

15:37:09 From Ken Birman : In a similar spirit: are our peers doing anything like this?

15:39:28 From Carole Boyce Davies : We see Cornell University as in the lead. There are other departments which want to do this and are following our lead.

15:39:44 From XXXX : Yes

15:39:45 From XXXX: yes

15:39:46 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:46 From XXXX: YES

15:39:46 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:47 From XXXX: no

15:39:47 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:47 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:47 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:47 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:47 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:48 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:48 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:48 From XXXX: yes

15:39:48 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:49 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:49 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:50 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:50 From XXXX: yes

15:39:50 From XXXX: Yes

15:39:50 From XXXX: Abstain

15:39:50 From XXXX: abstain

15:39:51 From XXXX: yes

15:39:51 From XXXX: yes

15:39:51 From XXXX: yes

15:39:52 From XXXX: yes

15:39:52 From XXXX: no

15:39:52 From XXXX: yes
15:39:52 From XXXX: yes
15:39:52 From XXXX: yes
15:39:52 From XXXX: yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: Yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: Yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: yes
15:39:53 From XXXX: yes
15:39:54 From XXXX: Yes
15:39:54 From XXXX: abstain
15:39:54 From XXXX: Yes
15:39:55 From XXXX: abstain
15:39:55 From XXXX: Abstain
15:39:55 From XXXX: Plant Biology, yes
15:39:56 From XXXX: abstain
15:39:57 From XXXX: Abs
15:39:57 From XXXX: yes
15:39:59 From XXXX: Yes
15:40:00 From XXXX: yes
15:40:00 From XXXX: Yes
15:40:00 From XXXX: yes
15:40:00 From XXXX: Yes
15:40:01 From XXXX: yes
15:40:02 From XXXX Yes
15:40:02 From XXXX: abstain
15:40:03 From XXXX: no
15:40:04 From XXXX: yes

15:40:04 From XXXX: yes

15:40:04 From XXXX: yes

15:40:05 From XXXX: abs

15:40:06 From XXXX: yes

15:40:08 From XXXX: abstain

15:40:08 From XXXX: Yes

15:40:12 From XXXX : Yes

15:40:12 From XXXX: Yes

15:40:13 From XXXX: yes

15:40:16 From XXXX: yes

15:40:18 From XXXX: yes

15:40:20 From XXXX: Yes

15:40:43 From XXXX: yes

15:42:08 From Paul Ginsparg : Charlie, the host of the zoom gets at the bottom of the participants window an accumulated count of yes and no from participants who click on those (green and red) icons. That would presumably be *much* easier for you than using chat for this. (that's what we use in our dept meetings)

15:42:33 From Wendy Wilcox : It would be useful to know how many students applying this year opted to not submit test scores

15:43:25 From Ken Birman : Paul, they wouldn't be able to enforce that votes must be cast by senators (also needed for quorum)

15:43:52 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:53 From XXXX: yes

15:43:55 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:55 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:55 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:56 From XXXX: yes

15:43:56 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:56 From XXXX: yes

15:43:56 From XXXX: Yes

15:43:57 From XXXX: yes
15:43:57 From XXXX: yes
15:43:57 From XXXX: yes
15:43:57 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: Yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: Yes
15:43:58 From XXXX Yes
15:43:58 From XXXX: yes
15:43:59 From XXXX: No
15:43:59 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:00 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:00 From XXXX: yes
15:44:00 From XXXX: yes
15:44:00 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:01 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:01 From XXXX: yes
15:44:01 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:02 From XXXX: yes
15:44:02 From XXXX: Yes
15:44:02 From XXXX: yes
15:44:02 From XXXX: yes
15:44:03 From XXXX: Yes!
15:44:03 From XXXX: YEs
15:44:03 From XXXX: yes

