

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2021

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Welcome, everybody, the 17th Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year, which is a new record.

Happy to have put up here the land acknowledgment statement, and very important that we understand that and appreciate it. And you also see the usual Zoom advice over there in the right panel.

We continue to be on this roller coaster. We know the Chauvin trial ended yesterday. There are messages for us all up and down that whole episode. One of them is sort of the bravery of some of the bystanders who took steps to record things and, kind of important to point out, the awareness that they showed would not have been possible without the millions of people who, over the months, have been actively protesting these issues. And of course, we have them here on campus. That is partly why we are having this session today on the various final reports of the working groups.

I have one announcement. We all know we are in the middle of a faculty election, which started last Monday and will continue till next Friday. There's an electorate that's very clearly defined by these titles. I'm just showing the RTE faculty title.

Through a mistake, some additional title-holders were emailed ballots. The assembly office knows about this. Steps will be taken after the polls close, to make sure those ballots are not counted. I double checked on their process, and there will be virtually no violations of the secret ballot process. I apologize for that, but it's a solved problem, will be a solved problem when the election is over and we tabulate the results.

Let me just pause right here. Are there any questions on those announcements or anything you would like to bring up?

Before we get into the actual reports, a little bit of background, just to understand and appreciate where we're coming from.

There have been projects like this over the years, about 30 years' worth of projects, and we looked at a lot of them. A lot of them are deep-sixed after they are done, and we don't want that to happen. Anyway, we paid attention to that history.

Starting last summer, when Martha made her announcements, we've been engaged in this almost full-time. The point of showing you this is the visibility of all the different steps. We've had both websites up there, memberships on those committees have been visible, the meeting minutes of those committees, working groups has been visible. That took us up to this year, where we wrapped up those three working group reports.

There have been some comments about how we do business, roughly speaking. There were no votes in those working groups. The way we worked was we had meetings and we had minutes, we had rough drafts, second rough drafts. There was a group editing project.

I'm pulling up one sample email, in case you are interested in this. It would go something like, here's a rough draft. We've got to hear from you, by Thursday, concerns, wordsmithing, anything. Dozens of these types of emails have gone out over the semester.

Where are we right now? In this meeting, we'd like to have the final discussion of the C report, and continued discussion of the other two reports. Following tomorrow, we'll launch a one-week Qualtrics email vote on the center proposal. Two weeks from today, we'll have the final discussion on the S and F reports, and that will also be followed by an e-vote. This was laid out for you Saturday morning, in my message to the senators.

There's another way of thinking about where we are. It has to do with the process. This has to be stressed, because I think there's quite a bit of confusion between this phase and the

next phase, which can be thought of as the implementation phase. This was drafted by Martha. It is on the very home page of the whole antiracism working group.

The idea is for the working groups to deliver to the senate, which they have done, their final recommendation. It was understood all along that, before anything is sent to the president and provost, that there would be discussion and possible modification in the senate. When we say it goes to the president and the provost, it really means going to the president, the provost, and all the deans and others who would be impacted by this financially and academically.

To say that we're going to vote on the recommendations in a report is to say that we are going to vote on sort of a corresponding resolution. The way they were originally phrased here was just, you know, one little whereas there, and then the following. The Senate endorses, yes or no, endorses the recommendations that are in that particular report.

It emerged over the last week or two that, again, there was nothing stated here about the importance of faculty engagement during the implementation phase. Again, there's this idea or metaphor the Senate acts on something, throws it over the wall and then, without further ado, the administration acts on it. That's not the case. We modified these resolutions to reflect that. We modified the be it resolved.

Instead of sort of all or nothing, to say that when you vote on this resolution or a particular resolution, what you are saying is every recommendation in there is worthy of careful consideration. Doesn't mean you agree with it or not. It means it rises to a level where it's worthy of careful consideration.

And then two follow-ups; one is that we expect broad, transparent consultation, if any decision leads to an implementation. Sometimes, that will touch one of our standing committees, and also the senate. Just a reaffirmation that when something exits from here,

that doesn't mean that we never seen it again; that there is a follow-up involving faculty in the implementation phase.

What does that mean in terms of voting yes or no? Let me stress it again. If you vote yes, what you are sort of saying is that the ideas in the report have sufficient potential to be considered for implementation, and that you trust the continued engagement of the faculty and the senate thereafter. If you vote no, you're sort of looking at the report, saying the recommendations are so off that they shouldn't even be considered by the president and provost, even if there's effective faculty engagement along the way. That's sort of the one way you might want to think of voting yes and no.

Let's now talk about the C report. Compared to F and S, many fewer concerns have been registered, but there have been a few. Let me just mention them.

There's a line in the report where it says basically the Center pays attention to current events, all the while, having a long-term research agenda and sticking to it. Some individuals have looked at that and concluded well, the thing is just going to respond to current events. What's on the news tonight is going to determine what the Center does tomorrow. That's an exaggeration, but there is a concern about that. Again, just read that more carefully; that the expectation there will be a long-term research agenda, and that continues on.

A good way to think about this is what the Arts College did this year in response to the news. Last summer, we had all these terrible things happening, and that prompted the Arts College to create a hugely successful lecture series called Racism in America. That's responding to the news, but it's on a very considered basis.

This concern actually brings up this issue about implementation phase versus the phase we're in right now. All during the fall and spring, when we were in that working group, there was concern about the impact a new center would have on existing centers, the concern of

competition for resources. It is an incredibly important question. We didn't take it up to figure out how this could be addressed. That's something that is to be addressed as the implementation phase.

I am sure that if the idea of a center begins to coalesce, the provost and the deans and everybody else involved, the center's directors and so on, will be engaged in the conversation about this. One shouldn't look at the C report and say oh, you didn't talk about this sort of detail. That's something for the implementation phase. I see a lot of comments out there, yeah, this is a really important issue; but it's not at this stage, not to be taken up at this stage.

Let's take down the slide and engage what I would like to think of as final discussion about the center. Is there anything anyone would like to bring up about the center proposal?

NEEMA KUDVA: I think David Zax has a comment, and Bensel has a comment. David's comment is really about the fact he doesn't understand the impact of the vote. If we -- David, do you want to just raise the comment?

DAVID ZAX: No. I think what's there is what's there. The whole process is just unclear to me what the impact of the vote is. If we vote, does that mean the report doesn't get transferred, or does it get transferred and people do with it what they want anyway?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: First of all, we had a slide there, what it means for you to vote yes or no, the guidance about how you might be -- we take a vote on that. Say it's 80-40 or something like that, in favor. Then they will get the report, they will get the chat, they will get the transcripts, they will get probably a one-page overview from Neema and me about the whole body language of the senate. It's advisory, like all our stuff is advisory.

If it was 100-20 versus 80-40, that sends a firmer signal. One can conclude on sort of imagining what a meter of our transmission would say, the Senate is strongly interested in the creation of a center. It doesn't mean how it's going to be implemented. They simply

communicated the ideas in the center report are worthy of consideration, and we're going to go about doing that in a transparent way. Does that help?

