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Announcements
Residence Hall Naming

The Five New Residence Halls:

Ruth Bader Ginsburg Hall
Toni Morrison Hall
Barbara McClintock Hall  (Resolution 156)
Hu Shih Hall
Ganędagq Hall

Video Overview
Remaining Meetings of the Senate

April 14 (NEW)   Meet-the-DOF-Candidates
                    Unified discussion of the three antiracism WG reports
April 21
May 5
May 12
Four Tenure Track Process Resolutions

Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status of the Faculty
Background

Most of the recommendations advanced by the AFPSF as part of the Tenure Track Project fall into the “advice, best practices” bucket.

However, the Committee feels that some of its recommendations warrant formal university-wide adoption and would like to see if the Senate agrees.

In this spirit, resolutions have been drafted that are concerned with

1. The Visibility of College TT Documents
2. The No-contact list
3. The Visibility of the Chair’s Summation Letter to Dean
4. The External Reviewer Selection Process
Visibility of College TT Policy Docs

Current:

While general policy is provided by the university through the Faculty Handbook, implementation details tend to be handled by the colleges.

Sharing college tenure processes is somewhat difficult because most colleges have chosen to store their procedure documents on local intranets that prevent public viewing.

CALS and Engineering are exceptions.
Proposal

Require the colleges put all their tenure policy docs online because

• It helps demystify the process.
• It minimizes the chance for procedural missteps.
• It fosters clarity
• It guarantees that all the players are working off the same version.
• It creates an opportunity for the colleges to learn from one another.

More details on the resolution webpage.
No-Contact Lists

Reasons for candidate to place Dr. X on a no-contact list:

- candidate had a professional fight with Dr. X.
- candidate worries that Dr. X might steal research plans.
- candidate competing with Dr. X in some external funding venue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>What the College Says</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Allowed and optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Allowed and Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVM</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCB</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal

The candidate can place in the dossier a no-contact list with a brief explanation next to each name.

The department can request a letter from a no-contact individual but then it must produce a justification that becomes part of the dossier.

More details on the Resolution Webpage.
Visibility of the Chair’s Letter to the Dean

Typically, this letter is NOT shared with the voting faculty.
Proposal

Require making the letter visible to the voting faculty for review before it is sent to the Dean. Reasons:

• insures accurate reporting of the deliberations
• supports the principle of transparency
• reinforces the idea that the decision is more than just the Chair’s decision.

More details on the Resolution Webpage.
The External Reviewer List Selection Process

Typical Method

• Department receives the candidate’s list C.
• With that in hand it produces the final list F by augmenting some subset C with its own chosen reviewers.
• The dossier indicates which of the reviewers are candidate-chosen and which are department-chosen.

Encourages the candidate to play second-guessing games with their selection choices.
Process

The candidate list and a preliminary department list are independently created with the charge being “produce the list that you would like to be used.” Both lists go into the dossier.

The department then uses the two lists to produce a final list with rules about using some minimum number of candidate names.

The dossier indicates which of the reviewers are candidate-chosen, department-chosen, or both.

More details on the Resolution Page.

Less “gaming” of the system.

Encourages the candidate to think broadly about external reviewers.

Instead of “list a few reviewers who are familiar with your work” it’s “list a compete set of reviewers who collectively are familiar with your work and its broader impact.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate List (CL)</th>
<th>Department List (DL)</th>
<th>Actual List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B C D E F G H J K</td>
<td>Z B C Y X F W H V U</td>
<td>B C F H Z Y X W J K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **On CL and DL**: B C F H Z Y X W J K
- **On DL Only**: Z Y X W
- **On CL Only**: B C F H
Approval Process

These resolutions will be voted on later.

Discussions with chairs, deans, and the provost office in the meantime.

Remember that approval involves all these players.
On Slate Size for Dean of Faculty Elections
....the Nominations and Elections Committee shall solicit nominations and canvass Faculty opinion and shall prepare a slate of three or more candidates. The Nominations and Elections Committee should consult the President in this regard.

