>> Chelsea Specht: Ok, I have 3:30 so we’re ready to begin. Hello. I'm Chelsea Specht, associate dean of faculty and I'm acting speaker for the senate meeting today as our speaker, Jonathan Ochshorn, is unfortunately out sick. A reminder to everybody, whether you're in person or online, please do sign in and welcome to the Cornell Sun, their journalist in our audience today. This meeting is officially called to order. We begin our meeting with the recognition of our presence in this space and on this land. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohón:ni' (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohón:ni' are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York state, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogohón:ni' dispossession and honor the ongoing connection of Gayogohón:ni' people, past and present, to these lands and waters. So, the first order of business today is the approval minutes from our previous meeting which was December 14th, 2022. As per usual this approval takes the form of a unanimous consent since the minute are a verbatim transcript of the events and there ought not to be any corrections. If there are any connections, please, bring them to the attention of the Dean of Faculty. The second order of business is the senate announcements and updates. We will have two five-minute presentations back to back followed by ten minutes for question and answers. I now invite the ILR dean and the Scheinman Professor of Conflict Resolution, Alex Colvin, to the floor to discuss the proposed department merger and name change in ILR. Dean Colvin, you're welcome. You have five minutes.

>> Alex Colvin: thank you very much. Pleasure to be here. So, I'm here to present a proposed department merger and name change at ILR. Can we have the next slide please? So, it's involving two current departments. The Labor Relations Law and History Department, and the International and...
Comparative Labor Department. Little history, 16 faculty members appointed to it. The second one comparative labor, six faculty members, directory appointed and four cross appointed to it. So, combined department would be 22 faculty members appointed to it. And this is my home department as well. Both are my home departments as well. Go onto the next slide. Oh, yeah, just -- so why are we proposing to do this merger? The core reason is there's substantial overlap in the expertise of the faculty across these two departments. These are multi-disciplinary departments that study the areas of labor employment and work. The focus of labor relations, law and history historically was domestic. United States focus and comparative labor was international comparative in focus, non-U.S. focused. However, if we look at disciplinary expertise we have sociologists, political scientists, commons lawyers, historians, in these departments and there's a number of members of the department -- each of the departments who are split between the two departments but have similar areas of academic expertise. Overtime more and more of the faculty across the department do both domestic and international research. So, we have a number of faculty members who can speak to the areas of the other department and by combining them in a merged department we'll have a sort of larger, more integrated group for making decisions around faculty hiring, tenure promotion, curricular matters. So, we'll be bringing the expertise together of the faculty -- faculty who already are quite integrated in many fashions. There is an ambition here. We like to think this is the -- will be the world's strongest department in this area -- the strongest labor and relations department in the world. So, there is a -- some intellectual ambition behind this as well. There's been a lot of faculty discussion leading up to the proposed merger, both departments, independently and together discusses extensively, faculty vote, 20 faculty members in favor, 2 abstained. So, a clearly decisive vote in favor of the merger. We also had extensive discussions around the name for new department. It might not surprise folks to know that was perhaps the most involved discussion. There were a lot of ideas about what the name should be and lots of different ideas. Eventually it was settled on that the strongest support was for the name Global Labor and Work. Reflecting both the global
ambi�ons of the department and also the multi-disciplinary nature. Some of our disciplines use labor
more, some use work more and this is inclusive of both etymologies. There was a unanimous
department and then school vote in favor of the new name after name had been settled on. So, I'm not
suggesting that people didn't like their own proposals, but they were all willing to go along with this
name in the end. next slide, please. So, impacts of the merger. I think this is important always to think
about the impacts of decisions like this. We aren't anticipating any now administrative costs from the
combination of the departments. In ILR many of the conservancy supporting departments are actually
part of school level, the department level so there's relatively less in the way of administrative costs. I
have committed as dean additional faculty lines to support the new department so I've committed to
three additional new faculty hires to support it and hopefully realize that global ambition to be the best
department the world in this area. There aren't any implications for -- for -- undergraduate curricula
matters because we have a single majored ILR. We are a school with a single BS in ILR, so curricula
matters are determined at school level. There will be, I think, better coordination with the two
departments together in terms of teaching, so, hopefully that will be an improvement but we're not
changing any degree names. Doctoral education is obviously within the field system. The field is ILR as a
field. The two departments have already collaborated extensively on doctoral education in terms of
admissions and advising, course planning, so, we don't anticipate changes there. They are in the process
-- as a combined department in planning to have a new concentration, our MS program on labor
research and policy. I think this is exciting opportunity to improve our education of students interested in
careers related to the labor movement and labor policy and so that's in the works. That will be sent to
the graduate school for their approval -- that's under the authority of the graduate school, but that will
be -- out of this department. The last thing in terms of impact that I'll mention is the issue of a tenured
promotion procedures. We have taken the approach that for faculty members in the department they
are entitled to choose whether to proceed through the tenure review under the departmental structure
they came in on or the -- new department structure after the merger. So, grandparenting in the faculty members and in the annual review meetings I have with the junior faculty I have been discussing this with them and we have been putting this in their letters, so we don't anticipate concerns there. And I should also mention it is a school wide -- we have a school wide vote in ILR on tenure cases so everybody in the department will already be voting on the tenure cases.