15:44:03 From XXXX: yes

15:44:04 From XXXX: abstain

15:44:04 From XXXX: yes

15:44:05 From XXXX: yes

15:44:05 From XXXX: yes

15:44:05 From XXXX: yes

15:44:06 From XXXX: yes

15:44:06 From XXXX: yes

15:44:06 From XXXX: yes

15:44:07 From XXXX: yes

15:44:09 From XXXX : yes

15:44:09 From XXXX: Yes

15:44:10 From XXXX: yes

15:44:10 From XXXX: yes

15:44:10 From XXXX: yes to admissions resolution

15:44:11 From XXXX yes

15:44:12 From XXXX: yes

15:44:12 From XXXX: yes

15:44:15 From XXXX: yes

15:44:18 From XXXX: yes

15:44:18 From XXXX: yes

15:44:20 From XXXX : yes

15:44:21 From XXXX: yes

15:46:06 From Paul Ginsparg : @ken — he can just recall that only senators can vote (you could then file a lawsuit i suppose if you think there was widespread fraud in this regard). also someone could take a screengrab of the relevant window associating votes with names

15:46:47 From XXXX: yes

15:47:48 From XXXX: yes

15:49:04 From Jonathan Russell-Anelli : Does this exclude "guest"?

15:49:15 From Jonathan Russell-Anelli : ie guests on campus

15:50:35 From Oren Falk : @jonathan: good points. language meant to be inclusive may end up doing the opposite

15:52:50 From Ken Birman : this change seems to say that offensive language is ok if there is no named individual who feels harassed and is willing to be identified?

15:53:09 From Richard Bensel : I suspect that "guests" would be "invited visitors," most particularly speakers or conference participants. They would thus come under the academic freedom of those who invited them (the "auspices" under which they came to Cornell).

15:53:39 From Thomas Björkman : Amendment #3 language is good for filling the kind of unintended loopholes that we have seen exploited elsewhere recently. I think the proposed amendments were assumed in the past, but need to be made explicit.

15:54:19 From Ken Birman : If I hear racist or sexist jokes, not directed at me, why can't I deem that to be a violation? I need to find a target person first?

15:55:50 From Frederic Gleach : I'm not sure "severe" really adds anything in #3, since it's no less subjective than "when required"

15:56:41 From Joanie Mackowski : I think that discriminatory tends to pertain to decisions: hiring one person rather than another, whereas harassment pertains to hostile environment

15:56:45 From Ken Birman : I am unsure that 1, 2, and 3 really change meaning, beyond adding words. an example would help.

15:59:29 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : Very much to the point, Laurent!

15:59:57 From Peter Wolczanski : Anybody bothered by the "reasonable" person language here? We have certainly recently witnessed a lot of "reasonable people" behaving unreasonably.

15:59:59 From Carole Boyce Davies : Thank you Laurent for providing a global context

16:00:01 From Carl Franck : Thanks Risa for the work!

16:00:05 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : I think I understand the point, but I think that the deletion of "discrimination" changes the meaning of the original document (that lists "discrimination, harassment" separately). I would ask that we leave "discrimination" and include the "protected status harassment" language as proposed.

16:00:34 From Bruno Xavier : Shouldn't "reasonable person" be changed to "reasonable individual"?

16:00:59 From Richard Bensel : Thanks, Laurent! I think the risk, for Cornell, is that we will inordinately restrict speech and that is true globally as well.

16:01:24 From Laurent Dubreuil : I agree, Richard, this is the obvious risk...

16:01:25 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : Agreed, Richard

16:01:40 From Carole Boyce Davies : Wondering too about "reasonable person"

16:02:18 From Ken Birman : Laurent, your remarks were helpful! Yet I am not convinced that these proposals are germane to your scenarios.

16:02:45 From Laurent Dubreuil : I share the voiced concerns about the definition of "reasonable person," though this is not unique to this text.

16:02:53 From Ken Birman : to me some add words with no change in meaning. the fourth strikes me as problematic in a deeper sense.

16:03:15 From Ken Birman : (by the way I lack a way to actually speak from here right now)

16:03:35 From Oren Falk : re the language of "faculty, students, staff": I still worry that this excludes non-Cornell persons on campus (e.g. a parent visiting her child, a contractor restocking a vending machine, someone lost looking for Rt 79...). I don't really see that the added language does what it is supposed to

16:04:36 From Ken Birman : What of the "anti-Zionist" language we all heard two years ago, very broad, very vague. and we had Israeli scholars nearly in tears in the senate over their perception of the language as anti-Semitic?