DAVID ZAX: Okay. And if the vote is no, if it's 40 in favor and 80 against, what happens then?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Then I assume -- they'll certainly get a copy of the report, and the no. I can assume that there will be no action on it, or there will be further discussion. In other words, next year, for example, if it emerges, if there was a certain thing about the center that was problematic, there might be further discussion next year about that thing in some venue, and it would carry forth. But the expectation is that a positive vote sends a signal that the faculty feel the recommendations are worthy of consideration. I don't know how more careful I can explain that.

Ailong.

AILONG KE: Hi. This is Ailong Ke, representing MBG. Marcus Smolka and I were collecting comments from colleagues in our department. One faculty asked a question -- there's certainly strong support for the Antiracism Center and all the activities. The question was whether we should consider to also add gender equality into the same umbrella, because we were talking about resources, so I was wondering whether there's effort in that and whether it's a good idea to combine those efforts.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's a question about scope, and we spent a lot of time on that. Neema, maybe you can address that.

NEEMA KUDVA: One of the things that came up was to really understand that intersectionality is really important in thinking about race and the race-gender question. And there's several other issues, of course, identity-based issues. Gender sort of does enter the

conversation a lot, if you look at the finer print in the report, but it isn't specifically written up as that.

The other way I think to understand or to see it is if you look at the educational requirements and the groups that the working group agreed had the kind of subject expertise we really wanted to learn from, that we wanted them to inform our learning. The gender studies folks are in that at GSS. Families, Gender, Sexuality Studies is within that group. So it does come in, but in this intersectional way, if that helps.

There's a question from Richard Bensel. Richard?

RICHARD BENSEL: I don't have a question on the center.

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay. Tracy, did you want to make your comment publicly or --

TRACY: I think everyone can just read -- I may be wrong in this; the Senate ultimately voted no on the many reiterations of the consensual policy that went around, and then the president still instituted it, regardless what the Senate thought. So I think that goes to David's question, as what would happen to this. The report is still going to go to the Administration, and they can act on this unilaterally, which is my suspicion will happen, based on prior behavior.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: What was your example from the past?

TRACY: The consensual relationship policy.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That was not the case. It was a 3-2 vote, and the thing that was implemented was mostly what the majority voted for, but they stuck in a little bit from the minority opinion, so that's not an example.

TRACY: Okay, sorry. That's my misrecollection. But I remember that the Senate voted against it, or maybe it didn't come up for a second vote, but I could be wrong, so thank you, Charlie. You remember this way more than I do.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The plan is then that we will launch a Qualtrics vote tomorrow. You will have a week to do it, so there will be transcripts from this meeting with the comments made. We'll make it easy for you to look at how we thought about this.

I was able to keep up with all the posted comments until recently, but I, like many of you, picked up the general tone of them. Some things are more S or more F. There's a lot of commonality there. I just picked five concerns and two ways of looking at them, one which may lead you to saying yeah, I'm in favor of the recommendation, or I'm not. Let's quickly go through those. The idea here is we want to set the stage for follow-up conversation with all of you.

Let's talk about accountability. You can look at accountability sort of in two ways. One way, things like coercion and sanctions, punishment go through your head. Another way of looking at accountability is that it's a way to express institutional commitment and a framework for learning and improvement.

Let's take a simple example we are all used to, which is course evaluations. To have accountability, someone has to read them, like your chair. Someone from CTI might help you with the results and so on, but that is a form of accountability. Also, requiring a teaching statement in a tenure dossier is a form of accountability.

This is an interesting example, because if you go back 30 years, there was no such thing as a required teaching statement in the tenured dossier. That became, so to speak, university law around about 1990. It creates an expectation. At the time, I can guarantee you there were faculty who said the teaching statement dilutes the dossier, this is a research place, teaching is a distraction.

I know, for a fact, that kind of tension is brought up, and okay. But here is -- I think most of us would probably agree that teaching has improved because of this expectation. The

question now is, right now people will say oh, a DEI statement dilutes the teaching and research parts of the dossier. You see what I'm sort of getting at. Just as we are kind of skeptical about that perhaps added component, just recall that probably 30 years ago, the same conversations ensued, and I think most of us would probably agree -- though some wouldn't -- that the quality of teaching was elevated on campus. Accountability, these are two ways of thinking about things.

Now the question is about the other constituencies. Again, the staff are required to complete a six-course program. The undergraduates have to go through a thing during orientation. One point of view here is that yeah, that's important for them, but we have bigger fish to fry. We have the academic freedom concern, and we're busy. You can put together reasonable arguments saying that this doesn't apply to us, the faculty and students are different, and there you go.

On the other hand, a point of view here is that required education, in the end, will save the faculty time, and it also sends the message to students, staff and the less-protected members of the faculty. A decision about this requirement does send a message, right or wrong, to the other constituencies, and you should just keep it in mind.

Empathy. I got a five-page letter from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. I believe some of you also received that letter. I'm in the process of going through and replying to the president, who sent it to me, but here's a line in that. It's about DEI expectations, faculty teaching and research, et cetera; but the claim here is such a step might be necessary on kind of a lesser place, where there's clear evidence of widespread bias, prejudice or racism, but not here. As noted above, this is not the case at Cornell's campus. You could sort of say yeah, there's a problem, but it's not a big problem here. There are other campuses where this really is an issue, but not us.

On the other hand, if you look at that statement, yeah, like myself, I don't think I have ever been on the receiving end of bias or prejudice. However, I know that many of my colleagues and many students on our campus have. You just have to take that into consideration. Empathy, extreme points on that scale.

Faculty expertise. Here's something you might say, back in the fall, when we headed into the pandemic and students coming back, let's tap into that expertise in Vet, in Operations Research. We've got faculty experts. Let's go in there and tap that. But when it comes to the humanities and the social sciences, we tap into their expertise, then that somehow is political indoctrination, that somehow our colleagues in those areas are different than the STEM faculty, what they can deliver to the campus is tinged with political indoctrination overtone.

Here's the other point you might take when it comes to reasoning about faculty expertise, which is yeah, there are different research paradigms across campus, and you have to respect those, and you'd better respect them if you want to fully tap into the talent that you have on campus. Again, different ways of looking at expertise and where that expertise sits.

There seems to be sort of -- I don't want to say double standard, but there are different ways of looking at these contributions. For sure, there's controversy in STEM areas, where you can say the scientist was tilted one way or the other; but I just think that's something to keep in mind.

Video, this comes up mostly in the student report, but this is right off one of the postings on the website, which is basically the plan for using videos made by experts, that can bomb. It requires a real expertise, even to talk about a video. You can actually make things worse, if the presenter and the video is suboptimal, so that is a point of nervousness.

Absolutely, I think everyone will agree the use of video has risks, but then so does a rollout plan whose pace is pegged to the level of tenure track hiring. The question is, yeah,

we've got to get experts out there, more experts, more people helping us to educate the campus. Absolutely, no one can dispute that, but the question is of pace.

When Do Better Cornell came to the senate back in August, many things could have been concluded from that, but my big take-away is sort of a sense of urgency. That should be kept in mind as you reason about, say, the S report, and is there an overemphasis on video and did they get it wrong.

I want to hand it over to Neema. There are other concerns about the scope of the problem. Some, like me, have never been a victim of any of these things, and you may underestimate the scope of the problem. Neema will talk about the scope of the problem and how we could think about it. Neema.

