

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 2021

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Welcome, everybody, to our senate meeting this afternoon. You see there are the land acknowledgment statements and the rules we have for running the meeting.

Every one of our meetings now for the last month and a half or so, we want to begin with a statement, because bad things are happening out there. In this case, it's some horrific new COVID-19 waves that are happening across Europe, India, Bangladesh, and so on. We are awfully sad to hear about that news, and we must remember also that in our midst are students and staff and faculty from those very areas, and we want to acknowledge our empathy for what they are going through. It's all, of course, magnified by this time of the academic year, where we're all stressed to begin with.

I have a sad announcement that Mike Thonney, a professor in Animal Science, DGS senator, and also someone that worked with us over the last year on the University Faculty Committee passed away last week from cancer. Mike was a researcher-in-chief. As you can see from the picture there, one of his more recent activities concerned having a solar farm and a sheep farm on the same land.

The last time I saw Mike in person was a few months ago at the Triphammer line. Mike was a real stickler with Robert's rules. I play fast and loose with Robert's rules, so we had exchanged some quips in the checkout line about that. Anyway, he's going to be missed. It's really nice to have a foil like Mike around. He had great insight in all our doings this past year. Mike Thonney.

As you know, the election completed last Friday. Eve De Rosa will be the next dean of faculty, and you can see the individuals who were elected to the other positions. We want to thank all who ran for these positions and, of course, all who voted.

This spread over the last academic year; we want to have a greater faculty presence in the admissions, so we set up the very light-weight group called the Admissions Advisory Group, who will meet roughly twice a semester with the vice provost for enrollment, who meets regularly with all the admission officers from the colleges. This will start in the fall, and I think it's an important development. This is clearly a critical area, and this is a nice low-overhead way for faculty to stay in touch. And we'll have more information on how this operation will work, but wanted to announce that.

In two weeks, we have our last meeting. Here's a sketch of what will happen. President Pollack will be with us for Q&A, the Financial Policy Committee will give an annual report. Couple of heads-up on new things coming down the pike. Latin honors and the freshman writing seminar ballot system are important discussion points, then we want to tidy up partly some of the things that have been going on. We want to wrap up the international dual degree program approval thing. We'll package it up as a resolution, and it would be good to act on that.

The tenure track project is going to have to be shifted to next year, but I want to do one thing before that happens. One of those resolutions has to do with the transparency of college documentation. I think that would be very important to get passed, if we can, so it sets a nice, clean stage for Eve and others to work on this in the upcoming year. There was a group, ad hoc group that was working on online harassment, and they produced a one-pager. We'll talk about that next meeting.

Now we get into the main business for today. And just a little bit of a preamble before we get into the presentations, there's six resolutions that we have to talk about, but let me say a

few things in advance of that. This is a metaphor, but it's one that I like. It's been a really hard year in this respect, but we should not be surprised about that. These are hard conversations. You're supposed to feel uncomfortable. The destination's important, but how we get there, how we are getting there is even more important. We all have to learn how to talk about these things, talk about these things when you totally disagree with whoever you're chatting with.

I would just say there's an easy way to do this thing, this blue-ribbon committee, you don't look at any of the details, you just cruise along with all the standard kind of discussion. We really dug deep, and we wouldn't be having this meeting, for example, if we took the easy way towards this. I know that a lot of us are stressed about this; but on the other hand, I'm really kind of proud that we took this route. Just speaking for myself -- and I know lots of others told me we have learned a lot -- I have learned an awful lot about this, but I think we wanted to keep that in mind today and going forward.

As you know, the C resolution passed. It was a pretty strong majority, about 4-1 ratio there. Comments were part of the ballot, as you know. You voted, and you also had a little box where you could write anything you wanted in there. We got about 20 or so comments; most of them were people who had some kind of hesitation over the idea of having this center. It's a two-pager. It is interesting to see what those hesitations were. That's done. We haven't actually sent that to the president and provost yet, because we want to send all three things in one package. Anyway, that's how the C resolution turned out.

Here's the format, roughly. We're going to do this six times. Somebody is going to present very briefly a resolution. We want to suggest something that, when someone's presenting, you want to pay attention. It's kind of aggravating if you are on chat, then you raise your hand with a question that was already answered. I would say when someone's actually

presenting stuff, it's really better to listen than to chat. I know I'm sounding like a middle school teacher here, but it's kind of an important point.

Then, we want to make sure senators have a chance to pose questions. Remember, the ultimate goal of this particular meeting is to make sure that all the senators know what each of those six resolutions says; then, once that pool is exhausted, open it up to discussion for anyone who's in the meeting.

Just a little preview. The plan is that the e-vote will start tomorrow. It will run for a week. On each resolution, you will see something like this. It is where, like with the center; the actual yes, no, abstain boxes at the top, a comment box that you can put anything you want in there. Just a reminder, it's totally anonymous. It is not coupled to your vote. We simply print out all the comments made when the vote is complete. And they're going to be public. Of course, you can sign your name there -- I think it's excellent if you do, as a matter of fact -- but the comment box, and then below is the actual resolution. The resolution might have links in that. That will be a carbon copy of what is on the resolution, the kind of thing where you may want to do a little homework in advance, because there's six things to process there.

Let's pause right here. Are there any questions about what I just said, any of the procedure we are doing here? Any hands up there, Jill?

I see Joanie. Joanie?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks. Just a quick question. I do see the point about encouraging people to pay attention and not to chat, but there are not Robert's rules that pertain to chat. And sometimes the chat also -- interesting stuff happens there too. It does happen in stereo sometimes, I think.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Just to be clear, we are saying when someone's presenting their slides. After that, clearly, I totally agree, the chat has been a very interesting feature we

discovered. No effort to quell that. I'm just saying you might want to pay attention when someone's speaking. That's all I'm saying.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Richard.

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, Charlie. I have a question about -- we wanted to propose an amendment to the UFC F resolution. It's unclear to me in the description of the process when we should do that. Should we do that after the presentation of the UFC F resolution, or should we wait? The parliamentary procedure here is really unclear, so that's the question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: As I said, sent all the senators a note yesterday, saying if you have any issue with the plan that we had, that you send it to us in advance. It's very hard to orchestrate spontaneous resolutions from the floor, and you were asked yesterday to send something. It would have been nice if you had sent that yesterday. However --

RICHARD BENSEL: Charlie, I did send you a heads up at 2:00. We were still deliberating. I'm sorry about that, but as you pointed out some time before, it's hard to have all the trains run on time and 24/7, so I apologize for that. But it is under parliamentary procedure, amendments are in order, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, so after we go through the UFC presentation and, as you know, we planned for an amendment already, out there for people to look at. We'll do that. Then after that, if you want to raise another issue, go ahead. You'll have to propose an amendment, it will have to be seconded, then we'll see if there's a majority that wants to go along with it.

RICHARD BENSEL: Thank you very much, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Now we'll go to the F resolutions. First of all, all the presentations are pretty brief, in terms of the number of slides. Each one may be three or four slides, and you have heard from us before, but let's say a few final things about this.

One thing I want to point out is that the faculty and the student pieces are highly related. If you look at the comments out there -- very few people point this out -- there are 150 comments on the F report, and about 20 on the S report, which is kind of an interesting ratio, but the two are highly related. Some of the comments really point this out, for totally different reasons, but I just want to stress two things here.

If you look at the goal of the student requirement and change two words, that basically is a paraphrase of what the UFC resolution is for faculty; for faculty to become critical thinkers. Again, when we start getting to the more practical things, for example, with the students, menus, choice, learning from experts, classroom and workplace climate, tight schedule, rollout, resources, the whole parallel set of issues with faculty, and sometimes they're related. Again, a question I would pose to people is that how would you rationalize supporting one and not the other, as a study question.

Regarding this interesting ratio of comments, I want to mention something that some of you may not know, which is that anybody, anywhere can post on our website. It's not just Cornell IDs. I'm not saying anything about what fraction of these are from the outside, but you should be aware of that. In fact, it's Eve's call for next year, but my recommendation is we really change the commenting feature on the website, so it's only Cornell ID people that can do it.

There's another sort of study question down there: Why do you think the ratio is sort of 10-1 that way? Again, the versions of this have been discussed before, but when we vote, we're sending a signal. After this meeting, there's someone from the National Review that wants to

talk to me. There was an editorial in Newsweek this morning about what we're doing. People are watching. And of course, on campus, students are watching, staff and so on.

Let's look at that first point there. I'm posing these as questions. I don't know the answers, but I'm encouraging people to think about these questions. What does this say about the faculty, the core of the university, if it resists required education for itself, while advocating for more of the same for both students and staff? What does that mean?

The second point here -- posing these as questions. When I'm done, we can get opinions on these -- but what does this say about the faculty with regard to accountability as a mechanism for coercion and an excuse for sanctions, while other professions, critical professions, ongoing education and credentialing are seen as important? These are questions I would hope everybody has thought about.

This is the last one. There's a fork in the road here. At the top is this. These are valid points of view. Despite current events and realizations, adequate DEI progress is possible through voluntary programs, as we know it. Maybe you want to dial them up a bit, but one school of thought is that, despite how things have changed over this past year in the country, you still feel the current way we do these things, which is through voluntary programs by a number of excellent offices, is this still a viable approach.

There's another school of thought, saying that because of all these current events and realizations, progress is only possible through something more than voluntary. That's kind of how I see the fork in the road. Again, I hope everybody thinks about that fork in the road and has a justification for the prong that they take.

