A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Fourth senate meeting of the year. You see the usual rules of the

game up there on the slide.

I have some announcements. They all revolve around one thing. Many of you are

aware of a petition that was circulated across faculty, graduate students and staff that listed

demands associated with developing a more antiracist Cornell. The link is on our website. It's

also there on the slide. There are close to 40 different demands. Some of them resonate very

closely with our planned agenda for this fall, and I just wanted to step through four of them.

The first thing has to do with how we're going to go about thinking and developing a

proposal for a Center. I whole-heartedly agree with that particular demand, and we'll talk about

Working Group C that will be in charge of sending something to the senate in about two

months, and we certainly plan on staffing that in an intelligent way.

The whole role of standardized tests has been around for quite some time, and I'm sure

we're all aware of that. The university has to sort of make a decision about it, or there's a

planned decision about it in early spring. And I have already talked to the vice provost for

enrollment about this, and the plan is for him to come to the senate and for us to get well-

versed in all the different issues. That's very much in our fall agenda plan.

Having a Toni Morrison Hall, in particular Goldwin Smith. As you know, over the last

week we have been thinking about an analogous thing for Ruth Bader Ginsburg. And I'll talk

about the act of renaming a building or a school or a program shortly, but that's something very

important to consider and highly relevant right now.

Systematic review of the curriculum. This was a request of Martha, and exactly the

same pretty much in the petition. This is a decentralized effort. We made an attempt maybe

about three weeks ago to plug into the colleges, and we have a web page where that's all set up, we have context. The colleges have sent me some things; however, it's kind of early days. What we are looking for is links to committees who are doing work so we can track them.

Then I had a sort of a second thought, realizing a lot of this work is centered in departments. All I'm saying, it's hard to figure out what's going on, but we want to make an effort to do that. Neema and I are planning on having some kind of Zoom forum in the next week or two, where we can get people who are right now engaged in that activity, figure out how they're doing it, develop principles and share them.

Let me pause at this point. Does anyone have any questions they'd like to ask me about these particular sets of activities that were identified in the petition and which are very much right in our path?

Let's go on to the issue of how we can honor Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who died a little over a week ago. We posted this question and circulated it through Monday message, and we got quite a few suggestions. Actually, it's sort of a short list of suggestions. They fall in sort of different categories.

One is structures, buildings. So Goldwin Smith was mentioned more than any other building, Lincoln Hall because her affection for music, ideas about an Arts Quad statue or building on North Campus, that's another possibility. And Hasbrouck Apartments, and there's sort of a story behind the Hasbrouck name, which you can read about on the website. And you have sort of academic unit renamings, such as the Law School. Of course, she was an undergraduate here; but nevertheless, that would be a relevant thing.

We had all the discussion last year about developing a school for public policy. Then you have programs like FGSS, so that's another cluster of possibilities. Embedded in all this are sort of the usual things you do, endowed professorships, special lectures, awards, scholarships and

so on. Those are sort of the things that came up. I did a little bit of homework about how you pull these things off. Let's take a look at the next slide.

Here are three facts. First of all, in the Alumni Affairs and Development Office is a standing committee that deals with memorials and name facilities. There's a group that vets these things. They interact with the senior administration and also the trustees. That's a target of where we can send something.

More specific to North Campus, Vice President Lombardi is standing up a committee that he tells me will involve some of the faculty-in-residence up there, a couple of buildings there that perhaps there's a naming opportunity.

And then, kind of an obvious sort of thing, which the Vice President Van Sickle, who runs the development office told me, which it's harder to raise money when the legacy in question is not the donor's legacy. That's sort of an obvious thing. All those things in the previous slide come with price tags. Name something like the Law School, talking about $100 million. Other things are smaller. So there is that issue.

This is sort of before I paid a lot of attention to these things, but I know when West Campus was building, those houses are named after famous faculty and people in Cornell history. When you do that, you can certainly inspire donors to contribute, but not quite as much as if you named a building after the donor. That's just out there.

What do we do? Just wanted to remind you again, in this whole space, same sorts of possibilities, maybe a slightly different set of possibilities, but for Toni Morrison. I know the English Department is staging a big event, I think, next week. This is an ongoing and very important salutation to one of our most famous alumni. So these two individuals are certainly worthy of some kind of senate action. How can we express ourselves?

Here's some possibilities, then I'll shut up and you can talk or make suggestions. We can do a resolution, we could do a sense of the senate resolution expressing how important it is we feel that there be some explicit recognition of these two individuals. We could kick it up a notch. It's not hard, but you could make a formal resolution. Then what I would do is take these and send them to both the development office, and also Ryan, who's working on the North Campus thing. That's about all we can really do, but I think it's sort of worth doing.

The question is what's the form of that resolution. You can't get too specific. Well, Goldwin Smith or Lincoln Hall, I don't think we have to get to that level. I think somehow we want to express how important it is to the faculty that a step be taken on this direction.

Let me pause right here and get some feedback from you. If we do the resolution, I would sort of work with the UFC to put it together, we'd run it by you and we'd vote on it at the next senate meeting. There's no big rush. These things move at a fairly slow speed. The next senate meeting or the one after that. Anyway, your thoughts on that, I'd be very interested to hear. Abby Cohn, one of our faculty trustees.

ABBY COHN: So one thought I have, if I understand it correctly, is this is something where we might want to make common cause with the other assemblies, with the employee and both of the student assemblies, because if all four assemblies make a resolution, it has to get put on the board agenda.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a really good point, Abby. From a practical point of view, getting it on the agenda, but this is a unified voice.

ABBY COHN: I think whatever we do, it would be great, then, for you to communicate with the assemblies, because that's how the carbon neutral thing got to the board. And it had to go to the board because of that, so I think it just is a powerful statement if we raise our voice collectively.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Absolutely. That's a really good point. We'll certainly do that. You know, just getting going. The pandemic delayed elections in some of the assemblies, so sort of getting in gear, but we could certainly orchestrate that. That's a really good point.

Additional comments or thoughts? I see Risa, and then Ken's iPad. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thanks. I think that's a great idea that Abby put forward in terms of the coalition building. I just wanted to clarify, and you might have been clear on this, but for myself, that some sort of resolution I think should be both for Ruth Bader Ginsburg and for Toni Morrison, as opposed to only talking about Ginsburg. It wasn't absolutely clear to me whether we were supporting both, and I would certainly support both.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think both. And I think a nice symmetry, I would sort of favor one resolution, but that's just my thoughts right now. Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: I would favor these resolutions. There's some discussion in chat about Goldwin Smith apparently was a terrible anti-Semite, and I was unaware of that. Now that I'm aware of it, I very much like the idea of renaming that building.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. Thank you. Doug Antczak.

DOUG ANTCZAK: Yes, concerning the buildings, I think Mike Thonney already sent a note to the chat that we already have a Morrison Hall up in the Ag Quad, but we could do with another. But I'm thinking also that it's very easy for us to urge the administration to name a building after one person or another, but after that's done, it doesn't require any work from us and it may have less lasting impact than some kind of program like a distinguished lecture.

I know there's one in the Ag School for Professor Asdell, and every year we hear the history of what he contributed to Cornell. And that's more like a living document, and I think we need something like that as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Right. Buildings taken immediately to the trustee level, so would naming a school. Something within a college, a lecture series or scholarships and so on, then you are at sort of the college level. I think for now we should focus on the stuff that might head to the trustees, but you're absolutely right, that things like that that you mentioned, Doug, would be very important too.

Seeing as there's no more discussion on that, thank you. I think this is a worthy exercise that we'll follow up on.

We're close to 100, so we likely have quorum.

Background, we have these special professorships, professor of the practice, clinical professor, research professor. Rules of the game are that when a college wants to offer such a title, they come to the senate with a proposal. There's a template for what the proposal must cover. The senate, after CAPP weighs in, votes on it.

