

Comments

Do you support the Resolution on Consultation with the Faculty Senate with Respect to Global Hubs?

I find this to be a very complicated issue and I am not convinced that the proposed resolution will improve the current procedures for establishing global hubs.

The Vice Provost has already reported to the Senate last spring. She has clearly indicated the administration's openness to dialogue on Global Hubs. Many faculty and Senators are serving on the advisory committees established for each hub. A CAPP representative is going to report to the Senate at the December meeting. This resolution is totally unproductive and introduces an element of antagonism into what is, and should be, a collaborative process. The latest in one Senator's unrelenting series of proposed resolutions, which raises further questions as to its legitimacy.

We are in favor of this resolution, which proposes that no *new* Global Hubs be approved while the CAPP report is still pending.

Although the resolution has a good intention, the proposed action is infeasible.

I agree with the "resolved" part of the resolution, and I agree that much of the Global Hubs stuff falls under Article XIII Section 2, but I disagree with the sponsors' capacious interpretation of that Bylaw section. E.g. I don't think Weill Qatar and the Cornell Tech Technion partnership fall under that section. Furthermore, sometimes, as in the case of CT-Technion, the nature of the situation (e.g. a competition) will necessitate the university's being able to cut a deal without consulting the rank-and-file faculty --- sometimes the benefit of such a deal outweighs the negative sentiments engendered by administrative corner-cutting. (Just my pragmatic two cents.)

I am very worried about this one. I have very little trust in the moral standards of many of our faculty senators.

Sure, but in the end, we're all just subservient to the Board of Trustees, so it's a moot point. We can whine all we want, but if the BoT sees \$\$\$, it's a done deal, ethics be damned (the BoT are all big money types, and in most corporate circles, ethics is not a big consideration relative to the bottom line). The only way a faculty 'protest' would gain any traction is if it had people so highly placed (say, a Nobel laureate or two) that even the BoT would have to pay attention.

I felt that this resolution overreaches by demanding a type of consultation that goes beyond educational policy to also include business policy.