>> Chelsea Specht: Ok, thank you very much. okay, our next item in business is -- I'll invite Eve De Rosa to come -- the Dean of Faculty to come to the floor to discuss announcements and updates. Dean De Rosa, you have five minutes.

>> Eve De Rosa: Why, thank you. I will hold this because I'm going to do something terrible. So, I just wanted to remind the senators in the room and those of you online that we will have three votes. We will be voting on the S.C. Johnson College of Business tenure harmonization clock going from six to eight years for tenure. We will vote on the medical gynecologist in the health services at the university resolution. And the academic freedom in global hubs resolution. All three of these are being presented today. You'll receive a link tomorrow morning and then you have two weeks to vote. We have extensive updates for the research teaching and extension faculty. So, we have compiled all of the RTE faculty across the university and campuses. We now know who our senators are representing and so they will receive that. Of course our RTE at large represent their own perspectives but the ones that are representing schools and colleges will receive their constituents which is new so, in doing that, we realized that there's a need for re-apportionment and so we currently do not have representation for the research division, the many research institutes on campus and we do not have representation for the School of Continuing Education and both of which have significant numbers of RTE so we will be doing that and we are also -- while I'm mentioning this we're also going to have to re-apportion our senate
representation because we have new schools like the School of Public Policy that do not have representation as well. And then lastly, and this will all of course go through the Nominations and Elections committee and then to the Senate. And then finally, we have a RTE resolution that has been drafted by the Senate Task Force and they would like to share this first to the RTE senators and then after the senators have had an opportunity to revise it if needed then it'll be shared with RTE faculty across the campus so they can sponsor it and then it'll come to the senate and we're hoping all of this will happen by March and next slide please.

In March, in addition to our RTE resolution we will also have the presidential task force on undergraduate admissions come and update the senate on the process and progress that's happening in that front and we will also have the swim test resolution from the physical education committee and the senate committee has been working really hard for like the last three or four semesters on whether to eliminate or retain the swim test -- compulsory swim test at Cornell. And, it looks like we will be keeping it and also building in an expanded so that transfer students will also have the requirement to pass the swim test and that will come to the senate as well in March. And the last thing that we definitely will have but I can't promise this will happen in March -- I think it'll be more likely in April is the Research Scientist title that's outside of the research division. That's exclusively where it lives at this moment and, in fact, it was something that should have become vestigial but the College of Information Sciences, Computing and Information Sciences as well as other places on campus like CALS would like to bring the Research Scientist back -- but in a different form and we're working on that with academic HR, the provost and I will bring that to the senate of course and we'll continue these conversations. It is not as easy. We have eight or nine RTE faculty with that title across the campus. So that's something else to resolve and those are the announcements and updates.