That's it. Let's take down the screen. Now we'll do Q&A. About time, I think we'll probably be able to end by 5:00, but maybe not. I did mention last night, let's be relaxed and, if

we have to go to 5:30 or even beyond, let's just get this done. We want to set the stage. It's time to vote, and we've got to set the stage for that. Were there questions? Joanie?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thanks, Charlie. This is more a comment than a question, but you were asking why are there so many more comments about the F report than the S report. I think it's clear; it's the way the F report is written. It begins by saying that faculty must do this. And what "this" is is not described. The report does not offer a rationale for why faculty should do this rather not-described thing, then it suggests penalties for faculty not doing this big thing. It's insulting to read.

The way the report for the students is written, it frames it as describing what the purpose of this education is, what the goals are, instead of just saying you must do this. I think it's an automatic reaction that made it harder to discuss the issues.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Can I just ask you a question? A lot of times, people say there aren't enough details here. Remember, this is step 1. You may be cynical about the step 2. You may think faculty are not going to be involved in how these things are implemented. No one is saying -- for example, if you look at those accountability things, they have to be approved, they have to be implemented. They are going to come back to the senate. Is that clear or not?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: The report is asking us to imagine this, while the document isn't saying it. The document, it could have been finessed better. I think the revisions offered today are helping us do that and, I think, as you say, it's been an interesting conversation; but it's a busy semester, hard to get these conversations.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks. Richard?

RICHARD BENSEL: Hi, Charlie. Is this the time to offer my amendment?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I mean, this is disruptive. The whole point is these Zoom things are very hard to run. You have two minutes. Tell us what the amendment is.

RICHARD BENSEL: I can speak to it. Go to the queue, because I'm trying to get it on the chat, but I can't seem to get it to work. Okay, there it is. I move to amend -- there's the text -- I move to amend the UFC F resolution, by striking everything after the second "whereas" and adding the following text. On that motion, I also asked for the yays and nays. At that point, I should ask for seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

RICHARD BENSEL: Now that we have the motion before, that's the amendment. And now I would like to send what the text would look like, if the amendment were adopted. If the amendment were adopted, the UFC F resolution would then read, and so forth.

Now, I would like to say a few words about why I propose the amendment to the UFC F resolution. One important reason is that the UFC F resolution and the second senator F resolution contradict one another. The UFC resolution would punish faculty for noncompliance with the training program, while the senator resolution would make compliance voluntary.

Because this is the central issue dividing the two resolutions, the best way forward, the most democratic way forward is to pair them against each other and have the Faculty Senate democratically decide which one it preferred, whether it be mandatory with punitive elements, or be voluntary with incentives.

Recognizing that the two resolutions contradicted each other, the sponsors of the senate resolution, in fact, propose that they be paired against each other. However, the UFC thought best not to do that. I should emphasize that the amendment incorporates much of the language of the UFC F resolution, so much so that the major issue between the original version and the amended version, amended alternative that I am offering, is whether or not compliance should be voluntary. I'd be happy to answer any questions that come up with that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: You're right; the two resolutions are opposite. In terms of information conveyed, is this worth pitting one against the other, versus someone will vote yes for one and no for the other? Won't those results communicate -- remember, this is not -- we are sending a message. And the question is, is your thing going to send greater clarity to this. Let's hear from other people.

RICHARD BENSEL: Charlie, that question was addressed to me, so let me answer it. One of the problems here is that all through this process, we've had a one-sided set of presentations, deliberations. We have not at any point been able to decide, as a Faculty Senate, democratically any issue. This has been offered, it's been seconded. Yes, I think we should do it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Carl.

CARL FRANCK: Thanks. I'm going back to your earlier remarks. I think the concern, at least for some of us, is with the training. I would just quickly mention that I had the good fortune, after the last meeting, of attending the Through the Lens diversity training, which Thomas recommended as excellent. I found it was absolutely excellent. At the same time, as we had discussed earlier, there's mandatory training we have for sexual harassment, which I feel is very corporate and wrong. So the question is, we have a history as to what kind of training we receive. In our resolutions, we were trying to bring this down to the departmental level and include good feedback. When I get to that, I hope people will remember that.

The other thing, this is anecdotal, but as a faculty senator, I have been talking to staff. Staff is not totally happy with their training. As a faculty senator, we work slowly, but we'll get the job done.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Ken.

KEN BIRMAN: Thank you, Charlie. I wish I could speak to Richard's proposal, but it got clipped off partly, and I'm not sure how one could do that without it being given to us in a written form. I will say I kind of object to it having been repressed in this way.

My colleagues have expressed a range of views. Some have been quite silent on this; others have been negative. What they are negative about has tended to be the requirement aspect of it, the fact that it's two-and-a-half hours, without that being justified.

I, myself, remember the all-day events that Frank and Hunter Rawlings would organize on important topics. Those were excellent. They truly were valuable. Arguably, the reason that the S proposal gets less criticism than the F proposal is that in two-and-a-half hours, whether it's once a semester, once a year, you can't accomplish what you can do over a full semester, which is what the students would experience.

And possibly people's sentiment is simply that two-and-a-half hours isn't adequate; it's lip service. Of course, if we are going to do it a full day, you couldn't possibly require the same full day every year, but it does suggest to me that not enough discussion and debate has occurred around the format of this or the punitive elements that have been proposed.

I don't know that what I've described in any sense is the majority in my department. I think if there's a majority view, it's that somehow we should support the University to do the right thing here, but I do believe that there are serious issues with what's been put in front of us and that the UFC proposal sweeps over those by simply saying that we support the spirit of it and encourage further attention to the question. I would much rather be voting on something concrete, with strong debate and strong support.

NEEMA KUDVA: Could I just interrupt for a second, Charlie?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Sure.

NEEMA KUDVA: Because we have a motion on the floor, we actually need to address the motion first and deal with it, before we can have a broader discussion, unless you want to --

KEN BIRMAN: Neema, if that's the case, could you possibly give Richard the opportunity to share the screen and project the full text of what he is proposing?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Jill, do you have Richard's slide?

NEEMA KUDVA: It's really hard for us to do that. It's really hard, which is why we had asked for everything to be sent earlier. It's interesting how sometimes -- anyway, I'm not going to go into that, but we should make a decision about whether we, as a body, should make a decision, because things are all so up and down, whether we're going to be talking about the motion or talking about things more broadly. I think we can, because we are breaking all rules -- Richard's going to have to agree -- that we are going to decide whether we want to do that or not.

RICHARD BENSEL: I added the sections that --

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie, what would you like to do?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think we ought to hear from Risa. Can we just go to Risa, then we have everything on the table. Risa is doing the two F resolutions. Richard, can we hear from Risa, then try to figure this out, after that?

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay. Is that okay with everybody? If you disagree, yell out no. If we don't hear anything, we're just going to hear from Risa about the other two proposals that are on the floor.

RICHARD BENSEL: That's fine with me.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: The screen up, Jill, for Risa's presentation.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I think there's certainly an overlap between the two resolutions, what's being called the faculty resolutions F1 and 2, there's a real overlap between

what I'm going to say now about those and what Richard has provided in the chat with regard to the motion to amend the UFC resolution regarding faculty education. My comments on the amendment, the proposed amendment, which has been seconded and actually on the floor, were going to be very similar to what I'm going to say now. But since I've been asked to do it more broadly, that is what I will do.

If you would like to look in the chat that Richard has, I saw, put in the rest of the motion to amend, and the amended UFC resolution that's been proposed is all in there. As Richard said, that proposed amendment maintains certain aspects of the UFC resolution, where there's significant agreement on goals and, then, to a great extent substitutes the major difference in conflict is the question of the requirements and the punitive nature of the consequences accompanying the requirement, if the requirement is not fulfilled, as opposed to a voluntary requirement.

Then, as you'll see in the proposed amendment, there also retains two of the resolved clauses, I believe it is, from the UFC's resolution with regard to maintaining faculty governance. If people do want to look at that proposed amended UFC resolution, you'll see a real congruence between what I'm about to say and what's in that proposed amendment.

I'm going to start here with the first resolution, here it's entitled supporting faculty educational programs to address issues of racism and systemic injustice and to enhance diversity, equity and inclusion. That one is the first one I'll deal with, then I'll deal with the second resolution, which deals with voluntary participation.

Could you advance the slide, please?

What I think is really important, and this is in this first resolution, is to identify what many of us across the board have been saying the whole time, which is that the goals are

extremely important and we should take them seriously with regard to having a strong and effective institutional response to address issues of racism and systemic inequalities.

Now, this is not a new problem. I realize that Charlie before was emphasizing, of course, that this past year has been so extreme with the terrible tragedies and the terrible police violence that has occurred and the impact of the pandemic on communities of color that has brought in front of people who otherwise may have ignored these issues, have brought these issues forward. These are systemic, which means they are long-lasting problems.

We have always used strong institutional response to them, and we need them now, more than ever, but this is a long-term problem. I think there's agreement on this; we need a collective faculty commitment to both understanding and to addressing these systemic inequalities, to addressing issues of diversity, equity and inclusion, to try to make this campus and this institution one that shifts its own systemic inequalities, as well as teaching and learning and researching and engaging collectively as a faculty, to advance those goals.

The resolution also supports, recognizing that we have initiatives, educational initiatives -- and I'm just talking about faculty ones. Of course, there are the student initiatives as well, in terms of courses that will be discussed in a bit, but that we should build on the educational initiatives that the OFDD and colleges and schools have created, and we should recognize those and build on them and develop them further, and that faculty governance should be part of that, so we should engage the Faculty Senate and its committees in the process of developing unit-wide programs for faculty education. I don't think anybody disagrees with anything on this slide, so let's move on to the next slide.