16:07:25 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : One more note: Policy 6.4 lists these (discrimination and harassment separately). "Policy 6.4
'Prohibited Bias, Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual and Related Misconduct'"

16:09:17 From Peter Wolczanski : The abuses of free speech across campuses in the past 5-10 years have mostly been cases of the unacceptance of conservative voices — students, faculty or visitors (seminar speakers) — in what is typically a liberal college environment. This has resulted in actions against faculty who simply supported free speech (read "The Coddling of the American Mind"), including harassment and in some cases loss of employment. It is in this context that "reasonable" people become decidedly unreasonable.

16:12:33 From Joanie Mackowski : Another reason you may not: you don't want to initiate any exchange of microparticles

16:13:14 From Bruno Xavier : I've been there, and I didn't express my concerns for fear of being shot. Honestly.

16:14:04 From Ken Birman : in the case of the language used a few years ago on anti-Zionism, the context was that Cornell faculty played prominent roles in an early version of the BDS boycott, arguing strongly that we should take actions aimed at harming Israeli scholars unless they publicly sever their ties to Israeli institutions. that version is still out there on the internet archive. and on campus and in the senate we heard that view strongly advanced. for example, the published language urged that Israeli research be rejected by conferences, that we refuse to teach such students. to me, highly offensive. proposal four seems to defend such language if we don't identify a specific person targeted by the specific statement...

16:14:54 From Richard Bensel : I think the discussion of this educational requirement should include three things:

16:16:45 From Joanie Mackowski : I like how the education programs are specifically tied into departmental leadership positions

16:16:47 From Richard Bensel : 1) the identity of those who design the program; 2) an explanation of why the designers believe they should impose their views on faculty colleagues; and 3) a specification of the punishment, if any, if a faculty member refuses to comply with the requirement.

16:18:18 From Courtney Roby : Well, course evals are already very problematic from a DEI perspective, so I don't feel great about using them as an instrument for enforcement...

16:18:49 From Neema Kudva : @Richard— in response to (1) we ask those with expertise on these issues to educate us. This is not based on anyone's identity

16:19:34 From Neema Kudva : Just like we asked Peter Frazier to work on the COVID scenarios

16:19:40 From Ariel Ortiz-Bobea (AEM) : ^

16:19:45 From Richard Bensel : I listen to people who know more than I do all the time..but voluntarily...this is thought control.

16:19:51 From Durba Ghosh : I find it hard to believe that any faculty member can "impose" their ideas on anyone else! I would hope that faculty would comply voluntarily in solidarity with staff and students who do undergo workshops in how to be antiracist.

16:20:09 From Bruno Xavier : For what is worth: I agree with the direction of the three proposals, but I expect mandate, enforcement by punishment, can lead to successful change in social behavior

16:20:48 From Bruno Xavier : (CANNOT lead to...)

16:22:32 From Joanie Mackowski : @bruno, I think that requiring training for department leadership might particularly have a positive effect, in that this leadership will shape the community

16:23:28 From Carole Boyce Davies : Are they accounting for the intersections with institutional sexism as they apply to BIPOC women who experience racism through these other structures

16:23:42 From Bruno Xavier : I like that idea. Leadership must be informed, officially so

16:25:07 From Durba Ghosh : @Carole: yes, the idea is that the programming would be driven by faculty expertise, so including programs and departments like Africana, Asian-American studies, American Indian and Indigenous Studies, FGSS, LGBT studies, Latino/a Studies in the design.

16:25:38 From Thomas Björkman : I'm concerned that making a "voluntary" certification a requirement for a required job function is disingenuous. Even many who agree with the goal will find it inappropriate. I don't think it needs to be done that way, given the quality of programming we can have.

16:25:50 From Joanie Mackowski : Are our PhD's thought control?

