion as around privacy issues?

SHORNA ALLRED: Yeah, so the privacy issues are something that are really critical. I just met this week with individuals at the library that were really responsible for the recent resolution on privacy concerns, so that information is being shared with the committee.

Part of the recommendations that we talked about around privacy for the committee to consider in their recommendations is making sure that if there's any data that's being collected as part of a reopening process, whether it's around health data or tracing data, student behavior, anything like that, that the data we're collecting or that the university would be
collecting, that we have a transparent process so that people know what data is being collected, how it's being used to really have clear guidelines in place for the retirement of such data, that it not be archived and there be a committee set up to really examine and advise the university with regard to privacy concerns, because it's not necessarily something that the IT function of the university is necessarily looking at.

And so having one of their suggestions was an advisory type committee or board that would really be able to provide direct kind of guidance on that, but that we really be quite cautious at the outset around data that we might be collecting on students and their behavior that would aid in things like contact tracing, but also be utilized for unintended purposes, so thank you for bringing that up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Just to follow up, this is not, of course, just privacy of students, right. We're talking about also staff and faculty privacy issues, but I -- there may be a board, and obviously there are people on campus who study civil liberties issues, including privacy.

SHORNA ALLRED: Yeah, absolutely. It would actually be across the board, because I think any of these apps or tools that would be able to tell who's in a particular location and when, would be something that would be applied not just to students, so I agree.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Harold.

HAROLD: If we're going to be having students return to campus, there's no reason why it has to be all students or no students. Depending on what course of study a given student is following, the case allowing that student return to campus for in-person teaching can differ. The possible options for the calendar did not try to distinguish between different groups of students depending on what sort of courses they are taking.

For some courses, I should think online teaching is virtually impossible. For other sorts of courses, though never as good as in-person teaching, I think it can work reasonably well. So
I'm wondering whether people have thought about the possibility of being selective with regard to which students are going to be on campus.

For example, students in the Vet School who are taking studio courses, I should think that the case for their being on campus is much stronger than for a student who's taking an entirely humanities curriculum, in which all classes could be done reasonably well online. I'm wondering whether any thought has been given to working for an arrangement in which only some students would be on campus.

SHORNA ALLRED: Yes, I think that's an excellent point. And what the discussion of the calendaring options is that those courses that require a special facility, like studio or lab courses, those could potentially be prioritized for classroom or space assignments because they're not easily delivered in an online environment, so that is one of the criteria that would be utilized in deciding, and also the class size. There are some factors that would be overlaid, I think, with any of these course options, in terms of modality of online or in-person.

HAROLD: Can I say a little more?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There's some other people with their hands up we'd like to get to.

Levent?

LEVENT: My question is closely related to Harold's. In terms of implementing this dedensification of campus, one of the biggest challenges will be to reduce the density on campus. I wonder if the committee considered giving the students the option to attend in-person or remotely, because the provost's email suggested that the faculty will have the option. Some faculty members will choose to teach remotely and others will teach in class, which is very nice. And faculty will consider the demands of their courses, their health situation, their age.

But we could give the same option to students. Students could also make intelligent decisions. And if my guess is correct, we could have a 50/50 split, and that would reduce the
density on campus. Then we could do all the other things like testing and isolation type of things much more easy. Thank you.

SHORNA ALLRED: Yeah, that's a really good question, which is the sequencing; because right now, it would be driven by faculty and their modality of the course. And then I think if students are not able to attend in person -- if, for example, that course were offered in person and they're living somewhere where they are still under travel restrictions, then they would not be able to potentially take that course, would have to opt for ones that are online.

But I think the decision-making would have to flow from the curriculum down to the students. There haven't been discussions about sort of asking the students first and then shaping the curriculum that way, sort of from both angles, so that's an interesting question.