NEEMA KUDVA: Do we want to take questions at this point, or just wait till I finish?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's do this, then we're completely done with --

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie and I thought it would be useful to go back and pick up --

Cornell keeps careful data on a large number of issues, so to pick up some of those questions so we are all on the same page in terms of what we are looking at. At the last senate meeting, there were various kinds of comments that were flying back and forth, especially in the chat.

One of them that really kind of caught my attention is the one which said oh, my God, you can't talk about racism in the same way as we talk about health and safety. I think not just events, but everything that's happening around us would indicate otherwise, that the question of racism is intimately tied to questions of health and safety and opportunity.

And if one needs any more evidence of that, it is now with Biden's administration, part of set of policy structures around questions of health and safety, and racism is part of that as well. I think that was something that really struck me in the chat last time that I wanted to raise.

Going to Cornell, where we are, this institution that is ours, it's useful to think of the number of students we educate. We know these numbers. Nice to have it up there again. We have about 15,000 undergraduates, and you see the graduate students, both research and professional, and Ph.D.'s, research students.

Within that are the numbers of students who self-identify as minority -- the definition is given out there -- is increasing. These are the numbers from 2020. And this year, Cornell has hit the 50% mark. If you look at the two wheels there, the upper one is really our student body. It's increasing diversity. The lower one is us, the faculty, and our composition, vis-a-vis our students. It's just useful to think about. There's no good or bad thing about this, but it is useful to think that the students that we work with, that we educate, are a very diverse community.

Cornell tracks how our students feel, how they think, how we're -- what kind of education are we delivering, et cetera. We have something called a diversity dashboard. It's public. Any one of you can go on it. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning maintains it and they track all the information.

I, like many of you, went on the diversity dashboard, and there are four metrics by which diversity is tracked. One of the metrics is this, the experience that students have. I just took two markers; do I feel like I belong to this community. We talk a lot about belonging. That's one of our core values.

I just took this metric. What is striking is the variation by race, in terms of who feels like they belong. What I found equally troubling, interesting -- these are difficult words -- was what our students felt like they had to do to get faculty attention.

Again there, look at the variation between if we start to analyze the data that Cornell has by race. What do our black students feel, as opposed to our Latino students, as opposed to our Asian students, international students, so on. I think the data here really speaks to the fact

that we live in very different universes. Whether that's perceptual, how it's created, these are the kinds of things we want to study, we want to understand; but the reality is that our students live and operate out of very different frames.

There are arguments that people make around the question of experience and that one shouldn't look at perceptual questions that deeply. Here, for example, is an outcome measure, an outcome of looking at cumulative GPA. And we would expect that, let's see, race doesn't matter so much, but GPA is an extremely problematic measure.

We all know that so much depends on the high school the students are coming from, the family and community structures of support they have, et cetera. But when they are graduating from Cornell, we find these huge variations in terms of GPA, if you slice, take the race variable and work through the data like that. I thought this outcome measure, which is also available, would be an interesting one to look at and to share with all of you.

The other way we considered this, of course, we talked about undergraduates. What do we think of our graduate students? The diversity measures and the belonging measures for graduate students is a little different than from undergraduate students. The student body is also quite different. Our graduate student body becomes almost 50% international, so it's a very different kind of student body.

Here, one of the things that comes up in terms of what are obstacles and stuff in terms of academic is the relationship with the advisor and how important that is. Of course, we are all faculty on this call, and the faculty at Cornell are in these advising relationships with students. Students see this as being quite fundamental to their success or their ability to meet challenges.

There's a doctoral student survey we have that the graduate school maintains, where students point to that, they point to the fact that advisors are mentors, they're collaborators. What is equally interesting, and I just picked up a couple of pieces there, just so that you get a

sense of the kinds of responses, but what equally comes to the fore is how important attitudes towards students are; that the relationship of the student and the mentor, the faculty mentor, the faculty advisor is multifaceted, it touches on many aspects of a student's life.

You see words like committed, kind, humane, generous, genuine coming up again and again. The conversation is about a mentorship that lasted for a lifetime, friendships that lasted for a lifetime, the ways in which intellectual lives were shaped and made.

What's equally sad is there are many comments like this, where for the student, some of the biggest challenges -- and I just picked two here. I picked these because what struck me here was not just the fact that racism was being talked about. It's difficult as it is, but two particular things that I want to point out, the impacts of this.

Very often, in the conversations that I had, Charlie and I received emails or hear from people saying this is just a BIPOC faculty thing, BIPOC people -- BIPOC being black, indigenous, people of color. I think what these two statements really sort of bring to the foreground are two facts.

One is the kind of culture, the kind of climate we create, the kind of culture we create in this institution as faculty has all sorts of repercussions. If you see the first statement up there, it really talks about how it wasn't just the faculty, created a culture of how second-year students treated first-year students.

I hear this from my students as well, that the culture of bullying or the culture of some sort of racist behaviors described in various ways, sexist behaviors, problematic behaviors, begin to make their way into the culture of the institution and even start to inform or shape the way students treat students. That was one piece that I think the first passage shines light on a little bit or brings up.

The second one talks about how this young woman, who's writing, says, I'm white, but when I see what's happening with my colleagues, women of color, what does it make me feel. To realize that these efforts are changing the climate and culture of an institution, which is what we are doing -- we are not talking about re-education, we are not talking about coercion.

What we're talking about is us holding a mirror to ourselves and saying is this what we want to be, and do we want to spend two hours a semester -- when people say to me two hours is too much, and the two hours was not just an idea that came out of a hat. It really was an idea the working group spent a lot of time over, and they rooted that time on the experience of programs like It Depends on the Lens that was hugely successful. It was a quality program, it involved discussion, it was taken out to departments. 1,200 of 1,700 of our faculty went through it, and it was hugely successful.

When the working group, of thinking about that two-hour point, which is has come up repeatedly in the statements that we've received, they really built that off programs like that. When we think about the scope of the problem and we think about the kind of things we can do, one way to really approach this is to say okay, how best can we at least start to chip away at it. That's what that connection was.

I have talked a lot about our students and our relationship with our students. What's equally important, of course, we all know, because every three or five years -- I have forgotten the exact time limit -- all of us complete a factually work/life survey, and Cornell has kept very careful records of the faculty work/life survey.

We get a little message which tells us what kind of things the work/life survey has discovered, et cetera. What shows up with every work/life survey we've done is the difference in the faculty experience at Cornell. Much like the difference that our students feel, much like

the ways in which our students perceive Cornell to be very different, based on their own identity, our faculty, too, feel the same way.

If you are a woman, if you are URM, if you are international, you are Asian, you experience Cornell very differently. We have enough data that we can pull up, if you go back and look at your email, at your faculty work/life survey reports, you will begin to see, and you can see here the green circle is our white faculty.

Then you can begin to see the movement away from the green circle, which shows you where our Asian faculty, our international, any race or URM faculty sit vis-a-vis the majority of our faculty who are white. You begin to see that, depending on which group you sit within, the way you navigate the unwritten rules of the institution; do you feel like you belong to this place, do you feel listened to, do you feel heard, do you feel like you are a part of the institution changes. I think this is a really important thing for us to remember.

This is a similar sort of piece which shows how differently people categorize the climate at Cornell for academics like themselves. This is a mirror of the question that we ask our students every year or every other year.