Thanks. The resolved provisions in this faculty resolution F1 supports, it endorses and supports the Working Group F report's goal to create educational programs to support faculty in creating an antiracist, just and equitable climate for our campus community, quoting from the

report. And it also supports both University and college, school department-level development of faculty education programs to address these issues.

It also supports and it endorses departments and colleges working with each other and with OFDD to evaluate participation rates and the effectiveness of these programs. We need evaluation and we need a collective response in this way to learn from each other and to build. And with regard to the governance issues, it supports the Faculty Senate with its standing committees to participate in the process of developing these kinds of university-wide programs for faculty education.

Again, I would assume that virtually everybody would agree with this, so I think we're ready to go on to the next resolution, where this is where we have the conflict, the contradiction with the UFC proposal. Again, the title here is very similar to the other resolution, but it now includes the resolution supporting voluntary participation by faculty in these educational programs and, again, starts with what does the resolution support.

I'm not going to read these out again, because the first two are exactly the same as what was in the first resolution, with regard to the institutional response and collective faculty commitment. The third piece, in terms of what's supported, has been eluded to already, which is that this resolution supports a positive, non-punitive approach to achieving these goals, of building and achieving broad participation in faculty education programs, and doing it in a way that is designed to succeed in having a positive collective commitment, where we encourage our colleagues and we create structures that will enhance that encouragement and really build deep discussions with each other.

The resolved clauses reflect the whereas clauses. The resolved clauses strongly encourage, will ask the Faculty Senate to strongly encourage voluntary participation by the faculty in these educational programs. It supports developing positive incentives for faculty to

participate in these educational programs. What the scope would be of those positive incentives, that would be to be worked out. This is an example of something that could be a possibility; supplemental funding for departments, for example. They could even be earmarked for certain purposes to enhance the creation of these programs.

I'm just going to end with, once again, noting that what we want is success here, what we want is success in addressing something we all agree upon in terms of our goals. To move towards success is, as a positive matter, is inconsistent with a notion of mandating participation on pain of punishment, which is listed in the report, the Working Group F report at this point, the pain of punishment with regard to not being permitted to teach, not being permitted to advise students, not being permitted to do anything in our jobs.

That is punishment that could result in somebody losing their job. I don't think that's the way that we move towards a positive goal of inclusion and addressing deep systemic inequalities and actually gauging self- and collective education, so thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Why don't we just continue talking about the content of all these things. Durba.

DURBA GHOSH: Thanks, Charlie. I'm Durba Ghosh, for those of you who don't know me. I'm faculty in the Department of History, I'm a member of the University Faculty Committee -- I'm in my second term -- also a member of Working Group F.

Maybe I'll just say one thing which I think is very positive, which is we have in front of us several resolutions, which as Risa Lieberwitz just pointed out, which roughly agree we should adopt some kind of faculty responsibility for educating ourselves on antiracism. None of these resolutions are absolutely perfect, and I say this as somebody who was involved in Working Group F. There were a lot of conversations, a lot of difficult conversations, a lot of lack of resolution, and I think the shape of all these resolutions reflects that.

I hope we're acknowledging that this is not the end of the discussion, but an important next step that will lead to some form of implementation. I want to encourage the faculty senators who are going to vote, please vote yes for one or more of these resolutions. I think it will send a very important message to the administration about what we prioritize in terms of what we, as a faculty, are willing to do to make this a more equitable place to work and to teach and to do research.

I have been hearing a great deal about not sending the Administration a quote, unquote blank check. I've also been hearing a lot of criticism of corporate-style diversity seminars and trainings. I think what I would say is I share that sense of criticism and, in some sense, I see these resolutions as pressing forth a vision for what the faculty wants. Again, vote for one of these resolutions, vote yes.

One thing I'll just say about the Working Group F report is the word "punitive" or "punishment" didn't really exist in the report. I just searched the report, and so one of the things that I would say is that the report is not calling for punishment, but promoting a process by which we are not in a position of punishing colleagues who make biased comments or conversations. Rather, the report is promoting forms of training to support faculty in helping them to be better at their jobs, all parts of their jobs, running their labs, teaching courses, working with other faculty, working with staff.

I have a preference in terms of the faculty requirement that does not depend on the voluntary goodwill of the people who are usually good willed, and I'll just say a word about the folks that have put forth these resolutions, the alternative resolutions. These are extraordinarily good willed, kind, supportive individuals, and so I really, really appreciate the resolution. I prefer the one offered by Working Group F, in part, because Working Group F was comprised of

faculty and students of color. I prefer the one offered by Working Group F because it does not depend on the voluntary goodwill.

I will just end by reposting a comment that was among the many comments that was posted in -- I don't like to call it Charlie's website, but it was posted in the chat, and that is a comment posted by a faculty member who was expressing opposition. I'll let you read it. These aren't my words, but their words; my sense is faculty members remembering with some fondness past moments in which they felt free to speak openly. This comment is built on a particularly resonant story about the past, and it's a story about the past that I hear a lot from some of my senior colleagues.

What I understand from this narrative sounds a lot like, quote, it used to be really great when we were less diverse and we could say what we wanted without being called out by minority and women faculty. I don't know if that's what this anonymous commenter is saying, but I think I would conclude by saying what Charlie opened with, which is having a diverse faculty and student population requires work. That work should not be a requirement for some of us.

In proposing a faculty requirement, we're not calling for a restoration of the old order, we're not calling for taking away. Instead, we're calling for the faculty to advance a future in how we change, how we teach, how we organize our labs, how we mentor, how we create equal opportunities for everyone. That change is already happening; but rather than being fearful of what you might lose, we might want to look toward a future in which all of us can speak frankly and be heard.

With that, I'll maybe just note that it's 4:20. We've been in this meeting for about 40 minutes, and I don't want to make too much of a big thing here, but I'm the first person of color that's spoken about this antiracism measure. In case you feel that everybody is free to speak, I

would just draw attention to how extremely sturdy and brave I am today, and so I hope this is an invitation for some of my colleagues to speak up as well.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Let's hear from Mark.

MARK LEWIS: Sorry. I think I want to just cut and paste what Durba just said, so I'll pass. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's go down the list here, and then get our way back to what we do with Richard's motion here. Carl?

CARL FRANCK: I quickly want to mention that I appreciate what Durba said, but I'm thoroughly remembering in Working Group F that there were comments concerning what would happen to faculty who didn't have the mandatory training. There was talk about lack of any contact with students. Durba, could you answer that? I mean, that was a very real concern that was expressed earlier; not the impression I just got from you. Thank you.

DURBA GHOSH: Thanks for that, Carl. I think the passage that you're referring to -- I was looking for it too -- is at the end. Maybe I'll just give a -- I know you've already heard a lot about Working Group F. One of the things we were thinking about is that we already have training like the one you went to for search committee, for serving on a search committee. I think what we were imagining was that we would have workshops for the particular roles that faculty do. If you don't sit on a search committee, you don't go to the search committee training. If you don't run a lab, you don't go to the lab training, but this would be a way of saying that you're kind of ready to teach.

I proposed an idea from Twitter -- I don't know if any of you use Twitter, but we have blue checks next to our name. I proposed an idea where we get a little blue check if you've been through the Center for Teaching, Innovation, Diversity workshops. You wouldn't be required to

do it, but you get a little blue check, and then the students would know that you have had some training.

The working groups, all the working groups had students. If you think I'm radical, you should meet the students. I mean, they were -- this was a kind of adjustment and compromise from what the students wanted. The students' perspective is there's a lot of required courses in the university that they are required to take to fulfill their majors.

And in those classes, they are exposed to various kinds of biased statements -- I mean, they can speak to it more articulately than I do, but it's an incentive system. It's not meant to be a punitive system. It's a system meant to accredit you with having done some form of training, just like we already do for the search committee trainings. We are already doing it, right.

And if I can just say, I think it's much better the faculty willingly adopt this, rather than if we are told we have to do it. In my experience, there's loads of people happy to tell academic faculty sitting in an Ivy League institution what we should be doing. It would be better if we adopted it, so that would be my case for it. I don't know if that's clarified, Carl, but thank you.

CARL FRANCK: Thank you for your words.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: TJ?

TJ HINRICHS: Thank you so much. I think we all share the goal maybe that this kind of training should be universal and ongoing. It's just a core -- well, one concern that I've heard colleagues say that they will, on principle, refuse, just refuse.

And the other concern is that for people who have a glimmer of how important this training is, they're already doing it in some way and, if more options are out there, they will jump on them. But just having seen a couple of examples of training of that sort that was mandatory, I really saw the mandate producing, itself producing a begrudging attitude and even a kind of violent rejection afterwards.

I would like everybody to take this training, but I'm a little bit concerned about a softer pressure in which this is a norm in the department and which, gradually, most people in the department have done different forms of this kind of training and discuss it in department meetings and in hallways and create that kind of pressure on their colleagues to at least begin to feel that there might be gaps in their skill set and in their knowledge, that kind of atmosphere is quite different from what I've seen personally, when things are required and then performed to tick off a box, to get a little check on your something or other. That's a major concern of mine.

I can personally live with a mandate. I'm just extremely worried about -- I think it should come from the faculty and not get prods on us from above. Some of my colleagues have been very concerned that their colleges are already doing these kinds of things and that these initiatives should look differently in different colleges. I think some of that was already built into the report; but anyway, I would just push for something more like that.