LEVENT: If I could follow up, we could ask the faculty first, and then the students would know how the course is being taught. We can certainly have a hybrid model. And we do it all the time with our faculty meetings, for example. And in-person, in-class teaching could also have a Zoom connection, and some students could join an in-person class remotely -- hybrid type of solutions.

SHORNA ALLRED: That's right. And that's what Courtney's committee has been looking at because, if there is a course that's meeting in person, but then someone is not able to attend, that student would then be able to access that course remotely ideally, under ideal conditions.

And I think also the important point is that students would have the choice to know how the course is being taught. Is the course being taught in person? Is it being taught totally online? Is it being taught in a hybrid manner, which I would imagine a lot of courses would have to be, yeah. So I think the student choice is really important in all this, too; that they know what modality the courses are being offered in and what those options are, ideally, yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'll have to move on. Ken Birman.
KEN BIRMAN: I want to circle back to Risa's comments about privacy. I'm one of the people that's been looking into these contact tracing apps and other types of campus data collection. There's obviously no question that they intrude and potentially they gather quite a bit of private information.

What's surprising is that many of these technologies might not actually work, in fact. You have to get quite a high penetration level, for example, with the contact tracing apps, for them to be useful. At that point, the human factors of contact tracing factor in. Someone's saying I was told by my phone that I was near someone who's infected may or may not actually contribute usefully to the contact tracing, so I think Risa's point is very good. And those of us that have been looking at this have really been torn on the whole question.

On top of that, it isn't really clear that these apps work. I'm saying that as a person who's really kind of an expert in this area. We need to test them ourselves, but it's very hard to get any concrete information about how well they work. People say it's Bluetooth; that must have some magical properties. If it's in someone's purse, it may possibly be blocked.

So I think Risa said something very important, that we not take steps to reassure people which aren't really effective, and they're sort of a false reassurance. Not saying that necessarily tracing technologies are in that category, but we can't rule out they might actually be in that category at this point. We're trying to learn more.

SHORNA ALLRED: Yeah. And also, I would note that contact tracing is in the domain of Tompkins County Health Department. They would actually be the agency responsible for doing any contact tracing of positive cases, so they would follow their procedures.

The Health Considerations Subcommittee is looking at this in greater detail, but it would be -- I think what they're examining would be potentially to augment what you are saying about
kind of the pros and cons of this. There are some privacy concerns around consenting to use these, and so we really want to make sure we’re weighing the costs and benefits.

Is the benefit great enough to justify this kind of intrusion into the privacy? Then, is it also effective? If it’s not really effective, it’s probably not something we want to be using, so I appreciate you raising all those points about the apps.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks an awful lot, Shorna, for an excellent overview of what’s going on. Let’s get on to the calendar part here, Jill.

Let me sort of say something. There are six calendar options out there. It’s not a referendum. Each calendar has one or more interesting ideas, and that’s what we’ve sort of focused on. As you know from March, a calendar can change on a dime. You can suddenly have to go online if there’s a hot spot here in Ithaca or, if there’s a miracle vaccine discovered in the fall, the spring would look different. All the calendars can be tweaked in small ways.

Again, let’s get on with it. Here’s the current calendar. What we call Option 0 is just that, only everything is online, literally. So simply a mapping of what we do now, only students never come to campus and it’s all online. Color coding: Green is a class day, yellow is -- day, brown or whatever is a study day. Pink is a weekend or a break day.

So what you will see in the remaining slides is sort of an axiom that when you go home at Thanksgiving, you don’t come back until the new year, and maybe often not until the end of February or March. So this one is the usual start time. The difference, then, is that when you go home -- well, that last week before Thanksgiving, you go home and you wrap up the course in those three weeks there, with seven more class days, followed by the usual exam/study period. So that would be handled online.

Then you stay home in the spring until middle of February, four weeks of online. And then there’s a move-in period. And those squares with the red outline is the move-in process,
and it will be staged. There's some thinking that's gone into this already -- actually, quite a lot of thinking, but what the students do during the move-in period and how you stage it is a very big issue.

