A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2020

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Hi, everybody. You see the usual rules there on the screen. Two minutes max, if you want to speak up. Got to make sure everybody has a chance. And use the chat, which is always extremely useful, really increases our bandwidth.

Just one announcement. The question is next semester. After this week, or probably by Friday, we'll suggest a schedule. I think you can sort of assume the first one will be Jan 20. The only thing in my mind is if we keep going at the every two week clip. We just have to think about that. We can always cancel a meeting or whatever, but this will be coming your way soon.

Let's get started. Since I've been here, there have been probably a dozen department name changes, Chemistry, Chemical Engineering, Rural Sociology, Optional Research and Industrial Engineering, Natural Resources -- we did that last year -- Electrical Engineering. Departments do this when the direction they are going in terms of research and so on, or just to better reflect what they do. Caroline Levine from English is here, who will tell us why English wants to do this particular transition.

Caroline, are you here?

CAROLINE LEVINE: I am here. Shall I take it away?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah.

CAROLINE LEVINE: Wonderful. Thanks so much, everybody, for helping us to move this forward. This initiative was spearheaded by three members of the faculty, Carole Boyce Davies, Mukoma Wa Ngugi and Derrick Spires, who have built on really several decades of research in English Studies, where we've come to understand that the name English really does, for many

people, more strongly imply the nation of England, as opposed to the many, many literatures written around the world in the English language, and that's partly a legacy of colonialism.

In fact, the first English curriculum in the world was started in India as a result of the British trying to persuade Indian people that England was a superior nation and they should study the literatures of England as a way to have something to look up to.

In the United States, British literature has been a more prominent part of the curriculum than American literature for many, many decades, and our desire is to emphasize that there are many literatures around the world in English and that we, in the department that we are members of, are really committed to those literatures and we are already teaching them, we are already very much evaluating them, but our name seems to suggest that we still have this attachment to the nation of England.

At the moment, we teach Caribbean, African, African Diasporic, Native American, African-American, Latin-American, Chicanx, Latinx, LGBTQ, Indian, Asian Diasporic and Asian-American literatures, and all of those written in the English language. We are building a tremendous faculty, especially in African-American, African Diasporic and Caribbean right now. We just hired two faculty in Native American literatures, and we want our name to be welcoming and inclusive to the many students and scholars who are working in these fields that are not the most traditional fields of English.

We don't ask for a transcript change. We think that English is a pretty good shorthand designation, and so the formal curriculum stays the same and the transcript designation stays the same.

We're very happy to answer questions. Carol Boyce Davies is a faculty senator and so is here, and maybe other members of the department are here and would be happy to take questions, but we're very happy to answer whatever comes up.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any questions? So this is the last step before it goes to the provost. The recommendation has been circulated among all chairs and deans and so on. Frederick.

FREDERIC GLEACH: I'm wondering about possible impact, perceptions of coming out of this change on classes that are taught in foreign language departments on Spanish literature and English translation, for example, that sort of thing.

CAROLINE LEVINE: So we have that question. We already have a lot of overlaps with departments where literatures are taught in translation, we teach some literature in translation in English. It's already a little bit messy, so we're not trying -- we're deliberately keeping it literatures in English to try to recognize and respect the differences among the foreign language departments and English, between and among the foreign language departments and English, but there is already a kind of porousness there, and so we don't expect that to change.

I think the one piece of this that has been -- where there's been more question or more concern is around media and whether focusing too much on literature, since we already teach television, film, other kind of media. But again, there's already a kind of porousness between us and Performing and Media Arts, and we try to be respectful, but we also know that there are boundaries being crossed all the time.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thomas. And please state your department before you speak. Frederick, what department are you from?

FREDERIC GLEACH: Sorry. I'm the alternate sitting in for Anthropology.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, great. Thomas.

THOMAS BJÖRKMAN: Hi. Thomas Björkman from Horticulture. I read the rationale for it and I found it surprising, so I wonder if you could speak a little more to the research on how widely people think in American universities English Department is about England, because that

certainly doesn't come to mind for me at all. In fact, that seems like a bizarre expectation.

Apparently, you have found people who think otherwise. I wonder how widespread that is.

CAROLINE LEVINE: I don't know about a popular perception. That is, we haven't done

research on how much people outside of English departments think that, but English

departments have been very focused on British literature and the British tradition for really

since the beginning. It was a big fight to get American literature into the English Department

curriculum at all in the first place. It actually had big help from the CIA during the Cold War to

get American lit in.

As far as English literatures, English literature departments are concerned the

expectation has been that the primary tradition that would be studied would be from the British

Isles. And that is, I think, shocking, given that we are in the United States.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'd like to move on to actually vote. We'll do a sense of the

senate. The senators, you're used to doing this. You simply indicate yes, no or abstain. And

please start doing that now because we have another sense of the senate coming up and we

don't want to intermingle with two.

Thank you, Caroline, and we'll send you the results or you can just hang around and

we'll let you know.

CAROLINE LEVINE: Great, thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: This is a very brief follow-up, but it's important to have these

follow-ups, otherwise things just drift. Two or three meetings ago, Jon Burdick, Vice Provost for

Enrollments came, talked about freshman admissions. There are a couple of action items there,

and they are captured right here. What this is about is asking -- he wants the senate to weigh in

on two things. We packaged them. One thing is, the whole standardized testing is not wiped

out, but certainly disrupted, and the University in the last cycle went to test-optional. And the idea here is continue that, because one more year of this stuff.

The second thing is more long-term, but extremely important, and I think it's something that we want to pay attention to and ratchet up in a very reasonable way, and it has to do with having a faculty presence in the admissions process. It doesn't mean oversight or whatever. It just means that we'll have a number of faculty, say three, from diverse colleges just sit in on -- within a group that Jon convenes every so often with admissions officers from around the university to talk about strategic decisions, short-term decisions or whatever. We just should have a presence there.

Going back a few years, there was much more faculty involvement in actually reading folders, but that's kind of gone by the wayside, and we shouldn't just be distant from this very central operation. Just sort of like keep tabs, keep the senate informed when big things come up, like do we go to test-optional or do we do away with GREs, things like that. We want to be able to share our views without fanfare and in a low-overhead way.

Incidentally, Professor Zax helped me put together a web page. If you click on that link, you'll see some information there, so we're going to try to work -- not try. We will work with Vice Provost Burdick and carry this forward, and we just have to pay attention.