The situation in the Business School is with the merger of three units, each with their own POP policy, some packaging was required. Just to be clear and respectful of faculty governance, the JCB came to us with a proposal, went through CAPP; they're fine with it. And we talked about it three weeks ago. Andrew Karolyi is here to give a quick overview, and then we'll lock ourselves into a vote.

We try to play ball with Robert's Rules, just to be formal here. We are now going to discuss a resolution, so can someone just raise their hand, saying that they're okay with this?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I move the resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, great, thanks. Andrew, give us a quick rundown of what you talked about three weeks ago, and then we can entertain questions.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Charlie. Thank you, everybody. I promise, less than 45 seconds for this synopsis. As Charlie mentioned, three schools merged just under five years ago

into one college, each with their own respective professor of practice policies. Our College Faculty Policy Committee convened -- this is our elected body within the college among faculty -- convened, and they wanted to advance a harmonized policy. And it came to the fore last year.

We brought it before our faculty for a vote, and the vote received approval within the college among the faculty. The key features are listed there for you: Experienced non-academics who can also be outstanding specialized teachers, that there is a 25% college-wide cap, but that specific schools, one of the three schools could have more stringent caps within.

And that it is made clear in the spirit of the university's guidance on this, that this would not be a promotion path for senior lecturers, senior research associates or senior extension associates, but rather it would be a reclassification exercise. There you have the votes.

A question arose in the meeting we had three weeks ago that what are our rules within the college on quorum, as I was reporting the vote to you. As I reported to you at the time, I was not sure because, in fact, it was the case that the college had not yet decided on what constitutes a quorum in its short life. In these instances, we typically fall back to the respective three schools and their policies.

Robert's Rules of Order were the formalized policies. As one of the senators suggested, it is two-thirds representation. And our count of the electorate implied 200 would be required. That is what we met, more than met with our electorate, so I just wanted to report that, because that's a letter I sent back to Charlie in the aftermath of three weeks ago's meeting.

I'll stop and take any questions from the senators on the policy.

MARY MACAUSLAND: I have a question, Andrew. This is Mary MacAusland. How are you?

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Mary.

MARY MACAUSLAND: Thank you for presenting this. One thing you said was that there wasn't a cap within each school, but rather it was 25% applied to the college. What are the current numbers in terms of how many already have that title in each school and how are they expected to be divided?

ANDREW KAROLYI: The first question, I'm going to give you an approximate number. It's approximately nine, and it's across two of the three schools. One of our three schools, the one you know best, the Hotel School, has a 5% cap. The Johnson School originally, when the senate resolved to approve its policy, had a 25% cap, 25% relative to the base of tenure track.

The harder question you asked is what the longer term plans are. And at this point, I can't say that our leadership has actually designed a strategy for this as part of its annual cycle of faculty authorizations or has designed any kind of intermediate plan for this as far as apportioning these types of titles across the three schools. We have a mechanism by which we do that, and I don't want to bore the senators on that matter, but I'll be happy to answer your question off-line.

MARY MACAUSLAND: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to make sure it was on the radar screen, so that all of these wouldn't go necessarily to one school or to two. That was just my only concern. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, then Richard Bensel.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. So last time, I had raised the question about the rules from the enabling legislation with regard to professor of practice. And the professor of practice simply adopted the same enabling legislation as clinical professors, and there's the requirement in that enabling legislation that the proposal must be approved by at least two-thirds of those voting in person or by ballot in each of two separate votes of tenure track and of non-tenure track faculty of the originating college or school.

Further, for the proposal to be approved, at least half of all those faculty members eligible to vote in each case must vote for it. I didn't see any more information about that, other than the dean thing that you don't distinguish between the two, but the enabling legislation does distinguish.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There was no separation between the RTE vote and the TT votes.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Right. A requirement in the enabling legislation is that it has to be done separately.

ANDREW KAROLYI: I understand. It just wasn't done that way. We didn't separate the two.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Well, then I think that this doesn't actually meet the requirements of the enabling legislation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Your proposal, then, Risa, is to postpone this vote?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Well, I'm not really proposing anything in particular. I mean, it shouldn't really have come to us, I suppose. Yeah, it seemed to me that it's not ready for a vote because it hasn't met the requirements and it just slipped through without, I guess, the appropriate committees recognizing that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: In terms of these votes, when you start from scratch, when a college proposes things, I'm not quite sure that this has ever come up. I also know, for example, there are about a dozen of these out there, and there's variation. For example, like in Engineering, it's 25% of the total college, whereas other units say 25% in each unit. Engineering conceivably could put 50 professors of the practice into a single unit.

What I'm sort of saying here, not saying loosey-goosey, but there hasn't been what I would say absolute strict following of the enabling legislation over all these proposals. I also

notice, for example, the Law School has 40 tenure track faculty and 18 clinical professors. That's above the 25% rule.

I guess my stance here, what I'm sort of saying, if there's agreement, we can postpone this or go ahead, but I'm saying there's not what I would say strict following of the rules in all these things. Maybe that's a deal-breaker for some people. The other point of view is whether or not the overall proposal makes academic sense, is good for the school and also for the university. That's all I can sort of contribute here. Maybe other people should chime in on this.

Richard Bensel had his hand up before. Richard, do you want speak? I would like to stick with this sort of issue, about whether or not we want -- I guess it's up to Risa, if you want to have this tabled.

RICHARD BENSEL: Not sure what you're saying, Charlie. I had a question, a different sort of question, but I can wait, if you want to discuss this one. For the record, I do think holding to our regulations is a good idea because sometimes we don't, we get in trouble.

What Risa's raising could be regarded as a technicality, but the vote isn't so overwhelming that it's possible that the distribution of votes would not meet the enabling requirement. But I do have a question that I'd like to ask, an information question. Is that appropriate now?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's see how long it takes to answer, yeah.

RICHARD BENSEL: Well, it's a fact question. Mary asked about the number of professors of practice, and that was going to be my first question. The second question is the number of professors of practice who have doctorates, because one of the worries about professors of practice and these other kind of categories is that we're shifting from tenure track to other kinds of informal employment.

So the question is how many of the professors of practice now have doctorates and what is the requirement in the future? I like the document explaining the different criteria and so forth. I thought it was very clear, but it didn't answer that question.

ANDREW KAROLYI: I'm not going to be perfectly accurate, but I just went through my head with each that I have in mind. If you include J.D. with Ph.D., I believe every single one. If J.D. is considered a terminal degree, the equivalent of a doctorate, then every single one of them.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We have to sort of process this fairly quickly. The question now, Risa, do you want to have a motion to table the vote on this? And then I guess we have to discuss that, and if we could quickly come to a resolution on that -- would you like to do that? Do you feel that's necessary?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes. And if that's the appropriate motion, to table, then -- I don't know if we have a parliamentarian, but if that's the appropriate motion, to table it, I so move.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Seconded?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I second tabling this motion until an appropriate vote that matches the enabling legislation, as has been reported to the senate from the Law School.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mike Tomlan, you want to just make a comment?

MIKE TOMLAN: I am glad for any clarification, because CAPP has wrestled with this repeatedly. And going forward, it's going to continue being an issue, so I very much appreciate any clarification that the senate wishes to offer.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's too bad I'm not a Robert's Rules guru here. I guess we vote on this.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I have my hand up. I wanted to just speak to the issue -- to discuss this. I think what I want to point out is that it's very easy to say oh, well, this is a technical issue

and why are we bothering with it, but my memory of the discussion about whether to do clinical professors originally, and now it's been extended to professors of practice, was that the separate votes were important because at that time -- the term is non-tenure track faculty. Now we use RTE. The RTE faculty may have a different view of this than the tenure track and tenured faculty.

