The committee was generally supportive of the sentiment of resolution.

Key comments from the committee for consideration include:

- The resolution is seen as addressing a political question vs. an academic issue
• Why does the resolution bothers to single out China instead of simply being more generally toward authoritarian regimes which embody specific characteristics?

• What is the point of the resolution given that Cornell cannot confer any “rights” to citizens of another country in that country or what “necessary steps” Cornell could take to “ensure...freedom of speech” in an authoritarian country that doesn’t tolerate free speech. Given that, it was suggested that Cornell could emphasize its principles but note that since it cannot protect the citizens in those countries who follow those principles, the resolution could state a desire to closely monitor whether the university’s academic freedom policies have traction in a given country, and if not to take some kind of action (whatever that might be.)

• It is appreciated that the resolution would strengthen the position of academics working with or at international partner universities as a way to reference their home institution’s (Cornell’s) principles.

• If the central administration of the university takes steps to ensure that academic freedom and freedom of speech is protected throughout the Global Hubs system, that could result in a conflict of interest/financial burden to college administrations which may require clear processes and procedures to address.