

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2021

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There you go. If you speak, two minutes. Let's get on with it.

Two announcements. You may recall December 2019, we passed a resolution that had to do with emeritus status for certain RTE title-holders. There you see the list. There was some follow-up.

Of course, it is not just our call. To have something like this, you need the provosts, the deans to approve, and I thought the trustees, but I made a mistake regarding the latter, which is that we did some RTE stuff, like, three years ago.

One of the things we did is change the bylaws so we can use emeritus as we see fit. We can have it modify any old title. Trustee approval is not necessary, but the other reason why we had this sort of 15-month gap is because of the pandemic.

There are a couple of links there, if you want more details. I sent a note to all the chairs and directors to alert their faculty about this new fringe benefit -- not a fringe benefit, academic recognition. It's really important, and I hope people take us up on it.

Three meetings ago, we had a presentation about a revised version of our Academic/Research Misconduct Policy. It's going to have a new name now, the Research Integrity Policy. We got some feedback from that meeting. We made some edits in the draft.

The draft is up on the website. We have a resolution page. That's how we get to get these things formalized. The resolution, I hope we vote on at the next meeting in two weeks is, yes, I support this new version of Policy 1.2. You can go to the resolution page, see exactly the changes that were made, register comments, and let's really try to wrap this up at the next meeting. It's an extremely important policy.

As you know, for the last three meetings, a topic in our discussions has been our international collaborations, especially as they might be of the form of a dual degree. We had a special senate last week; lots of feedback.

We have a website with that feedback on it and other things to take into consideration, but we really have to understand exactly how the administration thinks about these things. And we have in the audience today, very lucky to have Wendy Wolford, the Vice Provost for International Affairs. I believe the provost is also here. Wendy will give us a presentation, and we'll have time for questions afterwards.

Wendy.

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, Charlie. I don't know if people are lucky to have us here, but we're here.

I'm Wendy Wolford. I think I know a lot of you, but not all of you. I -- in addition to being the Vice Provost of International Affairs for the past three years, I'm a faculty member in the department of what was Development Sociology and is now Global Development in Department of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

I want to start by saying really, honestly, that I appreciate so much the conversation that you-all have been having, and I really appreciate the time to come and talk to you today. There are lot of issues on the table, a lot of issues that have been raised in the commence, in the meeting notes that I have seen and emails that have been sent directly to me.

I think about a lot of these things all the time, so I really appreciate the chance to meet with you and to have this conversation. I'm happy to come back at any time. We don't have a whole lot of time today. So if there are any specific issues in here that we should talk about further or if I can take more of your time another day for other issues related to international, I would be really pleased to. Thanks for having me.

Because there are so many different issues I think at play in this one topic of dual degrees, I have put an outline here, where I'd like to go first through our current process and the sort of infrastructure we have on campus to support and coordinate international collaborations, and then go through the principles by which we think about new collaborations.

Then, because the conversation really has focused on China, I want to talk more about how we think about China and then talk about dual degrees. I'd like to end with a proposal for the senate around the dual-degree process, and very pleased to have that conversation, to go back and torte on that proposal.

I think I have about 15, 20 minutes, then we have maybe another 20, 25 minutes for conversation, and I know Mike wants to weigh in too.

To start, I think you-all know we tend to be very faculty-driven at Cornell, and I appreciate that. We're faculty-driven when it comes to faculty and college collaborations in particular.

Most of our international relationships were formed by individual faculty members, and then sometimes they get taken up by their departments or their units. In Day Hall, we give a lot of weight to unit independence in that arena. I wish I could tell people what to do more often; but, in general, the University is fairly decentralized and fairly democratic when it comes to where people work and with whom.

Faculty usually have the right to create and also to terminate relationships with partners abroad. But a few years ago, before my time, but then when I came in as well, we realized that we needed more infrastructure at a central level in order to really support and, to some extent, coordinate international work and collaborations. This support, as you can imagine, was needed for two somewhat distinct reasons.

The first one was because we wanted more and better collaborations. This was on the heels of David Skorton's globalization effort. We wanted to be more present in the world and to do that in a way that was more effective.

The second reason why support was needed was because the international context was becoming and is becoming more and more complicated, and we needed more legal and regulatory help. I think sometimes that legal and regulatory help is seen as bureaucracy or a barrier, but I think that you'll agree in just thinking about this conversation about the dual degrees, that a lot of that legal and regulatory help is very necessary. We've created a number of new programs, new positions and new committees.

I want to go over just the key ones quickly. You have here on the slide our International Council. We created the International Council. It was Laura Spitz a couple years before I came in. The International Council includes a senior associate dean from every college and school on campus. We meet monthly and we discuss a whole variety of issues that are related to Cornell's international work and community.

People who sit on the council bring concerns from their college and school or new activities and vice versa. I take things that are coming from Central or from Day Hall.

At this point, the International Council doesn't have a real governance role. It isn't really involved in oversight in a governance sense of programs and activities, but I do think this conversation in the faculty senate has prompted us and the council to discuss the idea of creating more proactive committees, so I want to go over that at the end.

The team we have built to really help us navigate the legal and regulatory aspects of working internationally is called Global Operations. The team is led by Christine Potter. She is the executive director, and it has four people in it who specialize in international human resources; if you are working overseas or if you have a hire who is working overseas and coming

to Cornell, Travel Health and Safety, International Contracts and Compliance, and then International Entities.

This team works closely with a whole host of other institutions on campus, with OSP, with the Division of Financial Affairs, Risk Management, and counsel. The legal issues were so complicated, we have a designated lawyer in general counsel's office who works solely on international agreements and related business.

Because there's so much business around international work, Global Operations built a ticket system called Navigate for individuals in units to ask questions about any international matter, particularly around compliance concerns or how to put together an international agreement, an MOA, or a contract.

Right now, the system is called Navigate. It is changing this summer. We get about 10,000 queries a year. The group who are behind the scenes are answering and putting the queries in contact with the right units across campus or answering them directly.

Additionally, starting in 2019, Global Operations began reviewing all competitive proposals submitted through OSP that had any kind of foreign activity, and we have a definition of foreign activity. Global Operations also has to review those competitive proposals.

The Office of Sponsored Projects, also under the Vice President for Research and Innovation, has a number of functions, including the Export Control Office that helps us to understand and comply with export control laws and regulations.