So the separate votes were quite deliberate for that reason, both in terms of the two-thirds vote issue, and then also -- of those voting, two-thirds vote, and then also of the 50% of all those eligible to vote. It was quite deliberately done. It was not viewed as oh, well, this is just technical.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Mike Thonney, do we vote on the tabling or just let it go, ask the JCB to come back with a redone vote? Mike?

MIKE THONNEY: We need to vote on the motion that's on the floor. That's what's on the floor. There was no debate about that motion.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: On the chat, all those in favor of tabling the motion. Use chat. The simple majority, Mike?

MIKE THONNEY: Yes.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What do we have, Jill?

JILL: I see one abstain, one no. Everything else is coming in yes or supportive.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, so we'll have to table this. Andrew, we'll have to have a discussion after this about how to proceed. I guess basically, the JCB will have to stage the two votes or a vote where you have the separate votes, and I'll make sure we send a clear message.

ANDREW KAROLYI: Thank you, Charlie. We appreciate everybody's time. We're patient.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks. Let's go on to the next thing.

We now have four things to talk about that all connect to the antiracism initiative. One has to do with the working groups that were forming the charges, want to make sure everyone's okay with those charges. Then, Angela Winfield will talk about a mandatory program that's come up for staff and what its relevance might be for faculty. Avery and Yael are here to talk about what we sort of currently have in the way of educational programs for faculty. And then Professor Goffe from Africana, has experience with the Milstein Program and humanities and tech instruction, will close out the discussion here.

Let's get on with the working group thing. There are three of them. Before we step through them, just some reminders; or maybe this is new to you, not sure. This is our fifth meeting in a row where we've talked about these sorts of things.

First of all, we're referring to these as working groups, not committees. And they have facilitators, not chairs. The point here is that it's a very flat structure and one that's totally transparent. If you look at the last two items, all the agendas will be published in advance. Most of the meetings will be open, but for sure, all the meetings will be recorded and posted.

Another real important detail here, these working groups report to the senate, not the administration. That means it takes a little bit of the heat out of it. It is not the end result what these working groups produce. It is simply doing homework, showing up with the senate with proposals that we will then discuss much more globally and broadly.

So those reminders, let's get on and look at these three working groups. You know about this three-way split. One has to do with the Center, one has to do with students, and one has to do with faculty. They're all related, but we're splitting these tasks into three different groups.

Let's talk about the Center. Online is the full charge. Remember, charges can be modified as you go along, but you have to be good enough so at the start you can convince

people to perhaps serve on these working group committees and they provide enough structure so that you don't go all over the place trying to figure out what you're supposed to look into.

The first one here is really the most important thing across all three working groups, which is to say there has to be a compelling vision that encompasses the whole campus. That's a critical thing. We sort of know what it's about, but that has to be refined.

One way you do it, you sort of have to file an environmental impact statement, so to speak. What is going to be the connection between this Center and nearby centers? How are they going to amplify existing strengths? How are they going to support faculty and students who are doing work in this area? So that's a real important thing to consider, because there is a lot of current work on campus, a lot of it distributed across several important entities.

Third, what about external visibility? To what extent will this new center help us recruit excellent faculty and students? This is a critical sort of thing. In our discussions, and Neema and I have had quite extensive discussions across campus, there are all different models out there. I'm not saying, we're not saying the Society of the Humanities is a good one, but it's a very, very interesting one. It's highly endowed, it supports faculty on campus, brings in people from the outside, supports post-docs teaching, and it is perhaps a model that should be considered. Those are the key things that this particular working group will work on.

Getting back to the compelling vision, this is an example. The Mellon Foundation awarded Rutgers $15 million for an Institute for the Study of Global Racial Justice. That says a couple of things. The Mellon Foundation is out there and has interest in this area.

You also see, and it is a nice reminder, we are using the word "antiracism" as a placeholder, as indeed the word "Center." We have centers and institutes. Whether or not antiracism is the proper title is to be determined. Systemic racism, global racial justice. You can

see all the different factors here, and how that plays out is part of the exercise that this working group will go through.

Let me just pause right here, if people have particular comments they'd like to make about this. When you look at these charges, you want to make sure they're flexible enough that the working group will consider all the right things, the important things. And if something's missing, we'd certainly like to hear about that. Let me pause right here and entertain questions. I see Peter from Chemistry, and then Joanie from English. Peter.

PETER WOLCZANSKI: Certainly, the one thing that I would like to see in any kind of a center here is the inclusion of science, because a lot of the issues that we face along these lines are significant in terms of hiring, significant in terms of students having -- I would say they have a bad opinion about what we are doing in regard to hiring practices and so forth because they don't know the system.

We were talking about this today at lunch, at our faculty lunch, that what would it be like to get out of any of this stuff would be definitely inclusion and definitely opening up our hiring practices so the students could see much more openness in that regard.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think what you just said will speak to the working group concerned with the programs for faculty and so on, but those are very good points, Peter.

Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks. This is Joanie Mackowski in English. I want to point out, to frame this Antiracism Center, which is developing in consequence of the violence, the prevalent violence that can't be ignored anymore, that I sense, I guess, some torque in that the Center, that we're also framing it as in terms of our visibility and recruiting excellence, just competition and strife, and always seeking to best a part of the problem. So just part of the

language and intention of demonstrating our excellence and our power, our supremacy, I wish there were other ways to consider what we're doing.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, a key thing is to identify what the research scope is of the Center. Don't you agree that an attribute of a center -- and we have many of them on campus, so to elevate research on campus and also to attract faculty and to become well-known for what you're doing. I mean --

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Or finding truth, having well-known or framing it as a competition or as finding answers, ways to achieve peace.

NEEMA KUDVA: Could I just chime in for a second? Joanie, I totally hear you about sort of looking at this question of excellence or recruitment as being competitive and problematic, but I think when we were writing this and in our conversations with our colleagues, the issue is also of providing a supportive environment.

Maybe one way to think about it is the reframing of it, and then we should change the language. So it's really sort of about this question of the politics of presence and support, and that faculty who engage in this work, who engage in work that sort of decolonizes disciplines, it opens up questions of racism, that they find the kind of support and collegial spirit to be able to do the kind of work they want to do. So that is also part of it. And perhaps that language needs to be changed, but it's not only a framing in terms of competition or a marketplace.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. We have Risa and David Lee. Incidentally, you can always post comments on the agenda page, if we run out of time or whatever. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, I just wanted to follow up on what Joanie had raised and Neema's response. I found both of them very thoughtful and important, and perhaps to insert a connector between the two. I don't think that what Neema is saying and what Joanie is saying

are contradictory, but perhaps a connector is that to talk about an Antiracism Center and to come out of the particular moment where it has a certain activist aspect to it.

So it's supportive of all the ways in which Neema was describing, supporting people's work of decolonizing and looking at racism in terms of our work, our curriculum, our research, et cetera, but there's also the engagement aspect of it, which I think is an activist notion that perhaps isn't yet captured by the language. And that may also, I think, speak to what I heard also Joanie saying.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. David Lee?

DAVID LEE: Yeah, my point was pretty much the same as Risa's. We didn't plan this, but I guess I'm a little hung up on your Point Number 1. In fact, the whole discussion, it seems we're talking about research. I mean, we all do research, we have centers, institutes and programs on campus that all do research.

Going back to the summer's meetings of the senate, it seemed to me that the main thrust through many of those meetings was a lack of comfort with the fact that we're doing business as usual and that there was a sense that, as Risa's suggesting, that something more engaged, more activist, whatever you want to call it, was called for. Behaviors, basically, of students, of faculty and so forth.