Carl Franck.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you very much, Charlie. A couple of our colleagues in Physics responded to the charge to try to increase diversity. I went to the person who's the Director of Admissions in Arts and Sciences with the idea they wanted to be able to pull out folders for students who might not have been as broad a candidate for Arts and Sciences as normal, but showed real promise for Physics. They got rejected. So I think it's very important that we have

faculty involvement, and I think it's a very important component of this sense of the senate resolution. So I think, speaking for Arts and Sciences, I think this will be very important.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Yeah. Each college does their own admissions, but they get together with Jon every so often. It's at that table we're talking about, just to keep tabs on things. I want to thank Professor Zax for helping us put together some resources on that page.

The voting for the English Department name change is over. And now, please register in exactly the same way your thoughts about this. That can still go on, so as not to waste time.

This is about the official university text on academic freedom and free speech and related matters. We brought this up two weeks ago with this synopsis of what the expanded and revised statement is, and the Academic Freedom Professional Status of the Faculty Committee weighed in on it, and they're okay with it. However, Risa identified some things she thinks are in our interest to change.

Here's sort of the plan. Risa is now going to describe several changes. They're packaged in the form of amendments. There are four of them. We'll then take these and any feedback that we have here in the discussion to the AFPSF committee. Over the break, we'll weigh in on everything and then come back, and then we'll take it from there, so to speak. This is faculty, and then university counsel is involved, others are involved, so we can't do business back and forth with each little change, so we'll try to streamline it.

Hopefully, when we come back in January, we'll have some definitive votes and we can complete this business. For right now, I asked Risa to give a very brief overview of her four proposed amendments.

Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks, Charlie. Thanks for the time to do this today. I think we all agree this is a very important statement, and the proposed amendments that I'm going to present to you today are to try to make the statement even better. I think it's a good proposed statement, as I said last time, but I think we can make it even better.

If you haven't had a chance to look at them, you will have a chance right now, but I wanted to mention as well they're based on comments that were either posted on the faculty senate website or conversations that I've had with other people or hearing comments, you know, in meetings. I think it's worth the time to refine the statement.

This is set up as amendments, and then the rationale afterwards. As Charlie said, there's four of them. I think they're quite straightforward, hopefully, and the new language is in red. This is from the first paragraph of the statement. I hope that you have access to the full statement. I know it's posted, but it was too much to put up on all the slides, so you're only going to be seeing the paragraphs where there are suggested amendments. Hopefully you have a chance to look at it in the full context.

This is the first paragraph of the statement. And the red, Cornell University will abide by the protections of academic freedom and freedom of speech and expression as set forth in the following statement and in other Cornell policies, that's proposed to be added.

If we go to the next slide, the rationale, that was based on various comments that I heard I thought was actually very good suggestions to confirm not only are these statements that Cornell says they're committed to these concepts and principles and standards, but that they'll confirm that they will apply and abide by those protections.

Charlie, want me to just go through all of them first? Yeah, okay.

The next proposed amendment is under the subheading in the statement of responsibilities, and what this does is to -- again, this was based on a comment that I've read --

to clarify once again in this responsibilities part that academic freedom and freedom of speech applies to faculty, students and staff. That is repeating what was earlier in the statement.

Again, this is the rationale, just to reinforce that this is a full community statement. I would note here I switched the order of academic freedom and freedom of speech, but it doesn't change any of the substance of that.

The third proposed amendment, the new language is in red, and there's also language that's proposed to be deleted, and that's denoted by bracketed and crossed-through language to try to make that clear. This is under the responsibilities part of the statement, and this has to do with the caveats that are put in the statement about the president's authority and duty, as it says, though the necessity is rare.

University has long affirmed the president's authority and duty to protect the community and maintain public order -- originally said imminent threats, and the proposal is to include severe threats to health and safety require it. However, any intervention by the president or the president's designee in campus rights of expression and assembly shall be reported -- it says currently in a timely fashion. The proposal is to put "promptly" in, and to be reported promptly to the Cornell community, so to add Cornell, which is another suggestion, including the elected campus governance bodies with an explanation of the bases for the actions taken and the plan for restoring full rights of expression and assembly as expeditiously as possible.

Rationale, clarify that the president must have a strong justification for exercising this sort of intervention authority with regard to expression and assembly. It clarifies that the president should act promptly to explain the reasons for intervening, as well as explaining the plan for restoring full rights, doing it quickly. And this reinforces, by putting in the assembly's

aspect, the elected governance bodies -- it reinforces the importance of shared governance in this matter.

This final amendment, new language is in red. This time it is bracketed and crossed through. The last one was just crossed through. This is under the provision still the subheading of responsibilities, where there's language about the relationship between academic freedom and the goals to promote academic freedom, protect academic freedom and the goal to promote and protect a working and living, learning environment that's free of discrimination, harassment and sexual and related misconduct.

These amendments are both to create clarity for some of the language that I saw some comments saying this was not completely clear, and to also improve specificity. To read this here, based on the protections afforded by academic freedom, speech and other expression will not be considered prohibited conduct, unless the speech or expression meets the definition of protected status -- harassment would be the proposal to make it read that way, under Cornell policies and procedures and also meets one or both of the following criteria. A reasonable person in this setting would find it to be abusive or humiliating toward a specific individual, rather than person, or specific individuals or it persists despite the reasonable objection of the specific individual or individuals targeted by the speech.

Again, the rationale. The term "protected status" is more clear and inclusive in describing harassment covered by Cornell policies and procedures rather than some people saying oh, just sexual harassment. Protected status would include race and other protected statuses that are listed in the policies, to clarify that harassment is the main focus when we are dealing with speech issues. What crosses the line into unprotected speech, that's harassment, as defined under Cornell policies and procedures. It's not just policy. It's also defined specifically in procedures.

And then the third piece is person or persons seemed too generalized, as opposed to using the term individual that is the target of the speech, would be individual or individuals, as opposed to a diffused response to speech in general, which would be -- the diffused response to speech would not constitute harassment, as opposed to the targeting of particular people.

That's it. It hope we have some time for questions.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yes, we have time for some questions here; but don't forget, use chat. The chat will be sent to the AFPSF Committee and also to University counsel.

Mark Lewis.

MARK LEWIS: Oh, maybe I should just use chat then. I just want to understand what happened. Can you go back to the previous slide, please? I can't find that in my -- if I understand correctly, what you are suggesting here is language that discrimination, comma, harassment, that would be an ordered thing. Like discrimination, comma, harassment was there before, and then you deleted discrimination and replaced discrimination, comma, harassment with protected status, harassment.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yes. The suggestion is to focus on the harassment issue, which is where the conflict normally comes up between what is protected speech, as opposed to unprotected speech, which is harassment.

MARK LEWIS: Just going to respond very quickly. So what you are saying is that discriminatory speech is protected now?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: No.