Then there are a number of other committees that OVPIA sits on that have to do with reporting, compliance overseas. Because there's so many different issues working overseas, over the past couple of years, my office and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, we've worked really closely to prepare guidelines and recommendations. Sometimes those are

requirements, things you have to do when you work overseas, and sometimes they're recommendations or best practices.

Again, we don't tell people where to work or who to work with, but we do try to provide the tools for people so they can make good partnerships and good projects happen.

Manuel and I, the Vice Provost for Research, we also reach out to and we meet, not infrequently, with congressional staff in D.C. and Albany, as well as your university staff, where we advocate for the University as an international actor and as an international community. Along with our Ivy Plus peers, we try to help the government develop reasonable policies for academic who work or partner globally.

As the international arena has become more complicated, and I really think in the last four or five years, especially in the countries where we have most of our partnerships. So that is China and India or East Asia and South Asia, where that arena has become more complicated from a regulatory and a legal standpoint, it has also become more complicated from an ethical standpoint.

The paradox I see there is that international partnerships can be difficult in part for the same reason they are also really valuable. When we collaborate internationally, we're usually working with partners who speak a different language, almost at a minimum, but who also work in a different culture and who come from a different historical context.

That's part of the value of collaboration. We get to see the world from someone else's perspective, but it also is complicated because then we need to be able to agree on a set of core values when establishing an agreement. Those values have to be legible and make sense to both sides.

Moving to the ethics and the principles, in order to make sure that our basic values are enshrined in our collaborations, we do establish binding memoranda of agreements, MOAs,

with all our partners. It used to be that we were much more casual about signing MOAs with partners.

One of the things we've done in the last few years is really to clean up the existing database, to try to set aside partnerships that are no longer active or that are no longer vibrant and really to only create new ones where there is a strong connection and strong partners who we know well and who we have established a level of trust with.

The MOA, as you know -- I think you have seen it -- are based on a template that has certain nonnegotiable pieces. These pieces include protections for academic freedom, protection of intellectual property and nondiscrimination. I recognize that's on paper; I recognize that isn't always perfect in practice, but there is, at least, a written agreement that includes not only those protections, but also mechanisms for terminating or suspending those agreements for breach of contract or conduct.

I think you know that template for the MOA is on the Global Operations website, and that was, in part, because we realized from the discussion in the senate that many senators were unfamiliar with that MOA template.

We also have, as you can see here, a searchable database for these MOA. We are working with IRP in order to make this as up-to-date as possible because we want a public-facing map that shows you what MOAs we have with what organizations in each country, and then also what kind of flow we have of students back and forth, and, also, faculty partnerships, to the extent that we have that. This searchable database right now is still in progress, it's still being put together, and it includes all those partnerships with University institutions.

The MOAs have nonnegotiable elements of our core values, but they don't really provide guidance into ethical considerations that faculty should take into account when

initiating an international collaboration. This is difficult because what is ethical to one person isn't always exactly the same thing to another.

That's why we created the ethical guidelines. We did this two years ago. The guidelines grew out of a meeting with Martha and Mike and a few others, and we discussed exactly what we are discussing now, the value and the challenges of partnering globally. We drafted a set of principles, things that we felt had to be in our international partnerships.

Then a subcommittee from the International Council, it was chaired by Liz Brundige from the Law School, and also had Eli Friedman from ILR and Max Pfeffer from CALS. That team was fantastic. They reviewed and extensively commented on and revised the ethical principles.

I'm not going to read them. I think they're very good, but they do leave a fair bit of room for interpretation. I think, perhaps, the most difficult principle to nail down is the injunction to promote the social good. Again, that's because it's difficult because we don't all agree on exactly what promotes the social good.

Maybe the only thing we do agree on is that we don't want Day Hall to tell us what the social good is. That's why the ethical guidelines don't define that. Rather, they tell people make sure you're considering that and make sure you're privileging the social good when wilding relationships.

The last university-wide committee that I'll go into around values or ethics is the International Gift Review Committee that we created three years ago. This committee started as a committee that reviewed all international gifts or all gifts coming from international sources that were -- at that time it was over \$1 million. Now we've had to take it down to over \$100,000 for foreign-sourced gifts. We examined the potential solicitations for legal, ethical, and reputational issues.

Last year, this committee expanded and now reviews all potential gifts, domestic and foreign, over a certain dollar amount. This committee also includes leaders from across campus, but it also expanded just recently to include three additional faculty members so that we could discuss the issues around buildings named for controversial figures, another body that debates the ethical implications of international and, then, in this case, also domestic gift relationships.

All those resources, money the University spends, person hours, organizations, individuals, all of the meetings, all of these have been created in recent years to help people collaborate in the international arena safely, we hope, responsively, and productively.

This brings me, then, after talking about the infrastructure, to really what I think is the heart of our conversation today, which is collaborating in China. I think you all know, the number one location in the world where Cornell faculty and staff collaborate is China.

The number one country in terms of our connections out in the world is China. We have over 2,000 students. We had 2,700 students from China in the fall of 2019. We have 200-plus scholars from China, originally from China, who teach and work across campus. Most of those are full-time faculty.

We currently have 23 MOAs with China's institutions. In the last year before the pandemic, the last year that we were physically traveling in the world, our faculty took roughly double the number of trips to China as they did to any other country.

I'll give you one other example, just in my sphere. The Cornell China Center, which you are probably familiar with, we put a call for proposals out in 2019 for collaborative work with colleagues in China. The call was complicated. The proposals had to be for team projects with partners in China and applied to real-world problems.

That was in 2019, and we got 87 proposals from almost every college and school in the University. It was an astonishing response, and I worked in the Atkinson Center for four years as

a faculty director. We ran these kind of grant competitions pretty regularly; and, really, the interest in working in China was something that I had not seen before, that level of interest. They were for projects like hospital sanitation, food security, environmental resource management in the Three River Gorges and so on.

I think the reason people want to partner and work in China is because they believe that China's academics are among the best in the world. What I have heard and been told by many Cornell colleagues is that if they don't partner in China, they'll be behind the curve. Our faculty will be behind the curve in five to ten years.

Cornell's commitment, as you saw if you looked at the slides before the meeting, our commitment goes back a long way in China. We've worked there for almost 150 years. We began with agriculture and engineering and the fine arts. Our graduates are graduates who have played a real role in the modernization of politics and also the academy in China. Many of these figures here will be quite well-known to some of you.

This is, I think, part of the reason why we are in China, why we have stayed so long, because we are playing the long game, as people say. We are trying to do better science and build a bridge to a world where there is more understanding and respect across these cultural and national lines.