I guess I think almost there's another question that really needs to be asked first, and that is is the real need here for more research. I'm not convinced of that. There's a lot of research. I'm wondering if the real need here is, as Risa's suggesting, something that's more activist, something that's more behavioral change-oriented toward the community. And if that's the case, I'm not sure the word "Center" is even appropriate. Seems to me that effort or initiative or program or something that is more dynamic, more engaged is more appropriate than one more center.

I think you remember the president's initial email back in July, I think, listed twelve centers that are already doing related work. And I think Charlie, you had an email at one point that listed 20 centers that are doing related research. Do we really need another center? I'm not convinced of that, but I think something that's more active, more engaged might be more appropriate.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Remember, we're using the word "Center" as a placeholder. Let's get on to Peter, then we have to get on to the next working group. Peter?

PETE: Yeah, in our faculty meeting today, where we had discussions about this, the idea was brought forth that some sort of outreach would be really a critical component of the Center, I would think. Really unique environment here, being sort of the flaming liberal spot of Upstate New York, and some sense of outreach, I think, from a center like this, I think, would be a wonderful idea, especially given the wide disparity of both education and economics that we're seeing show up all across the country and pretty much every phase of life.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, very good. Let's go on to the next working group, which is concerned with a university-wide requirement for students. The Number 1 here is sort of what's the goal. There's a high-level question for all these things: What is the goal of this requirement and how is it different from what we already have. And it varies from college to college. Diversity, inclusion-related requirements already exist.

Then there's the other sort of thing about this university requirement. You can think swim test. Maybe this is a better sort of thing. Just about every degree program has some kind of quantitative reasoning requirement. It's not a university requirement, but over the years, math has been elevated as something that's important and it shows up sort of naturally. So when you think about the trying to sell or advertise or justify an educational requirement, is there some analogy that might be in play here.

Then you have the menu question at two levels. So colleges sort of control curriculum, so each college could be doing its own thing, but there might be some standard that they have to be held to. Well, what is that standard? How do you qualify? How does your college's program qualify?

Then you have the other level of menu, which is to say here's a list of 50 courses. You can take any one of them to satisfy this requirement. Again, how do you get on the menu? Who decides? How do you maintain it? Those are some practical sorts of issues.

Although the tone is sort of undergraduate, we're really talking about all students. Of course, it's a very different scene if you're here for one year as a professional master's student or if you're here for, say, six years as a Ph.D. student. In any case, that is something that should be addressed by this working group. How does the whatever we're trying to do for undergraduates, how does it show up, how is it delivered at the graduate level.

Any questions about this one? Sufficiently broad for this group to run with it and make a proposal to us. Angela will talk to us about this more and, actually, Avery and Yael.

So what about for faculty? Of course, anything that has the word "required" or "mandatory" or "training" immediately gets us on the defensive, so to speak. The question is we do a lot in this sort of area. Peter mentioned this sort of in his remarks a few minutes ago. There's a lot on the ground. How do we build on that? Or is it something totally different that we have to build on?

And then, what Angela talked to us about, a program has been developed that's required for staff. She'll tell us all about it. Is it relevant to us? Is the content relevant to us? Is the delivery mechanism something to pay attention to?

And then the thing about we're all booked to the gills. We have no time for anything and you get nervous about requirements. But think about, for example, department meetings.

They're kind of required, and if you could embed this educational component within a department, in the meetings that are held, and you begin to see it's sort of folded into our regular way of doing business.

Anyway, that's a very hard thing we have to come to grips with, which is that we're all just so busy. How can we incorporate yet another center, yet another requirement, yet another thing on our to do list. Anyway, it's very, very important, and all these things are highlighted by this Do Better Cornell and petitions that have been around now for several years from the students that they want to see some real progress in this regard.

Any sorts of questions, any way you can see this as being to embellish it, to make it clear and so on? Richard Bensel.

RICHARD BENSEL: This required programming bothers me. It looks like there's going to be someone who says to faculty these are the right attitudes you should have, and if you do not have them, you -- I don't know what. The educational program is mandatory. Is there a test at the end, where you say I don't think the answers that are being projected are correct? Then what do you do, the faculty?

This looks like ideology to me. This does not look like -- it's not a department meeting, at least not in my department. We don't have a test at the end that says you have conformed to the correct attitudes and you believe the right things and, therefore, you are an accepted part of the community. This bothers me a lot. I think that is an infringement of academic freedom and thought.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, part of it is there are hard things to talk about, and we have to learn how to talk about them. No one's talking about a test at the end of this. It's simply to take us to a new level of how we think about things and how we treat each other and so on. But anyway, good points. Landon.

LANDON: I think the intent behind these trainings is really good and important. I think that it's also important that we look at the research and what types of things work. There seems to be some research that suggests that short, required online trainings may not be particularly effective, especially if the types of people who might benefit most from it are frustrated that they have to do it. And it looks like sometimes -- in the research, there's sometimes kind of a backlash effect that people are angry that they have to do the training.

I'm not sure what the exact solution is, because what seems to be maybe most effective would require people's buy-in beforehand and would be much longer and more intensive training. For example, I teach statistics sometimes, and I don't think that I could teach statistics in an afternoon. And I don't know that we could teach systemic understandings of racial and ethnic inequality in society in an afternoon, especially in some sort of required online training. So I would just want whatever we did to be very intentional and evidence-based, to make sure that it was effective and that it was the type of thing where it's going to do kind of more good than harm.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yael and Avery, I think, will speak to many of those points, and they're all good. Andre, then Harold, then we want to move on. We're really running late here.

ANDRE: I fully agree with what Landon just said. And I might want to add, as a solution potentially to that problem, an actual course might not work, but what I think works extremely well currently is that greeting club that is going around that, not only are you actually reading the book, but by discussing the content, you learn far more.

And we are currently even in the process, at least in the group that I'm in, of coming up with policy solutions and suggestions for policy changes. There's a much more forward-looking thing and, certainly, to what Richard said earlier, no need -- and probably shouldn't be any kind of test at the end.

The idea of these mandatory informational sessions has to be that people are informed and know how to talk about racial issues so that we can actually move forward and see, in fact, what policies are wrong and racist and what policies need changing and what new policies have to be introduced. And if we can create some kind of platform with that mandatory program, then we all will win from that. My major suggestion here being that I think these reading clubs work extremely well, especially the discussions about structures as they are currently. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Harold, then Abby, then we move on. Harold?

HAROLD HODES: I take it that, in calling for an educational program for faculty, that would be to address some kind of ignorance that the faculty have. Maybe I'm wrong about that. And if I'm wrong about that, I'd like some explanation, then, of what the point of such an educational program would be. But if I'm right about that, I'd like to get a clearer idea of what kind of ignorance it is that would need to be addressed.

I mean, I know that when it comes to undergraduates, I see significant ignorance of history. I do think that it's very valuable for people to learn about the history of racism, especially in this country, but really all over the world. I'm not sure; is that the kind of ignorance on the part of the faculty that would be being addressed by such an educational program?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good points. I'm just speaking for myself. I'm sort of shocked at my ignorance of lots of things; for example, the Morrill Land-Grant Act. I'm discovering everyday things that I took for granted all my life, and now I'm discovering that there's different sides of things. I raise my hand; I'm ignorant of a lot of this stuff, and I think part of being liberally educated is to realize how little you know. I will admit for myself how little I know about these things, and I think others may feel the same way.

Let's go on. Abby, then we really -- I'm nervous here about getting all this in. Abby.

ABBY COHN: Two points. One is I agree with all the concerns about how we do this and so on that's been raised, but I just think enough is enough. I don't think we, as faculty, just always get to opt out. I think the president has called on all of us to engage with this very, very critical moment, and I don't see that we, as the faculty, again get to say well, we don't have to do this. I understand it's tricky, and I think the what we have to do piece is very important.