And you can sort of see, then, that the end of February, students move back in anticipation of doing the rest of the semester in person. Again, you sort of see the usual exam period at the end. There's no senior week, so it's ending a week later, but that's what the spring would look like in Option 1.

I should say, the winter session, probably don't know too much about it, but it will loom larger in response because it's a way of picking up that extra course or getting a head start on something. This particular calendar option preserves the winter session, which is three weeks. You typically do one course that moves at a rapid clip.

Next option. The hallmark of this is a four-week delayed start, motivated by the fact that we have to deliver very high-quality, modified courses with some online content, so this would give you four extra weeks in the summer. You start up there sort of in the third week of September. There is an on-campus version of that, and then you go home and you wrap up the rest of the semester online, but it wraps around into January. So the four extra weeks in the summer bump everything into the new year. That's the main attribute of this particular calendar.

A word here about breaks. Yeah, there is a break there before Thanksgiving, but you're noticing here in these calendars, there's no February break, there's no spring break. These could be adjusted. So you don't want to make a break so long that it invites travel, but you do have the stress angle.

So a possible tweak to some of these calendars is to put in a long weekend and, if you do that, then of course you have to start a little bit earlier or later. That is an issue, lack of
breaks, but to pull off these options, you at least, at the first pass, assume there are no regular breaks.

This one isn't quite as delayed. It's only a two-week delay. You start up just after Labor Day. And then, the idea here that obviously needs to be fleshed out is that you have some form of on-campus assessment. So those yellow lines there, you can sort of think of them as a final exam-like week; details, of course, to be worked out.

But one of the big concerns that was brought up by Courtney is academic integrity and the interest of having in-person assessments. So with this particular option, there's enough wiggle room there to perhaps pull off something there just before Thanksgiving. You then go home for Thanksgiving, and come back, and you wrap up with three weeks of online and so on.

There's no wrap-around. You end in December, you still have a winter session. And then the spring starts up with four weeks of online, then a move-in process, and then an in-person wrap-up.

Option 4 and 5 have the property that the fall semester is split into modules. In this one, it's a pair of roughly seven-week modules. You'll notice that the first one is entirely on campus, and you'd have some kind of exam period.

Again, details have to be worked out. How many study days? What does the exam period look like, and so on. But the idea here is splitting the fall into two modules, with the first one being entirely in person, and the last one would be a mix. You start out with a few weeks of in-person and then go online.

Again, when you go home for Thanksgiving, you don't come back until sometime in February. You've already seen that spring calendar in Option 3, so no need to talk right now about more details. But in any case, the idea here is to split that fall semester into these two modules.
Last option, 5. Again, you split the fall, but not symmetrically. You have an eleven-week, roughly, on-campus version with in-person testing, and then you sort of have a three-and-a-half-week or four-week small online version, where you typically do, say, one course.

Again, the advantage here is you have sort of a reduced -- maybe take three or four courses instead of four or five during the on-campus phase, and then do that single course online. This supports a winter session, and it's the same spring calendar you see there as well.

That's the quick overview, but let's look at this table that maybe will help frame our discussions. Every calendar has a fall and a spring. Every calendar has a certain number of weeks that are online and off-line. Other attributes are when do you start, when do you finish.

You also have these important attributes. For example, Options 3, 4 and 5 have a measure of on-campus final assessment in the fall. That's an important attribute for many people. All but the second options support a winter session. I didn't write it down there, but Options 3 and 4 involve these compressed modules so, as you know, that would require substantial work for you to reshape your course into that reduced time.

These are all the options. Again, it's not a referendum. Each one has a certain feature that's worth discussing and thinking about, so there you go. Online, as I mentioned at the start, we already have like 600 comments from students and parents on this. But if you go to that web page, the link there at the top of the table, there's a little fork in the road, and faculty can go off and post their comments on a separate page so that we can see how each other thinks.