MARK LEWIS: Okay. That's what I think the original point was, that none of this speech would be protected, discriminatory nor harassing.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Perhaps I can explain something a little bit more clearly, too, the reason for this. If you look at Cornell's Policy 6.4 and accompanying procedures, the caveat in

those procedures with regard to academic freedom is particularly focused on when does a hostile environment exist, a hostile environment as a form of harassment, as opposed to protected speech, which may be offensive to people, but is protected by academic freedom.

Most of the language in here is drawn directly from Cornell's policies and procedures that say that speech and expression -- because of the protections of academic freedom, speech and expression would not be prohibited under these policies as unprotected harassment, unless they meet the following criteria. The following language, the reasonable person, et cetera, is drawn verbatim from Cornell's policies, except here, where I'm recommending replacing person with individual.

MARK LEWIS: Thank you. I think I understand now. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Laurent Dubreuil, Romance Studies. We saw that prison, for instance, recently voiced an opinion about critical race theory. We heard recently that people claim that freedom of speech could be a mode of oppression, despite the clear stance of Frederick Douglass on that point many decades ago. There is no doubt that in the U.S., from right to the left, the very concept of academic freedom is currently under attack.

In a global context, one saw over the last few months in several Canadian universities appeals to restrain academic freedom through the implementation of new policies. At Cambridge University last month, a new piece of legislation was introduced, then finally rejected, proposing that professors should be bound by the respect of the diverse identities of others. That's their quote, and you might hear that diverse identities, others and respect are all pretty vague terms that could be used in any sense.

Right now, in France, my home country, the minister of education is currently targeting studies in universities because he perceives them to be a vector of Islamism. So that's the global

context we are operating with, and it seems to me that everything we would do right now in terms of rewriting status should be very carefully considered.

And I believe the new amendments, especially 1, 3 and 4, are quite good at that. I certainly support especially the addition of terms that might sound redundant or that might look redundant, but I believe to be very useful, and the reference to protected status and specific individuals as well. We don't want to create a kind of tacit list of topics, of words or texts or issues that would never be discussed in the name of protecting something that is pretty much like metaphysical concept. That's it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you.

Joanie, and then we'll have to move on. Again, please use chat. Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Hi. Thanks, Risa. One question I have here, and this is related to a question that Ken was bringing up in the chat. I'm thinking also of a seminar. And according to Cornell's rules about teaching, the professor of the seminar is allowed to organize the group and keep a certain person out to control who is in the seminar.

Let's say something offensive was said. That is an aspect of academic freedom for the professor to define the seminar in particular ways. Is there a sense that this could come around and work against or undermine that ability of a student to say no, this was not harassment, what I say is -- basically to challenge a professor's authority?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I don't actually see a direct connection between this language and what you're raising. I mean, there are going to always be academic freedom issues that come up that are not necessarily covered by every policy. This deals with the issue of when there's an objection to speech as being harassing speech.

And it's certainly possible that what you could have is an allegation of hostile environment against a faculty member, but also an allegation against a student of engaging in

sort of harassing speech, so that's really what it's affecting. I suppose you could have an issue that comes up where someone says I think the way the professor is organizing this seminar is itself somehow a form of hostile environment, but I think it's the specificity that's important to say what is the speech that's being objected to and is it targeting an individual, as opposed to somebody saying I'm generally offended by what I'm hearing.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Or what about it's targeting an individual who is not present in the room, so it's offensive, but it doesn't target any specific individual?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: That would be too diffuse to be harassment. I think the idea of harassment is that there is a direction, a direct targeting of an individual or perhaps a small group, as opposed to this person said something and I heard about it and this offended me.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Using a racial slur in a room where there's nobody of that race in the room. Still, the language is offensive and it shouldn't --

RISA LIEBERWITZ: That may simply come down to cases; how was it used and did it cross a line out of academic freedom into creating a hostile environment in the way it was used. It's possible, but that's the nature of context. This is designed to try to create some parameters. And then, if issues come up, there may be some issues come up where it's clear it shouldn't go forward, that what we have is somebody objecting in general to I heard something that I found offensive, and then there shouldn't even be an investigation. Or if there's an investigation, it would just be dismissed.

There may be other cases where there's clarity about targeting an individual for hostile environment, and then there may well be cases in between, where it comes down to what's the context, let's look at it fully, but within the parameters of understanding the importance of academic freedom and how we should value it in the context of teaching and research and extramural speech.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, we'll have to cut off here. Again, you can continue to use chat. This will come back to us after it's been scrutinized by the AFPSF Committee and others. Thanks, Risa.

We are going to move on now to a lengthy discussion about where we are with the antiracism initiative. Neema will kick it off with some comments about the process, where we are. Thank you. Neema.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Charlie. What Charlie and I were planning to do today is really report on the process and all the work that's been done so far, since we got the July 16th email from President Pollack. Just as a reminder, that email asked the faculty senate and the faculty to develop proposals on three issues for credit educational requirement for students, a required educational program for faculty and an antiracism center. That's the language that Charlie and I have been using as a placeholder, as we've mentioned before several times.

What we're going to be doing today is really presenting two of these three pieces, the two required -- the educational requirement pieces, and we are asking for feedback from the senate, as well as from the larger community in terms of putting in suggestions and comments on the DOF website.

I want to talk a little bit about the process so that is clear to everyone, what we followed so far. On the 17th of June, I think it was Joanie and Durba who proposed a resolution. There was a sense of the senate resolution on the situation in the United States at that point, the BLM protests just after the murder of George Floyd.

So between July 16, when we received the email from President Pollack, and the time that Cornell reopened on the 2nd of September, what we did was to sort of conduct a thorough survey of earlier efforts that had taken place at the university around questions of addressing

issues of race, ethnicity and climate at the university. We did a survey to really understand

earlier efforts, what worked, what didn't work, so we could build on what we had done before.

What Charlie and I also did was to have many meetings with -- and the list there of all

the various people we met. Not everybody, but sort of the categories of people we met is

included there, and Charlie started to set up the website to make sure that all the resources that

we were finding were going to be made available to the larger community. We provided regular

updates to the senate -- you can see all the dates there -- and invited students from Do Better

Cornell to speak with us as well. That happened in August.

Around the end of October, once we'd spoken with everybody, done due diligence for

all the kinds of issues that were coming up, the working groups include faculty and students --

you'll see the names and faces soon -- we put together three working groups around the three

charges, and the working groups started to meet at the end of October. They met weekly.

It's not been an easy semester. We've been challenged on many, many fronts. And in

the midst of that, our faculty colleagues and our student colleagues came together to work on

these questions as well. We're very thankful to everyone who agreed to work with us on this

and to bring their experience and wisdom to bear.