I agree completely with what Andre was suggesting. To me, it's not addressing faculty ignorance. It's really calling on faculty engagement, and I think we need to do it -- to me, it's about doing it in terms of all the activities we do as faculty. How do we engage in these issues in terms of both our teaching and research? And many of us feel like well, what I do in my research doesn't touch on this or it's irrelevant. I can stand at the sidelines on this.

I think to me, what I'm trying to grapple with this summer is I think this is a moment where we can't stand on the sidelines. So we have to, ourselves, not by having the president call on us to do something or our Office of Faculty Development and Diversity call on us to do something. We, ourselves, have to engage.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, very quickly, please.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: This overlaps. I won't simply repeat, but I think that one of the points that's coming out is that this should not be a training program that's simply called an educational program, that the problem with training is that it doesn't do the sort of work at multiple levels that we need.

I'd like to think of this Working Group F in relation to the first working group, that is to see the way in which our intellectual endeavors and our research and our teaching work together with activism, as opposed to some sort of separate notion of training, as opposed to the research and teaching; that if we have our peers who are doing this work, our peers in the faculty to lead whatever it is we end up doing, I think that's the way to do it, as opposed to

having a separate kind of program that isn't connected to the work that our peers are doing already.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. And I think the connection between this endeavor and what the Center does and so on is very important. Very good. So we'll take this and make some adjustments, but these things can be modified as we discover things in the next one and two months.

Let's hear from Angela Winfield. She spoke to the senate last year, and she's very well-versed in terms of what is now put in front of the staff. And I asked her to come and just maybe briefly tell us a little about the ideas behind it, with the eye towards how it will apply to what we just talked about for faculty. Angela, are you here?

ANGELA WINFIELD: I am. Thank you, Charlie. And thank you all for having me. What I want to share with you is a little bit about how and why we developed what we did for the staff and how it might translate into your context. And I'll leave a lot of that to Avery and Yael, but I will at least touch on that.

What we developed for the required program for staff is called Advancing Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at Cornell. One of the first challenges we had and one of the first questions we asked ourselves is what is the purpose of this program. What are we really hoping to get out of it, especially if we're requiring it of all staff, knowing that we have staff from all different levels of educational background, of knowledge around diversity, equity, inclusion concepts. What can we really do in a single program?

And where we landed was this is a foundational program that gives us a common language to talk about these concepts in the context of our work. And the work of staff, again, is very different than faculty, but also very different from one another, so it's a broad audience. So that was really what we're looking at; how do we give us a common foundation and

something to work with so that we have some common text around these concepts, why we're talking about the network, how they show up in our work and providing some opportunities to engage, to practice, to figure out how to integrate this into what we do.

I'm going to walk you through just briefly the six components of the program. Before I do that, let me tell you the format of it. The required portion is online. We developed this in connection with eCornell, so it's a series of short videos in each course.

There's six courses total. Each course has a series of three-minute or less videos, and it's interspersed with different reflection exercises, tools and resources, so that folks can go deeper into it. That's the online portion. There are some additional exercises in there.

Then, after they take the online portion, there's a voluntary optional opportunity to engage in community conversation, to go deeper into the concepts. If there are questions, concerns, if someone has a different point of view, we can have that in a facilitated dialogue. That's the overall format for each of these six courses that will be launched.

The first course in the program is really about line of sight. We talk about the mission, vision and values of the university and how diversity and equity tie into that. It really grounds the program and it grounds it to the university specifically.

As you move through to Course 2, we get into the more specifics about what it is that we're trying to achieve, so talking about what is inclusion, what is a culture of belonging, why are these things important to the university; also, what is respect, giving us a common foundation and really defining the concepts. So those are the first two courses.

Once you move into Course 3, that's where we get into the concepts of diversity, equity and inclusion. Let me just say that one of the things that we did specifically was think about what is diversity, what is equity, what is inclusion, and who are we talking to and what are we talking about when we do that. When we get into Course 3, we are talking about social identity,

we're talking about power, privilege and oppression, and we're talking about that across

identities.

We had a lot of conversation about should this be specific to race. And we do talk quite

a bit about race in this section of the program, but we also talk about other identities because

there are folks in the staff population who have expertise, a level of expertise about race,

racism, as well as inclusion and equity, so how do we incorporate them into the program.

One of the things that we didn't want to have happen is to put a requirement on -- I'm

going to be really plain about this -- folks of color who say why am I learning about this. So how

do we give them something that's new and engaging and something for them to engage with as

well, as well as folks who may not be as familiar with these concepts.

That's that section. We talk about power, privilege, oppression. We also talk about the

cycles of socialization and liberation, how this comes about, and also how theoretically we get

out of oppression.

Then we move into the final three courses, Courses 4, 5 and 6. This is where we shift

more into the practical what do we do, how do we incorporate this, what are the skills that are

going to be helpful, because there's a lot of difficulty, there's a lot of discomfort, a lot of fear

about talking about these concepts and engaging in these concepts.

So Course 4 is focused all around listening and communicating across difference. It's not

about changing people's ideas, beliefs or perspectives, per se, because part of diversity is having

those different ideas, thoughts, perspectives, experiences, but how do we leverage that and

engage it. How do we engage it? So one of the skills is communicating across difference. So we

dive deep into that, both sharing your perspective, and then also listening to a perspective

different from your own.

The fifth course is centered around speaking up and intervening and taking action when we see things that don't necessarily align; and that may be racist, biased, discrimination. We see this a lot where people don't know how, don't know what to do. And this part of the program goes into that. What are your options? How can you practice being an intervener and speaking up when needed?

And then the final course is around translating equity into your functional position. If you are a finance person, if you are a grounds person, if you are in administration, what does it look like to apply an equity lens to what you're doing in your job?

That is, in essence, in a nutshell what the program does, knowing that this is just a foundation. It's the basis. We'll have an opportunity to have people engage in community conversations, and that will be across colleges and units. We are also providing facilitation guides within colleges and units for departments, teams and groups who want to have their own conversation and talk about what it means for them specifically. We're going to provide them with those materials as well. Then also knowing that people may want to go deeper, so we'll provide additional opportunities for that, but this is a foundational course.

For the faculty, I know there's many differences and needs. One of the things and one of the contexts I'll put out there is the course we developed for staff is very much focused on engaging with one another as teams, getting work done more effectively, getting work done in a more innovative way, and then translating that.

Everything that we're trying to teach are the core principles. It's not just about the history. They do get some history. They do get some background and context, but it's not about making them experts in the concepts of diversity, equity and inclusion. We can't do that in a six-course program and we can't do it in six months. That takes a long period of time, but what we

are giving them are the critical key areas to help them be more active and to begin to think

about how their behavior may impact our climate and may impact the culture for each other.

For faculty, there are different contexts that you can look at this, and you can look at it

in terms of your relationships with one another in your departments. You can also look at it as

what happens in the classroom. And where you want to go with that is up to you, but I will

pause here and see if there are any questions about the staff program. And then, Charlie, I'll let

you turn it over to Yael and Avery to talk.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot, Angela. There's a lot of good comments in the chat

and so on. Would anyone like to ask Angela a question right now? There's a lot to learn from

this.

Thanks so much, Angela. I'm sure we'll be in touch in the coming weeks. I appreciate it.

ANGELA WINFIELD: My pleasure. And the information, if you want more details about

the program, there is a website that provides descriptions of each of the courses. And of

course, I'm available if there are any other questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks a lot, Angela. The link is up on the agenda page, so please

take note of that.

Avery and Yael.

AVERY AUGUST: If you stop sharing, we can share our slides. Thank you. Thank you all.

And thank you, Angela, for that overview of the new staff program. What Charlie and Neema

asked us to do -- I'm Avery August, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, and I oversee the Office of

Faculty Development and Diversity. And what Charlie and Neema asked us to do is to share

what we currently do, which are programs that are not the same as the staff programs.