(Article V,F.2 for the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty)
These Are Hard Times: “3” is a Big Number

....the Nominations and Elections Committee shall solicit nominations and canvass Faculty opinion and shall prepare a slate of three or more candidates. The Nominations and Elections Committee should consult the President in this regard.
Proposed Modification

....the Nominations and Elections Committee shall solicit nominations and canvass Faculty opinion and shall prepare a slate of two or three or more candidates. The Nominations and Elections Committee should consult the President in this regard.
The Resolution

Whereas Faculty Senate Bylaws currently stipulate that a Dean of Faculty election slates must consist of three or more candidates;

Whereas heightened faculty workload associated with the pandemic is making it more difficult to attract individuals who are willing to run for the position;

Whereas a two-person slate is perfectly adequate from the standpoint of giving the electorate sufficient choice in a Dean of Faculty election;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the University Faculty that bylaws be changed to allow for slates that consist of two or more candidates.

Need approval of the University Faculty to take effect (Article XIV).
Do we have a motion to discuss the DoF slate size resolution?

Second?
Discussion
Is there a motion to close debate?

Second?
Vote in Chat

I support the **DoF Election Slate Size Resolution**

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Abstain
Qualtrics Vote (April 1 – April 7)

Resolution on Crime Alerts and Race
Resolution on a Revision of Policy 1.2

Final Discussions
Resolution on Crime Alerts and Race

Arnika Fuhrmann (Asian Studies)
Nick Admussen (Asian Studies)

“Be it resolved that the Cornell University Police Department will cease to use racial descriptors in CRIME ALERT emails.”

Resolution and Details
Policy 1.2 (Research Integrity) Revision

The Feb 10 Senate presentation resulted in feedback that has been incorporated in this final draft. Concerns that wording seemed to exclude certain types of research and scholarship were addressed.

Details and background on this resolution webpage.

Basically the revision (a) improves clarity, (b) aligns our policy with what NIH, NSF, etc want, (c) redefines the role of the DoF in carrying out the inquity and investigation.
Qualtrics Vote (April 1 – April 7)

And that means you!
International Dual Degree Programs (IDDPs)
A Possible Approval Sequence

University Faculty Committee
New York State Department of Education is involved after the proposal exits Cornell.
Undergraduate, professional masters, and other in-college degree programs:

- **DAU** The Department or School that supplies the instructors.
- **PU** The College

PhD and Some Research Masters Programs:

- **DAU** The Graduate Field that supplies the instructors
- **PU** The Graduate School
## Desirable Attributes of the Approval Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>WHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Raising</td>
<td>The forms that the DAU fills out pose ethical questions.</td>
<td>It is important to reconcile the proposal with Cornell Core Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Each “stop” acts on prior assessments. Acts and assessments by the PU, UFC/Senate/CAPP, and IC are public.</td>
<td>Inspires confidence and squares with the idea of learning in engagement with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>UFC/Senate/CAPP assess and act within 60 days.</td>
<td>Senate has other business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the DAU Documents Its Proposal

Normally the DAU completes this Academic Program Registration Form.

It is proposed that this form be augmented to include three ethics-related questions derived from the University Statement Guidelines on Ethical International Engagement.
1. Alignment with Core Values

Explain how the proposed program is consistent with Cornell University Core Values, including our commitment to purposeful discovery; free and open inquiry and expression; diversity, inclusion, and non-discrimination; justice and human rights; and respect for the natural environment.

If there is something less than full consistency with Cornell values, then offer a “greater good” argument that justifies the collaboration.
2. History with Partner Institution

Describe the history of prior collaborations with the partner institution and why that history inspires confidence that the partner will be an ethical partner in the future.
3. Compliance

Explain how the partnership will be monitored to ensure that there is compliance with what the agreement stipulates about academic freedom, freedom of speech and expression, and other protections for students, faculty and staff.

Describe the process for handling instances of non-compliance.
The DAU “Proposal Narrative”

The **Directly Affected Unit (DAU)**

- **Proposing Unit (PU)**
- **UFC Senate CAPP**
- **International Council (IC)**
- **Provost**
- **Board of Trustees**

The [Academic Program Registration Form](#) includes a section that asks for a 1-2 page overview of the program.