The three working groups have been meeting since the end of October. The working

group on the Center, which is the largest working group, split after about four meetings into

three different groups, as you can see in that diagram there. One of the subcommittees in that

working group focuses on the academic issues that the Center will cover. The other really looks

at activism and advocacy questions, and the third is focusing on the governance of the Center.

That particular working group has just come back together as one group, and they are working

on the recommendations a little more. We will present that draft report in January. Today,

Charlie is going to go in and present the draft reports from the first two working groups.

All the materials that we've been looking at, the meeting summaries, the agendas, the PowerPoints are all available on the DOF website. If you go to the DOF website, there's a tab for ongoing projects. Please go to the antiracism initiative there and click on the links, and you'll find hopefully whatever you need. If something is missing from the website, contact Charlie and myself, and we'll make sure that it goes up. Charlie is the keeper of the website.

I will stop there, Charlie, and hand it over to you, unless anybody has any questions on process. Our idea was to try and be as inclusive and as transparent as possible. These are extremely difficult issues, emotional issues that we deal with and we are trying to deal with, and so the idea is to be -- I keep repeating myself -- to be as transparent and inclusive as we could, given the challenges that we were facing this semester.

Charlie, over to you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So a couple embellishments of what Neema said. First of all, these are messy rough drafts, they are incomplete, but the whole point of this is to get feedback. That is the absolute central thing we are doing right here. Keep in mind that the working groups are not uniform in their thinking. We have disagreements, just as I'm sure we'll have disagreements at this larger level.

Last, this particular topic really requires a maximum of transparency, and it's an emotional topic and we have to pay extra attention to mutual respect. There's a lot of terminology here, and I want to sort of get at at least how I think about antiracism. Everyone will have different views, but let's look at this analogy. Are you anti-pandemic? Suppose you see somebody who's not wearing a mask, and maybe you hesitate to speak up. Let's look at three possible reasons. One might be that you're not wearing a mask yourself, so that pretty much takes you out of the picture. Maybe you're wearing a mask and you think that's enough, that you're doing your part and that's it, you don't have any extra responsibilities. Or maybe

you're wearing a mask and you'd really like to say something, really like to do something, but you just sort of lack the confidence.

Suppose you see a racial situation that needs addressing, and maybe you'd like to say something, but you hesitate. Here are three possible reasons: Maybe you willingly buy into that situation yourself, so you see nothing to speak up about. Or maybe you just sort of shake your head and, therefore, you are doing your part. Internally, you disagree with this, but you express some displeasure and walk on, so to speak. Or maybe you shake your head and you'd really like to do something, but you just sort of lack the confidence. In both of these working group settings, one for students, one for faculty, these dynamics are at play. It's a question of how do we get that confidence.

We'll start with the faculty piece. It's a little simpler, but of course, everything is controversial and so on. There's the group that has worked for the last two months on this particular topic, and it goes without saying how grateful we are for each and every person's contribution.

This is part of the larger antiracism initiative, and this particular working group is put together to recommend to the senate what might be the best possible educational requirement for faculty. One might disagree with it, but if we're going to do something like this, the idea is what we'd like to put in front of the senate is the best possible version.

Here's the logic, and this is just pulled out of the draft goal that we see for this particular requirement. Structural racism and systemic bias stand between what Cornell is and what it should be. A faculty that actively works to dismantle racial and cultural barriers is critical. And the required educational program aims to support faculty in this effort. That's basically the logic behind this.

This pulled out a couple of key features here. Already, through the OFDD, we have lots of programming, lots of excellent programming. For example, It Depends on the Lens is a one-and-a-half-hour workshop. If you're going to be on a search committee, this is something you are required to go through. We'll call that DEI programming, and we have a list of more things like that that should show up. Again, the OFDD has done a huge amount in this area. For example, you're going to be the DUS in your department. Certain types of problems come up there. Are you ready for that, so to speak.

A new feature here has to do with we'll call it the literacy part of the programming, historically oriented workshops that acquaint you with more structural issues; for example, what's up with the Morrill Land-Grant Act. Colleagues on campus have been working on that. That's something we should understand. Why was there a water crisis in Flint, or why was there a Superdome situation in Katrina? Having a deeper knowledge to causes, we feel, is part of the scene here, and we want to become educated as a faculty in these sorts of directions.

The question here, and we have a paragraph on it, mandatory versus optional. How do we get faculty to believe in these trainings, these educational programs, these workshops and to participate? One idea that we're advancing here is the notion of accreditation. Here's an example. You can't be a DGS unless you are accredited, and you become accredited by taking an appropriate educational workshop. If you are asked to be DGS and you refuse accreditation, what that really means is you are refusing to do part of your job.

Accountability. There are a couple of venues where there's possibilities to reaffirm our commitment to DEI. For example, and we have three: Course evaluations, promotion dossiers and program reviews. These are important weigh points where there are evaluations. You have to be very, very careful in here, if you are, for example, to suggest a question on a course

evaluation that might get at the professor's approach to DEI and so on. Nevertheless, we are advancing these as things worthy of discussion.

Here are some hesitations, and I'm sure we've all heard these sorts of things. One is I know this stuff. I don't need this training. Well, if you've ever sat in a session where your implicit biases are exposed, you are in for a shock, or I was. You may think you know all this stuff, but maybe you don't.

I don't have the time. Well, remember something -- and I see this all the time -- all it takes is one screw-up by a faculty member, and suddenly others, colleagues have hours and hours and hours of cleanup, so you have to be a little careful about how you reason about time.

You may feel that you're not a racist. Well, that's not good enough, going back to that earlier slide I had. It's not enough to be passive. You must be antiracist. Finally, you might have an argument maybe tied in to free speech or whatever. I'm against indoctrination. But that doesn't follow just learning about alternative viewpoints. That doesn't say you are asked to adopt that alternative viewpoint. So those are four of the kinds of things at the surface, when someone might be skeptical of these sorts of programs.

Then discussion, because that's what this is all about. There's some assumptions here that we feel all this should be managed through the OFDD essentially, with extra resources. The proposed Center won't be directly involved. It will simply be a partner. The key thing, the whole make or break here is that these programs are interesting, that you're engaged. If we, meaning the faculty, build it and build it right, we'll participate and we'll be happy to participate. If the programs are not engaging, then, well, you all know what that sort of implies.

That's discussion. I'd like to go into discussion. Neema, can you handle this, while I log off and come back on again?