>> Chelsea Specht: Fantastic, thank you. We now have ten minutes for conversation or any questions and answers if anyone has any questions for either Dean Colvin or for Dean De Rosa now is your chance. If
you’re on -- please state -- you can -- if you’re online, you can raise your hand. If you’re in person, please feel free to come down to a microphone and please state your name and affiliation as you begin your question. So, we have one person in person and then we'll move to Ken Birman who is online.

>> Andy Horbal: Andy Horbal, RTE, faculty at large, senator. You mentioned the constituent list to be distributed to the school and college RTE faculty reps and you mentioned that at large senators are expected to represent their own views. Is there any interest in a constituent list that would be for at large senators to do things like recruit for vacancies for committees or to provide a means for RTE faculty to communicate with at large senators or is -- is it again that the expectation is that we're representing our own views and there's no need for that or that RTE faculty in colleges, in schools could reach out to us if they had anything they want us to address?

>> Eve De Rosa: So, my understanding -- and I'm sorry that I keep taking this off. Kenny and Matt. So, my understanding is at-large senators, do represent their point of view and then those that are inside the colleges and schools would do the sort of reaching out to their constituents to be -- to involve them in the issues. That does not preclude you from reaching out of course and there's also the senate task force whereas another place to sort of have conversation about issues important to RTE faculty, so, yes, I welcome you to reach out to as many people as you want. I love the energy you bring, Andy, so, yes, and then, I guess, for the -- like for example, the resolution that's currently drafted will come to you. Even though you're not representing a college or school you will have the opportunity to add your voice to that.

>> Andy Horbal: Thank you.
>> Eve De Rosa: Ok.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. Harry Katz, online question.

>> Harry Katz: thank you, actually I just have an endorsement statement to make, and I'll make it brief and that is I've been a member of The Labor Relations Law and History Department for -- one that's being merged with the international department and ILR. I just want to emphasize Alex is nicely presented the case, but I would also just like to highlight for everybody that this is very much a faculty driven switch. Alex has been supporting it as Dean. The faculty have strongly endorsed us substantially behind that -- not just signaled by that vote but on many other implications they are very much in favor of this merger. Thanks.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. Ken Birman.

>> Ken Birman: yeah, Ken Birman computer science. Alex, I -- actually ask you a question regarding your proposal but I support it and I think it seems to be a very sound and carefully thought through activity. I'm just curious to know whether there'll be any sort of a budget impact positive or negative associated with this merger. The reason I ask is that in the past there have been a number of organizational changes that have turned out to be costly in some cases and of course we're under a period of budget stress. So, I just think that for -- for completeness of the proposal I -- would be interested to understand if it's going to result in hiring new administrators, or other types of, you know, costs that we're not currently -- of course savings is possible too.

>> Alex Colvin: Yeah, thanks for the question, To understand kind of the budget impact at ILR it's
important to know that our departmental budgets only include sort of small administrative and
workshop kind of budget of about $10,000 a year. So, those will just -- you know doubling essentially so -
- you know, keeping each of those budgets. A lot of the functions are done at the school level. We have
department admin assistants, but we don't have a department manager, that's done at the school level
so there's no change there. We're not changing the number of administrative assistants, supportive
faculty, we base that on the number of faculty members so there's no change on that. You know, really
the only budgetary impact really is that I'm authorizing additional faculty hires, you know, which is in
mind with our strategy as a school wanting to grow this area. So that's the -- that's the one budgetary
impact that I'm taking on is adding faculty.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: It's ok, I got it. Hi, Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. Actually, that's also my home department in
ILR and I voted for the merger but that's not why I'm up here. The -- what I wanted to ask was about the
RTE faculty numbers and the percentage of faculty at Cornell. I think it would be really useful for all of us
to know how many faculty are on the tenure track and tenure lines and how many are on RTE faculty
lines, and that may be part of the task force report that will be shared but I think just as a general matter
it would be really useful to know that and I know that won't -- will -- what I just asked about won't
include faculty who have temporary appointments but I think we really need to know those percentages
and also how it breaks down by college and school, et cetera.