I just want to give a shout-out to Ken's point, which is that this kind of training, the training that I've seen work more effectively, that I've seen visible changes over time in people who underwent the training was semester-long, weekly lunch sessions, open-ended problem-solving discussions, which is labor-intensive, but it really made a big impact.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, thanks, TJ. We're getting now at the 4:30 point. Let's hear from Harold and Wendy, and then get back to how we process Richard's resolution. Think about this for a few minutes, which is can you express yourself through the two resolutions, the UFC resolution and the senate's resolution. This was the plan, that we would hear these presentations, and then in the e-vote, you would vote. So the question I would like the group to help us answer is can you express yourself adequately that way. Remember, this is communicating the body language of the senate on all this stuff.

Let's go to Harold, and then Wendy.

Harold.

HAROLD HODES: I'd like to speak in favor of the faculty resolution, the one that didn't come from the UFC. I mean, the UFC report may contain words like sanctional punishment, but I think it's obvious that it's all stick and no carrot. Unsurprisingly, professors don't like being told what to do. I think if you feel that you're forced to go to a training session, I think there's going to be automatic psychological response not to engage with it in a productive way. I mean, I think this is just reiterating Risa's point, but I think we should go with the faculty resolution.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Wendy, then we'll go back to Richard.

WENDY WILCOX: I just want to go back to a question I posed earlier, which is why is the program fundamentally voluntary for faculty and not for students and staff. And if you reply that it should be voluntary for everyone, then does this undermine all of the work of the working groups and it undermine the actual goals of the education programs. That, to me, is the tension that I cannot -- I like all of the resolutions that were proposed, but it can't be weighed without looking at what is the program that the students are being asked to participate in and what is the program that the staff are being asked to participate in. That's my comment.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Quick, Doug.

DOUG ANTCHAK: I don't understand how the faculty, who can possibly oppose the UFC resolution -- I'm a member of the medical profession, I'm credentialed, and I have to undergo periodic recertification. This is similar to that. We're all being forced to wear masks, to have testing every week for COVID. I just cannot understand how the faculty would not support our colleagues, our minority colleagues who clearly feel very strongly that this kind of program sends a strong message to the University.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, Richard. One suggestion I saw is that we would put your resolution as an e-vote, and we just have three different -- it would be part of that pool. That

would solve a problem -- everyone can weigh in, as they see fit, and we have to move on to the other half of the program. Anyway, Richard, what are your thoughts?

RICHARD BENSEL: Charlie, it has to have a vote now. It is the correct parliamentary procedure. I will insist that we have a vote on it. I do want to say a few things about the amendment and emphasize again that we have taken the best parts of the UFC F resolution and we have combined them with what we thought were the best parts of the faculty resolution. It is a composite, then, of those best parts. It does present to the Faculty Senate a clear choice between mandatory and voluntary compliance. We've heard a lot today about students and staff. Students and staff are important, but we can't legislate about them. We're a faculty senate. We can only legislate about faculty.

The second point I would make is faculty are not staff or students. We have a particular role in society, we have a particular role in the university. It is supposed to have dissent, it is supposed to have different points of view. We should not be going to psychiatrists to have our heads examined in order to serve our job. That is not what the role of a faculty member is.

When we're looking at this, a democratic choice between voluntary and mandatory, this should be made now. It should be made among colleagues, should be made in public. It would be impossible to put it in an e-vote; but luckily, that's not acceptable or possible under parliamentary procedure. We would have a vote now, and that's it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I haven't actually --

NEEMA KUDVA: Can I just jump in for a second? Richard, even if we vote now, the count is really difficult, because we need to check each person's vote against -- because we have a lot of people who are non-senators today in the meeting. Even if we hold a vote in chat, Jill and I have to be checking this or somebody has to be checking this, so we're not going to be

able to have the count. You can have a vote, it will sit there, and we will count after the meeting is over, because we cannot confirm -- we have to check it against the list of senators.

RICHARD BENSEL: Understood, Neema. The way it works is if the amendment were adopted, then that would be the resolution that goes to an e-vote. If the amendment were to fail, then the original UFC F resolution would go to an e-vote. What we would be looking at, we vote now, we have a count. Whatever that count is determined would be determining whether the amended version or the original version goes to an e-vote.

This is not a problem, and it is -- I have to remind folks, democracy is messy sometimes, but it's really messy when the presiding officer is not neutral. This is a problem, so we really should practice democracy, bottom-up, spontaneous, real democracy.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chris Schaffer, it went by too quick in the chat. Do you have thoughts on how we can get out of this impasse here?

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Chris Schaffer here. Richard, the one thing I'm concerned with is if things move forward as you suggest, it leaves very little distinguishing factors among the three different resolutions that would be e-voted on, which doesn't leave much opportunity for the full views of the faculty to come out in this vote.

I think an easier way to get the perspective of the faculty in a democratic way would simply be to formally amend your motion, withdraw it and reintroduce your entire text as an alternative resolution that could be included in this e-vote as a fourth possibility. That would allow all of these perspectives to be on the floor.

Richard, if you want to force a vote right now, I believe you do have the right to force that vote. I, who would like to take the time to consider what you've put forward, I would vote against it if you force it right now because I don't want to see the resolution that was produced -
- put forward by the committee not have a straight up or down vote.

RICHARD BENSEL: Chris, let me respond to that. I mean, we've been talking about this for a month now. We've been back and forth. The major issue has always been whether it's mandatory or voluntary. People who have doubts about where they stand on that, I understand that more time might be needed. If you wanted to move that we postpone these whole proceedings until another meeting and we go through it again, if that's not the case, then we really should be voting.

The issue before the Faculty Senate is whether compliance should be mandatory with punitive punishment of those who sincerely disagree, who dissent from whatever Administration decides to impose on us, which we do not know. That's one position.

The other position is whether it should be voluntary, compliance should be voluntary. That's a very stark issue. There's nothing really that I can see, especially once we've combined the two resolutions, there's nothing else that's dividing them. To be afraid in some way, to fear that the Faculty Senate would actually make a decision on a major issue that's before us, you know, we shouldn't be. This is a democracy. It's not ambiguous. To my mind, it doesn't take more time.

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Richard, point of order. This is not about anxiety. Let's get back to the table, where we can have discussion, please.

RICHARD BENSEL: Okay.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: I think we have to move on. Richard, can we call for a vote on your resolution, and we'll put it in chat and we'll count the votes -- it might take a while -- and then we get on with the other half of the meeting. Is that agreeable with you?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I object to this because it creates a bizarre situation where we're going to end up voting on the UFC resolution, without knowing which version we're

actually voting on. Chris's suggestion that there just be four votes avoids that ambiguity. I think the ambiguity is very problematic.

NEEMA KUDVA: Ken, if I may interrupt for a minute. If we don't agree and we want to be able to take the UFC -- if we want to be able to take the UFC resolution and the two faculty resolutions that we have already up on the DOF site, which Risa spoke to the two resolutions from the faculty, and Durba spoke to the resolution from the UFC, if we want to take those forward, all we have to do is vote no, if we take a vote now.

If you don't agree, vote no. If you agree with Richard, vote yes, but we really need to move forward, because we also have an entire set of resolutions to discuss around the student educational requirement, with enormous amount of work being put into that resolution as well. We can't hold this up. Everybody's been speaking to this question. I think there's enough agreement. We don't need to keep reiterating the same point over and over again.

We understand this is a democratic body, and so we will not have the resolution of the vote immediately, as I explained, because only senators may vote, but we need to check the votes against the list of senators. It will take time for us to resolve this, but unless somebody yells out no really, really loudly, except for Richard -- because he will, of course, as he should. This is his motion -- if you're okay, if all of you are okay, wave your hand if you are okay with it. If you are okay with it, just do the vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have ignored two people's hands that have been up --

NEEMA KUDVA: Sorry. Whose hand was up? Okay, Eva.

EVA TARDOS: I'm not a senator. I was on the F Working Group, and I guess I want to tell you with one sentence: No one asked to change your view, no one asked to examine your head. Ask that you spend an hour a semester thinking about a very important issue. Before you vote

against this mandatory one hour a semester to think about the very important issue, consider what this will look like when staff are mandated to do this.

The staff already are pissed that they are mandated to do things. Why do we not trust them to be inclusive and why do they have to do training? I think this is a really good thing to think about it and talk about it for an hour a semester. An hour is really short.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: If I could call the question. Can I do that?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Oh, I've had my hand up also. I've been wanting to respond to Doug's comment and framing this about the people who are against -- the people who are in favor of the mandatory are those in favor of this education and believe it's important, and those who do not support the mandatory are opposed to it. That is an incorrect framing. What we're saying is that people are passionate about this and it is important. To mandate, to infantilize faculty in this way just undermines the quality of our commitment, the reality of our commitment to this necessary education.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have Steven and Kelly heard the -- that one summer story workshop that was like the following week --

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: I'm done.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let me see if we can go forward this way. The plan was that we would have the e-vote over the next week. Departments were planning on talking about it over the next week. If you want to shortcut that, shortcut the discussion of Risa's resolutions and the UFC's resolutions, then vote for Richard's resolution. Why don't we do that right now.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Point of order. I think that you should state correctly what people are voting on. You've characterized what you think they should do. I think that what should be clear is that the vote would be yes or no on whether to amend the UFC resolution, as Richard proposed.

If people want to vote yes to amend that resolution -- if people vote yes on the amendment, then the e-vote will be on the amended resolution. If people vote no on the proposed amendment, then the UFC resolution will appear on the e-vote, as will all the other resolutions that have been posted.

RICHARD BENSEL: Yes. I want to echo just what Risa said, and she said it better than I could. Charlie, it's very important to state what the question is correctly.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: That's great. Risa really clarified it, so I move that we vote on that in chat right now. That sound okay?

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay. Charlie, are you going to say start and end? Because we need to mark it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Only senators, okay. No one put anything else in the chat until we say so. The question is Richard's amendment, and the way Risa described the implications for a yes and a no. Why don't we do that right now.