**Propose that the DAU fold into that narrative evidence of consultation with faculty across campus who have a relevant expertise of the partner country through their research and scholarship.**
How the DAU Communicates Internal Support

The **Academic Program Registration Form** measures internal support by asking the DAU to

Attach results of a faculty vote (all field faculty with voting eligibility should be polled); address the thinking behind negative votes or abstentions.

Propose a stronger and more detailed indication of internal support.
Measuring and Reporting Internal DAU Support

The electorate must include

• All professors, associate professors, and assistant professors.
• All RTE faculty holding the following positions: lecturers (all ranks), professors-of-the-practice (all ranks), and clinical professors (all ranks).

Separate tallies for the University and RTE faculties.

Each tally should report four numbers: Yes, No, Abstain, and Did-not-Vote.

A brief summary of negative voter concerns should be reported.

It should be made clear that low voter turnout reflects badly on the DAU and decreases the chance of approval.
Internal Support Comments

These are the RTE teaching positions:

- lecturers (all ranks)
- professors-of-the-practice (all ranks)
- clinical professors (all ranks).

RTE Faculty Figure Heavily in IDDPs.
How PU Support is Communicated

The Academic Program Registration Form measures PU support by asking the DAU to

Attach support letters from your college/school dean and other relevant academic and administrative staff, including related programs at Cornell that might be affected (positively or negatively) by this program change.

Recommended Addition: If a committee within the PU votes on the proposal, then the tally should be reported with a brief summary of negative voter concerns.
With possible input from the UFC, CAPP reviews the proposal on its academic merits alone, efficiently interacting with the DAU and PU as necessary. Produces a brief written report that includes its vote and a brief description of negative voter concerns.

CAPP report presented at a Senate meeting and discussed. A decision is made on whether to stage a second vote indicating whether or not the University should proceed with the partnership.

Votes are taken at the next Senate meeting.
International Council assesses the proposal taking into consideration the CAPP report, Senate deliberations, and Senate vote(s).

The International Council communicates its view of the proposal to the Provost through a vote of its own.

Like all assessments in the chain, it should be public.
Current International Council Make-Up

Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs
  Vice Provost for International Affairs (Chair)
  Associate Vice Provosts for International Affairs
  Executive Staff Assistant

Associate Dean-Level Reps:
  Grad School, Medical School, AAP, CAS, CALS, CHE, CIS, COE, CVM, ILR, JCB, LAW

Director of the Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies
International Council: Talking Points

Assessing IDDP’s would be a new activity for the IC. Is it necessary to augment its membership?

Recall that the IC would have access to all assessments/reports that were rendered before:

1. The DAU’s Completed Academic Registration Form that includes responses to the ethical questions and a synopsis of expert faculty viewpoints.
2. The PU assessment.
3. CAPP’s report and Senate deliberations and actions.
What Next?

1. Based on what is discussed today, the UFC will formulate a recommended approval process.

2. That recommendation will be posted online and framed as a resolution.

3. Posted comments and feedback from the Provost office will most likely further shape the proposed process.

4. Aim for a vote at the April 21 meeting.
Sense of Senate Vote

Dual Degree Program Offered by the School of Hotel Administration and the Guanghua School of Management at Peking University
Details Provided at the Feb 10 Meeting

• SHA currently offers a Masters in Management in Hospitality (MMH). They will provide the “MMH half” of the dual degree.

• Guanghua School of Management (GSM) at Peking University (PKU) will provide the “MBA half” of the dual degree.

• About 60 students/year. The GSM is a top school so selection from that pool will be very high quality.

• Students in the proposed program will be taught separately from students in the existing MMH program.

• The set-up is comparable to a program that currently exists between the Johnson School and Tsinghua University.
The collaboration was approved by CAPP and the General Committee of the Graduate School.

The Memorandum of Agreement has sections on academic freedom, non-discrimination, and intellectual property. (Always the case when Cornell enters into a formal collaboration with a foreign entity.)

As documented here, steps are taken to ensure that the academic credentials of both students and faculty are at the highest possible level.

The well documented issues associated with STEM-based collaborations are not entirely relevant to hospitality industry collaborations.

We are mindful of the situation in Hong Kong and the Uighur Muslim crisis, but believe that limiting academic ties between the US and China is not the answer.
Discussion
Vote Via Chat

I support the establishment of the SHA-Guanghua School of Management Dual Degree program described here.

