

Senator-F2 Resolution Summary

Results

The vote tallies for the Senator-F2 Resolution are

Yes = 49

No = 48

Abstain = 10

DNV = 19

The Resolution

This [resolution webpage](#) contains background and uploaded comments. Here is the resolution itself:

Whereas President Pollack and #DoBetterCornell have called for faculty to be educated about systemic racism and bias,

Whereas the Faculty Senate seeks a strong and effective institutional response to address issues of racism and systemic inequalities,

Whereas the Faculty Senate has received and considered the "[Working Group-F Final Report to the Faculty Senate](#)," dated April 5, 2021,

Whereas a faculty that collectively commits to understanding and addressing systemic inequalities and enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion is better able to fulfill the university's mission and guide Cornell's diverse student body,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate strongly encourages voluntary participation by the faculty in educational programs addressing systemic inequalities and ways to enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate supports developing positive incentives for faculty to participate in such educational programs, such as supplemental funding for departments with high levels of faculty participation.

Voter Comments

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

Comments from Buz Barstow (Faculty Senator for Biological and Environmental Engineering), after consultation with department faculty and staff (particularly Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee) These comments are the same as those posted for our vote on the Faculty Education Requirement, but we believe are important for this vote as well. We first want to emphasize our support for the recommendations of anti-racism initiative working groups. In consultation with my colleagues in Biological and Environmental Engineering, we are voting yes for the faculty, staff and student education proposals. We believe that racial reconciliation and restoring a sense of common good and community is the way of the future, both in the United States and globally. We strongly believe that doing nothing

(voting no) is not an option. We also strongly believe in the possibility of education, if done right, to move minds, and make the world a better place. If these proposals create rational, well-meaning dialog and action, they will be succeeding (and are already doing this). The turbulent summer of 2020 and the debate around the anti-racism initiative has created an unprecedented degree of engagement with our colleagues that we believe bodes well for the future. We have had some of the most substantive faculty senate meetings on almost any subject considered. However, just because this trend exists, it does not mean that any particular strategy for achieving racial reconciliation and opportunity for all regardless of background is the right one. While we believe a right strategy undeniably exists, we think that humility in the face of this challenge is essential for success. As of today, no faculty or student body exists that fully reflects the diversity of the United States or the world. This means we don't yet have a workable strategy to achieve this. This means we need to constantly experiment and constantly improve with training, hiring and promotion, funding, and personal interaction. We advise that the Center for Racial Justice evaluate the educational process from the outset. There is a strong, and we believe legitimate, fear amongst our colleagues that mandatory training, if done poorly could have a counter-productive effect on our community. It could unproductively use valuable student, faculty and staff time, generate cynicism, while doing nothing to build a sense of shared community. We are worried that this will be the end of diversity education, not the beginning. We believe these concerns are particularly acute with regards to staff training that has already begun to roll out. Here, time commitments are far larger than those envisioned by the faculty senate. While much to the credit of the CALS staff there has been no outright hostility, we believe this has the potential to be overly burdensome, patronizing, and ostracizing and to widen pre-existing political divisions that are found in the wider country. Given these concerns, we want to encourage the higher ups to strongly consider the use of persuasion first, rather than coercion first to educate the faculty, staff and students. We also advise caution in the roll out of educational measures, monitoring of their effectiveness, wide choice of material, monitoring of time commitment, and limits on the duration of any mandatory measures (say 10 to 15 years). We hope the educational tools developed are used to address systemic racism much in the same way that Title IX has been working to address sexual harassment, with the evolution of both rules and ways of teaching people appropriate behavior.

I am a little confused about the difference between these three reports, even after the meeting. I believe by voting "no" here and "yes" on the other two resolutions I am voting "yes" on a mandatory requirement, rather than an optional program. If this is incorrect, I am sorry for the confusion.

This would be the ideal situation. However, voluntary participation would only work if it becomes the culture of the university. How long would that take?

Personally, I am strongly opposed to this resolution because it makes a faculty education requirement entirely too voluntary. We will impose a diversity education requirement on our students. We also have mandatory diversity training for staff at the university. And yet we are willing to give faculty a "pass" on such training if they object? This undermines any moral authority we may have on imposing such requirements on student and staff populations. If diversity training is important for them, it should be important for faculty as well. I am very aware that the most vocal objections to a faculty education requirement came from white, male faculty (which I am as well), to the dismay of our BIPOC colleagues. This resolution preserves the status quo ('learn more about diversity issues, but only if you want to'), which is not OK. If we really want to move the needle here, then lets make a real effort, even if some of us are uncomfortable through the process. However, a majority of the faculty in my department (or vocal minority?) are in favor of this resolution, and I represent them. I will therefore abstain in this vote.