What does this mean? When I first came to Cornell -- and Charlie always talks about his 45 years, when he first came here 45 years ago, when the dinosaurs were walking through Wisconsin to drop all those rocks there, Charlie always talks about the fact that none of this was an issue. Nobody was talking about like whoa, you are black and so on, but we have been talking about it a lot more. When I first came to Cornell, we didn't talk about aggressions and microaggressions. I came here 19 years ago.

I think the ways in which we address these questions, the ways in which we think about climate and what it means to change climate, the ways in which we approach things keeps shifting and changing, as we learn more about these questions. If you think about the education

component, the student education one, we always talk about core, key conceptual questions we all have to understand. The language of the structural basis of racism, ethnicity, indigeneity and bias has entered our lexicon. The language of systemic bias has entered our lexicon.

Similarly now, the language of aggressions and microaggressions is in our lexicon, and it's described in all these different ways. I just raise it here, not to argue about whether it's right or wrong; that is not my point at all. I just raise it here because, again, going back to the ways in which the faculty working group was taking this on, when we looked at the two programs that really had worked well and had gotten very good faculty feedback, *It Depends on the Lens*, which is what we do when you are going into search committees.

And the other was a program on mentoring graduate students, diverse graduate students. That one was also very, very well-received. Again, same model; very well-put-together with Cornell Interactive Theater. There was these video models, accompanied by discussion within faculty meetings or in other groupings, workshops and so on.

But when we look at these kinds of programming, what we see, in the faculty piece at least -- and I can't shake this, and someone spoke to me recently, said all that it did was it made me hold up a mirror. It made me just look at myself. It didn't ask me to change my behavior, it didn't force me to do anything. It just required me to sit there and look at myself. I think that's what we were really thinking about.

I'm going to end, because I see a number of little hands are increasing. Clearly, we have some conversation that we want to have around this. I'm going to end there, but what Charlie and I really wanted to do is to, one, really lay out the scope of the problem that we have at Cornell, just in little hints -- it is not a comprehensive scope -- to lay it out there and to also respond to questions about process and how many people were involved in this and how we took this forward. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. My screen says Eric Cheyfitz.

Eric.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: I may have missed something, but in the demographic slides, the only one that mentioned Native Americans was the one on GPA. Otherwise, they were absent.

NEEMA KUDVA: Sorry. Eric, I just took these screenshots from the diversity dashboard. I can't answer that question, because I just took the screenshots from the public part of the diversity dashboard. I have seen other data, but our numbers are very small, and that's its own problem. Our numbers of Native American students, I don't know if that is coming into play in terms of how the diversity dashboard works. I can't answer that question.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: What's being presented to the Faculty Senate erases, for the most part, Native Americans, which I find, I have to say, reprehensible.

Second of all, particularly troubling because Cornell University, as we know, was founded on money from stolen Indian land taken through a genocide. That's not being addressed either. When you erase native presence on the faculty, which is small, and students, which is small, and that's a problem, and then we have no response from the Administration whatsoever, no sound response, no honest response about the founding of this university, I think it's an extremely troubling situation.

NEEMA KUDVA: I agree with you, Eric.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Eric.

Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: I want to speak about the student part, the question of your requirement, but I also need to respond to the presentations I heard. I would just like to say very briefly that it's good for you, Charlie, if you have never been on the receiving end of discrimination or oppression, but that's pretty rare, I would say, for people. In my case, sexual

orientation, health issues, abilities, international, not being a citizen, class issues, I have been and am still on the receiving end quite a lot. Just want to say that.

Neema, I appreciated your presentation. I see absolutely no way the requirement for students, in any manner, addresses the issues you raised here. I believe the educational policy is a matter of concern for the faculty, so asking engagement with the Faculty Senate is just not enough, if we are tampering with the educational policies.

Second point I would like to make, it seems to me that we saw there was no vote -- and you said it, Charlie -- there was no voting among the report committee members. We see in the comments that many people -- not very happy with what is being proposed.

For all of those reasons, I believe these important questions about racism, antiracism and education for the students will lead to either a very divided vote or maybe a negative vote, which would mean going backward. I really believe that many of us do very long, complicated -- next year, I am teaching a seminar on the race of the poet. I have hope that what I do on this topic in one semester is not equal to a module.

We should say if we want to require something from the students, they should attend classes that would be designated as antiracism, if you wish, by any committee that would be acceptable, but the rest is not a scholarly problem. Taking the corporate role is not the right way. I'm absolutely against the modules.

If you value faculty expertise, as you say, in the humanities and social sciences, since I belong to both, I would say our expertise is also in teaching and not in speaking to a camera in a digitized module. All those reasons, I believe the committee should work again on these recommendations. The situation is not really -- what is being sent to us is just not good. If we want to have a real vote, let's have a real vote on good and sound proposals.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Again, the working groups, their work is done. Going back to the drawing board --

LAURENT DUBREUIL: You decided --

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Going back to the drawing board -- if things go up to the provost level means interacting at that level, bringing up all those very legitimate concerns that you have.

Mark.

MARK: Thank you, Charlie. I just want to say quickly, I have been reading the chat and hearing about the time constraints and issues that people have with time. I heard a gentleman last time speak about I think it was three hours per year over 40 years is 120 hours.

I did a little math as to what we do. Three hours per year, if you work 40 hours a week, which no one does, over nine months, is about two-tenths of a percent of your time working. All we are asking for is two-tenths of a percent of time to study something which I think is really important. It seems to me that the message that this is not even worthy of consideration by our senior administrators, this is a message to people that look like me and students that look like me that this is not even worth two-tenths of a percent of my time per year. I find that to be a little bit troubling, to say the least. I'll leave it there. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Mark.

Richard Bensel.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, Charlie. On both Resolution S and F, there was no committee vote; is that correct?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That is correct. The point I made is that what exited the committee in the form of a final report is a vote. But you will also note, again, based on your concerns about the legitimacy of having a working group sponsor the resolution, the UFC is

sponsoring the resolution. My knowledge of that is it's unanimous. It's not that they are in favor of everything. It's simply saying that we sponsor these three resolutions.

NEEMA KUDVA: The other thing I actually want to raise here is that none of the working groups and a lot of the senate work in committee does not happen by vote. It happens by consensus. The important thing here is that the way we worked was that we worked by consensus. We wrote together, we had meetings every week, three meetings sometimes, but we worked together and we came to consensus.

Did we all agree? As posted last time in the chat, we had lots of disagreement. For those of you who think that the 40 faculty and students who were part of these working groups were not working their asses off over the entire fall semester, we were. And we worked through the winter break. There were almost 40 people, faculty and students, from across the university, different colleges, every college, who were part of these working groups. So Richard, no, we did not vote, but we worked by consensus.

RICHARD BENSEL: Excuse me. I would like a little bit more time, since I'm being ganged up on here. If there's no committee vote and the resolutions propose they are committee report, at the least you probably should go back and revise them and say it's the UFC, and not the committees that are doing the report.

I have two other questions. Who wrote these reports?

NEEMA KUDVA: We wrote them in committee, group by group.