16:26:15 From Bruno Xavier : (@joanie BTW I do believe some, maybe most improper behavior happens by lack of appreciation, understanding and information. So, training is essential, I'm speaking specifically about mandate and punishment.)

16:27:36 From Joanie Mackowski : I agree with you, Bruno!

16:28:30 From Laurent Dubreuil : But "being inclusive" and "getting online training" are 2 different things...

16:29:05 From Neema Kudva : The trainings are not all online — they include discussion and conversation

16:29:15 From Laurent Dubreuil : Even so...

16:30:46 From Neema Kudva : CITE is the interactive theater ensemble and OFDD engages them to run workshops in departments that are followed by conversation and discussion based on scenarios (one example)

16:31:48 From Wendy Wilcox : The bottom-line is that the people we need to participate in this educational program do not do it unless it is mandated.

16:32:25 From Beth Milles : I agree with Abby—I am so grateful for this work-and think it is so important—Training AND Conversation are vital.

16:32:41 From Richard Bensel : This discussion is avoiding the larger issue. I, for example, believe in climate change but someone who wanted to impose a program on the faculty on this issue would be absurd.

16:32:43 From Thomas Björkman : I like Durba's approach of making the context be providing resources to help meet normal performance expectations. That approach has the benefit of being outcomes based rather than compliance based.

16:32:56 From Bruno Xavier : We all probably agree that learning is a lot more efficient if the person chooses to attend. Moreover if it is mandatory we lose possibly the most important means to evaluate the efficacy of the training programs on effecting change.

16:33:05 From Joanie Mackowski : Yes, I agree with Abby-- no reason this training can't be fascinating. Like the Faculty Seminar in Writing Instruction: if you're interested in the topic, then the work is valuable

16:34:04 From Carl Franck : I agree with Risa, that training was poor.

16:34:05 From Courtney Roby : Abby, I think that's a great approach. I have reservations about the online training for the same reason Risa does - the current version of that form of instruction is simply not a good teaching tool (though it is a fine tool to verify I have seen some text on a page). But I'd be delighted to have a real conversation with a real person about these important issues.

16:35:18 From Laurent Dubreuil : The CITE workshop I attended was ok, but it is difficult to believe it would actually exert any meaningful, long-lasting experience.

16:36:07 From Courtney Roby : Neema, probably avoiding the term "training" like the plague in that case is a good idea.

16:36:25 From Richard Bensel : These references to educational environment are very dangerous because they bleed over into academic freedom.

16:36:26 From Neema Kudva : @courtney, and we will --

16:37:08 From Courtney Roby : And leading with the difference between this and the Title IX training, which is for many of us the only version of this kind of thing we know.

16:37:16 From Thomas Björkman : Wendy Wilcox raises an important point. Persuading the recalcitrant is an extra challenge. But mandating will harden resistance and therefore be counterproductive. We are learning how to better engage people who have historically been made to comply with mandates, and let their voices have greater influence.

16:37:31 From Laurent Dubreuil : Neema, the draft report at the bottom of p. 2 is tying the Title IX training with what you propose: "One way to "dial up" participation in a workshop program is to make it mandatory. For example, we have mandatory Title IX training for all employees"

16:37:35 From Wendy Wilcox : I have been taking the IDP program called Building Connections with Dialogue with other faculty for the last 4 months and it is very meaningful. These sessions can be very very valuable but they take an investment of time for the participants.

16:37:36 From Beth Milles : I like the idea of workshops we attend across disciplines interdepartmentally in smaller groups and then a conversation to follow up in our department —it should be expected of faculty that we should all need/want/desire to engage-it is problematic if we do not all make the commitment to engage.

16:37:40 From Carole Boyce Davies : Risa just articulated what I have been sharing with Dhurba

16:37:52 From Yael Levitte : @Laurent on it's own i agree. but with bridge funding and accountability there are outcomes. check the irp website for new faculty hired:
<http://irp.dpb.cornell.edu/university-factbook/diversity/composition> pick ranked faculty

16:37:57 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : Especially when these people, Thomas, are more familiar with the research literature in question than the people reading the workshop. It does happen.