That's it. So the idea here is to have just a general discussion, and happy to answer questions. I want to mention I'm just the reporter here. Lisa Nishii, Kim Weeden and David Shmoys especially spent a lot of time on this and really helped shape this discussion. I want to acknowledge that very much. I haven't read all 600 comments, but I read a lot of them.
What's missing here, what students are calling Option 6, is what you may have read about at Notre Dame. In other words, start three or four weeks early and totally wrap up everything on campus before Thanksgiving. I would say lots and lots of students have weighed in on that one, so that's kind of a missing option here.

We did not consider this because -- for various reasons. Just to get the campus ready that quickly for early August start just didn't seem possible. You'd have all the course prep work as well. I think one of the lessons we learned in S20, it's really valuable to have three weeks to prepare instead of two, which we could have done, and that extra week is really important in terms of designing your course in a positive way.

I see Joanie has a hand up. Let's start.

JOANIE: Hi. Thanks. My question, rather thinking aloud, first of all, generally I lean toward Option 0. That's the only one that seems reasonable, ethically, not inviting people into a situation which they might lose their lives.

Otherwise, I'm thinking Option 4, with the two-week modules and the ways -- when we discuss ways of dedensifying, thinking of smaller groups to invite to campus, ways of having a somehow minimized student and course population, if somehow for designing or offering a seven-week course is a way to begin thinking about dedensifying the campus and then moving to online. So that's my thought.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right. So it gives you wiggle room, having the two seven-week modules. If a student takes two courses -- sort of having traffic on campus, there are all different ways of looking at that and so on. Levent, and then Mark Lewis.

LEVENT: All these options are on or off, either all students are on campus or all the students are off-campus. It doesn't consider, similar to my previous comment, hybrid solutions.
For example, Option 0, I’m also leaning towards Option 0, like Joanie, but Option 0 says everything is online.

   Everything doesn't have to be online. We could have a hybrid option; some students on campus voluntarily. Some students may want to take courses off campus. That will dedensify the campus. And under that hybrid model, we can easily implement Option 0. And all of these options have hybrid versions. I mean, it doesn't have to be on or off. It doesn't have to be all students are here or all students are gone.

   CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right. Calendars only show you where the class days are. If we're on campus, you might have your big CS1 course taken remotely, and so on. So don't confuse on-campus and off-campus with online or not. We can have versions of -- your schedule as an undergraduate might have a mix of classes you take in person and remotely online.

   In terms of inviting subsets, that's been studied, but it's extremely complicated. For example, let's not have the freshmen come this year, then we can have the population in the dorms. But what happens next year? You can look at some of the colleges -- some colleges are more self-contained than others.

   You mentioned Law and the Vet School. Those are professional schools. But for example, AAP, you might think about that group as being somewhat able to come back on its own. All these things raise equity issues. You can shut down the dorms. Then who can afford living in Collegetown? Well, the rich students and so forth.

   So extremely complicated, but I can safely say, from my vantage point, every possibility is being considered, every single one. In terms of, again, having subsets of students here, maybe a certain subset in the fall, in the spring, or freshmen in the first seven weeks, sophomores the second. You look at all these things and sometimes they sound good at first glance or look good
at first glance, but then you start thinking about how would you implement this and is it fair. You get into big complications, but good points.

Mark Lewis.

LEVENT: My solution is completely voluntary, to leave it to students whether they want to come on campus or stay off campus and attend classes remotely. And I don't know if that's being considered. I mean, students, they can make decisions. They can look at courses, they can look at the demands on their time, on their health, on their family, their financial resources, and I'm not sure if that is being considered at all. Everybody’s talking about bringing certain groups that we decide that they should be here.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Take into consideration international students. Those things are being considered and whatever; but again, I can't answer everything right now. But please post your ideas and, I guarantee you, we will look at them. Mark Lewis.