Jill, are you able to count votes and run this live at the same time?

NEEMA KUDVA: No, Charlie, I'm going to do it, but we still have to check it again against the senate list. It's going to take a while. It may not happen before the end of the meeting.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We'll calculate these votes, and that will determine what the e-vote looks like tomorrow. Why don't we now go on to the S resolution, just real quick summary of the UFC's S resolution. Again, you have heard from us several times. Just a little review here, because we are talking about -- we are a research university, and we all know the little sequence; the research informs how we set up our majors. Majors get edited down into minors by scholars, and introductory courses can be thought of as snapshots of what shows up in the minor.

In this particular area, there are six programs that are in play. This is the heart, the cornerstone of what's been called the literacy component. These six units -- and you don't want to think of them as Arts College departments, these are units that have faculty from all over the university.

Roughly speaking, the expertise in these units is perfect for the development of what we are calling the literacy component; the idea that the faculty in these units, the researcher would help shape this new curriculum. You could think of the new curriculum as a central course of an array of courses. Just think of it as resources that will then be made available, in some way, shape or form, to address the literacy component.

This is incredibly important. This is what would distinguish us from other schools who are working on this very same issue, but it's not enough. This is where the discipline part and the skill set part is also part of the proposal. The UFC proposal is that entire box. Part of it involves the literacy component.

There's a very strong emphasis also on work being done in the disciplines. Already, that work is underway. We're talking about colleges, schools, programs, departments; that work is underway. The key thing in all these venues is students have to learn how to talk about this material with others. Again, it's broad strokes. Remember, this is the recommendation phase. There are a zillion details associated with this, how this is rolled out, the inner workings of all that; it's something that has to be developed later.

The key thing is do you think those components are important; do you think they warrant further resources coming from, say, the provost, to pursue these ideas that you see there. That's sort of the overall view of the working group.

As usual, when we post resolutions, we get feedback. That's the way we do business; a resolution, we learn a little bit, then we modify it. The UFC would like to modify its report, not

change anything other than to clarify some of the issues that surface, plus add in much more detail on their literacy part that was supplied by the six directors that you will hear about.

I see a typo there. It's large enrollment course. But much more detail on the literacy part. Basically, that section has been expanded, using the input that we received from those six directors. Then there was a little bit of clarification about the connection between the skill set part and the literacy part. Again, consistent with the interest in making sure everyone understands the essence of the resolution, put it in more detail, where there was none before or little before, that's the gist of this.

What we want here is to sort of formally do this. We told the other proposers on Friday or whatever, if you want to modify your resolution, that was fine, but we stressed the fact that this change should be done so it's semi-formally. We have a modified report. It's up there. All we want to do is just change the reference in the resolution to the modified report, replacing the existing final report. It really doesn't even change the one-pager. It's simply more clarification. Do we have a motion to -- someone want to second this motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Does anyone want to discuss this? Does anyone find this not reasonable, if they would like to raise their hand and talk about it.

I guess we'll close debate on this.

JILL: Chris has his hand up.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yeah. At one point, there had been a group that organized from some of these departments that brought forward some objections to the student requirements. I was just wondering the extent to which this revision of the report addressed some of those concerns that were brought forward and, in particular, from the perspective from the ones that were concerned.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: There were concerns from six directors. Our response to that was to add in -- because we support their points of view -- they had a thing on how the program is going to be rolled -- we'll hear all about this in a second from the director group. Again, just a little clarification on the skill set part.

The main hesitation about the working group's proposal is from the six directors, and they have an alternative proposal that addresses that -- I don't know if that answers your question -- the usual things about indoctrination, those sorts of things, at a much reduced level than we see with the faculty piece.

Again, a quick vote in the chat; do you support the motion. And if you do, all that means is that the modified report becomes the basis for the working group recommendation.

We'll let that run for one or two minutes.

Why don't we get set for the director presentation. Kurt Jordan, are you here?

KURT JORDAN: I'm here, Charlie. Christine is going to lead off.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Christine, take it away. And Jill will run the slides for you.

CHRISTINE BACAREZA BALANCE: Good now evening, everyone, and thank you to the senators for this opportunity to present our directors' resolution. As Charlie mentioned, Kurt Jordan and I will be presenting today on behalf of our colleagues from the six programs and departments that are listed here on this slide.

As some of you may have read in our open letter on the Faculty Senate comments, despite our expertise and established presence at Cornell, we were directly consulted relatively late in this process, we were not asked by the deans of faculty to meet together until this past January 19, 2021, when we were presented with an earlier draft of the Working Group S's report. In spite of a series of last-minute meetings and tight deadlines, our group of six has worked collectively and met in good faith with Charlie and Neema over these past few months.

We have also kept in communication with the senators group, who you will be hearing later from.

I just want to underscore these facts and thank my fellow directors for their spirit of collaboration throughout this process. Just a brief rationale for our proposal; first, our proposal works to ensure that every Cornell student has a class with a professor for whom teaching in structural racism, sexism and other forms of institutional inequality is the reason for their being here at Cornell. To this end, we want to underscore the second point, that faculty in our units were hired, tenured, promoted and now lead based on our expertise. We are committed to employing it in service to this institution in its current antiracism effort.

Third, our faculty have the specific pedagogical knowledge and experience necessary to teach these difficult and delicate subjects. As stated in earlier senate meetings and meetings with the deans, the work of studying and teaching racism, antiracism, colonialism and decolonization actually requires a level of rigor and depth of analysis that we, as scholars and teachers, have crafted over years.

In turn, throughout various iterations of the student requirements proposal, issues of campus climate as affected by race and racism are also often highlighted. I can say that, as scholars, pedagogues and directors, we and the faculty in our units are also the first, if not the only, to already deal with these issues in our classrooms, at our events and of course in our scholarship.

Therefore, fourth, we do not see a separation between literacy and skills. We believe that academic rigor, which is the foundation of a Cornell education, is best achieved through the specifics outlined in our proposal.

Finally, our proposal seeks resources to strengthen our units, rather than leaving them in their current marginalized and ever-burdened condition. If the charge of this antiracism

initiative is to both enhance existing programs that promote racial justice and to think carefully about the role that we all must play in building a just, antiracist world -- and these are all words from President Pollack's letter -- then there would be no better antiracist act for the Administration to undertake when it comes to the student curricular requirement than the strengthening of our programs.

KURT JORDAN: I'm Kurt Jordan from American Indian and Indigenous Studies, and I'm going to talk through a little about the specifics of the proposal from the directors' group. Our approach, one of the main components of it is that it culminates in a plan to offer a larger enrollment course on racism, antiracism, colonialism and decolonization to many students on campus.

We have a rollout proposal that I'll talk about on the next slide, but we -- I think we see this as an open issue; that we have a number of iterations where we would test this, and it may possibly end up serving as the sole means to fulfill the required course function or it may end up being one option from a menu of courses. I don't think that we can predict that right now.

There's certainly an awful lot of resources that would need to be developed to offer a campus-wide course, and we really need to see how this would be implemented to figure out whether that's really even a viable possibility. Certainly, this would need to be developed gradually, resources would need to be provided in terms of faculty, T.A.s, administrative staff, that sort of thing, to make it a reality.

And also, we assert that representatives from our six units, alongside officers from the proposed Antiracism Center, we don't know how that will be implemented or what it will look like, but that we would evaluate auditions to the list of approved courses.

Our proposed timeline, obviously, where it may already be original, the intent was to try and do something, roll something out in fall 2021, and it is simply not logistically feasible to do

that. What we're planning here or what we've come up with is that we can direct interested students who want to take courses on these subjects to a menu of relevant introductory courses, all of which have no prerequisite. Some of them are fairly large enrollment courses already, and we have a list that we'll show you on the next screen.

The other thing that we would intend to do is have a series of public presentations in a variety of formats, so there may be panels, there may be lectures, there may be podcasts, just a variety of different things that would be made available to the entire campus community, and I think we're sort of thinking about the Racism in America panel series that was offered this year as a kind of model. This would be new programming, all of it would be offered in ways where it would be recorded and available to the full campus community.

I don't think we see this as being sort of modules that could be exported to other units, because this is not something that would be done in a coherent, organized fashion, because we don't have time for that; but in fall 2022, we would offer an exploratory pilot large enrollment course that would be taught in person, and we think that what would really be ideal -- this is an unusual suggestion, but we think that we're really at the point where we need to think in new ways -- that we would have representatives from each of our units and we would have a six-way team talk course.

And there would be some provision where we would organize at spring 2022 to develop our curriculum, figure out what we needed to talk about and the order we would need to teach it in. I think this is a really interesting intellectual exercise, and it's one of the things that the directors' group, I think, was -- we were very excited by this particular proposal.

We do feel that this should be recorded, because we realize that we won't be able to offer a six-way team talk course forever, and there may be segments of it that are very effective that were taught by a particular expert that we might be able to use in subsequent iterations of

that in-person course. We also saw those as sort of place-holders, and we saw a role for the production of higher-quality versions of those segments that would be shot in studios or perhaps even on location in a relevant place, either on campus or elsewhere.

In spring 2023, we would do a second iteration of the exploratory course that would, again, be team-taught, but perhaps might use some of those videos from the previous fall. And then, in fall 2023 and beyond, we would continue to offer this full version of a large enrollment course each semester; and then we would have to consider the logistics of expanding it even beyond what we've talked about here.