>> Eve De Rosa: yes, so, last spring I did just that and, presented it to the senate and we learned a lot. I
think it was an important exercise, so we broke down across all the schools and colleges the percentage
of university faculty which is the term for tenure track faculty in the by-laws. We had the research, RTE
faculty, teaching RTE faculty and extension RTE faculty separated so we saw four classes of faculty for
each college so you can get a sense of the flavor of RTE in each of the colleges and schools and we are
about to receive the results from the work life survey and if you remember we were able to integrate RTE driven questions into the universities work life survey for the first time. These were questions generated by the task force and so we in-- it was given both to RTE faculty and re-- to teaching -- sorry, to tenure track faculty and tenure faculty and our intention is to look at the results for all of the questions for the work life survey, separating tenure track from research from teaching from extension from university. Librarians, curators and archivists because they are different needs and so trying to learn from that and I have recently received from RPIP updated numbers for the apportionment. With that -- and I should mention this as well we’re also looking at the distribution or proportion of what sex is in the different classes of faculty as well as race. And that is because I have received concerns that women and people of color are being pushed toward RTE contract-based faculty positions and not toward tenure track and so, we'll get the data and know if that is real or not.

>> Chelsea Specht: Do we have any other questions or comments on either of the two announcements? I don't see anything online; nobody is rushing down toward the front in this room. So, with that, thank you very much. And, if there are no further points of discussion we will move to our resolutions. As a reminder we have four proposed resolutions to consider today. The first is the resolution to harmonize the tenure clock across the College of Business. I invite Dyson Dean of Faculty and research of -- of faculty and research and professor of marketing, Suzanne Shu, to the microphone. Dean Shu will have five minutes to present the resolution followed by ten minutes for discussion. Thank you.

>> Suzanne Shu: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here back in front of the senate. I presented this proposal in December of last year, so today I will do a very quick summary to set up the resolution to help you think through it for voting. So, if we could have the next slide, please. As a bit of background on this, why -- you know why is it that we're doing this tenure clock harmonization, before the merger of
the three schools -- the Dyson school, what's now the Nolan hotel school and the Johnson Graduate School of Management into the College of Business several years ago. The Johnson school had successfully brought here to the senate a resolution to move their clock to an eight year tenure clock and that was based on competitive pressures. Since the merger in the three schools are now together, we have a situation where two of the schools, Dyson and Nolan came in maintaining the six year tenure clock that they -- that the university traditionally used and the Johnson school had the eight year clock. So, we had a bit of a miss match within the college across the three schools. In a time in which tenure decisions were being made internal to the schools and based on school faculty votes, that was sort of survivable but based on a task force that was put together in 2021, next slide please, we have restructured the college to move all of the faculty out of the schools and into the college itself into areas -- discipline areas -- you can think of them as departments in other parts of the university -- and so, under this new structure the faculty sit in those areas -- that is their tenure home. Those are the faculty who vote on each other's promotion, reappointment, tenure processes. And then, they are affiliated about the schools to handle teaching because the schools are very program and student focused. So, the Dyson, Johnson and Nolan school as you can imagine, those are the red bars and the faculty sitting in the areas that are the horizontal bars, up and down. The impact of this is that imagine -- imagine the area of marketing where I come from which is the middle one up there of the bluish colored bars. in marketing, last year, we hired two new faculty into the Johnson graduate school. This year we have hired one new faculty already into the Nolan school and we are working on hiring another faculty into the Dyson school. So that's four new untenured assistant professors coming into that area of marketing. They are drawn from the same hiring pool; they have the same sort of expectations in terms of what their publications should look like. They go to the same conferences. They publish in the same outlets. They will be voted on by the same group of faculties when it comes time for tenure. And yet, when we hire these faculty right now, the ones coming in with the affiliation to Dyson and Nolan come in with six years
and those coming in with an affiliation to Johnson come in with eight years and it's creating some -- you
know, sort of -- not -- inequality but a confusion on expectations with in the areas -- let me put it that
way. And so that is one of the things we are trying to resolve. Even this week we made an offer to one of
our other areas for an assistant professor affiliated with the Dyson school and she came back and said
why is it that my colleagues in the Johnson school have eight years and I'll only get six? This is coming up
as an issue for us in recruitment and that leads to the next point which if we can go to the next slide,
please, one of the things in these hiring pools for the business school faculty, we are up against a
competitive set that has been moving to longer tenure clocks anywhere from seven to nine years. And
our candidates that we're bringing in know this. They prefer longer clocks. They would rather have an
eight-year clock than a six year clock and so when our college sat down and looked at this question of
harmonization we chose the eight year clock as a better competitive standard to have across our three
schools than a six year clock. So, final slide, please. Just to summarize where we stand with this
resolution the question of harmonizing tenure clocks is something that came up through the 2021 task
force, has been endorsed by the provost as something that we need to do. We put together a committee
to work on this. We have done votes within our faculty. It's strongly supported by a majority of our
faculty to switch to this eight-year clock. It allows us to be competitive to the other schools that we're up
against for new faculty and, and -- this is something that now at this point we have presented to the
provost staff council, the academic deans meeting, the senate's academic freedom and professional
status of the faculty committee and was presented here in December to the faculty senate. So, I'm asking
to move forward with the resolution. Thank you very much.

