

Voter Comments on the C-Resolution

The vote tallies for the C-Resolution are Yes = 101, No = 12, Abstain = 5, DNV = 9.

Voters were able to upload comments on their ballot. Below are the comments so obtained.

There was some troubling unclarity in the report; but on the whole I think that it would be good to have such a center.

I am in support of this and have deep gratitude for the working group-I think there are complex issues around the next two reports but remain in support of creation of this Center-and feel it is our duty and obligation as educators to learn and grow alongside our students and to offer safety and support -as well.

I think that the center should be more "inclusive" on whom it interacts with, versus just BIPOC students and trainees.

The Dept. strongly supports racial equality. It is difficult to explain all the misgivings that this proposal has elicited. It seems to be a combination of a diffuse, intangible set of objectives for the Center, a suspicion that the Center has little to do with scholarship and academic standing, an apparent duplication of efforts within the University and the me-too attitude with respect to the establishment of such centers at other schools.

I and my colleagues strongly support initiatives by the university to combat racism, discrimination and bias. The very few comments from my colleagues were negative or showed concern about the resources needed. My fellow senators have voiced concerns that I agree with; they were more eloquent than I. I am told not to concern myself with the implementation. I am not able to come to terms with this. I look forward to a modified version to be able to vote yes.

I strongly support the concept of the Center. Major concern: In contrast to successful proposal for centers (e.g., proposals for NSF centers), which provide detailed information on (1) the research activity in the first 2-3 years, (2) the research team and (3) the administrative structure, these items are only vaguely addressed in the final report.

The proposal will allow the administration to shift significant resources to the newly created center from other programs. As a result all such programs need to petition to new center to gain their fair share of resources to continue their work. Nothing in the proposal guarantees the funding decisions of the new center will not be politically motivated. The part of the resolution saying "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate believes that the recommendations set forth in the WG-C Final Report are worthy of careful consideration by the President and Provost" is very confusing -- the dean of the faculty can (and should) submit the report of the working group to the provost without approval of the senate. An endorsement of the report by the senate suggest that the senate allows the administration to implement the report in any way they want. However there are many details in the implementation which normally would require a separate approval from the senate and the resolution does not guarantee that the administration will ask for such approval.

Regarding the clause "...that broad, transparent consultation with the faculty must attend any decision to implement..." -- "consultation" is not sufficient. This phrasing suggests that the university is run by decision-making executives and that faculty are ancillary. We need to be an organization of faculty: that's the university's mission. So, I'd revise the final two "be it resolved's," condensing them into one that reads: "Be it finally resolved that the ongoing broad and transparent engagement with the Faculty Senate and whatever standing committee might be relevant, e.g., the Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, and the Faculty Committee on Program Review, must guide further development and implementation of the WG-C recommendation."

Kudos to the working group for a very thoughtful and far reaching proposal. I believe the pipeline to the academy component is particularly important and potentially impactful.

If we want the center to accomplish more than symbolism, it would be useful for it to be the driver behind hires that would help diversify the faculty. The center could be an important part of the other resolutions. I get the sense that people don't want modules (these can become just annoying tasks that people try to rush through as with so many

online training requirements, and they can have unintended consequences for people who don't want to take them and potentially develop more racial resentment), and the center could be a place that coordinates in-person courses, seminars, discussion groups, etc. for improving understanding of race and racism.

I support rigorous academic investigation to measure the level racism using scientific methodology, the causes of racism, the consequences of racism and the policy solutions to racism. Mandating reeducation programs, quotas, class content requirements, limitations on free discuss or points of view.

The creation of the center is of great importance to achieve our DEI goals.

Prior to voting I engaged the members of my department in discussion about this issue. My vote represents the majority opinion of my department. Several faculty expressed concerns about implementation that reflect skepticism about perceived top-down initiatives from the University. Doug Antczak - Microbiology & Immunology (CVM)

I would like to emphasize the importance of ensuring that existing programs doing teaching, research, and outreach work on issues of social justice receive adequate funding and resources to accomplish their goals. The creation of Center for Racial Justice and Equitable Futures should be a catalyst to provide equitable distribution of funding and resources to existing programs that have been achieving excellent accomplishments even as they are struggling with under-funding from the university.

Neither the internal governing council nor external advisory board provide for representation of opposing views (expressed in a civil manner). Current resolution thus sets up a non-white vs white "us-against-them" echo chamber that I am not 100% comfortable with.

I am voting in favor of this resolution. I really don't think we need yet another center, and am concerned that a new center will draw resources (faculty time and univ funding) away from other centers and efforts. However, the proposal is a good one and has been thought through well. I think it has enough broad-scale support to potentially work.

The focus on "equity" rather than "equality" is concerning and eventually an affront to meritocratic principles the should guide hirings or any selection committee in the context of mathematics. Gender or race should play no role, neither hindering nor benefitting anyone on the basis of those immutable characteristics. A person's views on race and gender should also not be asked at any point from the institution's standpoint, as they are private and everchanging (e.g. someone who wants to benefit an ethnic minority today for the sake of being an ethnic minority, may be considered a moral criminal in the future, and viceversa).

I particularly like the 'diffuse' intellectual location of this center with contributions from units such as museums and botanic gardens as venues in which our values of justice and equity can be visualized. Physically centered in the library as a nexus of all learning and center for collective growth is also brilliant. I would recommend that the working group on the required course (S) take a similar approach, incorporating perspectives that students might otherwise not see if they stay canalized in their colleges and adding unique value to anti-racist curricula and courses already in place in many colleges.

The goals of the Center are widely supported. Certain implementation approaches proposed in the Working Group reports are problematic and will not be effective, nevertheless there are effective alternatives that are effective and can respect both the need for faculty autonomy and just behavior.

I support this resolution, but hope that attention will be given to the concerns raised in the Senate about not diverting resources from our existing programs, or creating duplicative structures. It would be a shame if an effort aimed at enhancing Cornell's resources actually somehow led to a step backwards by triggering major cuts elsewhere in programs that share similar goals.