I would say Cornell is known in China for its work primarily in agriculture, in literature with Hu Shih, and in engineering. This is in contrast to most of our Ivy Plus peers, who got involved -- who have been involved in China for a long time, but who have invested in a heavier presence more recently. That presence has been primarily through their business schools.

Most of our peer universities now have significant brick and mortar presences in China. Duke, of course, has a campus in Shanghai; Chicago in Hong Kong, full academic campuses; and

several other peers have sizable buildings on local university campuses, so in partnership with local universities like Stanford at Peking University or Princeton at Tsinghua University.

Other peers established China Centers in the early 2010s. If you haven't been there, they're all significantly larger than Cornell's presence.

Our presence, we opened a center in 2018. We ran what is essentially one large seminar room with a conference room and two offices so that we can host Cornell faculty, students, and also alumni and do workshops, seminars, and some social events; although, of course, that hasn't happened recently.

We support the Center in China. It's a two-year lease, and we have a pretty modest budget we support, almost entirely by gifts from alumni, either from the region or people who are based in the United States who believe that we should be collaborating with China.

I want to just take a second here, because I've heard comments, of course, suggesting that we're in China just to make money from wealthy donors. I want to tell you that isn't true. We get funds from two main sources in China, from individual alumni and friends, and corporations. The total lifetime giving from the first group, from individual alumni and friends, is roughly half that of the lifetime giving from alumni who live in my home state of New Hampshire.

The majority of the money that comes into Cornell from China isn't from alumni. It is from corporate gifts and contracts. That \$17 million over the five-year period from 2014 to 2019, I think, is a big number. I think that number is going to be decreasing for a number of reasons having to do primarily with some of the tensions between the two countries, but that money is a fraction of the money that comes in to Cornell from non-China-based corporations. All contracts with corporations are very tightly regulated and very highly overseen from an intellectual property, academic freedom and security perspective.

Just really quickly, to finish this piece on funding from China, the largest China-related gift the University has received is not from a Chinese donor, but is the gift that maintains the China, Asia-Pacific Studies Program in the College of Arts and Sciences.

You're probably all familiar with this program. It has one regular student semester at Peking University. I know it's under discussion, but I do think the CAPS program is a great example of some of the benefits of collaborating in China. You can read the bios of the alumni to see what they learned during their time in China and how that experience has shaped their understanding of both cultures.

Even with this long history of working in China, there are significant concerns. There are concerns around human rights, as you all have pointed out, quite rightly. There are concerns around academic freedom and professional and personal security. These all greatly complicate our ability to work there.

It would be crazy not to take those seriously. We have to choose our partnerships and our partners carefully and well, I think, when working in the country.

I have very good friends at China Agricultural University. They spent time here at Cornell. We've had Tang scholars funded to be here at Cornell from the University, and I go to the University and work with students and I have given talks there.

One of my colleagues is in a leadership position at the University, and I know he is critical of many of the government's policies, as I am of mine. But he is critical of many of the government's policies, and he has to be careful about what he can and cannot say, but he doesn't monitor what I say. I'm glad that he can visit me here, and we've met in other places. The last time we met face-to-face, we met in Brazil.

I hope and I think that if we created a collaboration together, we would protect academic freedom and student safety and intellectual property, and I would be able to trust him

on that. But if you have a collaboration, and that collaboration can't continue, for whatever reason, and it could be any of the reasons already stated above, both sides have the mechanisms to withdraw from that relationship, and that's important.

That whole discussion brings me, then, to the Hotel School, the dual degree. This conversation with the senate has been really helpful in raising a number of issues that are related to the process for dual degrees. I think that these had been considered within a particular college, so they are the purview of that college.

But I think it has been a good point that these are actually cross-college because they are with a partner outside of the University. I will say these dual degrees are very rare. We have two. This dual degree proposed by the Hotel School would be the third, and we have left those collaborations in general up to the governance of the units proposing them.

As you know, the information that's required by IRP for all new degrees, and then by SUNY for new degrees in contract colleges, the information required is fairly extensive. Then all new degree proposals need to be reviewed by that department by the college, by The Graduate Committee, if it's a graduate degree, and by CAPP.

In considering all the points that you all have raised, though, and thinking specifically about the international arena and some of the challenges working there, I definitely agree that another layer of cross-college review for that holistic set of issues would be really valuable.

I'd like to propose that the International Council, which you saw in the first slide, that council be involved in reviewing international degree programs from this point forward, including the hotel administration dual degree. We don't get very many of these, but this could be an important step in the process.

For the hotel degree, depending on the conversation today, the International Council could take into account a report from the senate, providing by the dean of the faculty. And

Charlie can also convey the vote from the sense of the senate as one piece of information that the International Council evaluates. The policy may need to be changed in terms of how degrees get reviewed, but I would propose the International Council vote be binding.

I know I need to hand it over to Mike, but let me answer two really quick questions that came through. Peter Katzenstein asked whether our peers have dual-degree programs in China. Some of them do, and some of them don't. Yale, MIT, Penn, Duke, Columbia, and Northwestern have dual degrees with partners in China; but Harvard, Brown, Dartmouth, Stanford, Chicago, and Princeton do not.

Peter also asked whether we exchange best practices with our peers. The answer is yes. The Ivy Plus Vice Provost for International Affairs, there are 14 of us, so Ivy Plus-plus, meet every two weeks, and we discuss everything from international students to international collaborations. We spend quite a bit of time on China.

Allen Carlson asked what would happen if one of our students or faculty were disciplined by a foreign government and disciplined for actions that we believe to be consistent with Cornell values; students doing something that was consistent with Cornell values who then were disciplined by a foreign government. And Mike and my answer is that we would protect the students and faculty and suspend the program. That would need to be evaluated, that would need to be reviewed, but I think protection would be the number one issue, and suspension, were that found to have been the case.

With that, I will turn it over to Mike for any comments, and then open it up. Thanks, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Wendy.

Mike, did you want to say something?

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Sure. That was terrific, Wendy.

Look, these are very complicated issues. And I sense, having listened to this debate in the Faculty Senate over the last few weeks, or listened to most of it, there are a lot of divisions amongst the faculty or different points of view about how we value engagement versus our appropriate outrage at some of the actions that the Chinese government undertakes. And, of course, this is one example of international agreements, and we have many other countries with many different levels of concerns associated with their degree of democracy.