And listening to the conversation, I will just say many of our approaches take the

approaches that you all suggest, which are engagement, reflection and discussion. Let me just

turn it over to Yael, who can share, as she is the Director of the Office of Faculty Development

and Diversity, can share what we do out of her office. Yael?

YAEL LEVITTE: So our office really focuses on processes around faculty work when it

comes to bias and climate. The first program is Depends on the Lens. It focuses on effective

search practices. It's a video and engaged conversation. Usually, many times departments

invite me afterwards either to have a conversation with a committee or with the chair to kind of

clarify more things.

It's also connected to the fourth bullet point, which is the best practices in hiring and

recruitment, which is on our website. All these things are linked, by the way. I think that since

2009, probably three-quarters of the faculty have gone through this program, initially

voluntarily. Later, I think most of the colleges now require it from search committees.

The second portion is Effective Academic Interviewing. So you've made a selection, now

you're bringing people to campus, and some of them are running as quickly as they can away

because of the odd behavior of faculty. So this is really about how to create an inclusive

environment in the interviewing process. And I would say that since it was launched, there's

about 80 to 100 people, again voluntary, taking this session.

The third session is Viewpoint on Tenure and Promotion. It's aimed at tenured faculty.

It was done later. I think we launched it about five years ago. And that's really about things that

you should consider, like teaching evaluation, cross-collaborative for a whole bunch of things,

and diversity in the tenure and promotion process. And about 300 people have gone through

that in the last few years. It's a slower launch.

We have tools on our website that support these workshops, best practices in hiring and

recruitment, best practices in mentoring and, also, we've launched earlier this summer a page

that sends you to many other programs, both at Cornell and nationally.

The Cornell Interactive Theater Ensemble was charged about three years ago with going department by department with a program about classroom climate. I think about 30 or 40 departments have brought the site to the campus. And your deans and your chairs have agreed that this was a valuable program. And so therefore, we decided to offer it to each department. I think all the engineering departments, CALS, have gone through it.

The Center for Teaching Innovation provides other programs that focus on classroom environment. The Teaching and Learning in a Diverse Classroom, which was launched two years ago, has about 164 faculty taking it, all voluntarily. Faculty Institute of Diversity, which is a two-day, much more intensive, had over the last 10, 12 years about 250 faculty engage in it. And that's real conversation about diversity in teaching, also offered by CTI. There's about 127 faculty engaged. I'm sure there are some overlaps here.

The Intergroup Dialogue Project is launching a program this Friday, and it was limited to 50, and it was filled by 50 faculty, called Building Connection, with dialogue. Some of you have taken over the summer, you have engaged in a two-hour workshop. Now we are offering, in collaboration with IDP, but really, IDP is running the whole thing, a program that is ten hours where you can engage more deeply.

I'll just say to Julian, who kind of talked about -- none of these are training. They're workshops. They all build on each other. And I agree with the analysis that this alone will not get us where we need, so the next slide will show you some other things we are doing.

It's freezing on my screen, so -- okay. It has to be coupled with some accountability structures, and it has to be coupled with funding. And in 2013, the deans have agreed to insert accountability structures into the search process, where the searches are looked at at various points, at the beginning of the search, before the short list is made, and at the end.

And in 2017, any college that wasn't engaging in that hiring accountability process was unable to access the bridge funding or other forms of funding. Two years ago, we also launched the statement for contribution to diversity, which all candidates are supposed to come up with. And Avery, you want to take it from there?

AVERY AUGUST: Yes, so the other piece is just a more defined guideline on the inclusion for specific recognition of diversity within ten-year dossiers. And that's linked to the Faculty Senate website to the dean of faculty on the tenure project for more information.

We also provide funding to incentivize increasing faculty diversity. They are linked to many of these programs, including the provost faculty fellow. This is a postdoctoral-like program that candidates who are hired can start up to two years and then transition to their tenure track position. That's linked to bridge funding, which is 75% equivalent of the salary of the candidate goes to the college for five years. That incentivizes funding.

We also recently awarded two faculty diversity awards this past spring. We have small group mentoring grants. We support faculty on the National Center of Faculty Development and Diversity for all faculty here on the campus. We built a pipeline with Institution Resource and Planning, so you can identify which institutions graduate students who could potentially diversify our faculty, and we encourage departments to use those -- and we know some departments do -- if they hire straight out of the Ph.D.

We were planning a summit to bring potential underrepresented advanced Ph.D. students here on the campus. This was supposed to be this summer, but was disrupted by the COVID crisis, so we've postponed that. We also built into the Cornell Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program additional slots to support candidates who could contribute to the diversity of our post-doc, as well as faculty pool.

We spend a lot of time working on retention, statement and community, with monthly get-togethers with various faculty groups. We do exit interviews for those faculty who do leave, after they leave, to understand the nature of their experiences here. We've spent time -- and Yael can share some of these, and some of these came through the senate -- meeting time for parents, such that meetings are held during business hours, and the parental leave attestation, to ensure that the parental leave that we do provide is equitable.

We just want to spend a few more minutes talking about the dynamics of faculty demographics. Much of our work is tied to enhancing the recruitment of faculty who diversify our ranks here on the campus. Here, what you can see is the dynamics of faculty demographics over a period of time starting in 1982-83.

Records are hard to keep the farther you go back in terms of who is called what, but you can see here that we've made steady progress in increasing the proportion of both women faculty, as well as faculty who diversity our ranks on the campus. Just overall, looking at the dynamics of underrepresented faculty, since 2009, the last ten years roughly, we've had roughly 41% increase in the number of faculty. At the same time, Cornell faculty number only increased 2.5%. And nationally, underrepresented minority Ph.D. production increased by 21%, so we're significantly ahead of overall Ph.D. production in terms of how we recruit.

Obviously, we want to do a lot more. We think many of the things that we do and more of what we would like to do will allow us to do that, but I just wanted to put this in context for the senators.

If we look at gender, we can see here again that we've made significant progress. If we look at the last seven years, 21% increase in the number of women among our ranks, whereas before, the last five six-year periods, progress was much slower and I would say coincide with

more deliberate intention to ensuring that faculty searches are carried out in particular ways such that they're equitable and fair.

Here again, you can see broken down by STEM and non-STEM, gender. The non-STEM faculty gender tends to be more equal in terms of proportion, compared to the STEM. And you can see here, the arrows indicate the announcements of bridge funding for ensuring diversity of the faculty. You can see that each time we have had a proportionate increase in the number of new faculty appointments that come with regards to gender.

Finally, by race and ethnicity, a similar analysis. Over the last seven years, we've had a roughly 35% increase, compared to the last two five-year periods, where the rates of progress was much slower. Again, this comes from a deliberate intention to many of the issues that we have workshops on.

These are all very public data. You can see these on the IRP dashboard, but this just indicates the composition of diversity of new faculty who come in each year here. This is all ranked professors, and you can see for the fall 2019, about 16% of the faculty we hired were underrepresented faculty, and another 10% were minority faculty, and 47% were female.

If we go at the assistant professor rank, where about 60% to 70% of our hiring exists, you can see it is even more female, more progress on the gender front, where 54% of the new faculty coming in, assistant professors, were female. Almost 26% were underrepresented faculty, and another 11% were minority faculty.

Then, as we go to associate professor ranks, those decrease; but again, still significantly above where we are as a current faculty. I'll just go through this quickly, because these are public data and we want to make sure we have some time for questions.

With that, we'll stop. We're happy to take questions. Please contact us at these links here, and I'll stop sharing and allow questions. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you for the overview. It's very instructive. I think, combined with Angela's presentation, I think we're in a good position to reason our way to the next step. There's also lots of good chat.