>> Chelsea Specht: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Dean Shu. we now have ten minutes for questions--
that are slated for any discussion associated with this proposal. And a reminder that the -- the option to
vote will be made open tomorrow in our ballots.
Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I know we had that long discussion in December about this but what I wanted to highlight here is that the six-year tenure clock is the standard and actually comes from the AAUP standards. The American Association of University Professors as a protection of faculty. So, rather than having a longer tenure clock which can actually create a burden for faculty in terms of coming up for tenure review the six year is -- the six-year clock is protective of tenure and this is the exception. So, you know, I understand the arguments with regard to the business school and harmonizing, et cetera, but I think this is an issue that we should really be cognizant of in terms of whether this is truly going to be viewed as exception or whether it may affect other views about the tenure clock and perhaps you could talk about that.

Suzanne Shu: So, I cannot speak for other parts of the university and what would happen to a tenure clock more generally. I think in our view this is an exception but it’s also exception that with in the space of business schools it has become pretty standard. And so, you know perhaps if you use that as the competitive set, I think it’s -- you know, it’s a direction that we have been sort of pushed to move to be able to compete in that arena. The other thing I will mention in, you know, into the spirit of why there is a six-year clock of not sort of taking advantage of faculty for a super long period of time. We are putting extra attention onto the midpoint review that would go with this. We have had some discussion about whether that should be a four years or five years. Five years starts to feel much more similar to a six-year tenure clock where the faculty member is getting after a reasonable number of years some very in depth thoughtful feedback on how they are doing on progress and given the opportunity at that point to move on but not being forced out if they haven’t quite accomplished enough for tenure. Again, this is something that our faculty as we are hiring them are really pushing for and demanding. So, there’s a little bit of feeling that the market place itself has moved in to a direction of encouraging this longer
Chelsea Specht: We have a couple of online, hand raised, and I realize I didn't say this at the beginning. For everybody who is making comments to keep those comments to two minutes. Debbie Cherney, you have the floor.

Debbie Cherney: All right. Debbie Cherney, Animal Science. I was just wondering what that would do to faculty salaries given that usually you get a pretty good raise, at least in the contract colleges when you become tenured with the associate professor.

Suzanne Shu: An excellent question. So, we -- we're very focused on being competitive in the marketplace on our salaries for our existing faculty and watching those carefully. You can imagine a world where one of our faculty who is an assistant professor who hasn't hit that eight year clock for coming up for tenure yet starts getting outside offers to push where they might be able to get tenure at another institution if they have a record that would allow them to do so. We intend to be competitive and responsive on those as well. So, if we see faculty salaries increasing elsewhere that we're not keeping pace with because they haven't hit associate with, we make market adjustments and we come in and make sure our faculty is being cared for from a salary perspective so, so -- I don't expect that to be a disadvantage for our faculty. But there will continue to be a bump at associate. It's just that the bump itself might not be quite as large as a percentage because they have been increased overtime if they are doing well and attracting attention. [INDISCERNIBLE]

Laurent Dubreuil: It's really a question of comprehension in fact and I might be biased because I was on [INDISCERNIBLE] for two years on the tenure track before getting tenure by I don't really understand
why there would be a competitive advantage to stay on a position without tenure for longer time. I heard that you were saying that the -- the people you hire tend to prefer longer clocks but if you have more explanation for me, I would be happy to hear that.