RICHARD BENSEL: Excuse me. If there is no committee vote, then how do we know that the committee approved the report?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Anybody can comment. For example, in that pool, Eric spoke up. Eric spoke to a part of the S report that he disagrees with. Every one of those 40 people knows

about posting comments on the website, and we welcome even opposition or challenges, such as Professor Cheyfitz.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you, Charlie. Why didn't you have a report in the committees? This is a procedural question, and I'm going to press it because I want to know exactly what the status of these resolutions are. Why was there not a vote in these two committees to report the resolutions?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Because we don't do business your way.

RICHARD BENSEL: Charlie, we have to do business --

NEEMA KUDVA: We don't have to vote, Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yes, you need to approve a committee report. You're telling us that there was dissent, and I believe that, because I'm aware of it. How do we know how much dissent --

NEEMA KUDVA: We all compromised and we decided that it was important enough for us to come together. I see several of the committee members and the working group people who are in the senate, and they can speak up as well.

RICHARD BENSEL: You keep interrupting me.

NEEMA KUDVA: I'm sorry, Richard. Please go ahead.

RICHARD BENSEL: This is the reason why the Faculty Senate should proceed in a procedurally correct manner. If there's dissent on a committee -- I'm actually not persuaded that the committee wrote the report. My information is that's not quite the case. I am not persuaded that a resolution can come before the Faculty Senate without the approval of the committee.

I do think the sponsors, whoever they might be, of this resolution should come forward and say that they are the sponsors. This whole procedure is quite extraordinary, and I do think

the best way to proceed probably, in the end, is to send these two reports back to the committees and have them do things in the right way. This is extraordinary.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thank you.

Harold.

HAROLD HODES: Yes, I'm speaking to the student side, report. As I understand the proposal, there will be video presentations by experts, basically MOOCs for a few hours, and the discussion is to be supervised by people who are not experts. We know that face-to-face teaching on virtually all matters is more effective than video teaching. I think the University realizes that, given the emphasis on restarting face-to-face teaching next term. Why shouldn't we have an arrangement where the experts get face-to-face with the students?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah, think about the numbers. No one is going to dispute that interacting in person with a researcher on a particular topic, you cannot top that. Given that you cannot do it with all our students, what is a next best thing you can do. It's not MOOCs, it's not like handing over a 14-week course to video. It is about modules where you integrate that into your own teaching, perhaps.

HAROLD HODES: Why can't a few experts meet face-to-face with groups of students? That's what they would do, say, be relieved from teaching in the term they are involved with this. And in place of the teaching, they would be an hour or two, face-to-face with students, one group of students after another.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Again, look at the arithmetic. But also, it's at the implementation stage, where clever methods for doing just what you say could be worked out. Again, recognize, I think, two things: There's a numbers thing. Then also, video is -- it has to be done carefully. Those are the two points.

Buz.

BUZ BARSTOW: First of all, I want to extend from my department, BEE, we discussed the working group recommendations in our DEI Committee meeting on Tuesday, and we just want to say thank you for everybody who put work into these things. Our departmental vote on this, on all three proposals is yes, to all three of them. But we do have some concerns. I think we see this in the chat.

I just want to say to Mark Lewis, maybe I put this point about the time a little bit indelicately, and I'm really sorry about that. We do have concerns about time. Faculty time is limited, and it's pretty maxed out. Anything that goes onto our plates, something's got to come off. Anything that goes on, it'd better be very effective, right.

But we also think, and I really want to stress this, the things that you guys, the working groups are proposing, we think are really important. We're very protective of our academic research, but we think that this is a mission, a just and equitable future is a mission worth taking up for the university, a mission worth taking up for the country. Putting this on our plates means that something's got to come off. We would love to couple this with a discussion about how faculty use their time, how we can save time in other areas that are less consequential. But in general, you've got our support on this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Buz. We go on now to Robert Travers. Robert.

ROBERT TRAVERS: Thanks, Charlie. I just want to add my broad support as one of the History Department senators, for these committee reports. I thought they were excellent.

First of all, I want to thank the faculty and the students who worked on this. I think they're really excellent reports. They, themselves, say they haven't found perfect solutions to the complicated issues that they are addressing, but I broadly agreed with Neema's presentation today. We know we have issues on campus in terms of climate, in terms of all our students and faculty feeling empowered, and students and faculty of color feeling marginalized.

And these reports seem to me to give us an opportunity to say we, as a faculty, want to be better-educated on issues of racism and racial justice, that we want to listen to the concerns of our students especially. I just really strongly believe that this is an opportunity for us to listen to all our students, and I think this is a really important vote.

The committees themselves say they don't have all the answers, but I really hope that we, as a faculty, can move forward positively on these issues to the next phase of implementation, in which we'll also be involved. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Robert.

Risa.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thank you. I have just a couple of substantive things I want to touch on; but another one, my main point is a procedural question. Substantively, based on what we've heard, it seems to me -- and I'm also looking at the chat -- that with regard to the S report, that the consideration of menus is one that kind of dropped out without appropriate consideration for taking care of the numbers issue that you raised, Charlie.

I was concerned that the six faculty members who were talking about the work they do in their units and they were surprised by the final report coming out without hearing their alternate proposal, that did concern me. Seems to me that really was not addressed at all. I wanted to mention that.

The other substantive piece on the faculty, the F report, that I wanted to highlight, because we haven't really talked too much about it, is the teaching evaluation question. I was a little surprised to see that, because there's been so much research done on the flaws in teaching evaluations and how those, in particular, harm women and people of color and people who don't take a mainstream position, so it seemed odd to me to want to add to a flawed process. Just stuck out to me.

But I don't want to take more time on the substance because it seems to me that one of the questions is, as you mentioned, Charlie, what are people going to be voting on. You had to give us an interpretation of what a yes or a no vote means. Seem to me the yes or no vote needs a footnote with a paragraph, and that then your response has been well, everything else is for the implementation phase. That implementation gives, of course, weight to what people are actually voting on. I think everybody will interpret a yes or a no vote in ways that are either approval or disapproval of the reports as a whole.

I would suggest that one thing we could consider would be perhaps a more accurate way to measure the senators' views, which would be to have resolutions on specific recommendations, rather than boxing people into a yes or no. There are certainly going to be recommendations that some people would say I vote definitely on this, but there are other recommendations in that report where I would vote no.

How do we actually interpret a yes or a no vote is really confusing. I don't think it's adequate just to say well, these deserve careful consideration. Maybe there are some things in there that don't deserve careful consideration, in the view of some people, and others that should really just be adopted. So I wanted to put that out there as a possibility.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Risa.

Neema, why don't you respond to Risa's comments about the six ethics -- our discussion about menus, then the teaching evaluation thing. Then I will address the specific thing.

NEEMA KUDVA: Thank you, Risa. The faculty from the six units that had signed the letter, we had two meetings; one just this morning, and the other yesterday. They have been meeting separately with their colleagues and are articulating a proposal, which will come back.

They are coming together to decide whether they want to actually propose a separate resolution on an alternative model or whether they would prefer that the senate resolution gets

reframed and reworded. I think that's where we are with the colleagues that we wanted to be at the center of the ways in which this education requirement would get articulated, so we identified a group of colleagues who have subject expertise. These are the folks who were hired to teach this here at Cornell. Their scholarship is in this area. They are meeting to decide this, then they come back to us with the direction they want to go in. That was the first thing.