NEEMA KUDVA: Sure, Charlie. I'm just calling on folks. We're open for comments, questions, clarifications. Members of the committee, of the working group are also on this call so they can participate in responding as well. Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Thank you. So this is coming from someone who wrote two books and many articles on race, and I advise students in these areas, but the first thing I would say, and it's a full disclosure, I'm completely a fan of the free curriculum. That means I am opposed to the swim test for everyone, because I saw the swim test was alleged as a way to justify this kind of training. Not a big fan of that at all for students, and certainly not for faculty and staff.

But even if you disagree with me on that, and most of you will disagree, I have two questions then. One is, did you take into account the many empirical studies that tend to show that many of those trainings that we see, diversity, against bias, et cetera, end up creating a situation where people believe they have been cleared, in a sense, from any sentiment of racism, for instance, and tend to reproduce them and to have a behavior that ends up with less diversity in hires than others?

NEEMA KUDVA: Just so I could respond quickly, and others could step in. We did. Some of those studies are posted on the DOF website, so we did look at them, Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: It goes both ways. You have contradictory --

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. One of the things that comes out from the studies that when education is accompanied with discussions where you really go into the question and you bring your own experience back to bear on these conversations, that's when it doesn't create the kind of perverse effects that are well-known and that also exist. We are never going to reach everyone, we are not going to be able to force anyone to do anything, so this is not about a forced indoctrination, but we are hoping that the way this is designed allows for those kinds of conversations, allows for those kinds of in-person engagements that lead to a better-educated

faculty and that lead us all to be more confident about being able to step up, step in and address questions that are causing lots of problems.

Richard.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Quickly, maybe the other remark I would do is that a university's not a corporation. At least that's not what it should be, and so it ties to what you just said. The emphasis should be an interracial and scholarly dialogue, which is why I believe the antiracism Center should be at the center of all this, but we should not prioritize so-called online educational modules to the expense of intellectual dialogue.

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay, thank you. Richard, and then Chiara.

RICHARD BENSEL: I appreciate the good intentions and an educational program of this sort. We're multiplying them. Some of them, as you know from this fall, are coercive, they are mandatory, a state-imposed one that we just went through. I interrogated the central administration as to who designed it. They said the staff. It was anonymous. I asked if there would be punishment if there weren't compliance. I was told not at this time, wouldn't get any answer back. I then asked well, what if I take this program and I fail? Then I was told well, you take it again. I said well, what if I failed it the second time? You take it again ad infinitum.

It was really Clockwork Orange. I mean, man, they were -- you were going to do it the way it was said, and that was it. I refused. I didn't do it. I see this as academic freedom, I see training programs. If it's voluntary, I have no objection if people take it or not, but when it's coerced, it is thought control, and I will not participate in it.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Richard. I think the point is that we don't want it to be coercive, but that creating a hospitable climate for everyone who comes to the university to study, to work, our colleagues, our staff colleagues, the idea is to be actually educating ourselves to create a hospitable climate in ways that are not always very clear to those who

have been here a long time, so that's the impulse. And I know you and I are on the same page in terms of the impulse, but how we get there is something that we need to think through. Chiara.

CHIARA FORMICHI: Thank you, and thank you to the working group for this. I just had one question, which maybe is a little surreptitious in a way, but isn't making it a requirement for a DGS and the USs and a requirement it can be bailed out by saying I don't want to do it, and therefore you can't do the job kind of give an easy way out to people who don't want to do service? I think in every department we've had this and people say oh, I don't know how to do this, where we add another layer, oh, no, I'm not going to do this. I don't mean to be comical about it, but just something to be thought about in putting a requirement so that then you can do more service. That's it. Thanks.

NEEMA KUDVA: It came up. And Mark, Durba, I mean, there are others here from the working group, if one of you wants to jump in, Beth.

DURBA GHOSH: We did talk about this. If you look at the report, we talked about this pretty extensively and we also talked about the issue of the mandate and having it be voluntarily; also talked about the issue exactly that you said, if you mandate it for everybody versus whether you have specific programmings for different roles. I think the feeling is that all faculty have responsibilities to upholding the inclusion of our students.

I don't think that's complicated for most of us. In some sense, what we imagine is that every faculty has some responsibility that relates to being inclusive of a diverse population of students. For instance, if you run a lab and all of your students look like you, that's not a diverse lab. I think what we imagined is that even though we know some percentage of faculty -- the search committee workshops are the example we used.

We learned in the process of working on this that of the 1,600 faculty, 1,200 faculty have gone through the search committee training, so that means that's now required for

anyone who serves on a search committee. So that means that 400 people either have not served on a search committee or have served on a search committee without doing the workshop. But surely, those 400 people are doing something else, and so the hope is that whatever we come up with covers the different components of our jobs. I think there's still going to be folks who refuse to comply and so on, but I think we want to send a message that the expectation is that faculty will think of being inclusive as a component of their jobs, rather than as something extra that they do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you don't mind, I will jump in very quickly. I'll just say that as the director, when a faculty member says I don't want to take a particular service job, I have other things the person can do. And so that's part of the job. If it is your turn, it is part of the job. If you don't want to do that job, I will assign you something else. Part of my job is to make those assignments. And most of the time they agree, because they don't want to do the other thing.

NEEMA KUDVA: Other comments? Is Charlie back?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Richard, just so I can understand better how you think, let me just pose a little scenario. Suppose I'm a new assistant professor in Government, and I get one of these requests, a workshop on X or whatever, and I come to you and I say should I do this, it seems important, what would you say?

RICHARD BENSEL: Charlie, I'm not sure I understand the example.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'm a new assistant professor in your department, I receive a request to participate in some kind of workshop. You're my mentor or you're the office next door and I come over and I say look, I got one of these, what's it about? Should I do this? What are you going to say?

RICHARD BENSEL: That depends, I guess. I'd have to know the specifics. I get requests like that all the time, of course, and so probably handle it the same way. What's the point?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What are you going to tell me? That's my question. What's your advice? Go, don't go or how are you going to respond?

RICHARD BENSEL: I'd be thinking about their career interests, their intellectual orientations, projects and so forth and so on. It would be their interest.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, fine. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I think Abby was ahead of me.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Abby.

ABBY COHN: First of all, I really appreciate the work of the working committee, and I think one of the important issues here, which I know the committee's really well aware of, is nuance. It can't be a requirement. It's not doing just some online thing that we chug through. The question is how do we make this a meaningful way for us to engage. And I don't think there's any question. I think of course it can be required. It can't be required what we're going to think or how we're going to respond to it or what we're going to engage in.

And so I really appreciate Richard's criticism, like doesn't make sense we have to do something online and we have to keep doing it till we pass. That can't be the way we do this thing. But I know that I, myself, have found many of the discussions I've had with colleagues this year just very informative and enlightening, and I think to me what would be nice is to have the commitment to have to engage in that discussion. Maybe it's discussion groups that we just have to participate in.