I come back to my original comments when we started this discussion. I believe we need a process which is manageable and respect the views of the faculty around general principles. I again urge the Faculty Senate not to push for a process in which every individual program comes to the Faculty Senate and then meets this disagreement, really, amongst the faculty about how we value engagement versus value democracy, but rather articulate general principles, ask the International Council, as Wendy has recommended, a group of faculty, to use those principles as guidelines in approving programs.

Co: ^^^^ please check that with the audio

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Mike. We'll probably jettison the third agenda item. That will give us an extra 20 minutes. I want to make sure we have enough time with both Wendy and Mike here to really run this to a good level. We can take questions now.

Why don't we take down the slides, Jill, so we can see each other a little better.

Use the chat. We'll make sure Wendy and Mike get the chat as part of the feedback package. Do we have some particular questions from the floor for either Mike or Wendy?

TJ.

TJ HINRICHS: Thank you so much for the clarifications. Regarding our discussions with our peer-research universities especially, besides just talking through the issues and how to respond, I was imagining there might be situations in which Cornell might worry about some

kind of retaliation, which is something that people in the business community seem to be facing. I was wondering in that case whether there was also a discussion of collective response, because Cornell responding on its own might make less of an impact than a collective response.

WENDY WOLFORD: Can I just ask if you could clarify what you mean by retaliation? The business community is concerned --

TJ HINRICHS: One of the things, reports have been trickling out the last couple of years of business people, for example, not being allowed to leave the country, being denied exit visas, not on the basis of something that they said or did, but on the basis of some other situation that has to do with what their government is doing or what their company might be doing or something else.

The faculty that work in China -- and this might be less common in the agriculture and STEM fields. But the faculty who work in the humanities and then just young students can transgress boundaries, along with their Chinese peers, innocently, and face consequences, as was reported for a group of students who held a birthday party, as reported in "The Washington Post" this morning.

These kinds of situations can happen. And rather than trying to get on top of that, if and when it hits Cornell in some way, I would be reassured if there was strategies at least discussed for how to deal with those situations in advance; and especially not just at the level of Cornell, of a higher, more collective level, which could be more effective.

WENDY WOLFORD: By higher level, one potential would be for the Ivy schools to be in coordination and be able to make a statement. We tend to do a lot of things together, so we coordinate our response on things that matter across the colleges, not usually something specific to a specific collaboration.

NYU, of course, and Duke, they have their own specific issues or challenges because they have a whole campus, but the Ivy League does tend to collaborate on responses externally. I think it would depend on the specific issue at hand. I do think Allen's point in the chat about having something in writing that would be anticipatory and able to look ahead at the kind of challenges that would come, I think putting something in that's quite -- that calls out the potential difficulty quite so clearly might be over-stepping and anticipating something too much, but that would be the sort of thing we would need to be prepared for and think about how to act on.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you.

Joe Margulies.

JOE MARGULIES: Thanks. Wendy, I want to pick up on the last thing that you said. I thought it was a very good presentation, and I appreciate the care that you've put into it. I appreciate also the suggestion that your committee would now have a veto power over a proposed agreement, but I want to push back on the suggestion that I gather you taking that delineating red lines, lines in the sand that if they were crossed or comparable transgressions were made would have consequences, and those consequences would include termination of the program, that you are shying away from that.

I would strongly encourage that. Those red lines can be drawn in collaboration with your committee and the Faculty Senate or a portion of it, of the sort that Allen has already proposed, and we can imagine others, that not only provides some transparency to all the actors involved, it also alerts the Chinese government of that which we will not tolerate, we will not abide.

There is never a disincentive, there is never a lack of value in making that commitment clear. So I'm curious if you could explain why you would resist that.

WENDY WOLFORD: I think it's difficult to know ahead of time all the different issues that could come up. I think the statements about academic freedom and the statements about nondiscrimination are quite clear. Those should be our guide, and we should use those when any given situation comes up. I think those are legally and ethically very powerful.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Very good.

Richard Bensel, then Carl.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thanks, Wendy. I have sort of a clarification question. As I heard your presentation -- this is an interpretation. I would ask if you agree with it or not -- I asked if you were open to a pause in the consideration of the Hotel School-Peking University proposal, and that pause would include withdrawal of the sense of the senate resolution now pending before the Faculty Senate.

If we did that, then we could work on the creation -- you outlined it -- general process through which joint degree programs and other programs that might come within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate would be reviewed before coming before the Faculty Senate for discussion and a vote. Once that process is in place, we would then renew consideration of the Hotel School-Peking University proposal in light of that process. That's my interpretation of what you were saying.

Is there anything in that interpretation that you disagree with?

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, Richard. I don't control what the Faculty Senate does, so I can't tell you whether you should have the vote or delay the vote.

What I was suggesting is that if you took the vote, have the discussion and had a vote, after you had these three meetings dedicated to this conversation, that input would go into the International Council deliberation on the full proposal put forward by the Hotel School.

The Hotel School has quite a bit of description of their proposed degree. We have the conversation and the vote in the senate. There is also the discussion in the Graduate Committee and the discussion in CAPP and the International Council --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You're frozen, Wendy. Are you finished with your response there, Wendy?

WENDY WOLFORD: Sorry. I did finish. It was just to say that we would take that vote, then, under advisement.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Excellent. 4:30 is our deadline here. We have another 15 minutes, so everyone who's posing questions, please be brief.

Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you very much. Thanks for the presentation. Very interesting. The anticipation of problems in business occurred a long time ago when we heard of China's requirements on businesses that would deal with giving up intellectual property.

The question I would pose is what requirements are in the dual-degree program is China placing on us?

WENDY WOLFORD: I don't know if all of you have seen the IRP form with all of the information that's been filled out for the degree with the different courses that would be taken from the two different institutions. It's important that it's not a joint degree.

I think Richard said a joint degree, and I meant to correct that, because that's a very different thing. That is actually one degree that everybody participates in. In this case, it is two separate degrees, and the Hotel School here at Cornell would take a certain number of credits, almost like a transfer student, from Peking University.

That's not to minimize the fact it is a very close collaboration, but just to say the expectations are that the students would fulfill the requirements for a Cornell degree, and the

Chinese government and Peking University do not get a say in the Cornell requirements for the Cornell degree. There is a separate degree that is the Peking University degree in hotel management. That degree is under the Peking University management.

CARL FRANCK: I'm not concerned about those details. I'm concerned about these issues. We've raised concerns.

Does China raise concerns about our behavior?

WENDY WOLFORD: Not that I know of. I might not be understanding what you're asking.