Though I personally think all faculty should take anti-racism training, I do not think that is an appropriate requirement of employment. We are NOT responsible for the continuing education of faculty and employees. While I could make an argument that this is like safety training (b/c if we don't do it, we are opening up possibility of violence on campus), ultimately I think that's a stretch. I'm concerned about 2 elements: the futility of forced "trainings," and the danger of indoctrination (again, unlike students, this is not a "curricular" issue for faculty).

The WG report is problematic in its suggestions for repercussions if a faculty member does not fulfill the education requirement developed, but I am still in favor of moving the WG report on. I don't agree with F-2 that it should be completely voluntary. I do believe that the repercussions for non-compliance be different than prohibiting ability to teach (as the current WG_F report uses as an example). Perhaps related to a portion of a salary merit increase? There are many creative things that are positive rather than seeming punitive to doing one's basic job that I am sure can and will be considered by the groups that work further on implementing the Antiracism Initiative as the Faculty Senate recommends.

Senator-F-2 resolution: Yes Comment: Please note that this alternative resolution was arrived at in collaboration with colleagues across the university and has the support of some, but not all members of my department. Carl Franck, Physics

Out of the 3 resolutions this is the only one which is worth considering. However I am against connected any funding with the completion of such educational programs especially on low level like a department.

Comments: generally supportive; the mandatory aspect of the UFC proposal was particularly irksome to many. The majority thought voluntary efforts might do as well as mandatory ones and should be tried first. A minority said that voluntary efforts don't reach those most in need of the fruits of education. Both camps generally felt that "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink". The question is under what circumstances will those on the fence learn something valuable; most thought a voluntary effort would be more fruitful in this regard.

One incentive that I hope will be on the table is money: something like an honorarium for faculty who participate.

Making faculty participation voluntary will disappoint or anger some, and some will object to the contrast between voluntary participation for faculty and mandatory participation for graduate students. We acknowledge and respect these positions but still think resolution F-2 merits our full support. Voluntary faculty participation will be the wiser and more effective strategy in the long haul, changing our overall institutional culture as more and more faculty voluntarily take part.

This resolution supports faculty education on important issues of systemic inequality. It presents a positive, non-punitive approach to encouraging serious engagement with these issues. Thus, it will be far more likely to advance the goals of education in a positive way, as compared to the mandatory educational requirement proposal.

My colleagues strongly favor this version of the plan, in which participation is not mandatory (but is encouraged), and with no sanctions for opting out (because, they feel, freedom of academic thought and expression dictates that one cannot sanction a person for preferring not to participate).

The incentives make this a better alternative than F-1, which doesn't seem to really make any changes.

I really would have liked to say yes to this, because I don't think making it mandatory is going to help anything. I think we could accomplish this in different ways. I strongly believe faculty will take the classes regardless, but will not continue to do so if they become repetitive, are boring, tedious or ineffective (like much of the training implemented by HR). Or we will do so, but not pay any attention to the training - click the video and let it run while doing something else. Is this really training or just a tickbox exercise. It would also be good for the administration to put its money where its mouth is. White men still dominate in all areas of administration (look at the representation in deans of colleges and administrators at Day Hall). How about setting a better example for faculty and students from the top down versus forcing faculty to "go to training" so Cornell says it is doing better.

Absolutely not.

I don't think that the faculty senate has any role in this "recommending" process.

Yes, but only because it is voluntary. I still think that Critical Theory based ideology does far more harm than good. y. Although this may seem extreme, in my experience, near universal celebration of critical theory is the academic equivalent to pithing, a neurophysiological technique used to separate the spinal cord from the brain, so that simple reflexes that do not depend on the brain can still occur. Again, this is my opinion, and you are welcome to agree or disagree. The anti-racist thinking of the Foundation Against Indoctrination and Racism <https://www.fairforall.org/> is far more rational (by definition) since Critical Theory is based on Postmodernism.

This is an all in issue and while voluntary participatory approach is ideal, it would be unjust to those non-faculty status individual we are requiring to participate.

Voluntary participation is the only path forward. It would be foolish to believe that racist faculty who would attend a 2h required training would in any way become better persons. If it is voluntary, they may skip this training, but in a university whose faculty is 97% democrat, it seems difficult to believe few individuals would volunteer to join such efforts.

I'd rather everyone engage in these efforts, but if that's not possible then I think we should have at least something so I'm voting yes on everything for the F component.