___ Yes

___ No

___ Abstain
Presentation of Two IDDP-Related Resolutions will be followed by an SoS Vote on the SHA + PHU Proposal.
Resolution on the Vetting of International Dual-Degree Programs

Presentation by Joanie Mackowski
Associate Professor / Literatures in English / Creative Writing Program
Sponsors, Faculty Senators:

Joanie Mackowski (Literatures in English), Richard Bensel (Government), Harold Hodes (Philosophy), Carl Franck (Physics), Neil Saccameno (Literatures in English), Michael Nussbaum (Statistics and Data Science), Risa Lieberwitz (ILR School)

Sponsors, University Faculty: Magnus Fiskesjo (Anthropology), Matthew Evangelista (Government), Allen Carlson (Government), Rachana Kamtekar, (Philosophy), Charles Francis Brittain (Classics), M. Alejandra Gandolfo (Plant Biology), Joseph Margulies (Law School), Jeremy Braddock (Literatures in English), Kenneth M. Roberts (Government), Rebecca Slayton (Science and Technology Studies), Jane-Marie Law (Asian Studies), Natalie Melas (Comparative Literature), Grant Farred (Africana), David Levitsky (Human Ecology), John S. Henderson (Anthropology), Eli Friedman (ILR), Nick Admussen (Asian Studies), Robin McNeal (Asian Studies), Lori Khatchadourian (Near Eastern Studies) Barbara J. Strupp (Nutritional Sciences/Psychology), Adam T. Smith (Anthropology), Darlene Evans (Knight Institute), Rachel Bezner Kerr (Global Development), TJ Hinrichs (History), Derrick Spires (Literatures in English)
Fundamental:

Collaboration across difference is good!

Collaborative research, scholarship, and creative endeavor are crucial practices to advance human rights and freedoms, and we affirm the ability and the responsibility of faculty and scholars to reach across all kinds of divisions to forge scholarly and creative collaborations.
but... a program is
Not the Same Thing
as scholarship / research /
creative practice

Degree-granting programs
are business structures
to manage, control, and
account for credit
hours, staffing, and
revenue.
Currently:

Our international partners attest their commitment to academic freedom and non-discrimination. However, the vetting process includes no specific steps to investigate and assess the credibility of a proposed partner’s attestation, or to assess the potential ethical and human-rights implications of proceeding with an alliance.
Violations of ethical and human rights are occurring at increasing rates across the world and have been over the past 15 years.

“2019 was the 14th consecutive year of decline in global freedom... [T]he brutality of autocratic regimes and the ethical decay of democratic powers are combining to make the world increasingly hostile to fresh demands for better governance....”

--Freedom House 2020 Report
Violations of ethical and human rights are occurring at increasing rates across the world and have been over the past 15 years.

“….the citizens of 94 countries suffer under non-democratic regimes... 3.97 billion people are currently controlled by tyrants, absolute monarchs, military juntas or competitive authoritarians. That’s 53 percent of the world’s population. Statistically, then, authoritarianism is one of the largest—if not the largest—challenges facing humanity...”

-- Garry Kasparov and Thor Halvorssen, Washington Post, February 2017
among states with populations of more than one-million people, the share of electoral democracies has recently fallen to less than half for the first time since the very early days of the post–Cold War world.”

Larry Diamond, Prof of Political Science at Stanford University and a Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies & the Hoover Institution
Additional Risks:

Recent transitions toward authoritarian and repressive governance have not resulted from armed takeover but have rather occurred gradually, subtly, and the line between democratic and authoritarian regimes grows increasingly porous and ill-defined.

“The most blatant examples of globalized authoritarianism are when governments actually kill or attempt to kill their critics in other countries, as Saudi Arabia did in the case of journalist Jamal Khashoggi, or Russia allegedly did to Sergei Skripal... But other expressions of authoritarian power are becoming much more subtle and difficult to trace... Leaders of authoritarian countries are increasingly able to pressure and silence critics in the “free” world.”

Joshua Keating, *Slate*, Jan 2020
Additional Risks:

As anti-democratic and authoritarian regimes worldwide increase in number and power, they currently do so without cutting ties with democratic countries, and without fearing the influence of such countries.
The line gets blurry in the U.S., too….