AVERY AUGUST: We're also happy to answer questions on the most recent progress -- the most recent provost faculty diversity task force, where many of the things we're doing came out of the task force recommendations. And so we're happy to share any progress, if people have questions about that as well.

YAEL LEVITTE: To answer Wendy, I would say the core lens is about 1,300 faculty have participated in that. And the interview, probably 600, 700. Then the other one, 300. And then we provided numbers for the programs at CTI. It's overall, I think, 500, 600 people, but some of them might have taken the same programs.

AVERY AUGUST: Just to respond to Tracy's question on the chat, and Tracy points out it's still at most 50/50, which means for women, the number isn't increasing. The current university rate is around 34%, I think. This is across all ranks, so this is an important point, Tracy, when we talk about the overall dynamics of our faculty diversity. It's one, of course, that our offices pay particular attention to.

Given the size of our faculty, we hire, at least in the last round, last fall, as you can see there, there were roughly -- it was over 50% in terms of the promotion of women that were coming in, and this is on the backdrop of roughly 1,600 faculty.

Just based on the dynamics of faculty hiring, we hire about 80 to 100 faculty per year, depending on college recruitment. You can do the math and figure out how long it would take for us to completely get to where we would like to be. That is not to say that we shouldn't be doing any of these things, but it just makes it more acute that we spend all the time that we can

within departments we're actually doing the hiring to ensure that we both have candidates in our pool that can diversify our faculty and that the processes for evaluation is fair and equitable.

JILL: Risa Lieberwitz has her hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks for the presentations. Avery, I think that you mentioned something pertaining to this, but I wonder if you could say something more about issues of retention. How do you feel we're doing on retaining faculty as we increase diversity of hiring?

And Yael, looks like you might have something to say there too.

AVERY AUGUST: Yeah, so it's a really important issue, Risa. One of the things we worry about is that we provide an environment here for -- even with all the best efforts to recruit faculty, if we don't have an environment that's hospitable and welcoming to the faculty, they don't stay. And that is actually worse, in my view.

So we do spend time talking about and working through retention practices. We work with chairs, with associate deans and deans on approaches. Each retention is unique. Each person who is looking to leave has a different reason for leaving, and so we work through with chairs and associate deans strategies for how to go about trying to do that.

It's varied. Sometimes it's Ithaca, sometimes it's the disciplines. It's just an offer that someone can't refuse. Yael and I have been speaking to faculty. I believe Yael can share more about some of the things that we found, but this is a very, very important point and goes to the climate in departments as well.

YAEL LEVITTE: To answer your question, Risa, yes, we do exit interviews. We do find that dual careers is a huge issue, but climate in some departments is also a huge issue. The competing offers are sometimes really, really lucrative, but I would also say that the way that chairs and deans do that differs sometimes between institutions.

Sometimes, when someone is being recruited, they have the president of the university call. We don't necessarily deploy in every departure the president and the provost to call, and maybe that's something to consider, but I'd say that we're improving a bit on our numbers.

So two, three years ago -- and it has to do with the number of people we recruit -- we'd see almost 20% people leaving. So we'd hire four, and one would leave, and that would become 20%. And right now, we see it at about, over the last ten years, about 14%, which is still higher than white and Asian faculty.

On gender, we see about 8% to 9% of faculty leave after tenure or before -- no, after tenure. And there are chairs who come to their deans and deans come to the provost's office to discuss retention. While we don't have general pots for anything, even the recruitment is a rolling average. The provost does intervene sometimes in retention offers and provides resources, right, Avery?

AVERY AUGUST: That's correct. And it all depends on what's the nature. Each retention case is different in terms of what the individual sees would keep them at Cornell.

YAEL LEVITTE: One last thing; that we see more departures in social sciences and humanities than in the sciences, to a certain extent, because sometimes easier -- I mean, there are issues in social science and humanities, but also it's harder to move a whole lab sometimes than to move 15 people than to move a person, basically.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you very much, Yael and Avery. I'm sure we'll be in touch in the coming weeks on all this stuff.

We're at time, but I do think if we can just stick around just for another ten minutes, it would be really great to hear our last speaker. Tao Leigh Goffe is a new professor in Africana. I think the reason it's important to hear from Tao, she participates in the Milstein Program. The question is what does all this mean for STEM instructors. We can understand the social science

and humanities side, but when you think of rethinking curriculum and so on, you maybe pause a little bit if you're in the STEM area. Tao has worked at that interface and has some really interesting experiences, and I asked her to maybe come and share these with us.

So Tao, are you here?

If you have to go, it's okay. Everything will be online, but Tao, take it away. Thank you.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE   : Thank you, Charlie. I'm just really honored to be here. Thanks for the invitation. And thank you, Jill, for help with the presentation.

Yeah, I'm here today to talk about technology, humanities and STEM instruction and why this question of diversity should matter to the sciences, to Cornell Tech, so I'll talk about my experience having taught there and my role as a senior curator at Cornell Tech.

I'm a joint hire, 50/50 between Africana Studies and Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies, and I began here at Cornell last year. I think that it's just been really great to hear the conversation prior to now, to kind of think about this national conversation regarding diversity, because I think we have to talk about how diversity has become kind of a dirty word, in a sense, and how it is that people are calling to divest from diversity and people are saying that why don't we put that money towards cluster hires for faculty of color in particular because it's common that you hear about a kind of exodus of faculty of color, you hear that diversity is lip service, you hear that a lot of these Ivy League institutions are revolving doors for faculty of color who look like me.

And Elizabeth Alexander has written a piece about that many years ago when she was at Yale and left, so I think we ought to consider that maybe there's a new language for what it is that we're talking about, and there's ways that we can think about research for each of us, and this is the question of bridging technology, the humanities and STEM instruction.

I can share a bit about my practice and how I actually think through this in terms of DJing, which I do as well as being a professor. So I joke that I'm a Ph.DJ because of the way I deploy technology in the classroom and music.

So some of you might have seen on this email that goes out to all of us from The Cornell Chronicle this article, Bridging Tech and the Humanities Virtually. I have the honor of teaching, as part of the Milstein Program, a workshop that I was asked to design, and I decided to call it Sound and Color, a way to think through music and race and the way that music bridges different cultures and the kind of question of technology, so looking at the Grandma Phone to the MP3, so really thinking about the rich heritage we have at Cornell in terms of Moog, the synthesizer, and the question of what electronic dance music is.

I think this is a perfect way that we can consider the way that sound and sound technology is not often thought about in terms of STEM, but it's so critical to the work that I do in terms of digital DJing. So you can read more in the article about this ten-week course that we taught over the summer. And it was two hours a week, but the students were there two hours every day, Monday through Saturday, and it was a real crash course in how to teach through Zoom, which was a real challenge.

Yeah, this is something that is a part of my research. I was interviewed by the New York Times last year about women in DJing, so this is another way we might think about diversity, gender. And the finding was that a lot of women who DJ are actually part of collectives.

This had me thinking about what does it mean to be a DJ and how might we, instead of thinking of a Center, think about the language of a laboratory. In what ways is a DJ a professor, a professor a DJ, in terms of the syllabi that we create, thinking of it as a kind of mixed tape, in a sense, and what would it mean to kind of co-teach to collaborate and DJ together.

This really went into how I taught this class, a brand new class, Electronic Music and Technologies of Empire. And yeah, it was just really wonderful to work with these 40 students. So rising freshmen and sophomores in the Milstein program, and we talked about the technology of empire, so really thinking about infrastructure, thinking about World War II, PA systems, radar, sonar. And yeah, computer science is entirely relevant to this question, as well as the fact that we would have been on Roosevelt Island, we would have been at Cornell Tech, but we were all online.