The second thing is about teaching evaluations that you brought up. Yes, we all know this. I actually was just writing to someone the other day -- and Sara Pritchard in 2015 wrote a blog post -- there's lots of data, OFDD has lots of information, research, different metrics, how do we think about this fact that women and BIPOC faculty get very different ratings than do white men. We have talked about that.

I need to go back because I don't remember the exact language. I think the idea was to make sure that that language that this research exists enter the report, because I remember that conversation happening in the working group. I have to go back and look at the actual report. My apologies; I can't chart that out now in my head, but it was discussed at some length.

The third piece I'm blanking on. What was the third part?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The menus.

NEEMA KUDVA: The menu piece was discussed a lot. On the working group, we had two people; one person who had chaired the CALS diversity requirement group, then another who had been very involved and part of the Arts and Sciences' three-year-long process to arrive at a menu for the social difference requirement. It's a long story and a long history.

What both of them, especially -- one, we did a little bit of digging around, and the CALS menu at that point had grown to almost 300 courses. We heard a lot from our colleagues. Not everybody in CALS agrees with this characterization, so I want to make that very, very clear, but

we heard from the colleagues on the working group and the chair of this committee that this was deeply problematic, long listings of all the ways in which courses come into this and how problematic it is and -- big discussion.

Essentially, we landed in a place where all of us agreed that there was a core set of key concepts around questions of the structural basis of race, ethnicity, indigeneity and bias that really needed to get communicated, and how were we going to do that. Were we going to do it through -- that became the conversation. It was a very deliberate move away from menus, because menus, in the Cornell experience, they get difficult, and they are not always very good at delivering key conceptual issues. That's where that conversation went.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Neema. On the specific resolution, first of all, this day we are at the senate, talking about the working group reports. Anybody can submit a resolution. If you want to go into one of those recommendations and really find out how faculty think, just send us the resolution. It will happen.

Think a little bit more about these sorts of things; everything is related, we know that. The idea of pulling out a little billiard ball and voting on it may be a little problematic, so I recommend thinking about that. The Qualtrics vote, you will be given a little box, where you can write anything you want, including I voted yes, but I really don't like this, okay. All that stuff goes to the next level. Just keep that in mind. Maybe that isn't enough and maybe you really want some kind of global consensus or body language reading on some particular -- just send it. The resolution will make it happen.

Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you so much. I also acknowledge that we have had this for quite a while, but only now is my department really discussing this. Our numbers are small, but they

are strong. People are feeling very strongly. I come from Physics. This is Carl Franck, from Physics.

I want to point out there's lots of concern, based on bitter experience, not just here, but in -- faculty members have been in repressive regimes like the Soviet Union, about forcing indoctrination. But a small component of our faculty, one person in particular, was extremely eloquent in his point about the need for this. I think he totally got it. He isn't an underrepresented minority or anything like that, but he understands the problem, he looks at this history of not dealing with it, kicking the can down the road.

Others were very concerned about the indoctrination aspect. Personally, I'm very concerned about the punitive aspect of the proposal -- I'm just speaking to the faculty thing -- and the idea that it seems to me like a power grab a bit, of some group on the top of the rest of us.

But the theme of training to help people walk in other people's shoes that they wouldn't have otherwise is excellent. What I would argue -- the objections I heard is simply this: For example, I went to this thing on sexual harassment. It was a waste of time, and I told people I would not attend the second one.

I think what people will -- if people can give genuine feedback unto what they have experienced, and then it's acted upon. In other words, put feedback into the system. And I think that will be compromised, that will move it forward. Thank you so much. I think there's a lot of good-heartedness out there, and I'd been very clumsy, I should say, in dealing with this. Part of it is not getting over-excited. Thank you so much for setting good examples.

NEEMA KUDVA: Could I just respond to that? I think the question of accountability and us giving our feedback for the kinds of things we have to do, like that Title IX training, which was just so terrible, truly terrible, I don't know one person who wouldn't agree, or at least I haven't

met them. I do think you're right about that. Like Charlie says, if there is something like that which hasn't shown up, then we should make sure that it works its way in.

I also just wanted to -- the chat, I have been trying to keep up with it. I can't. The piece on faculty evaluations, Risa, apparently that is in the report already.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Ailong.

AILONG KE: This is Ailong from Molecular Biology and Genetics. I passed the reports, and gathering comments from the faculty. This is the department that is very enthusiastic about the antiracism, and we're implementing a lot of educations and programs in those topics.

So far, the comments, we didn't have too much time to gather in the comments, but the comments so far I got have a lot of concerns on the implementation of the Working Group F proposal, I guess for the same reasons that have been raised.

But in addition to the ones that has been raised, there are concerns about the materials being a little bit outdated, so the training materials. And people felt it's a waste of time when they receive the training, even though it's with good intention.

Then there are a lot of concerns about the evaluation, teaching evaluation component. I think that's where we got stuck. I think everyone is very enthusiastic about the report, the topic in general. I was wondering whether Risa has a good point, that maybe we should really vote on specific implementation issues.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I'm always in favor of maximum flow of information. As I said, this is not new; any group of senators want to do something like that, do it, just do it.

Saida. Apologies if I pronounce your name wrong.

SAIDA HODŽIĆ: That's all right. I want to speak to S, but I'm not sure if we are discussing student requirement.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: It's all mixed up. S and F, even C is okay.

SAIDA HODŽIĆ: Okay, thank you. If I hear you correctly, Charlie, you identify concern about numbers and the pace of hiring as the main reason for the video modules. I would like you specifically, but also the entire senate, to place more faith in both the willingness to increase the pace of hiring in these key areas, as well as in the various departments' and programs' interest in doing so.

We are not at a static point in history. We are at a place of change, and we need to actually lead with imagining how we might push that change forward. The way to do that is to make the right steps, the steps in the right direction; not that things are the same and, therefore, we're going to do the next best thing. The next best thing is not enough, and it's not even necessary. I would like us to envision a different kind of Cornell, not to envision a Cornell that's defensive and that's working against change, but a Cornell that actually wants change.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: A good point. Exactly. They're not in conflict. In other words, rolling out some kind of faculty hiring initiative and also rolling out some kind of -- I can see how people get up in arms about video. You say video module, and a bunch of things go through your head, and they are negative. You can do both. You can do both. Thank you. Michael Lovenheim.

MICHAEL LOVENHEIM: Thanks. I want to reiterate what others have said, which struck a chord with me; just feels like -- we are not voting now, but it feels premature to vote on this. To me, there's kind of two issues here. One is kind of the ethical, moral issue of the importance of diversity and inclusion and supporting those on campus, which I strongly support. I expect most people on this call and at the university do, although that's just my sense.

I'm in Economics, by the way. In Economics, we strongly support those principles. In that sense, these proposals are on point about highlighting the importance of these issues on campus and wanting to do something about them. I strongly support where they're coming

from. I don't necessarily disagree with all of what they're suggesting, but I'm not sure what I'm voting on here. I mean, there's incarnations of what is being proposed that I would find very troubling. There's incarnations of it that I would not and I would support.