CHRISTINE BACAREZA BALANCE: We are just sharing here the roster of introductory courses that Kurt has mentioned, courses that students next year in the 2021-2022 academic year could take if they're interested in courses on racism, colonialism, antiracism and decolonization. Then again, just to kind of underscore that we're open to any additions or even developing additional courses for the list; but that, again, based upon our expertise, the leaders of our six units and other representatives, including those from the proposed Antiracism Center, would be the ones to evaluate those additional courses.

That's it, in terms of our formal presentation. At this point, we just wanted to invite our fellow directors, Noliwe Rooks, Jane Juffer and Vilma Santiago-Irizarry, to join us in answering any questions you all might have.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Christine and Kurt. Questions for the group?

Joanie?

JOANIE MACKOWSKI: Thank you for that presentation, great presentation. I'm very excited, I really support the idea of the area programs taking charge of this, and it sounds meaningful, engaging. I do have a question about why you go for a large lecture course. Sometimes people think that some small seminars are better, sometimes students think large

lecture courses are more meaningful or more serious, more important or they're more boring, but I was just wondering what were your thoughts about deciding for a large lecture course.

KURT JORDAN: I'm happy to answer that one. We're thinking about reach. These definitely would have small in-person discussion sections, but I think if we sort of had a small seminar approach, we would need to do something on the scale of the freshman writing program, and that's obviously -- we're talking about strengthening our units. I don't think we're imagining something of that magnitude. I don't know if the directors' group would add to that.

NOLIWE ROOKS: I would say lecture courses are great for breadth, and seminars are better for depth. If we're going to cover information that comes out of all of our programs, we need the breadth. Then what we would try to do is encourage, not require, but encourage, given the strength of our pedagogy, given the breadth of what's offered, students who want to go more in depth, to do so.

Also want to add one thing in support of our proposal. There's a quote that's big in my house. It's from a performer named Sun Ra, who has passed. What he says and what my husband and I often say to each other is: The possible has been tried and failed. It's time for the impossible.

That's big in my house because, so often, when we talk about the kinds of issues that we're talking about here, we run smack up against how are you going to do that, what do the resources look like, how will you convince people. The ability to dream beyond what hasn't worked is what's animating us right now.

What we know from information that has been placed on the dean of the faculty website that Neema or Charlie put up is that in the 20th Century, these same issues have come up repeatedly, the same kinds of concerns, the same kinds of asks. And when Cornell faculty has chosen to respond, they've responded in a decentralized let departments do what they

want, let faculty do what they want, don't centralize, don't raise up certain people, let everybody, let 1,000 flowers bloom; or we hear a version of a libertarian, what about my rights, what about me.

It hasn't worked because then, in the 21st Century, we find ourselves with multiple instances of the students saying the same thing. We've tried what we know how to do. We've tried it. Cornell has tried it, the colleges have tried it, the schools have tried it. It hasn't worked. It's time for the impossible.

We recognize this is big, we recognize that is out of the ordinary, but we're willing to try because it's time to take ourselves beyond our comfort zone, it's time to take ourselves beyond what we know to do, what we think we know, because what I'm telling you is, the numbers of times that our students keep coming back to us, they're telling us we do not. At the very least, let's take a leap here, let's try the impossible.

CHRISTINE BACAREZA BALANCE: Just to amplify what Noliwe just said and respond to Joanie and highlight what Kurt has said, part of what excited us about the big lecture course is the fact that it could be team-taught, that we could actually, as these six units, have a kind of comparative analysis, a kind of conversation across the kind of silos that we have been operating under for the last decades.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Harold.

HAROLD HODES: This resolution sounds great, but there's one thing about it I find kind of puzzling. Not saying I find it troubling, but it's puzzling because the focus seems to have widened from antiracism to anti-structural inequality. Is that intentional? Is the idea here to go from a narrow focus to a wider focus? I'd like more clarity about that.

NOLIWE ROOKS: I don't know what anti-structuralist -- the words you're using, I'm not actually understanding.

HAROLD HODES: Well, there was the remark about structural inequality. That's much broader than -- addressing structural inequality is much broader than addressing antiracism. It would involve, for example, addressing sexism, I'm sure other -isms I'm not thinking about at the moment; so I want to be clear, the widening of the scope is --

NOLIWE ROOKS: I think the simple answer would be no. Within an antiracist initiative, if I use a term, we use a term like structural inequality, I guess we would assume that you would understand what we're talking about -- you can certainly bring other things in, and I'd be fine with it, but I think as we discussed it, this was not like all bad things. We're not proposing to teach all bad things in the -- that's my two cents.

CHRISTINE BACAREZA BALANCE: Could I speak to what Harold's saying? I think part of the breadth is also I want to look at the terms that we use in our proposal, which are histories of colonialism and processes of decolonization, so that I think the term -- this is me speaking, personally -- the term "antiracism" has a certain import right now in this moment. But again, as people who have been studying these histories for decades, they do have a longer history and they do have a wider breadth. To be simply an antiracist kind of educational requirement doesn't actually really meet the needs or address the situation that our country's in and our world is in right now.

NOLIWE ROOKS: -- asked about FGSS. I don't know if Jane wants to -- I don't know if Jane is here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I can also add something, because the thing is that racism is encompassed through structural inequality. And then there's also intersectionality, in which different forms of inequality enforce each other. This is where sexism, homophobia, racism and so on intersect.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Landon.

LANDON SCHNABEL: I'm really excited about this. This is the type of thing I would have hoped to have seen when we were talking about training for students, so just want to say I'm very excited about this. I also want to say I'm glad you are considering other courses that are taught in the university.

I'm in the Department of Sociology, and we have the Center for the Study of Inequality. A lot of the courses that would probably be relevant to this are already cross-listed with your units, but I just want to highlight that I'm excited and I think there's good ways of kind of capitalizing on what Cornell is already offering, and then expanding that, and I'm very excited about this. I think this is a great way forward.

NOLIWE ROOKS: I would also add the large lecture course, to your point, that we are proposing actually is inspired by that large inequality course, which I would say, it is not that we cross-list a lot of courses that you teach. Those courses actually originate with our program. I think Africana offers more courses that are part of the inequality major. I know FGSS and LSP's courses really make up the bulk of it. Just wanted to clarify, it's the other way around. We are offering the courses, and it's kind of benefiting Sociology, so we also saw this as a way of evening that out some.

LANDON SCHNABEL: Yes, thank you so much for clarifying that. I appreciate it.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Laurent.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: It's a very quick question, and thank you for the presentation. I also appreciate the fact that you are encompassing more than just the six programming units. Is there a graduate student studies component in what you presented? The list is only a list of classes for undergrads, so I was wondering if you had considered that, if you had ruled it out.

KURT JORDAN: We have just a very brief mention in there. We realize the president's task included graduate education. I think we have a sentence in the proposal that sort of says

we have to think about this one harder. We had the most traction in our group thinking about undergraduate education, but I think that was a placeholder that indicates we have to do more thinking and work to consider what's going on with that.

VILMA SANTIAGO-IRIZARRY: I also think the graduate training here at Cornell operates on the committee system, and there's a certain degree of autonomy in graduate, and special committees that basically shape and guide graduate training, that will have to be taken into account.

NEEMA KUDVA: Charlie, if I could just follow up with what Vilma just said. Just so everyone is aware, when we talk about graduate education, we include professional, master's, research and Ph.D.'s. In terms of scale, we are talking about 14,000 undergraduates and about 10,000 graduate students.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa?

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks for the presentation. I think it would be useful if you could perhaps crystallize the differences between your proposal and the way in which the UFC modified report has adopted part of your proposal, and what you see as the key differences.

NOLIWE ROOKS: I'll start us off. One of the things, the UFC proposal is still really holding on to this idea of autonomy in the disciplines, autonomy in colleges, autonomy with professors, that there would be materials that are made available.

And as a part of this project, one of the ways to fulfill this charge is professors, colleges, units can pick and choose what they want to. They would have, I guess, IDC, is that still in there? They have the intercultural dialogue, with grad students leading discussions, and that seems to stand alongside this idea of a course that is a four-credit semester-long course.

What we are saying is that we want to say that it is deeply encouraged -- we cannot require. We recognize at this point it would take years to align everybody's curriculum to say

you have to, but that that's a worthy kind of goal, but we're saying everyone should be encouraged to take one of these courses. And then, whatever the colleges want to do, I don't even -- we're fine with, after that.

What we're concerned with is there's a semester-long course taught by faculty who are best able to do it, that is offered to the greatest number of students, as opposed to this piecemeal thing, where you have grad students and different faculty with different interests able to shape whatever they want to, however they want to.

We're saying these are fields of study, there's curriculum, there's decades of work; just sort of saying get some grad students to watch some videos and have some chat, and maybe you do a discussion guide, maybe you try to tell them some questions to ask seems to me at a school like Cornell, where rigor is supposed to matter, it just comes up short. That's the fundamental difference. We don't see it as let everybody do anything willy-nilly.

CHRISTINE BACAREZA BALANCE: Jane, I don't know if you wanted to talk to the response, also the skill set outcome language of the Working Group S.

JANE JUFFER: Yeah, I think one still significant difference between the two reports is that the directors object to the distinction between the literacy component and the skill set component. And our concern there is that the kind of critical content that we produce will then get disseminated into different departments and disciplines and that, in that transference, there's going to be a loss of the critical component and more of an emphasis on the skill set, which we think kind of diverges or digresses into kind of corporate diversity discourse, so that's our real concern.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Jane. Chris.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: I just wanted to raise what I had seen as an alternative way of thinking about this sort of in the disciplines requirement. I'm in Biomedical Engineering, for

example. One thing I think would be important for us to teach the trainings in our major are about the existence of and factors that have contributed to health disparities in this country and around the world. I very much saw the ideas that were put forward in the proposal as investing in the right places in the university to create structures and programs that would help us be able to develop high-quality content that was tailored to how antiracism perspectives could benefit these trainees when -- these students when they go out into the world.

