From Oren Falk: given Goldwin Smith’s reputation for antisemitism this seems especially fitting.

From Michael Thonney: We already have Frank B. Morrison Hall.

From Joanie Mackowski: I agree with you, Owen.

From Beth Milles: I think a resolution is a good idea.

From Courtney Roby: Great idea, Abby!

From Paul Ginsparg: from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goldwin_Smith “Smith had virulently anti-Jewish views.[29] Labelled as "the most vicious anti-Semite in the English-speaking world", he referred to Jews as "parasites" who absorb "the wealth of the community without adding to it".[30] Research by Glenn C. Altschuler and Isaac Kramnick has studied Smith’s writings, which claimed that Jews were responsible for a form of "repulsion" they provoked in others, due to his assertion of their "peculiar character and habits", including a "preoccupation with money-making", which made them "enemies of civilization". He also denigrated brit milah, or circumcision, as a "barbarous rite", and proposed assimilating Jews or deporting them to Palestine as a solution to the "Jewish problem".[31]

Smith wrote, "The Jewish objective has always been the same, since Roman times. We regard our race as superior to all humanity, and we do not seek our ultimate union with other races, but our final triumph over them."

From Carl Franck: I think it would be great to honor RBG in this manner, and Toni Morrison as well.

From Connie Yuan: +1

From Beth Milles: I support both- and I think it is the right idea to reach out to the other assemblies as well.

From Landon Schnabel: Smith was also against admitting women to Cornell, which would be another reason why it would be symbolically fitting to honor Ginsburg specifically by renaming Smith Hall.

From Carl Franck: We have two Olin Halls in Chemistry/Chem Eng, drives us crazy when we go to the wrong one for a talk.

From Richard Bensel: Well, technically we need a second...

From Ken Birman: Richard, for formality, could you or someone else please type "seconded"?

From Elizabeth Lamb: I’ll second.

From Jill Short to Richard Bensel (Privately): got one.

From Martha Field: I seconded it, but I was on mute.

From Martha Field: :)

From Neema Kudva: the challenges of zoom !! ;)

From Mark Lewis: Was the vote anonymous? Could you back out the respective groups?
From Tracy Stokol: What is the point of enabling legislation if it is not followed?

From Joanie Mackowski: I think that it is good to follow our rules.

From Neil Saccamano: I agree.

From Chris Schaffer: Sucks to slow something down that seems obvious, but I concur that a vote that meets the requirements of the enabling legislation should be held.

From Joanie Mackowski: I second risa's motion to table.

From Michael Thonney: Motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

From Michael Thonney: Vote.

From Larry Van De Valk: Aye.

From barbasch: yes.

From Michael Thonney: Yes.

From Tracy Stokol: Yes.

From Judith Peraino: yes.

From Neil Saccamano: yes.

From Chris Schaffer: yes.

From Jason Kovari: Yes (alternate for the Library).

From John Callister - Cornell University: Yes.

From Beth Milles: Y.

From Courtney Roby: yes.

From Carolyn McDaniel: yes.

From Maria Gandolfo Nixon: Aye.

From Thomas Björkman: Yes.

From Ken Birman: yes.

From Bruno Xavier: Aye.

From Rhonda Gilmore: Yes.

From Erik Born: yes.

From Ailong Ke: yes.

From XXXXXX to Jill Short (Privately): Abstain.

From Landon Schnabel: yes.

From Brooke Duffy: yes.