I wouldn't just do it in the department. I think I've learned a lot from my colleagues in other departments, so maybe it could just be a thing where we sign up for a one-hour discussion

with a faculty facilitator with a couple questions that we're discussing or maybe that's the way we could pilot something and see if it works.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Now Risa, yeah.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I had some similar thoughts. I'm thinking about the video, the online so-called training that we had to do with the sexual harassment 6.4 stuff. Number one, I resented doing it because that's what I study, but I thought well, I should see what's in there. If I didn't know a lot about it going in, I wouldn't have known a lot about it going out, so I think -- and I'm not casting aspersion on anybody's good faith in trying to put together a good session online, so I think there's a great deal of agreement that just is not education, it's training.

So I think the word education is so important, and I saw in the chat there's lots of programming that is not online kind of training stuff I think what Abby is saying, and the ideas people are raising is to move away from people thinking they have to tick boxes and say I did X, Y or Z, but to actually dig into hard discussions, really dig.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yes. Could I just step in for a second? Thank you for that, Risa, Abby, everyone. When we looked into the trainings, the things that were put together for all of us to go through, it is not like the Title IX piece that we just did. What the working group is talking about is not to the Title IX training, so please, that is not what we're talking about. What we're talking about is engaging with our students and our colleagues who both experience the forms of harassment and climate issues that we don't want at Cornell.

We're talking about that, we're talking about engaging with faculty who have huge amount of expertise. Their scholarship rests on these kind of questions, we have a number of people across units in this University, we're talking about engaging with them. We're talking about using research and scholarship to create an educational requirement where we all engage in person to have conversations.

That is how the OFDD trainings work, as far as I understand it. It rests on scholarship, it rests on incidents we are having in the university that are being reported by our students and our colleagues. They desire things, scenarios based on this research, and then we engage in conversation within the department or within a group of colleagues. That's how all these workshops are run. They're workshops. They're not mandated indoctrination following an online module. That's not what we're talking about. And if that's not clear, you should tell us how we can make that clearer.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, is your hand still up?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: It is, actually. Neema, I think that what you're describing is what everybody is actually endorsing. I think one of the problems is that there is this -- I was really quite surprised about how bad the Title IX training was, and that is not divorced from what we're talking about here, so that perhaps what needs to be done is to not simply hand it over, the Title IX training as to an office, as opposed to what I think you're promoting, which is faculty engagement with creating programs that deal with inequalities that are not only on race. Nobody thinks it should be only on race. We talk about intersectionality because there's a reality to that.

So I think there is, in fact, a disconnect and a tension between people's experience in continually being told you've got to watch this video on issues of sexual harassment, which is quite bad, as opposed to what's been promoted here, so some way to make that connection to say this is across the board. This is not focused only on race in a narrow way.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Very good. Please, again, you have the chat and you can also use the website for comments. These are extremely important to us. I think we should move on to the second half, which has to do with the student component. Let's keep advancing all that, Jill.

This is Working Group S, and the idea is to propose to the senate some kind of educational requirement for students. Sometimes you'll see a required course or it could be a metaphor for a number of things. For credit can mean literally three or four credits or it could be a metaphor for on your transcript, for example. Anyway, it's been a great group, and I want to publicly thank them all for participating. As I told all the working groups, it's not over now. It goes well probably into February.

This is one of the three parts, and the idea is to somehow propose an educational requirement for students. Here's the logic. Our students need to be literate in a sort of historical way about the origins of structural racism, colonialism, bias and injustice. This is sort of the liberal education half of it. We have to understand these things.

The second part is a more practical kind of skill part, which is that we want our students to be skilled as antiracists, not only in their fields of study and beyond, but in their everyday lives. These are in sort of distilled form what this is sort of all about.

This is more complicated than the faculty piece, simply because the number of -- it's a huge undertaking. Here in sort of schematic form are the players, the pieces, and they can be intermingled and dialed in and out and so on, but the key thing here is that the requirement has these two halves. And we'll use the word central course to where they come together.

First of all, they aren't separate at all, but they need to be intermingled and whatever. Students are going to see that box, and we'll call it the central course. The proximity of the two halves is essential. What about the literacy part? We have people on campus who study these sorts of things, and we should use them.

And listed there are five academic programs where a lot of this material sits. It's very important to use our faculty expertise. For example, we have colleagues in Vet who are helping us with the pandemic, we have modelers in Engineering. We have tremendous talent out there.

Let's use it to solve major issues, and that's the philosophy here in that pink box. And every unit that's mentioned in our talks have been contact. We haven't engaged them deeply on stuff, we've given them just a heads up. Of course, all these things are premised on resources. Anyway, just to get going on that literacy part, there's a consensus or a feeling that those five units somehow should contribute to this literacy part of the scene.

Then we have the embedding part. Students, once they affiliate, sit in a discipline and they're majoring in something, and they have to learn how to exhibit antiracist behavior in that venue. Only the faculty in that venue know how to pull this off, so this is sort of the skill part, and very important there be a discipline-specific part. It's in-person discussions and exercises. It's not just watch a video and then check your box. It's the opposite of that. We're trying to figure out how to pull these two things together for all of our students.

Here are some of the many questions. The working group has thought about this stuff, but it's not cast in concrete. The idea of showing you the rough draft, get something written, something so we can really respond to it. Anyway, let's step through these. What about the volume of this? That's clearly a dial you could play with. We've sort of been thinking about three or four credit hours and rough parity between those two halves.

You have this sort of standard thing, students are booked up or my college has a requirement, this is disruptive. Well, honestly, it's supposed to be disruptive, but you don't want to get into the mindset that everything is a zero-sum game. If we can cleverly embed things, if we can rethink some of how our requirements are satisfied, it doesn't have to be zero-sum, but nevertheless, it's a major challenge.

Then we know this. We talk about a university requirement. We all know that Cornell is highly decentralized. The colleges control the curriculum, so does this undermine college

authority? Yes, it does, in the sense that the swim test does, and so does the freshman writing seminar.

These are some of the major challenges associated with pulling this off. Just to be clear, additional resources will be required. The literacy piece, you'll hear about the proposed Center at the next meeting, but the idea is that that would be under the auspices of the proposed Center. The proposed Center is a focal point for research and teaching, and the organization, the running of the literacy part would sit in that venue.

Rollout, it has to be realistic. We had some preliminary ideas about that, but maybe you have a great idea of what this thing should be, but you can't get it to overnight. Well, what's the interim rollout look like? These are things that are, quote, up for grabs, things that have to be worked out.