I just don't know which one I'm doing, so I worry that voting yes here is going to basically give carte blanche to someone to do something that I don't like and do this the wrong way, I guess is the way to say it, rather than the right way. I guess this is just -- I would like to see a more fully developed proposal that says okay, well, what's the training going to be about, what's going to be the focus, what are going to be the incentives. Is it going to be the carrot or the stick? How are we going to get compliance?

I think this is all going to work best if we bring the faculty on as a willing partner to do this, rather than forcing people to do it. I think probably most of us would agree with that, so let's figure out what that looks like, let's figure out how to do this correctly, then we can kind of full-throatedly support this.

It just seems -- I'm not trying to undermine the work that the committees have done. I know they've worked really hard on this, I know these are very hard issues to work on. I want to thank them for the work they've done, and this is not trying to undermine them. I think we need more.

One way to read the disagreements that we're seeing here is not about principle, it's about process and about how this is going to be implemented. I understand on the one hand that this is not something that we are necessarily tasked at doing, that is the next stage; but I just don't see how you can separate those two things here.

People on different sides of this seem to have very different views of how this is going to roll out, and that seems to be driving a lot of the different views. I think this is a really

important issue, I think it's something that is best if we can come to an agreement on. And I think to do that, we need to have more information. Okay, thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Michael. Very much tied up in your response there is a matter of trust. If we pass this along, do we trust that the envisioned faculty oversight down the road will come into play, so there's a trust element.

But just to take on a particular thing, do we or do we not put a DEI statement in every tenure dossier? That will go nowhere, unless it goes past the AFPSF Committee, Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty. So the question then is about trust.

Then there's also a devil in the details thing, which goes back to the very start of our session today, which is that is at the implementation level. There's a line in there. If you don't trust it, the line says faculty are consulted in some way, shape or form before anything is implemented. That means devil in the details comes before the faculty. Maybe you don't trust that.

Then there's a time thing, to your comment there. Sure, you want to look at some of those reports that we showed, the very first slide; two, three years, then they get deep-sixed. There's a sense of urgency, articulated by those student visitors to our senate in August. It doesn't mean rush to judgment. It means let's get started, let's try things out, let's be open-minded about what works and what doesn't work. Those are the kinds of things that came to my mind, as I heard you speak, Michael.

Maybe Neema, would you like to add anything? No, okay.

NEEMA KUDVA: I was going to say no, I completely agree with you. One of the things we learned, which came out in the discussions, in the working group discussions was very much not wanting to spend years and years thinking about this, but to take an approach that involves - taking a more experimental approach to especially the two educational requirements.

Yesterday's meeting and today's meeting with our faculty colleagues was in that vein. They have been thinking about it, they have been working on it as well, so the question of taking an approach which involves us starting to do things.

There is somebody else said to me, these many conversations we're having here, that the perfect is the enemy of the good, that this business of looking and seeking and seeking perfection and of being paralyzed by perfection, of our search for perfection is that we don't do anything.

So Mike, I hear you. There's not going to be anything that every single one of us agrees to, but I think remembering Mark Lewis's words that we are sitting here as a faculty and arguing that -- what was it, Mark? Two-tenths of 1% is what you said, of our time, that we cannot give that much of our time to engage in something and to then work through it --

MICHAEL LOVENHEIM: Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm not being mischaracterized here. I'm not saying it's not worth our time. I'm not saying --

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah, but you're saying you want something perfect.

MICHAEL LOVENHEIM: No, I didn't say that either. If I did, that is not what I meant. I'm not saying I want something perfect. I'm saying I think it would help us to know more specifically about what needs to be done -- let me just finish -- that if we are going to experiment and figure out what to do, well, that requires us actually doing something.

What I'm saying is I think it would benefit us to know what that's going to be at first, and to be able to have a specific conversation about it. I'm not saying it needs to be perfect, I'm not saying we should wait six years to do it, or a long period of time. But at some point, we're going to have to -- someone's going to implement a policy here. And I think the issue that we're dancing around in terms of what we're going to do and people's disagreements often about

whether this is a good idea or not is about those specifics. I think it would help us to know more about those specifics. That is all I am saying.

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay, wonderful. May I ask you a question? And I don't mean to be offensive, but I have been now in so many meetings about this, that I feel the need to ask this question. Have you actually read the reports?

MICHAEL LOVENHEIM: Yes.

NEEMA KUDVA: Oh, good. Thank you. Sometimes I'm in conversations with people who haven't read the reports. I'm always like scratching my head and going, I don't know what conversation to have with you. But thank you, Michael. I appreciate that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We're back to Buz. Take us to a new level.

BUZ BARSTOW: First of all, Charlie and Neema, I really want to second what you said and I think what we see in the chat. I think experimentation is really important, and I think that will go a long way to assuage a lot of the concerns, especially if it's done in a tolerant way.

You know, Richard makes this point, what about the centers. You're going to have to be tolerant of that. But to Richard's side, something again that keeps coming up when I discuss this with my fellow faculty is, if you look at the demographics of the country, where they're going, if you look at the economics of the world, where wealth will be concentrated in the next few decades, if we don't get ahead of this, we really risk irrelevance. At the same time, we have to maintain this perception of academic freedom. If we don't do that, we also kind of risk irrelevance. But I think, like Neema said, we do really strongly support seizing this by the horns and going with this as quickly as we can.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Buz.

Wendy Wilcox.

WENDY WILCOX: I have a couple responses to some of what we've heard here today. One of them was related to the Working Group F and kind of questioning why we need to kind of move to a different model of diversity programming. I do want to mention, and this also relates a lot to what Neema brought up about reading the actual report, because the report does indicate that the Officer of Faculty Development and Diversity offers a tremendous number of these sessions. There's not capacity for that group to do more, and there's a limit to how much more they're going to get people to do. They've already acknowledged that in there, so we're looking for something else.

The second point I want to make is that I hear a lot of kind of concern against not trusting where the curriculum, where the implementation will go. It's kind of interesting to me, because most people in this room teach classes. And I'm sure the first class that you taught, the proposed content and curriculum evolved over your many iterations of teaching, as it should. I don't think anyone proposes a course and that course content is firmly in place from day one of teaching. I do kind of feel like it seems reasonable to apply that same standard to the student and the faculty content.

The third point is, again, going back to what Neema said and actually some questions about the punitive nature of these required programs. I'm not reading this in this report as it being punitive. What it's simply saying is, similarly to the incentive where if you want to be on a search committee, you have to participate in this training, they're saying if you, as a faculty member, want to hire students or teach or supervise teaching assistants, advise or mentor students and what not, this is what you have to do. There is no punishment if you don't do it. It's just that you can't do your job because you haven't taken the time to further develop your expertise.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Good point. The quality of these resources, let's talk about them as resources that can be used by faculty and departments, it is an absolute critical point. They have to be high, high-quality. We mentioned two of them that are in the library right now that work well.

I would be the first to say forget this whole thing if the library of resources produced was sub-standard. But what's the greatest way to ensure highest standard? It's to get Mike to invest in it. How do you get Mike to invest in it? A strong faculty voice saying look, we're willing to try this out, but you'd better make this stuff good. That's sort of how I think about the quality. We all have these episodes in our past where I've sat for 90 minutes, this thing is a waste of time. But there are other examples where, like -- never mind. Sorry. I had a great thing there to say, it would have wrapped it all up.