From Laura Goodman: yes.
16:01:39 From Risa Lieberwitz: yes for tabling
16:01:39 From Robin Dando: Yes
16:01:39 From Bruce van Dover: aye
16:01:39 From Sarah Murray: yes
16:01:39 From Joanie Mackowski: yes
16:01:39 From Abby Cohn (SEAP Director): In favor
16:01:39 From Andre Kessler: yes
16:01:39 From Tamar Kushnir: yes
16:01:40 From Jason Mokhtarian: yes
16:01:40 From Jennifer Birkeland: yes
16:01:40 From Alexandra Blackman: yes
16:01:40 From Guillaume (GEE-yohm) Lambert (LAMB-bear): Yes
16:01:40 From Jaclyn Kelley-Widmer (she/her): yes
16:01:40 From Buz Barstow: yes
16:01:40 From Richard Bensel: Yes
16:01:40 From Martha Field: yes
16:01:41 From Elizabeth Lamb: yes
16:01:41 From Marcus Smolka: yes
16:01:41 From Frederic Gleach: Yes
16:01:42 From Pamela Chang: Yes
16:01:42 From Harold Hodes: yes.
16:01:42 From Melissa Hines: Yes
16:01:43 From Charles Walcott: Yes
16:01:43 From Teresa Pawlowska: yes
16:01:43 From Nancy Pollak: yes
16:01:43 From Connie’s iPad: yes
16:01:44 From Peter Wolczanski: yes
16:01:44 From Margaret McEntee: Yes
16:01:44 From David Lee: yes
16:01:44 From Anthony Hay to Jill Short(Privately): yes
16:01:45 From Roxanne Marino: yes
16:01:46 From David Delchamps : Abstain
16:01:46 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : Yes
16:01:47 From Michael Tomlan : AYE
16:01:48 From Warren Bailey : No
16:01:50 From Gregory Weiland : yes
16:01:51 From smk16Suzanne Kay : Yes Robert Kay
16:01:52 From David Zax : yes
16:01:52 From David Chernoff : yes
16:01:53 From Paul Ginsparg : yes
16:01:54 From Ariel Ortiz Bobea : yes
16:01:54 From Rajesh Bhaskaran : yes
16:01:55 From Kimberly Kopko : Yes
16:01:57 From Mary MacAusland : Yes
16:01:57 From Sherry Colb : yes
16:01:58 From Carl Franck : Yes
16:01:59 From andrew yen : yes
16:01:59 From Jolene Rickard : yes
16:02:02 From Oren Falk : y
16:02:04 From Juan Hinestroza : yes
16:02:09 From Robert Travers : yes
16:02:30 From andrew yen : yes
16:03:37 From Christine Olson : yes
16:14:47 From Neema Kudva : I completely agree with you Risa —
16:16:24 From Neil Saccamano : Project?
16:16:29 From Joanie Mackowski : Thanks, David– not more research necessarily, but how to enact it and change ourselves based on what we already know
16:16:45 From David Delchamps : Did Charlie get clarity from the petitioners about what they meant by this “Center,” i.e. a research center or something else?
16:18:33 From Neema Kudva : Thanks all for the input for reframing the charge to include an activist/outreach/engagement focus
16:20:33 From Neema Kudva : I’d also like to remind everyone that the DoF website has place for suggestions to be submitted on each charge — anonymously
From Courtney Roby: Existing trainings (e.g. Title IX) do rely on tests - IME mostly quizzes based on videos.

From Courtney Roby: Likewise the staff training program, I believe.

From K.E. von Wittelsbach: Which brings us back to the idea of the old First-Year Reading Project. Should it be revived?

From Courtney Roby: I was sad to see it go - I'd love it if it were brought back!

From Carl Franck: I agree, it was very good when we had our faculty discussions with experts first.

From Ariel Ortiz Bobea: There are anti harassment trainings already in place, those are not ideology. I think it is important to reach out to faculty doing research on D&I efforts about this

From Thomas Björkman: The concern about mandatory trainings being counterproductive if done wrong is real. I am optimistic, if it is done similarly to Yael’s program on implicit bias in hiring. That was eye-opening and engaging for participants. So we have a positive model.

From Landon Schnabel: Here’s an overview of the research on what antibias training is effective, and one of the authors is a Cornell faculty member (Neil Lewis): https://muse.jhu.edu/article/765209

From Paul Ginsparg: that’s “morill land grant act” not “moral land grant act”

From Ariel Ortiz Bobea: Good point Landon

From Wendy Wilcox: I agree Abby!

From Courtney Roby: Thanks, Landon!

From David Delchamps: *Morrill

From Joanie Mackowski: brava, Abby

From Ariel Ortiz Bobea: Thank you Abby! 100%

From Robert Travers: very much agree with Abby on this

From Beth Milles: I agree with Abby—thank you!

From Richard Bensel: What is most troubling is the notion of "required programming" which, to my mind, calls up "Clockwork Orange". Mutual and free discussion on a topic is far preferable to a "top-down" imposition of thought control.

From C.A. Shugarts: https://hr.cornell.edu/our-culture-diversity/diversity-inclusion/advancing-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-cornell

From Wendy Wilcox: Richard, what if faculty don't educate themselves on these issues?

From Richard Bensel: What does "educate" mean? In some societies, it means something quite awful..."reeducation camps" right now are training millions of people...I am not certain that this would not be much different...
From Courtney Roby: I’m pretty sure this would be quite different from "reeducation camps"!

From Richard Bensel: I should have said "in China"!

From Courtney Roby: Whether it would achieve the larger goals is a different question.

From Richard Bensel: Then why is it "required"?

From Courtney Roby: Just because something is required does not mean it is inhumane and injurious.

From Courtney Roby: At worst, it might be annoying and/or superficial.

From Richard Bensel: It should be voluntary...What should the University do to me if I refused to participate?