MARK LEWIS: Thank you. So had a little conversation with my faculty before coming here, about 20 of us. And the overwhelming, I guess I could say, sentiment was that we should try to maintain the same timing as we would have otherwise. Basically, what I'm trying to say is that we're avoiding coming back to campus in November, but we basically are leaning toward Option 3 for that reason; it is a continuous sort of set of time that mimics what we have now. That's one quick thing.

The other quick thing I want to mention to you and others is that some of our colleagues are saying that you could start classes early, but online for a few weeks, then have students move here, meet on campus. So I don't think the two sets of people that would be helping to move them in are those people that would be actually moving, so then you get started a little early and avoid having anything after November as well. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. Let's see. Ravi, then Carl and then David.
RAVI: Hi. I just had a comment, I guess, about if we teach classes in person, whether they be lectures, discussion sections, what have you, at some point, maybe students will be ill, maybe they'll need to be quarantined and we'll essentially have to do an online version of that as well.

And I just want to make sure that people are thinking about that in this planning because this semester, we did everything online after whatever it was in March, but to sort of do a hybrid version, where you're doing it both online and in class strikes me as a lot of extra work, or at least maybe CTI will help us and make that work out. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That is correct. Behind every one of these things, from the faculty point of view, is how much work and will it be possible to reshape my course to accommodate these things. And students, of course, look at the opportunities, the stress angle and things like that.

I think one thing that Mark sort of brought up, if two courses don't overlap in the current schedule, you don't want them overlapping in the new schedule. We have to pay a lot of attention to graduation dates, courses that are fall-spring sequences. We have to be very careful about that.

And it's kind of a truth in advertising thing, which is to say we have to really portray a course time roster with these details online, off-line, remote, will these details afford students coming back. Would be very unethical to portray a certain thing, then they get here and things are totally different.

Let's go on to Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you so much, and I sure appreciate the tough work that people are doing in these operations and also the -- must be going on behind the curtain to keep Cornell afloat financially. I really appreciated the extra time we had to prepare for our spring. I
taught a live course, and it was really beneficial; but I would argue from that, that we could follow the Notre Dame model. And I think we should really have that on the table, because I think we can do that.

The hardest thing I could say is that we had to change our plans a couple of times, and it's fair the administration had to respond to the changing circumstances, but I really appreciate how Cornell was appearing in a good way for this.

But my question is the following: While we prepare for it, our freshmen customers vote with their feet, so I'm very curious as to know how are we doing it, selling the freshman class. That also bears, I guess, on our finances. Have people found these -- are allowed to defer? What is the situation for freshmen looking at Cornell? Are people turning away from Cornell?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'll say three things. If you look at this time last year -- there are different levels of commitment: Whatever, the April 30 deadline, yeah, I'm coming. So that statistic is actually a little higher than normal. However, then pending now is a survey the administration's going to send out to all undergraduates, sort of saying what's going through your head.

I don't know the questionnaire, but they're going to try to get at this issue about we can deliver this, is this enough for you to come back. Just sort of paraphrasing. So there's going to be a systematic gathering of data like that. But I can bet that when August comes around, students can have a gap year and defer.

Right now, each college runs that show, and there's certain rules about it. And I think those rules have to be revisited before we get to August, but it's going to be pretty hard to say no to a student who says in August I studied your campus safety, I studied all these things, and I just want to take a gap year. It's going to be very hard to say no to that. So I would anticipate a big scene in August, one way or the other.
David Delchamps.

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie, can I jump in for a moment, based on something going on in the chat. So a lot of you have raised the question of an early start. And one of the issues that goes into considering the early start in the fall is that several of our colleagues already have commitments over the summer in terms of their research, in terms of the work they've already said they are going to be doing.

And this also plays into the argument of when we can start. They can't have the time, they don't have the time to commit to preparing for the courses in quite the same way. That's an important piece to remember as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Neema. That's absolutely true. A quick thing before we go to David, schools that are around the quarter system, they sort of have the advantage. They can play with their summers a little more than those of us on the semester system. If you look out there, you see universities taking advantage of that.