CARL FRANCK: I'm just looking at it from the other point of view, from the other side.

WENDY WOLFORD: No. They would sign the MOA that we provide that has the requirements around academic freedom, intellectual property, and nondiscrimination. They have not added additional requirements.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you very much.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Ken?

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you, Charlie.

Wendy, I thought that was an extremely clear presentation, and I'm appreciative that you came and talked to us about this.

The question that Magnus raised in the chat -- I don't know if you had a chance to see it because it came up while you were talking -- is the thing I would be curious about.

He describes a situation in which NYU faculty were cautioned not to talk about certain topics because it would be illegal to do so in China and they would be at risk. If I think about the hotel management program, the obvious kinds of issues might relate to business planning for a hotel that might have a chain partly in Taiwan and be interested in expanding it to China or vice versa, that would obviously cross a line from the Chinese point of view, or Hong Kong, or you

could think of many other scenarios where a business, a prudent international business perspective would force the faculty member to talk about how one would analyze those risks. But doing that physically in China could be viewed as provocative.

How would we deal with that? Are our faculty going to be warned that certain types of even financial discussion could cause them to be arrested as they step out of the room?

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, Ken.

A significant part of the degree in the case of this specific degree would be taught in Ithaca. There won't be, as far as I understand, any requirements placed on faculty to talk about or not talk about different issues. It is a hotel degree, so I think they feel that many of the issues that would be particularly sensitive wouldn't necessarily come up in the regular running of that degree. But the students enrolled would also spend significant time here on our campus.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Joanie.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks for your presentations.

I want to reiterate and raise the point that Magnus just made in the chat, too.

Mike, you've advised us to stick to general guidelines and not to micromanage on the details of specific programs, but we haven't these guidelines, the ethical guidelines.

Considering what's happening in China now and how quickly things have been changing and that there is genocide happening now, and students have been detained, it's an increasingly dangerous situation. I don't understand how this program is going forward meeting our existing guidelines.

I want some assurance that people are aware of the situation and engaging with faculty here who know so much about what's happening in China and are prepared to change course rapidly, responding to what's happening so that -- to recognize the severity of the situation that is going on. Thank you.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: If I can respond.

I'm not sure which guidelines you're referring to. I think Wendy had laid out a process that we go through that results in a signed agreement between institutions --

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: The guidelines are ethical international engagement, representing freedom of inquiry, value human rights that you published in November of 2019, you and Wendy together.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: I see. Yeah, the real question here, seems to me, you are asking is do these dual-degree agreements or other research agreements or the CAPS program that we have, are there sufficient safeguards that basically state these principles and result in an agreement between institutions about those principles.

I think the answer is yes; although, I think they are legitimate questions about, well, what do we do if they don't abide by them; what do we do if other difficult or heinous things occur?

But Joanie, we feel like we've got a process that has stated those guidelines, is very clear about them, and then has a process that results in an agreement between institutions that essentially embodies those guidelines.

That is between our institutions. We can't control national government activities. We don't, of course, constrain national government activities, but for the purposes of what we are doing in educating students, their students and ours, we, I think, embody those guidelines in our agreements.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's move on. Very brief questions here, please, Risa, then David, then Durba, then that really is it. We have to get to other stuff. Risa, quickly.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I'd like to hear more about the proposal that Wendy put up there about more transparency, because what I think is the best way to respect everybody's role

in this is -- picking up on some other things that people have said -- is to not only have CAPP involved, but also have CAPP report to the Faculty Senate for the Senate to vote, based on a recommendation from CAPP, and for both CAPP and the senate to have full access to reports that have been written and information that's been provided with regard to the either dual or joint degrees, whatever it is, for those programs to explain what considerations have been taken and what information's been considered with regard to the guidelines used to approve programs, including those ethical guidelines.

Seems to me, that's both transparency and it's also a respect for shared governance. I think it should be done with regard to the Hotel School program, along the lines of what Richard Bensele is saying, and also going forward in the future.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Wendy?

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, Risa.

CAPP did have access to the IRP template with all the information. I don't think it typically gets shared with the full senate. That's something that CAPP has had purview over.

I think that CAPP should make a report that makes sense to the full senate, before Faculty Senate sense of the senate vote; but seems, to me, that once we can put up those IRP guidelines for information on the website, so everybody can see what is asked of the programs when they're joining a venture like this, then I think it should probably be the purview of senate to have a discussion, but also the International Council to consider the proposal against the ethical guidelines.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you. David Lee. Quickly, please.

DAVID LEE: Yeah. David Lee, Dyson School. Thank you for the excellent presentation, Wendy.

I had a question, perhaps for rhetorical, that you may want to just briefly answer or address, and that is it sort of stems from a point that you made that I think has a logical corollary that you didn't make explicit.

I have been working internationally for almost 40 years and have worked in many countries with many different types of governments, the entire range at various times. It's a simple question, which is our relationships with China picked up in the early '80s. That was 40 years ago.

The question is: Are we better off because we've had that relationship? And 40 years ago, China had a very repressive government, extremely repressive, 45 years ago, before the opening in '78, '80, '82. Are we better off as an institution, as a community?

I would argue strongly we are better off. That's not to minimize the importance or the severity of what's going on now and the importance of this discussion, but I really think your point about the long game is very important here, and that we keep our eye on the long game. If you have any additional comments, fine; but that was really the point I wanted to make. Thank you.

WENDY WOLFORD: Thanks, David. No, I think you said it well. I don't disagree and don't really have anything to add.

One thing I'll say is about the sort of collaboration on the business front, that I do think, in some ways, collaboration between businesspeople across the U.S. and China is one of those arenas where mutual understanding can really work for the better of the relationship between the two countries.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Wendy. Durba, wrap it up.

DURBA GHOSH: I'm going to be quick. I'm Durba Ghosh, faculty in the history Department, also very involved in the South Asia program, so I travel and have researched for 30 years in South Asia.

One of the things I've reflected on -- something Wendy said early in the presentation -- is a lot of what we prize about being faculty is having the freedom and the trust of the University in forging collaborations internationally, so I'm really, really appreciative, Wendy, of some of the guardrails that your office has set up to kind of enable these collaborations.

I think one of the things I see here, and this is dovetailing on David's point, this is a really complicated situation, but it does impact on our students and, of course, impacts on our faculty. In some ways, I'd really like to see us move forward in a process where individual faculty ability to forge collaborations remains intact, to some degree, and is not somehow bureaucratized into a process by which we can't be trusted to make the decisions that we need to make, in order to figure out ways to educate undergraduates and do our research, which is what we're here to do.