16:38:03 From Neema Kudva : @Laurent —t hanks for pointing to that — will take another look

16:38:04 From Wendy Wilcox : Most faculty will not be able to dedicate the time involved in these type of meaningful course without the mandate

16:38:21 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : ...people LEADING the workshop, that is

16:39:36 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : The question of whether or not we can/should REQUIRE a training is the only similarity to the Title IX training. The content in how it is developed and delivered would be different.

16:39:44 From Bruce Lewenstein (he/him) : +! @Wendy-- I'm also taking the iDP workshop, and it has the engagement with issues that we're trying to achieve. But, it does require time commitment.

One of the issues we've discussed, without resolving, is how to engage those who don't volunteer for such workshops.

16:40:16 From Neema Kudva : @Mark — YES!

16:41:12 From Bruno Xavier : @Wendy - I guess then the task for leadership is to change our mindset to one that considers antiracism a priority?

16:41:33 From Harold Hodes : Why isn't the History department listed in the pink box?

16:41:47 From Beth Milles : I am in the IDP workshop as well-and agree it successfully achieves issues/engagement/conversation towards progress.

16:41:48 From Risa Lieberwitz : Title IX "training" should not be Title IX "training." We should be engaged in education about sexual inequalities as well as racial inequalities.

16:42:27 From Paul Ginsparg : Most faculty will not be able to dedicate the time involved even with a mandate

16:42:29 From Neema Kudva : @it's as much 'fields' as departments and many of the faculty have multiple affiliations — several historians are part of it

16:44:02 From Laurent Dubreuil : again: swim test and FWS that I'd be happy to see leaving...

16:44:42 From Neema Kudva : @laurent :) you don't want students to learn to write?? :))

16:44:47 From Thomas Björkman : Regarding the colleges primary role for courses, will they take leadership on their own? CALS already has.

16:45:01 From Laurent Dubreuil : i don't believe the FWS achieve that goal...

16:45:28 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : @Paul. I agree about the time commitment, but if we plan a multi-year set of trainings where some faculty start on "stage 1" and then progress through two to three stages we have an opportunity to have a sustained impact without a huge time commitment in each year.

16:45:41 From Laurent Dubreuil : but I do teach a few things to my students, including reading and writing

16:46:05 From Carole Boyce Davies : FWS may have issues but is more advanced than what is available elsewhere.

16:47:23 From Laurent Dubreuil : well, Carole, I am not so sure. But I am fine with being on the minority on this issue (and many others).

16:48:48 From Wendy Wilcox : Aren't we looking for informed dialogue not specific beliefs? The idea that knowledge is enhanced through the discussion of these topics

16:48:58 From Richard Bensel : Ken is right...we need a broader discussion of freedom of speech on campus...

16:48:59 From David Zax : I agree with professor birman.

16:49:17 From Wendy Wilcox : And it needs to happen not with students who choose courses that center on these topics

16:50:50 From Carl Franck : Durba: Please give an example

16:51:18 From Wendy Wilcox : +1 Durba! We need to have the conversations. They are not happening now.

16:52:03 From Carl Franck : Thanks Durba!

16:52:18 From Joanie Mackowski : I agree with Durba

16:52:22 From Laura Goodman : I agree that we need the subject matter experts involved here, but if faculty being called on to support these initiatives are junior, I hope that they will gain meaningful credit towards promotion/tenure for their contributions. We need to be sure not to overburden the very faculty we are trying to recruit and promote with these initiatives.

16:52:35 From Chiara Formichi (she/her) : Absolutely, Durba!

16:52:43 From Doug Antczak : I agree with Durba

16:52:50 From Thomas Björkman : Thanks Durba, very nice description of the dynamic of a successful program.

16:53:04 From Joanie Mackowski : I think this conversation may be about status: whether or not we're willing to learn something, to be taught

16:53:06 From Richard Bensel : I think these conversations are already happening in many courses. Certainly that is true in my department. What we would be doing is to coerce students who do not want to have those conversations imposed on them.

16:53:11 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : +1 with Durba.