We've kind of been under the assumption we're talking undergraduates, but Martha was pretty clear, this is for all students. Clearly, some version of whatever we do for the undergraduates has to show up in the graduate and professional student venue, and that of course brings up challenges as well. There is a huge amount of work that's already been done in these directions, and we don't in any way intend this to be a slight or a diminution of that work. The idea is to multiply it, fold it into this larger initiative.

There we go. Why don't we stop sharing, so we can have everyone out there, and let's now talk about these things. These ideas have come up for years and years and years. The fact that nothing comes to pass doesn't mean those were failed task force or whatever, but we're trying to get enough detail out there so we can respond. I looked at the 2018 report, and it says yeah, we needed a required course. Well, that's fine. We're taking it one step further, trying maybe in a very naive way, trying to actually say what it would look like, because only then can we reason correctly about it.

Enough of me. Let's talk. And I see a hand here, Ken Birman.

KEN BIRMAN: I want to suggest there's a broader question that Richard Bensel spoke to, and actually Risa as well, which is this tension between the right to free speech and our academic freedom and the coercive, but I think necessary aspects of protecting people against harmful speech potentially or harmful behavior or people who even advocate for things which might be perceived as harmful. I'm seeing that tension.

I was mentioning in chat earlier I don't think this is new on campus and that we've sort of operated in a sphere where we tolerate some degree of unpleasant language, even hateful language because of our sense that academic freedom trumps this. I've questioned that in the past and I question it now. I think the idea behind this Center, the idea behind the training is laudatory.

I worry, though, about the sentiment that was expressed earlier, that we're moving towards a motive which we impose a set of beliefs on people, whether they accept those beliefs whatsoever personally or simply parrot them, in order to hold the job at a prestigious university. I would like to see the senate have a real engagement around that question before we find ourselves with proposal after proposal to do things that sort of implicitly assume a buy-in to a certain perspective on this, which we seem to be hesitant to talk about.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'd like to focus the discussion on the required course or program for students. Those are very excellent comments.

KEN BIRMAN: I'm suggesting, Charlie, that it is premature to do this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You feel that A, then B, so A is again --

KEN BIRMAN: I think we need a better understanding of what our views are with respect to freedom of speech for students and academic freedom for students before we can

seriously engage in the design of material of this kind that seeks to sort of stamp out a view, even though I actually do believe that the direction you're going is correct.

I had a graduate student once who mentioned in passing that he believed in eugenics. He wanted to just sterilize the people who didn't rise to his -- that was pretty offensive. And at the time, it might have fell under what Cornell called free speech. We need that debate before we embark in a kind of coercive program, to understand where we actually stand as a community on the broader principle.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Can we not have colleagues talk about the Morrill Land-Grant? Just the act of talking about that flirts with indoctrination and free speech?

KEN BIRMAN: No. Actually, I believe we can and should, but I also believe we need to understand where we set that limit. What would be protected free speech? It's a little bit of inattention of which should be protected. Risa made some proposals. I had some issues with the details of the proposals, but Risa stepping forward and saying we need to talk about what we're protecting, she was absolutely right, and that is true now as well with regard to this proposal.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Let's go to Durba, then David Delchamps. Durba.

DURBA GHOSH: So I guess having been on the working groups, I don't actually think this would be infringing on free speech. I think it would be enabling free speech. And I guess, as a faculty of color and as a woman faculty who also writes about colonialism, books and articles, this is what I'm an expert on. What I find is that actually the existing landscape prevents us from talking about racism, that there's a kind of code of civility that keeps people from addressing issues of discrimination, and so I think that this kind of material, this kind of infrastructure to have these conversations will be liberating, rather than dampening.

I've participated in a number of these workshops, and I guess the thing I would say is that there's a lot of diverse views expressed and worked through. I was in one of those week-long faculty diversity seminars run by what was the Center for Teaching Excellence and is now the Center for Teaching Innovation, and there were a number of folks who were post-docs who had enlisted partially to get a better sense of how to create a course, how to develop a syllabus. And a number of them felt that we shouldn't be changing our plans for a syllabus because some students might have learning disabilities.

So one of the principles in the workshop is that you think about universal design and making your courses accessible for the widest range of students, not just the best students. It was a super-interesting conversation. It was also very, very difficult. There were some faculty that were very deeply upset by the conversation, but I think we did end up in a place where there was some shared understanding of what we were talking about and, in particular, what our professional obligations are to students with different kinds of disabilities, which many of us have had.

I see this programming or this set of programs, however we develop it, is not dampening our right to speak out. For some of us, it will liberate us to speak about things that we have been wanting to speak about. The free speech thing to me doesn't make sense on those grounds.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Durba. Let's go to David Delchamps.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: I'd like to talk specifically about the student part and not about the free speech part, even though Ken feels there's a link there. I serve on the student working group. Unfortunately, four out of six meetings were at times I couldn't make. I did listen to every single recording and I did send extensive comments to Charlie and Neema about my thoughts on the matter.

Some of the tension in our group -- and I think it's worth sharing this with the bigger body -- was between people like me, who really wished the pink part was the whole thing almost, because students know so little about the history of, say, this country, in particular in southern colonialist terms, racist terms and all that kind of thing. There's lots of facts that they just don't know that don't change over time, whereas the stuff in the green box, that changes, the fads -- I don't want to call them fads because some of them are very constructive. But in my opinion, someone looking from the outside, an intelligent, reasonable person could view some of the things as indoctrination in the green box. Those are the kind of approaches and the terminology that people use that changes over time, and that's what I worry about.

And so I'd like to ask everybody here -- I'm thinking purely from an academic standpoint. I think the students need to see history to understand how it got this way. They really need to see that, because there's so many things they just don't know, and certainly I don't know. I would like to see the bulk -- I would like to see the dial that Charlie talked about turned more in the direction of the literacy part and away from the other part. That is not a view that's shared with everyone on the committee, but I'd like to hear what the senators think about that splitting, that division of labor.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, David, for summarizing it so nicely. There's a hand, two hands. Robert Travers, and then Rhonda.

ROBERT TRAVERS: Thanks, Charlie. I just want to endorse something I saw in the chat that Wendy Wilcox wrote, that it seems to me this is about creating an opportunity for informed dialogue, rather than creating opportunities to teach specific views. And it seems to me, again, this is exactly about the academic freedom of students like those students who came to talk to us earlier in the year, the students from Do Better Cornell, who feel that their academic freedom is not being currently well-served by an academic community which too easily reproduces forms

of racial hierarchy and racial exclusion that are deeply embedded in our history and in our society.