I'll just end with that. I know Charlie's giving me the time's up eyeball. Thank you, Wendy and Mike. Thank you to all the senators. I'm really impressed with the really careful engagement on the issue.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yes. Thank you, Durba. Thank you, Wendy and Mike, for coming. We'll be in touch.

I see the chat has record length and there will be lots of interesting things to go over with that.

Once again, thank you very much, and we'll continue to work on this and be in touch.

WENDY WOLFORD: Thank you.

MICHAEL KOTLIKOFF: Thanks, everybody.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's go back to the slides. The stuff on the tenure track resolutions, we'll just put off, hopefully maybe to the March 31 meeting. I want to make sure on the table is that everyone knows the final report from the working group on the proposed Center.

I'm going to skip and dance through these slides, because we've felt it is much better to hear from particular faculty about what the Center would mean to them and how they think of it, instead of having another PowerPoint from me.

There's the working group. We have been in business since the summer. So a couple of questions about why we have centers. This is not particular to this particular center, but let's review why we have those things. The main reason is they can do things that departments, schools, and colleges can't do.

How do they do it? How do they elevate the quality of scholarship? The key thing is they provide infrastructure for collaboration. That can mean programming and space and other things. That's how they work. Why are they incredibly important in terms of outside perceptions? The reason is centers become sort of authorities, go-to authorities that the public sees and consults with. It is extremely important to have them for that reason. Just a couple of high-level things about centers.

In the general area of developing a center that's concerned with antiracism, gender issues, migration, you can see all the key words up there. There's no question; our peers are on board with doing these things. I don't have dates when these things were set up. That might be kind of interesting to look at, but you can see there a tremendous lineup. All our peers are working on this problem in a concentrated way. I'm sure they have a whole network of centers on their campus, but they find a way here to focus on this particular and very important topic.

It's not to say we are extremely active in this area ourselves. We have close to 100 different centers on campus. We looked at 20 or 25 of them. These are centers and programs that engage in various ways in this general topic. We are in this field of study, most definitely.

Here's a schematic about how we envision this. When you look at this, to me, I sort of think of it as the Hawaiian islands. This is a place I want to visit. Look at those connections. The idea here is that if you visit a center, and centers are known for the people who show up there, the people and the students and the kind of work they do.

We have a tremendously attractive campus for this kind of work, and we see the Center as being a node for that kind of activity. In the lower left corner, you see various student-centric activities, things that resonate perhaps with the Public Service Center and some of our other units that get students out of the classroom, into the community, doing things, applying what they learn on campus.

Some of the attributes of the Center -- and, again, the report's a nine-pager. We'll get an executive summary out. I know everybody is incredibly busy -- but some standards. The idea of theme years, much like the Society for the Humanities has. You have a theme, people come from around the country and the world to be here for that semester or year. We have an important obligation for developing pipelines to the academy for BIPOC students, undergrads, grads, and post-docs. That's part and will be part of the scene.

We know about the A.D. White Professor Program. We bring stars to campus. They come for two weeks, they give great lectures, show up in undergraduate classrooms, and so on. Same kind of thing, only professors of the practice program, bringing to campus recognized leaders, not from academia, but from the public and civic sectors.

This will slide into the comments we'll now hear pretty soon, deep collaboration with the library and several other units on campus. Again, we thought very hard, ever since we got

going, the first thing we heard is not another center. We're absolutely convinced this center really will add to the quality of work in this area on campus.

This is a no-brainer for us. This is a dramatic example, this upcoming conference on campus. Here are the players in that particular event. You can see the whole can be greater than the sum of the parts, if you do it right. If you do it wrong, it's another layer of bureaucracy, but we are convinced we have a way of doing it right.

To sum up, and this is in Martha's July 26th note to the entire community, the idea is to amplify research and scholarship. We're very strong in this area; a lot of talent. Let's shape it and magnify the impact of our colleagues are having in this area.

Enough of me. On to our guests. I asked Jamila and Gerald and Andrew to come and just informally -- they have all been students of this exercise that we've been engaged in for months now. Jamila is on the Center Working Group. I just said, hey, ten minutes, just tell us what you think about this idea, where you see the potential and so on.

Jamila.

JAMILA MICHENER: Hi, everyone. I'm happy to chime in here. I'm going to assume that I'm heard and all is well, unless I start getting hands waved and such.

As Charlie mentioned, I have been a part of Working Group C. I have some perspective based on that experience, and then some perspective that's unique to me, idiosyncratic, and that's rooted in my own experiences, as someone who studies racism and public policy and equality as a scholar, and someone who exists as a black faculty member on campus.

I will say it's good to always start, I think, on a note of honesty. When I first came to Working Group C, I agreed to sort of be a part of it because I wanted to see what would go on, but not necessarily because I was sold on the idea of having a center. I approached the work of

the working group with a fair bit of cynicism, which is how I approach most things, so not terribly surprising.

But I had some healthy skepticism about the kind of watering down of any effort that can happen when it becomes more deeply institutionalized, and I think this is probably especially a risk when it comes to antiracism efforts that were sort of spurred on by an astute set of events and that were creating demands.

I worried there was, perhaps, an inclination to act, but if that inclination wasn't followed through with a real and a deep institutional commitment, we could end up with something that sort of institutionalized antiracism as a goal, but did so weakly and did so in ways that, if anything, hindered efforts to advance antiracism in scholarship and practice on campus. That was one concern I had.

Another concern was a genuine kind of worry about the implications of this center for other units on campus, especially, although certainly not limited to, Africana Studies and other kind of ethnic studies units on campus.

Then I also had a concern about whether the Center would tax already overburdened and overtaxed faculty, staff, and students of color. I say all this to set a context for you-all, knowing that I didn't walk into this process sort of starry-eyed thinking, ooh, another center. It must be a positive end in and of itself. Not at all. Even the folks that are like, oh, another center. We have so many centers. That was something that I thought, as well.

What happened in the process of the work that we did as a working group, the process of envisioning and planning a center, as that process unfolded, we actually talked about extensively a lot of these critical questions that I've raised and we addressed directly a lot of the points of skepticism that I had.