NOLIWE ROOKS: Let me say, we are not opposed to units -- we would encourage units to do whatever works for them. What we're saying is students need a baseline. And we understand that this adaptation, if faculty don't have the skills, there's no shortcut to it. That's what we're saying. There's no shortcut to understanding the pedagogical and intellectual field.

We want to offer an intro course basically, if you think about it like that. We want to offer a base, a ground. What grows up out of that, we're not saying oh, Engineering can't do anything else. Sure, adopt it, but we believe that students need a semester-long course laying out what these fields are, what these topics are, that they can also probably then have some kind of say in how they'd like to see it adapted. It is not all coming then from top-down.

Perhaps they leave our class and say I'd like to see some more about how this works or that works, and then they can work collegially with faculty in their units. We're not opposed to people adapting, but we're saying there needs to be, there has to be, to our mind, a course that's an actual degree-granting course in these fields.

And to not do that feels like -- it's not just a missed opportunity for the University, but it may be that our colleagues literally do not understand what we do, you do not understand the fields that we work in, you don't understand what we're teaching students, if you can say we're going to have an antiracism course -- they may do specific topics -- but who don't do this are

now responsible for teaching. That doesn't make sense to us -- or to me. I don't want to speak for everybody else; but for me, I find that confusing.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yeah, thank you, Noliwe. And if I could ask for clarification, as I read the new proposal, it sounds like it is this three- to four-credit large enrollment course, with the development timeline similar to what you propose. And then, in addition, it is a push for, and I would assume, then, provost-level resources for this partner development in the discipline courses. I just want to be clear about what we're voting on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess, Chris, that question would be for Charlie or folks in the working group who modified their own reports.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: Yes, thank you.

NEEMA KUDVA: Chris, were you asking -- I understood it as you're asking the directors.

CHRIS SCHAFFER: No, I was asking for the folks that produce this modified report, I read the modified report in very much as saying the large-enrollment, taught-by-experts required course is a part of it, and then that there's additional resources that go beyond that. Noliwe is shaking her head one way, and you saying the other thing, so I really think we should try to have some clarity.

NEEMA KUDVA: Okay, so we see hands up. If it's still not clear at the end of everybody else speaking, we can speak to that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Chiara.

CHIARA FORMICHI: I just wanted to speak as a member of the working group for the student requirement, to answer Chris's question, which yeah, so we took the proposal from the directors very seriously, and we were actually quite -- I was enthusiastic about the fact that they were willing and interested and saw the opportunity in taking care of the unit part.

And we took that and we retained a second part, which is exactly what you are talking about, which is an infrastructure in which we ask for resources, so that departments can also tackle the questions that you were pointing out. How do questions of structural inequality, in its multiple manifestations as we are taught so far, affect specific fields, so that we train majors into not just thinking in a compartmentalized way or just to think this is something that affects society, but actually also affects the field in which they are being trained; and also has the graduate students' component.

It's more deeply fleshed out, in a sense, because we are aware the mandate for the reports was also to focus on graduate students, not just on the undergraduates. We're understanding there are challenges in implementation because various colleges and schools have their own structures, but we tried to figure out how to give space to each of those aspects of the mandate. I hope that clarifies the question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Neil.

NEIL SACCAMANO: I just have a question for clarification. I was looking at the report, and then hearing the account given of it today by the directors, and I was wondering exactly what the relationship is of the required course that you're developing to the other courses that you're also imagining could possibly fulfill the requirement.

Maybe this is tailing on Chris's question; I'm not really sure. I think the wording was that the work you are doing to develop this course would be a required course or an option from a menu of courses. Could you explain that? It sounds like you are doing all this work to put together a required course, and it's just going to be one course among many that is an option. I happen to favor, myself, several different courses, rather than one, but I would just like to know what -- could you clarify that a little bit for me?

NOLIWE ROOKS: Yeah, this question of menus, especially over in CALS, has taken up a lot of time. People are kind of like well, over in CALS, we have 300 courses that do the exact same thing. Again, the students are still saying something is needed here. We were just pointing out, we also have courses that students could take, if they want to; but our big contribution here is saying that we need a semester-long, to the extent that you are requiring a course taught by the experts, that there's nothing in our report that suggests that there's a substitute for that.

I think that's where one of the differences between our report -- which we actually didn't know the working group was going to take our report and then put it into their report, like that was a complete surprise to us when we sent them the draft and they were like look here, now we're doing it, but there's still some parts of what we are offering that I think is really different, and that's one of them.

We believe there needs to be a semester-long course, because the other courses don't cover -- they are not covering the regions, they are not covering the time periods. If you take Intro to Africana Studies, which I've taught before, you're going to get one view of antiracism, but you're not going to get an intersectional view, you're not going to see how that relates to the Latinx experience, you're not going to get some of the more intersectional things, if you just take the one that we're offering.

We're saying we have the opportunity to put together something that has real depth and breadth, and that should be the focus, and that is equally as important as what individual professors or colleges want to do. We're asking for centralization in our report, quite frankly, when all the others are saying we don't want centralization, we reject it. We're hearing that centralization should be rejected because the board of trustees and Administration and the deans have no interest in it.

Part of what's animating our conversation is this is our moment to say what faculty would want. We could work out what deans and administrators are thinking, what the board of trustees wants to do later. We understood this to be for faculty to put forward our best-faith effort about what we thought would serve the students, and that's what we've done.

NEIL SACCAMANO: May I have a follow-up question? Again, I'm still not really sure. Are you saying that colleagues in CALS who have been teaching courses that could cover the antiracism topic in their courses for years -- and I've been in contact with CALS colleagues who said they have had various people teaching courses, as you mentioned, on the curriculum for many, many years. Are you saying those people teaching those courses should not be credentialed to teach those courses, or only courses that are credentialed by the people in the programs are the ones that should -- and I don't mean this in a critical way. I'm just trying to be --

NOLIWE ROOKS: If someone else wants to jump in, because I will talk, not a problem.

NEIL SACCAMANO: Please don't take this as -- I'm trying to clarify exactly what we are voting on.

NOLIWE ROOKS: It seems collegial. I am not insulted. It seemed like a reasonable question. Sorry if I gave you some impression that it was somehow offensive. The thing we are saying is in our fields of study that are really delving deep into institutionalized racism across time, across region, across space, there's an expertise in teaching the whole of it, the breadth of it.

We are in no way suggesting that we are the only people who know anything about race, that we are credentialed to tell other people what they do or do not know about racism. What we're saying is we know what our fields have to offer. We understand the training and the credentialization, and that we would like that to be respected.

We're not trying to stop other people, but we're saying there needs to be a survey course, in the same way there's intro to whatever the rest of us teach. That doesn't mean the person teaching that intro course is the keeper of all knowledge about everything in that discipline forever, that's the only way to do it, but there is a value to teaching with that kind of -- and after that, the people in the departments who have expertise, you run, you go. I feel like I'm talking a lot. You all talk. I'll stop.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to follow up with the comment, and actually in response to Simone's earlier question from 30 minutes ago in regards to the fear that somehow the folks in our six units are only focused on U.S.-based or U.S. contemporary. I was speaking for myself, also have affiliation with Southeast Asian Studies, and firmly believe that one cannot understand the Asian-American experience or the Asian experience in America without understanding policies and histories and wars that were fought overseas in Asian countries.

Again, I think something that Noliwe mentioned earlier, this kind of perhaps our colleagues need to know a little bit better the ways in which we do our own research, the ways in which it is already engaging with the global and other spaces, and longer historical timelines than just the contemporary.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's do Eric, then Mark, then get on to the senator S proposal.
Eric.

ERIC CHEYFITZ: I'm a member of the American Indian and Indigenous Studies program, former director of that program. I was also on Working Group S. As everybody knows, what I proposed was that people would take a series of requirements from all these six programs. They would take one course in each of those programs, and that would suffice for the requirement. That way, they would get an intersectional look at things, but through separate

courses that were on the books and would be created. Of course, that was rejected because there was not room in the Cornell curriculum for those kinds of requirements.

One of the things that I stated early on was that I thought this was an opportunity for Cornell to look at its fundamentally Euro-centric curriculum and start to think about redesigning that Euro-centric curriculum, but that's not on the books either, so we're down to one centralized course now. I'm for an intersectional, large lecture course.

My question about it, given the constraints and the fact that we're trying to shoehorn this one course, wherever it's coming from, into this curriculum which does not want to give much room to this kind of material is the implementation of that course and the distribution of it, so that all undergraduate students at Cornell can take, that still seems to me to be unclear how that can be done.

Until there's a clear path to doing that, I support a menu, but a menu that clearly has the six directors on the committee that decides what that menu will be. That proposal will be presented subsequently. Those are my thoughts. I think it's unfortunate that Cornell will not examine the Euro-centric status of its curriculum in a serious way that would allow for students to take -- and in a required way, since we require all sorts of things at this university, that would allow students to take required courses in these fields.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay. Thanks, Eric. Mark, then we'll go to the senator S proposal.

MARK LEWIS: Thanks, Charlie. I have a question, but I will say I appreciate what Noliwe Rooks' point is about the fact that some of us don't have the expertise to teach those kind of courses. I have been African-American my whole life, and I certainly couldn't have written Cutting School, and I appreciate that someone else can do that for us.