David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Okay, I didn't have the data point that Neema just threw on the table. I was going to speak for part of this in favor of thinking about the Notre Dame model, at least putting it on the table, because not only are the students and parents on board with that, a lot of faculty members in their comments have said how much they favor that, because it leaves open on-campus assessment, et cetera, none of this half online, whatever.

Now, as far as what Ravi was talking about in terms of will we have to do things for people who are sick, et cetera, of course. There's going to be international students who can't get back to the country, who still want to enroll in our courses. They're going to need to have a way to take the courses.
I'd assumed it all along that in the fall, when we do in-person, we'd also have to record our lectures. And I've also assumed that we are not going to be able to shoot for a synchronous online delivery, for the same reasons we weren't able to shoot for synchronous online delivery this spring; because there are people in mainland China, et cetera, who can't access their courses synchronously.

Conclusion I've drawn is that what remote access to our courses is going to mean, and this is going to be -- not necessarily for international students, but also for those who get sick during the semester, is going to be limited to lectures are recorded and you can Zoom with the professor. I think that's what it's going to be. We aren't going to need a room for every class to be able to have synchronous Zoom access, a TA sitting in the back to field questions for people online. It's just going to be recording lectures and Zooming with the professor. That's my piece on that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot, yeah. I forgot to bring up, if you look at any of our classrooms, there's a certain square footage. And you divide that by 50 if you want to do the six-foot spacing, and then you could get an estimate about how many people you can fit in there. In general, it's around 20% to 30% of what you would normally put in there, so you can see there's a gigantic room availability scene here. The kind of mixed thing that David is talking about is one way of addressing that.

More questions? Jill, can you read some stuff on the chat that we should talk about?

JILL: There's a concern about when the local schools will be starting and if that will affect people's ability to start their teaching and when, and lack of summer camps this year, that sort of thing.
CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Trying to do our work is creating huge angst. Neema, we were talking about that yesterday, and you were really articulate about what faculty are facing who have all these things piled on top. Neema, you there?

NEEMA KUDVA: I've been in so many meetings, and I don't remember what I was talking about.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So eloquent, come on. Just sort of talk about suppose I have to prepare my course during the summer. There's no summer camps. Describe the --

NEEMA KUDVA: -- came up in the chat as well. It's coming up with a lot of people. There are no summer camps and we don't know when schools are going to reopen. And so for those of us that have children in the schools or young children who go to daycare, this is a huge issue. And this is something we are trying to make sure is part of the conversation when we consider, when we think about using the summer to prepare for classes in the fall, which ever format it's going to be in.

This issue, I think it's Ken Birman -- I'm reading from the chat -- brings this up in a different kind of way, when he says unclear to me which options force me to create a whole new set of lectures and which ones basically are compatible with being able to work mostly from my existing set of lectures from previous semesters.

Each one of these options, as we're evaluating them, we all need to consider how much it's going to take to completely restructure a course. Are you just taking your course into a virtual space? And how are we really beginning to think about how we create a really valuable, excellent learning experience online and how much work it's going to take us to do that.

In the committees, the online committee that I'm a part of, that Courtney and I are a part of, the discussion is around creating an excellent virtual experience, so it's going to take some amount of work from us. It's not going to be the same as the spring, where what we were
mostly trying to do -- we were working super-hard, it was a heroic effort, but we were taking existing courses and taking them online.

We're really going to have to start thinking about the fall, not just thinking in existing experience, but to transform it to make it truly excellent. So it's going to take some work. In response to Ken's comment, I don't think you can stick with your 27 lectures. You're going to have to think of how the assignments change. We're going to have to think of how we build the community in the classroom, that differently.

And most importantly, what Courtney raised earlier and that Charlie also raised, questions of academic integrity. We're seeing a huge jump -- some people think it's a huge jump, some people think it's not so huge, but we're discovering it more easily now, but we are seeing a jump in terms of integrity violations.