From Courtney Roby: SIP denial!

From Courtney Roby: Well, that's what I imagine would happen, not what I personally think should happen.

From Neil Saccamano: This is getting scary

From Neema Kudva: Folks, this is OUR mandate /program to decide ...

From Neema Kudva: And to design ...

From Oren Falk: @Richard it seems like this is the pt in the conversation where you might make a constructive suggestion. Other than opting out (on which cf. @Abby), what do you suggest?

From Courtney Roby: Absolutely, Neema. Now is our chance to suggest what this can look like to be productive and genuinely meaningful for us.

From Thomas Björkman: Angela is providing great techniques for bringing others around to your values without resorting to mandatory training.

From Neema Kudva: Having Angela come and share the programs they are developing is to bring ideas to us .... Not to suggest that we have to do this in exactly the same way

From Wendy Wilcox: We could incorporate an educational component in the tenure/promotion process...

From Wendy Wilcox: My point being a required training is the MINiMuM we are being asked to participate in

From Richard Bensel: Two things: I don't think democracy should be the device through which we infringe on freedom of thought. I am a political historian and can give you many examples. Second, I think that any program should be voluntary and have opportunities for open dissent, particularly with respect as to whether what people say will do what they presuppose it will.

From Rhonda Gilmore: Affirming to know that staff participate in this comprehensive program...

From Elizabeth Lamb: Thank you for this!
16:42:08  From  Ariel Ortiz Bobea : Thank you Angela

16:44:48  From  Courtney Roby : Richard, I fundamentally agree with you on those two points. But also think about Neema's point, that we are being asked to weigh in on what a possible requirement might look like. Can you really not think of any forms of engagement with these issues that might strengthen us as faculty?

16:47:11  From  Richard Bensel : I cannot advise constructively on any "required" program that is so clearly implicates an imposed ideological agenda, even if I agreed with its intent.

16:47:33  From  Wendy Wilcox : Not to be difficult, but how many faculty have participated in a number of the OFDD programs? I have attended a number (they are fantastic) but it is often filled with the same attendees.

16:53:12  From  Tracy Stokol : It is still at most 50:50, which means the number of women is no increasing. It is abysmal that it is still only at 30%

16:57:11  From  Ariel Ortiz Bobea : Avery/Yael: I know you conduct exit interviews. In your view, what is the main issue hurting the retention of minority faculty at Cornell. And what are things that could be done precisely about the major gaps in that retention.

17:01:08  From  Ariel Ortiz Bobea : Would be great to know how big of an issue “Department climate” is in retention (relative to other reasons), because that sounds like something the university could do something about.

17:01:39  From  Ariel Ortiz Bobea : Thanks Avery & Yael

17:01:55  From  Elizabeth Lamb : Thanks for the information. Very useful

17:12:15  From  Beth Milles : Tao this is fantastic thanks so much for sharing all of it

17:14:59  From  Rhonda Gilmore : Wonderful work and vision Tao: incredibly innovative student engagement...

17:15:16  From  Erik Born : Thanks, Tao! Hope to see some people at the Dark Laboratory event: https://events.cornell.edu/event/dark_laboratory_virtual_block_party_1008

17:15:34  From  Connie’s iPad : Tao, this is amazing!

17:16:48  From  Trevor Pinch : Tao: Cool music and visuals. Great work!

17:17:44  From  Hakim Weatherspoon : Thank you, Tao!

17:17:47  From  Abby Cohn (SEAP Director) : Some argue it’s not an affliction but a gift.

17:21:56  From  Tao Leigh Goffe : https://www.darklaboratory.com/

17:22:06  From  Jeanne Varney : Thank yo Tao!

17:23:28  From  Tao Leigh Goffe : https://www.darklaboratory.com/

17:23:37  From  Tao Leigh Goffe : https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1M_SIkJzOSFEC1_1JpTMROBcdm4syNruzRUse6NI_2G9tU/viewform?edit_requested=true
Some institutions have managed to change dept culture with cluster hires

http://www.cprescodweinstein.com/

https://physics.dartmouth.edu/people/jedidah-c-isler

Here are two Black women physicists I’m thinking of.

Thanks for the presentation and links, Tao! I’ve signed up for the block party.

Thanks for signing up, Sarah! Thank you, Jolene! Excited to collaborate with you.

https://events.cornell.edu/event/dark_laboratory_virtual_block_party_1008

Thanks everyone. I have a class to join...

Mellon Mays Undergraduate program - https://as.cornell.edu/mellon-mays

Posse program - https://oadi.cornell.edu/programs/student-opportunity-programs/posse-program.html

Thanks everyone.