I think that we really ought to consider how research is key because, if we are to think of the intellectual stakes of this conversation, everyone at Cornell is producing research on land. That is, as Charlie mentioned regarding the Morrill Act, it's stolen land.

So my question is how could we think of the university as an engine not of settler colonialism, not as a space where we think about the production of financial instruments in the econ department, or of weapons, military weapons in terms of what's being produced for the Department of Defense, or to think about gentrification, that we could actually think about what sort of work could be done in the humanities by using the model of a laboratory coming from the sciences to develop something new.

Brand new at Cornell, and with two grants of support from the Rural Humanities, part of the Society of the Humanities, and the Atkinson Center here on sustainability, along with another new professor, a Native American filmmaker, Jeffrey Palmer, I have begun this laboratory called The Dark Laboratory.

We're going to have our launch party on October 12th on Zoom. It will be recorded, in case you can't make it, but we really are setting about this question of how we can change this conversation and consider the kind of underside, the kind of dark history, the kind of landscape of freedom and abolition at Cornell in Ithaca regarding the Underground Railroad, regarding the

Cayuga people, regarding the Lenape, and how it is that all of the research that we create depends on these ill-gotten gains, if we think about indigenous land and the people who continue to live in these communities.

We really are embarking on this, we are fund-raising right now, and we're really excited that this could be a multi-institutional venture. We heard about the Rutgers initiative, thinking about global racial justice. We're similarly thinking globally, but we think that Ithaca can be a case study for the world to think about black and indigenous people in particular and how it is that the disposition of native sovereignty is entangled with African enslavement when we consider the endowment of these universities and especially land-grant universities.

We have a really wonderful advisory board of folks from other institutions, from Hollywood to Silicon Valley to academia. So Henry Louis Gates, Jr. from Harvard is helping us out, as is Tamar Evangelestia-Dougherty, who's also new to Cornell and is an associate university librarian here. So we're going to be doing archival work to think about these questions.

Again, we want to emphasize that there's a national, international debate on abolition. And really, we can see that in Upstate New York. We can see it in the sense of Harriet Tubman's house, we can see it in the sense of burial grounds of enslaved people, of Indian mounds. And this is something that we think that everyone who's a part of Cornell should be reckoning with, perhaps in orientation, because it's relevant to us all.

That concludes the slides that I had to share. And I just wanted to share my screen, if we have a little bit of time, just so that you can see a video, so a trailer that I made for this class, Sound and Color, where we were using virtual reality. I designed that video and was able to think about the technologies that were required to make it and to foreground that for the students in terms of sound and color; so again, thinking about race and this history of technology.

I know that we're short on time, so I just wanted to share that students are really excited about this question, too, in terms of STEM, tech, how diversity is relevant. A student just shared this document with me and what they're working on. We hope that you'll all RSVP for the block party, the virtual event on October 12th, Indigenous Peoples' Day, where we will talk more about Dark Laboratory and the kind of stories that we want to give a platform to.

Here is a sneak preview of the website, and you can see that we're highlighting constellations of Afro-Indigenous thought and, then, this landscape of abolition in Upstate New York.

I wanted to just conclude with an example of student work. This is a video called Humanity, Sound and Color, that my students created in the summer. And it just shows you that they understand there's something really profound taking place amidst this crisis. This is an original song that my students actually produced themselves, and video. So I'm just going to play 30 seconds of it for you, and you can get a sense of how they're thinking about the sound track of COVID, of the protests.

(Music)

I'll pause it there, but you can get a taste of what I was able to get students to produce and work together collaboratively to produce original music, to make these videos, to learn sound, video editing and to think about STEM, to think about technology and humanity, because that's so critical to the title of the Milstein Program. "Humanity" is part of the title, not "humanities." And we want to think about the fact that the students are already asking these questions and we want to encourage that work.

Thank you for your time.

I think you're on mute, Charlie.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you. That was fantastic. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, just wanted to say exactly that. Thank you so much. There's a world shortage of people who straddle humanities and STEM, and we're really lucky to have you on campus. If people can stick around, we have a couple of questions. I see Carl and Peter have their hands up. Carl.

CARL FRANCK: I appreciate it very much. I'm in Physics and concerned about the -- I also appreciate very much -- I'm a little concerned about some of the premises -- where we are, and I think it bears some critical discussion. Thank you for your presentation, but I think it's going to take more than the time we have right now to -- better understanding.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: I agree. I appreciate that. I think part of it is we need new language, we need new ways to think about land acknowledgment and how that's insufficient in its current form, so these are things we're hoping to do with the laboratory.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Peter.

PETER WOLCZANSKI: I'm just curious about your research. Have you invoked or thought of something called chromesthesia in your research?

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: Yes. I'm definitely thinking in a sensory way, like how can we trouble the sense of the archive and think about embodied knowledge. So I would love to hear more about that, but I think color theory can be a useful metaphor, because what I see as blue may not be what you experience as blue, and that's why Sound and Color was a useful title for me.

PETER WOLCZANSKI: The chromesthesia is the individuals who sense color when they hear music.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: Right. And we talked about synesthesia and the fact that it's like 4% of people, they say, have this. And it's interesting to think about feeling what you should taste or this kind of crisscrossing of the senses.

PETER WOLCZANSKI: -- came out of China probably 25 years ago maybe with some of the practitioners in the school supposedly had this affliction. The colorful works of art that came out of it is -- fantastically primary colored art came out of people. It's really something that you might -- if you don't know the guy's name, you might want to look into it. Spectacular stuff. I've got one hanging at my house at home.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: Thanks. I feel like there's so much we can learn from people who experience the world that way.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, thanks. That was a great presentation. And I think the timing of your presentation, Tao, was really, really interesting, after the discussion we had, because it seems to me that what you're pointing to is what happens when we do institutional self-analysis; that it's not simply oh, well, let's talk about issues as if they're separate from us.

So it seems to me that the discussion about whether we're going to have a Center on Antiracism and what should we do with regard to teaching, what should we do with regard to ourselves is that kind of self-analysis at multiple levels. And I think it's a very powerful thing to do. And once you start it, it's very difficult to unsee that, and that's why I think it's so powerful.

One of the things I also wanted to bring in, in terms of issues of colonizing and oppression is to actually -- the study of the Cornell Tech program itself and the relationships that have been criticized over, to bring in the issues of choices to have relationships with the Technion. And these are, as I said, once you start to do that institutional analysis and you think not only historically in the long-term, but also more short-term, it becomes a very powerful way to actually bring these issues into our historical and current discussions.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: Exactly. And I feel like I met all of these tech bros at Cornell Tech, and they don't know what I'm talking about, but it was a real learning experience because I think

it does involve all of us. And I think that those coders might not be aware of the way they are reproducing these asymmetries, but I think we're already ahead of that in terms of Austin Bunn being appointed as the new director. I learned about Cornell Tech from Amy Borrajo, who is so helpful, and the fact that they're both in performing and media arts says a lot. The fact that Austin is a filmmaker, is a screenwriter, says a lot about Cornell's commitment to the humanities.

And then the last thing I would just say is that the hip-hop archive is also really exciting here, and we can think about what forms are not considered technology or research that actually are. I think it's amazing that we have this resource of the hip-hop archive, and we could really think about what it could do at Roosevelt Island and involving Cornell Tech more in this conversation.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah, and I'm also, of course, to raise a critique, just as you're talking about in terms of Cornell being built on stolen land, a serious institutional critique, and then I think that critique has to continue. And many of us have raised it already regarding Cornell Tech and how it was developed and those relationships that have been built. I just think that's a very powerful notion, especially if we keep pushing the critique.

TAO LEIGH GOFFE: Yeah, because people are being displaced as we speak.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We are going to end the recording, and you can stick around. This is what we call hallway chat.