Okay, Paul, take us to a new level.

PAUL: I think I'll be taking us to a lower level, unless my computer as well decides to censor me, as yours did. I apologize; I wasn't able to follow the discussion entirely, because I've been on a simultaneous faculty meeting for the last hour, which just ended. I listened to the comments, though.

I'm surprised, because I'm representing here two departments, Physics and Information Science, and we sent a note about this. The responses I've received are presumably not representative of the faculty at-large because we know the people who respond are extreme in one direction or another, but it was overwhelmingly opposed to the faculty requirement on a variety of principal bases, maybe some of which you have seen already on the 90-plus comments on the faculty website; everything from it would be ineffective, oblivious to the literature on the efficacy of this training, poorly considered, and the thought control from people from the -- but including people from InfoSci, who have been involved in these kinds of

initiatives and just not convinced by it, there were a few comments on chat that I found disturbing of people who said they were moving towards favoring the proposal because they didn't want to be associated with some of the negative comments on the faculty website.

I don't really like the logic, but I'd just like to sum up something I proposed in haste while I was on the other meeting, which is I'm simply shocked that the question about teaching is in there as a punitive measure because it's just too simplistic, okay, so you can teach. That's what faculty do, that's what you're paid for. If you can't teach, you can't advise students, you can't do anything else, you can't do the job, you can't be paid, it's therefore an assault on faculty.

I just want to make the point, and that's why I formally proposed it, but I want to make a very strong statement: I cannot fathom how any faculty member here could vote for that proposal with that wording in there. It is a frontal assault on tenure, and it just can't be there. You can have incentives, but you cannot have a punitive measure.

And I don't know what people are thinking. They're thinking oh, well -- there was what I regard as a borderline disingenuous response on the faculty site from Charlie that oh, well, this is just words and it will depend on the implementation, and all the details are in the implementation. That's not a principled response. The principled response is no, we cannot have terminology that threatens faculty members with their livelihood, if they're not compliant.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Paul.

Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Since I wrote that, I guess Paul was referring to me. Paul, I agree with many of the points you're making, but at the end of the day, I disagree with you on what the bottom line has to be. I think we have to side with our faculty colleagues of color and others who feel that they have been victims of various kinds of regressions. We know that this is a

reality. We can see it in the news today, and we have to make the positive affirmative statement that we're willing to go here.

Furthermore, I would argue that Cornell does need this. There's wording in the report that I find problematic. We've expressed that point clearly, and I'm going to trust that people will cure those deficits and not create something which is an affront to the tenure. I think that's an exaggerated reading, and I actually think the comments Michael made were also, in my mind, exaggerated comments.

It's true, a worst-case reading of certain kinds of language can lead you to very negative conclusions about what's going to be implemented, but we have long histories with Cornell. Cornell, as an institution, does not, in fact, implement thoughtless punitive structures. The report was intended in a positive sense, clearly. I think we ought to express support for it. Do that, in light of our concerns about it, and trust that the people who implement this are going to fix some of the deficits here.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Ken. Just a reminder, we're beyond time. Anyone can go any time they want. Everything is recorded, whatever, but we'll continue. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer from the Biomedical Engineering Department. I think it's critically important that the University show -- communicate how important of a value this is with something that's substantive, given the striking pushback on a requirement and punitive effects associated with it.

And just kind of off the top of my head, I'm wondering if there's other ways that you could have similar levels of participation and similarly communicate the value. For example, what if the University just said we will take 50% of the SIP pool and we'll just divide it among faculty who participate. I think that is expressing a lot of value about what -- showing a lot of

value in participating in diversity initiatives. It's not a punitive requirement, and I think we would get broad participation.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Chris. That's an interesting idea, and it is a comment that's posted on our website.

Sara Pryor, we'd like to hear from you.

SARA PRYOR: Hi. Maybe it's a threat that nobody has any intention of realizing, but I think it's unfortunate to think about having these kinds of threats against the faculty. I mean, a lot of you have experiences, as I have, the system that's supposed to record reporting of our conflicts of interest failed, and so we got emails saying if we didn't do it, we'd be struck from PIs, we would not have our proposals submitted, even though we've been completely compliant, and now we get a threat. I just think that, as faculty members, we deserve to be treated with respect, not to receive threats from our institution.

I mean, I'm a woman. I'm completely committed to diversity, but I don't need to be threatened by my employer. I think it's horrifying. For goodness' sake, let's try and think about bringing people willingly, rather than forcing participation and then we will have exactly what we saw at the diversity training, where people sat at the back, reading a newspaper. Now, that is formally participation, but it is useless participation, so let's try and encourage people and have them come to it with a constructive mindset. I'm sorry, I don't enjoy being threatened. Thank you very much for your time.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Sarah. As I said, we've all probably been in that back row for 90 minutes, while someone up there is going on, but there are other counter-examples as well. Again, if the resources made available for faculty for this, the menu of items there that the faculty and departments can choose based on need and what's coming down the road, that I would be the first to say forget the whole thing. But again, how do we elevate the quality of

these resources? In the report is mentioned more for OFDD, and the point of view is let's try it, let us try it. If we discover that you can't elevate the quality enough or that some kind of metric sheds light on hey, this has no impact, then jettison the whole thing, but don't we want to try? That's sort of the philosophy there.

I don't see any more hands. Jill, is there anything in the chat that -- Risa, yeah. Take a look at the chat, if we can get someone to verbalize what they post up there. Risa, yeah.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: I wanted to follow up on the last comment that Sara was making. One of the things that has dismayed me about the discussion is that because of our focus on required or not required, we've lost the feeling of connectedness to what we're trying to accomplish.

The idea of all the possibilities that we can build on -- I saw in the chat there was a comment about all the things that other departments have been doing. This is not new for some departments. What can we do to build positively on things that have been done here and collective kind of faculty engagements around these issues, do this with our students.

All of the very positive moves we can make to develop a way of addressing this, whether -- some of it may be using other people's materials they've created, but I like to face-to-face, whether it's with my students or whether it's with my colleagues. Seems to me, this is not an individualized endeavor, that what we're trying to do is create, as the reports have emphasized, to create an environment where we can all live and flourish and learn from each other and develop. That's what we are trying to do here.

I don't think this is about the question of checking a box. I know nobody intends it to be that, but I think that the statement of -- the concerns about well, if you don't do this, then you may lose your job, I know I feel that way every time I get one of those reminders to do

something that I'm an expert in, on Title IX, and I resent getting those kinds of reminders to do those sessions.

If we're experimenting, I think the emphasis should be on how do we experiment initially to bring people together and have successful programs to really address these issues. If we cannot get participation in that way initially, then we can ask are there requirements that should be imposed or developed. I want to go back to the essence of what we are trying to do, not an issue of imposing requirements in the name of accountability.

Seems to me, we should all be accountable, regardless of that. I develop my classes not because I think somebody's going to fire me if I don't update my classes. I do it because I care about it. How do we create that sort of environment? I wish we could return to that as a positive way of addressing this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Risa. I don't see any more hands up, and Jill tells me chat kind of died down, so why don't we officially go to our so-called hallway chat mode. If you've got to go, thank you for coming. I've learned a lot. I hope you have too. Thank you.