16:53:22 From Neema Kudva : ^

16:53:27 From Bruce Lauber : I agree with Durba, too.

16:54:20 From Courtney Roby : Isn't the "green" part of the box the discipline-specific part?

16:54:35 From Paul Ginsparg : @Mark There's an implicit notion that faculty has copious amounts of spare elective time to devote to any new mandate. (Example: Fall'20 teach in-person/online, figure it out on your own, don't expect knowledgeable support. OK that was a specific one-time occurrence, but nonetheless the extreme formulation of what we experience all the time.)

Everyone I speak to is already scheduled out of existence.

Therefore any new mandated time would effectively come out of either leisure time at home or sleep.

There should be some sort of zero sum: any new mandate has to come with an explicit decrease in other administrative responsibilities to compensate.

Otherwise we're nickled and dimed to death.

16:54:38 From Courtney Roby : If so, I think it serves an important role in getting student buy-in from disciplines that don't currently emphasize this.

16:54:38 From Neema Kudva : It's both discipline specific and both parts cover the 'skill-set' part

16:55:20 From Wendy Wilcox : Richard, we are saying, if you are a Cornellian, you should be educated on having these conversations on race, you don't get to not participate. We are asserting that it matters if we are ever to move forward as a society.

16:55:33 From Courtney Roby : Paul, thanks for bringing up that issue.

16:55:39 From Joanie Mackowski : Bingo, Robert: well put

16:56:03 From Wendy Wilcox : EXCELLENT

16:56:18 From Richard Bensel : And that is exactly the view I oppose, Wendy. It contradicts the very concept of academic freedom.

16:56:46 From Maria Gandolfo Nixon : @Paul Ginsparg: I totally agree with you.

16:56:48 From Wendy Wilcox : For faculty to perpetuate racism in the academy?

16:56:52 From Mark Lewis - ORIE : @Paul. I appreciate the point. I simply pose this as something that should be at the top of the priority list. I do respect your right to disagree.

16:57:16 From Joanie Mackowski : Richard, you're reminding me of Frederick Douglass' comment about being "an abolitionist for oneself" but not an "abolitionist for others"

16:57:36 From Carole Boyce Davies : I too like the literacy component...and there are several literacies...African diaspora literacy is a frame that has been used so that one does not homogenize all African descended peoples. Yes, to the history of US settler colonialism and its ongoing effects.

16:57:51 From Wendy Wilcox : I am actually very heartened to hear how many faculty value and support this for our community.

16:57:53 From Richard Bensel : Hey...I am a abolitionist for everybody!

16:58:26 From Joanie Mackowski : that's good :)

17:01:16 From Richard Bensel : At Oral Roberts, this course might be "on the proper interpretation of the Bible"...

17:02:11 From Ken Birman : I strongly support the literacy element here. but for me, it must be coupled with an engagement of the tension between free speech versus hate speech

17:03:38 From Joanie Mackowski : There's no way to explain it, I think, Chiara

17:04:33 From Laurent Dubreuil : Certainly, Risa.

17:05:35 From NOLIWE's iPad : I think every department should do come up with an anti racism reading list relative to the field and do a departmental history with a focus on questions of racism and graduates have to demonstrate competence to graduate.

17:06:03 From Neema Kudva : ^

17:06:22 From Joanie Mackowski : Great plan, Noliwe

17:06:32 From Durba Ghosh : @Noliwe: yes!

17:07:33 From Beth Milles : Yes!

17:07:39 From Paul Ginsparg : you turn off the recording, not the mic

17:07:47 From Carole Boyce Davies : @Noliwe @Durba but the specifics of BIPOC women as they experience racism...as it intersects with sexism would give some departments a pass. But a good idea

17:07:50 From Ariel Ortiz-Bobea (AEM) : Thank you Charlie and Neema, unfortunately I have to run to another meeting now!

17:07:50 From Beth Milles : Thank you!

17:08:01 From Tracy Stokol : Thank you. Have a good break

17:08:08 From Connie Yuan : Thanks!

17:09:38 From XXXX: I vote yes for both