I guess my question is, my concern is, I looked at the required resources you're asking. What if you don't get all of them? Is there some way you're going to prioritize what's going to

be done? Seems like you are asking for a lot, and I'm worried that what you may get is not all that. And then we're stuck with a part of this, and we need more, so what is the answer to that question? Thank you.

NOLIWE ROOKS: This kind of relates to something Carol Boyce Davies put in the chat. Budgets are documents that speak to priorities. Saying that what we don't have -- the condition that our programs are in, we will not bore you with the tiny shoestring budgets that we have and then tell you about what we do with that.

That's a part of the reason that we're saying that this university, you can't just say we want to raise up this kind of issue, we want to solve it. That's why I started by saying let's do something different. What we have been doing is we don't have the money. Let's do something different. Ask us. We have been thinking about this. Ask us what we need to be successful. Find out what that is. Let's think creatively about how to get us there. When we decide that we want a new School of Public Policy, it was a multiyear process, it was a lot of meetings, it was a lot of goodwill, but we figured out how to get there.

Budgets, the absence or presence of money is all about choices. We think that this is worth supporting. Somebody said you're going to need 100 T.A.s. This is like ridiculous. Again, ask us what it is we think we need, but our programs have got to be strengthened. Otherwise, what's going to happen, we're not going to be doing Inequality Studies. We are all going to be doing -- everybody's running around doing whatever, and our programs with the most expertise, with the majority of people of color in and around them, are suffering.

It's a retention issue, it's a PR issue, it's a pedagogical issue, it's a rigor issue. It's a chance for Cornell to actually lead, not give lip service, but actually lead by asking what would it take for us to realize this. It won't be cheap, but we're willing to get it started. We have a path to get it started that actually is not requiring very much. We don't want to leave it there, we

don't want to shoulder all of that, but what we have in there about how to roll it out, that's rolling it out with the resources we currently have and who's on the ground. We can see it, and we're just asking the chance to make the case.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Let's get back on the slides for the last presentation. Laurent, this is the senator S proposal.

Jill, how long can the recording go? Is there a limit?

Anyway, let's just keep going until the tape runs out. Laurent, you are up.

LAURENT DUBREUIL: Thank you. I will be speaking with Carol Boyce Davies as well, who will present the second slide. We will be as brief as we can. We have only two slides. This first one is for me. Some of you have heard me in the senate saying repeatedly that I was an advocate of the free curriculum, absolutely free curriculum. I am an advocate of that. I understand I may be the only one in the entire university, so trying to be practical, if we are requiring something, then what should we require.

I have to preface that by saying what we have been doing, what these committees, senators and other faculty have been doing is stemming from the very critical reading, while doing the reports coming from the committee that Charlie said to me two weeks ago that it would never reconvene, even though we saw it was resurrected from the dead, which is an interesting case.

At any case, if we are asking for mandatory education for students about anti-racism, what do we want to do? I believe we should, at the university level, not the college level, we should have a very strong scholarly content, because that's what this is about. We should have a class or a seminar, a real one, and this class or seminar should be taught by people who know what they are talking about, people who have been studying racism. That's in commonality with what you heard before.

Based on the agreement we had last meeting with Carol Boyce Davies about these core values, I would say -- I wrote to her last week, and we both crafted a resolution, with Risa's help, not knowing there had been another resolution against the report as it stood at the time that had been prepared by Thomas Björkman, Brian Chabot and others. And when we heard about that, we tried to create a convergence -- the other resolution was more decentralized than what we were doing, so we came to a compromise we thought would be valuable.

And then, over the weekend, we learned there was the presentation you just heard, and we have been in touch with the directors over the weekend and until yesterday night, actually, over email. We didn't have enough time to see our views converging, and maybe wouldn't be possible completely with some of us, but we are now really looking at the content. And the content will be introduced to you in the next slide by Carol Boyce Davies.

CAROL BOYCE DAVIES: Hi, everyone. Carol Boyce Davies. I'm in an interesting position because I'm in Africana, so a part of me supports the initiative that was presented by the former group, but I see a lot of limitations in terms of the execution of it, and I can say more about that.

This resolution supports requiring that all students before graduation complete at least one full credit course addressing race, indigeneity, ethnicity and bias already taught in the departments and programs. We are seeing implementation of the course requirements primarily in the schools and colleges as required by Cornell bylaws, bringing university-level faculty governance into implementation through support from faculty senate committees and, an example, as you can see, ad hoc committee currently invested in research and structural racism, colonialism and injustice -- Africana, American Studies, American and Indigenous Studies, Asian-American studies.

In my reading of this, teaching and studying race is a specialized field. Not everybody in Africana Studies automatically can do that, or any of those other fields. People have studied

race, written about the history of it, the psychology of it, the historic ways in race has been configured under western civilization, and so on; and of course, the reason it's been distorted, the way racism works. There's a whole set of fields, so I don't think we just automatically assume because people are black or of color, they automatically have the expertise to teach this subject.

In my view, if the first position is going to work, the last one that was proposed, which I hope it does, it will need for the University to really hire people who have expertise, training, publications, knowledge and study of race, so they can actually teach it properly.

For example, in this proposal that was submitted earlier, has only the Intro to Africana Study as an option. And I do try to include a lot of discussions that have to do with all those components, bringing in the Caribbean, Latin America, Africa and the U.S. as well. Takes a great deal of negotiating to do that, and I'm not sure in a big course that's possible to do it in a good way, unless you have people who are really absolutely trained and able to do that, unless in their proposal the idea is they will create a structure where, over the summer or over a period of time, people are training how to talk about, teach about race.

Otherwise, a lot of complications and problems in understanding how that is delivered -- I'm not sure that many faculty in Africana, for example -- I would be happy with teaching race right now in the way that this is proposed. They have to be retrained, for sure. They have to understand the dynamics of how to do this properly, as opposed to just pulling together a big floppy course that is going to be taught in the way that is proposed.

But I'm hoping, if that option works -- I'm partially in support, because I understand the logic of it and I have been a director in Africana Studies before, so I technically support, but it would have to be really built in deep resources, hiring many more faculty in all those departments, in order to make this work. I think that would be probably, for me, high on the

agenda right now. It should be accompanying, I should say, the proposal, and not just an assumption that it can be done with whoever is there right now.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks, Carol. Questions for Carol or Laurent?

LAURENT DUBREUIL: We also have other senators here.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Yeah. Anyone want to speak up? Neema, I think we have some preliminary results from the two votes we had.

NEEMA KUDVA: Yeah. The motion that Richard Bensel brought forward has been voted down. These are provisional counts. Please, these are not final counts, because we have to check for repetition, as well as we have to check against the list of senators. Provisional count is that the motion that Richard Bensel brought to the floor or to the Zoom room has been voted down. 56 to vote it down and 22 to take it forward, so we will not be taking -- so that will not be moving forward.

The motion for considering the S modified proposal as the basis for the UFC vote has been accepted. 57 yays, 3 no's and 14 people abstained. These are, I'm underscoring, provisional votes, because Jill and I have to still check these against the list of senators. We will be going forward with the S modified proposal. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Risa, you had your hand up.

RISA LIEBERWITZ: Thanks. I had it up for the last resolution, and I got a little mixed up with my computer here. I was one of the cosponsors of the resolution, and I just wanted to emphasize that what that resolution was trying to do -- I think that both Laurent and Carol explained the process to put it together, as well as some of the substantive concerns that we had.

I wanted to just emphasize that resolution was trying to really put out, as something very rich, the many courses that we have. Everybody was in agreement that having a

requirement of at least one course that students need to take addressing race, indigeneity, ethnicity and bias is a very good idea, and we support that; but that to also emphasize that there are courses across this university that are really excellent at teaching in that area.

I was thinking about Neil's question, you know, when I read the report from the directors, I also read it as saying that there could be this one large course created and that it could be a choice among other choices for people to fulfill the requirement. Would be even better if students would go on and take more courses; but that Cornell, in many of the colleges and schools, including my own, ILR, think we have a really rich selection of courses that could fulfill that requirement.

This was trying to emphasize that, along with the governance aspect, to say that the Faculty Senate Committees and we recommend an ad hoc committee, as you saw in terms of the language of the membership of the ad hoc committee, should be looking at how the implementation could take place that would enable the larger class, if people want to create that, but also have that alongside a roster of courses that could fulfill a requirement, if we only have one requirement for the students.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you, Risa. I'm not sure if all the chat questions -- maybe there's some unanswered questions or whatever. What we'll try to do is make sure the presenters see the queries that were posed. They probably do already.

Then I want to stress that we have a resolution page for every one of these six resolutions, and that you can modify -- there's a background section in there. If you want to preface the resolution with comments that were driven by what was discussed today, that's all fine. And we'll also set up the Qualtrics vote and make sure it squares with all the proposers' understanding of what we are doing.

Are there any other things about process here? In other words, we are going to digest all this material. We'll have a week. It's not like you have to vote on Friday. We have all through next week, meetings with your units and so on. We'll have all the information up online probably by tomorrow morning, all the chat and so on. Time has come to vote.

We talked a lot about these things. It's tricky, it's complicated. Remember, we never were ever going to send some crisp little message to the president and provost. It's going to be an array of opinions. And don't forget, you have that little comment box. Maybe it sounds kind of corny, but it is important. You're going to vote some way. You can give a rationale or express some kind of hesitancy about it. And somehow, in the collection of all these votes and those comments, some sense of how the faculty are thinking will emerge.

Having said that, I thank you very much for -- this is the world's longest senate meeting, two-and-a-half hours. Also, we never had so many senate meetings in a year. Setting all kinds of records. Just a reminder, these are difficult, tricky things, and I think we are at a better place after these meetings. Thank you very much, and we'll be in touch.