Those conversations aren't always easy, and they weren't always straightforward. Some of them are conversations we'll continue to have, but I was certainly struck and impressed by how thoughtfully and consistently we grappled with these questions, with the difficulty of them, and how we thought through -- and I think this is reflected in the proposal -- ways of making sure we avoided some of the challenges and the pitfalls that I entered into the process worried about being possibilities.

I was especially moved, I have to say, in my time with Working Group C, by my engagement with the students of color, who lent themselves to this process, their time and their energy, and who were initially part of the kind of demands that bubbled up for this kind of an institution, for this kind of a center, and really understanding what a center like this meant to them, how important it was to them and to the work that they did, often what sort of moved me away from the cynicism and skepticism and problem-oriented thinking that is likely natural for many of us -- it certainly is for me -- and towards a kind of recognition of potential challenges, but more of a focus on how to overcome them to advance this initiative and effort.

I'll also add that as co-director of the Cornell Center for Health Equity and co-director of a new initiative on campus, I cofounded called PRICE, the Politics of Race, Immigration, Class, and Ethnicity, and a member of the public policy implementation Committee, and the chair of the board for the Cornell First in Education Program -- I do a lot of things -- I'm connected to a range of institutions on campus.

I was thinking about all of these institutions as I engaged in the work we did as a working group. I was very attuned to, and in many ways, sensitive to whether the Center could potentially displace or overburden or, in any way, whether incidentally or directly, any of these institutions that I'm connected to.

Instead, what I found myself thinking of, as we planned and envisioned the Center, were points of connection, potential opportunities for kind of reinforcing the work of other units and centers and efforts across campus.

Given the various roles that I play on campus, it really struck me that a carefully considered, well-planned, and inclusive center -- so there's a caveat that's important -- can really be a central institutional node on campus for advancing, enhancing, and supporting the work of antiracism in research, in pedagogy, in engagement among faculty and students, graduate students and undergraduates alike, and our partners, community partners on campus and beyond. There's so many possibilities that are rife here.

I'll end here by saying there are always pitfalls alongside possibilities. I don't say any of this from a place of naïveté or from a place of assuming that there couldn't be such a thing as a Center for Antiracism like the one we are imagining that ended up being a net negative for campus. That is a possibility.

But what I saw, working in the working group, is that the kind of deliberation, the thoughtfulness, the creativity, and -- I think this will be very important -- the accountability I saw reflected in the working group. If we can extend that and continue it through the process of developing and envisioning and ultimately enacting and implementing this center, then the possibilities can really manifest as a real thing.

That will be a benefit for faculty and students and other folks on campus and beyond, in particular faculty and students and staff of color. That means we have to do it right, and we have to be thinking carefully about who is harmed and who isn't, about what the benefits are and what the burdens are, and about what sorts of resources and commitments need to be invested in a center like this to make it a net positive on campus.

But if we do those things, I think there are lots of fruitful connections and possibilities here, and I am excited about them, both personally, as a black faculty member on campus, and professionally, given all of the different ways that I operate institutionally across Cornell. I'll leave it there. Thanks.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks an awful lot, Jamila. Really appreciate that.

We'll go through the list here, the others, then we'll have time for questions.

Gerald. University librarian, Gerald Beasley.

GERALD BEASLEY: Thanks, Charlie. And thanks, Jamila, as well. What a great description of the proposal.

I'm going to -- just to let you know, I will speak very briefly. I'm going to introduce co-chair of the senate's Faculty Library Board, Drew Hicks, whose photograph is, I think, in front of you, then I'm going to do my best to answer any questions you may have.

In this very short introduction, what I really wanted to say is just how thrilled I am to see the library named as a potential collaborator in the working Group C's report on the proposed center. The library would be honored to collaborate with such a center, we would love to be asked to host such a center.

That's really the strongest part of my message. Please do put questions in the chat box. If I don't get time to answer them, then I'm sure I'll get to answer them later, and that will be a pleasure. I look forward to it.

Right now, what I'd like to do is introduce Professor Hicks. Drew, as you know, is an associate professor from the Department of Music Program, in Medieval Studies, as well, and co-chair of the senate's Faculty Library Board.

Drew, I haven't seen you on the call, but I'm hoping you're here.

DREW HICKS: I am here. A pleasure to speak on behalf of a unanimous Faculty Library Board, which has both put together a statement, which I'll talk about in a moment, that has been shared with Working Group C, but also was a focus of a discussion of one of the initial drafts of the working group's proposal. It met with unanimous enthusiasm and support for the library's continued integration and work with the proposed center.

Our discussion focused really on three things. First off, in terms of the possibility of the library being the physical host, what that allows for is a kind of integration of the Center into the fabric of the University. Libraries across campus are part of the daily life of so many of our students, of our faculty and our staff, and locating the Center within the library in some way allows it to participate in that already-established and vibrant network.

What that does, then, is it increases the visibility of the Center, such that it's not merely a destination, but it is something that is encountered as part of the intellectual and social fabric of the campus itself; but also in ways that Jamila was talking about, it can allow for new connections and new lenses on many of the library's holdings, both specific collections, as well as the connections between those collections.

One thing we did talk about is what the final location of the Center could be. I think the answer is we don't have enough information to really start thinking about that, except to say that in our statement, we didn't include the words "centrally located," because we also recognize the idea of identifying a center is itself a kind of ideological, as well as geographical question.

We think that is a question that needs to be very, very carefully considered and certainly one the library is excited about considering carefully.

Our discussion, rather, focused on the collaboration as enabling connections and activities that span multiple libraries and spaces, and that the ultimate location allows for those networks to happen.

I'll conclude just by reading the statement that was not passively, but actively, unanimously agreed upon by the Faculty Library Board.

"The Faculty Library Board offers its unanimous support for Cornell University Library's integral collaboration with the proposed center, including, but not limited to, the library's hosting the physical location of the Center. The library provides a space that is not confined to a single college or a single discipline, it is deeply integrated into the lives of our students, faculty and staff, and that has a wide-reaching presence throughout the university.

"The intellectual and social reach of the library can inform and shape the life of the Center, and the Center can make visible the range of library resources that document the history of oppression and dispossession that record the voices of active and activist resistance, and that chart alternative paths to a more equitable future.

"The Faculty Library Board acknowledges that no single physical location has been proposed, and that the final decision will depend, in part, on the needs of the Center. We feel strongly that the final location should not indicate ownership of the Center or dictate its focus or scope; but to the contrary, by locating the Center within the library, its activities will extend across all library spaces, resources and collections, including Africana; Crop ASA, Asia; the RMC; Catherwood and so many more and, therefore, across the Ithaca campus as a whole.