So I see this very much as an expansion of academic freedom, and I very much agree with Wendy, that what we're trying to do as a university is to create more spaces for informed dialogue for beginning to converse about and debate questions that we haven't thought deeply enough about.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Rhonda Gilmore.

RHONDA GILMORE: As a designer and someone who teaches universal design, this is the way that we look at every problem, and so I think for academics to sit around and talk about academic freedom and these other issues, it's not that it's missing the point, but I feel that it's really important that we all learn empathy. And I'm not exactly sure how a training program or a seminar can do that, other than to bring people together and to encourage students to practice empathy as global citizens. And I really support these programs and I think they should have been done yesterday and I really don't want anything to stop the process. I want it to move forward really as quickly as possible.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Ronda. We have a few minutes left here. When a student leaves here, I would like them to be able to say I'm a lifelong learner. That sounds corny, but that's liberal education. You were exposed to new things, and it stays with you forever. This historical literacy point is really important that it stays with you forever, because this is something that's going to be -- you're going to be confronting issues your whole life, it would be nice to have that as part of the scene. And also, we have Intergroup Dialogue Project. When I was at Cornell, I got practice talking across difference, I got a lot of practice engaging with faculty and fellow students on these matters.

Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I may not be understanding, but you may have said it -- with reading chats, sometimes I lose the thread a little bit -- in terms of the pink part versus the green part discussion. The way I'm understanding when I'm reading and hearing is that the idea is to provide resources -- the pink part is to provide the resources to departments and disciplines to draw from in their courses, as opposed to recommending a particular sort of course that everybody has to take. Am I understanding that correctly?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a parameter. Neema, you want to speak to that? I think you thought about that a little more than I have.

NEEMA KUDVA: It's like a sketch, and we're just kind of playing with it. As many comments and suggestions as we can get, I think the better it will become. This is like the reiterative process that designers go through. What we are trying to do, Risa, is we have a group of colleagues who have expertise in questions of understanding the structural, the relational and structural construction of race, ethnicity, indigeneity, secular colonialism.

So what we're trying to do is to bring them together, the proposal is to bring them together such that they create -- it's like a multimedia textbook, that's one way to explain it. What it will do is, like a good multimedia textbook, it would include materials, it would give us this historical sense of how these concepts have evolved, using the United States as our example, and then what it would also do is set up these modules for us, for the rest of us, you and me, to take to our students and be able to engage in discussions. So it doesn't just remain something abstract, something that is viewed that is two-dimensional; that it really becomes something that we can relate our experience, each of us, and make that learning our own. So that's one piece of it. That's the pink part.

The green part is where each of us in our disciplines -- I'm in Architecture, Art and Planning. I look at cities. You are in law. So each of us in our disciplines begin to take this and

think through what our disciplines have done. You can use a book like Richard Rothstein's Color of Law. I can use work that -- I mean, there's so much work. City planning is so deeply embedded in creating deeply segregated and racialized environments, and so I can take that and then build the rest of the course out as an introductory course based on my discipline.

That's the idea of this. The green part is really the instructor in that particular field and department. The pink part is our colleagues who have a huge expertise and share scholarship is really sort of based in these areas. And we interact with each other, in the process, educating ourselves and our students with us. Does that help?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. I mean, it's very consistent with what I was understanding with the way that you explained it, I think is quite useful in terms of the ability of people to build courses that are informed by the expertise of our colleagues, as well as the expertise that we bring to it within our disciplines from ourselves and our disciplinary colleagues. The first is more the broader colleagues. I think it was a great explanation for what you're intending.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chiara.

CHIARA FORMICHI: Yeah, I have a question for some of our colleagues. I'm coming from a perspective of not being American. I've been in America just a few years, so maybe there's something that I'm missing in terms of how academic freedom and freedom of speech is understood or framed; but also having lived under an authoritarian regime that banned conversations about certain topics, I'm trying to understand how creating a space to have conversations facilitated by historical perspectives and sociological statistical data, for example, can be an infringement on freedom of speech or academic freedom. I would really appreciate it if someone in the audience or, you know, in the space could help me understand this, because I'm really struggling. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, Risa, you have your hand up again.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: This is in response to the question. I study academic freedom. It's a big, complicated area. I don't think that the way you articulated it has any infringement on academic freedom, to provide places for people to discuss and learn and deepen and debate. That is the idea of academic freedom. I think that what people are raising is more in terms of pedagogical choices that are being made and how we develop curricula and what are the sorts of requirements, which is not just in this issue, but generally we have questions about what should go into a curriculum, what should be required. I think that is what I'm hearing being raised in terms of requirements of courses, requirements of pedagogical approaches, as opposed to there are lots of resources out there and if departments want to build -- from what I heard from Neema, if departments want to build a course that can be taught in this area, that we can provide a lot of resources so that people can build their competence, if they wish to do that. That seems to me consistent with the notion of academic freedom.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'll wrap it up with Carl, and then Ken.

CARL FRANCK: Carl, from Physics. I really appreciate Chiara's point. If anything this year has taught me, although a lot of really ugly things about America have been revealed, but boy, I'd hate to be on the other side of not knowing about these things. So I just want to support what Chiara said. Also, it sounds a little sappy, but it makes me very admiring of our system, of our American system.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. Ken, and then we'll wrap it up.

KEN BIRMAN: Yeah, this comes a little late because the question was asked two minutes ago, but in my spring course, at one point I was talking about technology and issues around privacy and free speech, and some students objected quite strongly, actually went to the department chair of the university. They are from a different country and, in that country, what I perceived as privacy, they perceive as blocking technologies that are needed to stop terrorism.

And what I perceived as a right to free speech, they perceived as defending terrorists who are trying to tear down the government in their very, very large country.

So Cornell listened to them and sided with me, but I think it illustrates there is a line present. I don't personally see such a line if we're talking about racism and we're talking about diversity; but nonetheless, that type of a tension is present. In my experience in the spring, it illustrated it's very present, if we talk about surveillance technologies in a technology setting, ethics in a computing course. So it is hard to separate these things, in my view, and I'll reiterate that I think we need, as a community, to engage on that question before we turn around and try to teach a way of thinking about this to our students, because I don't believe you can discuss the literature without an opinion about where you're hoping people will go with that.

Nonetheless, I agree with Risa, by the way. I think we should support this and provide resources for it. I think it's a positive thing if we engage in it in a serious way.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, excellent. I noticed the chat, almost 100 entries in the chat. We will be poring over those. So thank you very much. As you know, we just turn off the mic and we hang around in the hall afterwards to just informally talk. Everyone is welcome. I know we have a number of student visitors today. You are most welcome to hang around and talk with us.