As you review these options, as we discuss these back with our departments, I think the question really should also be not just about the start, but how much work it's going to be taking us, going back to Ken's comment. So I don't know, Charlie. I think in terms of everything we've been hearing in the last couple of days, in and out of meetings, these are the kind of issues that come up a lot.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's right, yeah. When you start looking at these things hard, there are always trade -- if we did the Notre Dame thing and you rigidly just moved that entire regular fall semester back three weeks, you'd have minimal changes to your course, theoretically, and you'd have a longer research period, from Thanksgiving into whatever it is in the spring.

But all the reasons discussed here, why it's an extremely tough challenge, so we really encourage you to look hard at these things, if only to discover the complexity of it. Sometimes it looks great when you glance at it, but then you start thinking gee, what does this really mean.
Risa has her hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thanks. On the point that we were just discussing about the issue of labor, of course, it's not just our labor. It's also staff labor, it's also teaching assistants' labor, graduate assistants, et cetera. I think this is also one of those moments to remind ourselves of how important it is for people's jobs to be preserved. We have more work to do, not less, so I wonder if anyone has any updates on those issues of preserving jobs. And administration, have they given any updates on that?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The big watershed event is going to be early -- these recommendations go to the president and provost June 15. That's the watershed event, is how we're going to handle the fall. At that point, all these things -- a huge fork in the road there about the issues you just sort of mentioned.

Neema, did you have something you wanted to add to that?

NEEMA KUDVA: No. I agree with you, Charlie.

Risa, how many jobs we're able to maintain will really depend in part on how many students we can bring back. Faculty jobs are secure, but the staff questions are so dependent on student campus life, on all the other kind of co-curricular things that we run, and so there's a lot of issues here that will start to come up, once we land on a decision of who's coming back, how many can come back and what we can teach.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Very quickly, I just wanted to throw in, I think we should go with an option that does not commit us to a big change for the spring. I think we can wait to see what's going on, see what's happening, see how this thing flows to decide on what happens with the spring. That's my personal opinion on that. So the Notre Dame model, or Option 1, I think, for example, are the two that have the least impact on the spring, least commitment.
CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Those 600 posts, people are saying why are you thinking about the spring. Well, one of the options has wrap-around into January. You sort of start having to think about that. I can think of those spring calendar -- just sort of place-holders and we need a lot more information about how the pandemic plays out before those details are wrapped up and so on.

SHORNA ALLRED: Can I mention one other thing, Charlie, around the start date, too, which is wrapped up in this, which is our capability to do rapid testing and to really ramp that up for every single member of the Cornell population, faculty, staff and student.

I think some of the delayed start is also around when the Cornell Vet Diagnostic Lab could be up and running for the capability of these tests, as well as when the experiments and the data would be there for the accuracy of saliva tests, which would be much more comfortable to do than the nasal swabs on a week or two-week basis, whatever interval that surveillance testing would take place. I know that's another variable that plays into the start date as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Do people feel we should actually flesh out -- it would take like half an hour -- an Option 6, which is the early start, just so we collect comments on it, or do we feel - - I haven't been looking at the chat line. Is it really sort of off the table? We don't have to answer it right now, but we'll take a look at that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, from a student perspective, it seems there's an appetite for that option from the student perspective. The thing that students have been talking about is the challenge of doing online work from home after Thanksgiving and that they would prefer to end the semester at Thanksgiving, if there's an option to do that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, well, we're at time. Again, thank you for the discussion, and please share your thoughts. It's great to see how the other person thinks on all this sort of stuff.
And it's going to be part of the recommendation of the TRO committee is -- well, there will be chitchat in the final report, and all your comments are extremely important to make sure we portray all the positives and negatives.

With that, I guess we're all done, and I'd like to thank you again and all the speakers and so on. Okay, bye-bye, everybody.