"In short, by locating the Center within the library, the Center will be, like the library itself, located everywhere. It is an ideal partnership."

Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Andrew. Let's take down the slides. We have some time for questions. Just a reminder, remember, what exits the Senate goes to Mike and Martha and to the deans. Resources are then taken up, including, of course, physical location, which is certainly a very parent resource that has to be figured out.

Just a little reminder about the framework there. I would like to -- perhaps at the next meeting, we can continue to discuss this and perhaps then vote on our support of this proposal.

Do we have questions here for any of the panelists or speakers here with their excellent perspectives and comments? Everyone's still talking about the international stuff.

I started out thinking very much of what Jamila talked about, what would be the environmental impact on the other centers that we have on campus. I, too, was somewhat skeptical about it; but as things emerged, I got more and more enthusiastic about it and could see the advantage of having a focused center on this particular topic.

Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thanks so much. One of the ideas that came up at the very beginning was that the Center could provide scholarly material that would go into the education of students and faculty. Can you give us any thoughts you have on those lines? In other words, how to guide the courses or whatever it is, the trainings and stuff like that, will the Center function in that role?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The answer is yes. Maybe Neema, would you like to respond to that?

NEEMA KUDVA: Thanks for that, Carl. The proposal contains a section on how the governance of the literacy part of the educational requirement that the Working Group S, I think, that the working group put together would actually sit within the Center. That is a part of

the proposal. But like Charlie pointed out, the proposals go to the provost and the president, and then the implementation part gets handed there.

The other thing we are finding out in terms of these educational requirements for students -- we knew this always -- that our curricula, we know they are managed by colleges and departments. The interaction there between something that we're trying to articulate as a central priority with the fact that the curricula are actually managed at the departmental and the college level, it's going to need a lot of coordination, and coordination by purr situation.

As Charlie and I have been doing -- someone called it this morning, the road show. We go from meeting to meeting, selling this thing. The responses have been interesting. There's a great deal of openness to thinking through new ideas.

And one of the ideas the working group had was to think about an experimental year. Charlie really encouraged that idea. So we're trying to find a group of partners who would take this experimental year forward, to test out all these questions, and the question of the govern fans of the literacy part signature in the Center. Long answer, but I hope it covers the question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I learned a tremendous amount from the students. And in local history, the library has holdings that really speak to this in a very direct way.

Gerald, maybe you could elaborate on that?

GERALD BEASLEY: That's absolutely right. We're super-excited for lots of reasons about this proposal and to be included in the collaboration; But, certainly, one of them we feel we have a lot of academic resources that we could put towards the mission of the Center and make them available. This is very exciting for us. It's something that we do, of course, but for the whole university, it would be an honor. I think it would play for our strongest suit, if you like, to be able to do that for a Center on Antiracism.

JAMILA MICHENER: Can I quickly chime in? Shannon asked a question in the chat. Shannon asked how will resources flow back to existing units on campus who are already doing antiracism research, et cetera.

I know we can read the chat, so I won't repeat it. But, in part, one of the answers is we don't know, because the details about how resources will flow are a matter of implementation that hasn't really been within the purview of the committee.

But another answer -- and this is what I think is a possibility, and it will only become manifest depending on what the implementation looks like here -- but the possibility I find exciting here is that the Center can be an institution that either kind of works with other units on campus that are doing this work, and often over-burdened doing it, to balance out some of those burdens and to provide resources to do so.

What I hear is a concern, well, people are already doing this, and why can't they get resources to do what they're already doing, as opposed to having this whole new thing that ostensibly resources will flow to instead. I think the logic I have is that, yes, people are already doing it. Often, they are doing it with insufficient support, so we can have a kind of institutional node that identifies where this is happening on campus and is thinking systematically about how to reinforce and support and provide resources for that work, as opposed to a bunch of different places doing it and kind of hoping for and scratching for resources. There's like a central channel for amplifying the needs, as far as resources are concerned.

NEEMA KUDVA: Just to add to that, and I completely agree with Jamila. It is about amplifying what's happening and not taking away.

The other piece of it, Shannon, if you look at the governance portion of the document, we spent a lot of time, we broke up into subgroups and spent a lot of time thinking about

activism, engagement, academics, the amplification, as Jamila pointed out, as well as governance.

The governance part of the Center, that part of the proposal pays careful attention to bringing in core graduate fields and units who already are doing this kind of work, the scholarship, the engagement, the activism; to bring them back into the governance of the Center itself. That's another piece of thinking about how the Center amplifies and doesn't take away from the work that's currently being done.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa. Then we'll call it a day and go into the hallway chat. Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Yeah. This was exactly the place in the discussion I had wanted to come in. Not saying there's anything wrong with the word "amplify," but I would think more in terms of advocacy, that the Center could really advocate for resources going to programs which have, for years, been doing wonderful work on shoestring budgets -- and shoestring may be too generous -- that's what's really needed.

At Cornell, so often, we're put in competition with each other because of the way the structures are created, that one department's gain is another's loss. Seems to me -- in labor law, we use the word "mutual aid or protection," to give that notion of the concerted activity we engage in for the benefit of all.

It's an advocacy issue that we have each other's backs and we do not see their getting resources as our losing them, but to make sure the resources do go where they're needed, and the Center would have that clout to be able to do that.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. Again, Jamila raised the question of the students. I think for the students, for our students, a really big concern -- they came around this question with the idea of having a cultural center, a center that supports their thriving on campus.

When you thrive, you do well in all aspects of your life, of your academics and all of those pieces. There is that piece to it, and that kind of comes together with what you're talking about, Risa, as mutual aid and support and to sort of provide that. That's a piece of this.

When the library got identified as one of the spaces that could also become part of this conversation, it was very much about that sense of a space that was not just about academics, but it was about advocacy, it was about activism, it was about advocacy for our faculty and our students so they can do the best work that they want to do. That's very much a piece of that, especially for the students. It was very important and they pushed hard for it, so want to acknowledge that as well.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I'm talking also specifically about advocacy -- resources to go to the others. I know, Jamila, you wrote a note there, and I am assuming you mean that, as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Anyone else would like to bring up a comment? I know we're very busy. I do hope in the next two weeks, you have a chance to look over the report. We'll get some kind of one-page executive summary or whatever it's called, so people can really get their heads around it. To me, it's a pretty exciting development, and I'm really happy with what we did there.

Thank you, Jamila and Andrew and Gerald. We'll be in touch.