Human rights violations are happening in the United States. **Several states have or are currently enacting legislation that restricts the voting rights of U.S. citizens.**

“The avalanche of [new voting-related] legislation…raises fundamental questions about the ability of a minority of voters to exert majority control in American politics…”

“‘The typical response by a losing party in a functioning democracy is that they alter their platform to make it more appealing,’ Kenneth Mayer, an expert on voting and elections at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, said. ‘Here the response is to try to keep people from voting. It’s dangerously antidemocratic.’”

University’s Pledge to counter racist injustice:

“The University is currently embarking on new measures to address and counter the racist injustice and violence that has been ongoing in the U.S. for centuries.

“I want to make clear, both personally and on behalf of Cornell, that we will do all we can as a university to address this scourge of racism. We will address it directly in our educational programs, in our research and in our engagement and related activities, working through the ways we know best to push for a world that is equitable and kind; where people do not have to fear for their lives because of the color of their skin; and where everyone has the same opportunities to grow, thrive and enjoy their lives.”

Cornell President Martha Pollock, May 29, 2020
University’s Pledge to counter racist injustice:

Work is underway on a Center for Anti-Racist, Just, and Equitable Futures.

“Our ability to understand and to challenge racism(s) depends on recognizing both their respective specificities in our local contexts, and the ways in which they become articulated across time and space.”

Final report, Working Group C
So,

Given President Pollock’s commitment to address “this scourge of racism,” and given the importance of our mission as an educational institution, we must take action to ensure that academic freedom and non-discrimination cannot be empty phrases, and cannot be equivocated. The future of this institution depends on these words to mean what they say.
Resolution on the Vetting of IDDP’s

Whereas the university has developed and continues to develop degree-granting programs with universities in countries around the world;

Whereas the Guidelines on Ethical International Engagement emphasize the importance of maintaining the University’s commitment to “free and open inquiry and expression; diversity, inclusion, and non-discrimination; justice and human rights; and respect for the natural environment”;

Whereas the Guidelines on Ethical International Engagement also assert that we should “avoid partnering with colleagues, organizations, agencies, or companies that are under credible and direct suspicion of malfeasance or serious legal or human rights violations”;
Whereas democratic governance is in decline across the world;
Whereas, currently, the transition toward authoritarian and repressive regimes does not result from armed takeover but rather occurs incrementally and subtly, and the line between democratic and authoritarian regimes grows increasingly porous and ill-defined;
Whereas, as a result of the above, we have increased opportunity and fewer barriers to collaboration with authoritarian regimes;
Whereas to collaborate in degree-granting partnerships with organizations and universities under the sway of authoritarian regimes risks degrading and compromising the University’s mission, function, and reputation;
Whereas to collaborate in partnerships with organizations and universities under the sway of authoritarian regimes also lends such regimes legitimacy, allowing them to further their anti-democratic aims;
...

Whereas the University’s Code of Conduct states that “The University, as an educational institution, has a special set of interests and purposes, the protection and promotion of which are essential to its effective functioning”;

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Senate calls on University administration to recognize the grave and present risk of entangling our institution with anti-democratic forces;

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Faculty Senate calls for an immediate revision of the vetting and approval process for International Dual Degree Programs (IDDP’s), including greater transparency about the details of proposed programs and active consultation with the Faculty Senate and its committees, to ensure compliance with the Guidelines on Ethical International Engagement and to promote and protect Cornell’s interests and purposes as a higher education institution.
Resolution on Joint or Dual Degree Programs Involving Other Academic Institutions

Richard Bensel (Government)

Whereas one of the primary responsibilities of the Faculty Senate under the University Bylaws (Article XIII, Section 2) is “to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school, or separate academic unit or are general in nature; and to recommend to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification, discontinuance of degrees.”;

Whereas the proposed dual degree program between the Hotel School and Peking University clearly falls under this provision of the University Bylaw;

Resolved, The Faculty Senate reaffirms its responsibility to consider and advise on all joint or dual degree programs involving other academic institutions, including those with other colleges and universities.

Resolution Details