>> Suzanne Shu: That's a good question and a tricky one to answer because I feel like all of us as research faculty who are on the tenure track feel that the effort to put out publications and papers and to keep up with that research process is a grueling one, so I don't want to claim that the College of Business is somehow different on this dimension. I think what we do tend to see among our faculty is that the pace of research publication is a bit lumpy and so, a paper can easily take three or four years to get out and when we see our faculty publish, or especially our young assistant professors they might have two years with no papers and suddenly a year with three or four papers. And, so, eight years gives us a little bit more time to sort of spread that out and see what the overall average of publication looks like rather than hitting them perhaps at a time when they have got a lot working in the pipeline that could still make it out and, again, those are the ones that right now, we are very vulnerable to lose because other universities that have longer clocks can hire them and give them an extended period of time to finish getting that pipeline out and become really productive, impactful researchers whereas if we had a longer clock and been able to give them a little more time we would be able to keep them here which is often what we would like to do.

>> Chelsea Specht: Harold Hodes.

>> Harold Hodes: I'm muted, okay, I think I've unmuted. Harold Hodes, Philosophy. I wonder what would it be an increase in the expected publication corpus for someone who is coming up after eight years as opposed to after six years? Wouldn't the thought be well, this person has had an additional two years.
We would expect this person to have published a certain amount more after eight years than after six years. I would expect that things would work that way. Given that, I really -- am still baffled about what would be so appealing to people about having eight years rather than six years if they are going to have to have a greater total output after eight years.

>> Suzanne Shu: Very nice question And, absolutely, after eight years we would expect an uptick in publications relative to six years. That's part of honestly what's causing us trouble right now because with in our areas, again, imagine those two faculty that have been hired in at the same time but are now under different clocks. The faculty evaluating them for tenure cannot put the two cases side by side because the expectations are different in terms of what they should have produced during the time up until the tenure decision. So, yes, after eight years we will expect a higher publication rate but again, because it's a bit of a lumpy publication rate it gives them a little bit more time to get the papers that are in their pipeline through before coming up for tenure.

>> Chelsea Specht: I see no one running down to the front of the room in person and I see a cessation of questions from the online audience. I just want to use a second to remind everybody to sign in whether you're in person or online. If you are in person there are sign in sheets by each of the entrances so do make sure you sign in. I continue to not see any more questions so, thank you very much, Dean Shu and again a reminder you will have a ballot coming into your emails tomorrow morning and be able to vote on this resolution. With no further discussion we'll move to our next order of business which is the resolution to provide funds for an MD gynecologist at Cornell Health. Graduate student and PhD candidate in plant biology, Arielle Johnson is here to present this resolution to the faculty senate. Arielle will have five minutes followed by ten minutes for discussion.
Arielle Johnson: Thank you. Oops. There we go. Yeah, so I'm Arielle Johnson and I'm a PhD candidate in plant biology and SIPS and I'm a co-founder and a current treasurer of the pelvic pain foundation which is a student run support and advocacy group for people with pelvic pain. A lot of people's work went into this resolution so I would like to thank the 12 undergraduate and graduate organizations focused on diversity, equity and/or health care who contributed to and endorsed it. Thank you as well to the university faculty committee for helping bring this resolution to the floor today. Just for context we're trying to pass this through all of the shared governance bodies here at Cornell and a nearly identical version of this resolution has already passed the student assembly, the graduate professional student assembly and the university assembly. So, simply put we believe Cornell needs an MD gynecologist on campus for students. It is a reasonable ask because many of our peer institutions including Harvard and Yale do provide this level of care to their students. At Cornell Health, gynecological care is currently performed by nurse practitioners who have expertise in that area, who many people have a great experience with. We want to add an MD gynecologist which would expand the type of care that's available to students. Currently students are referred off campus for common pelvic pain conditions and to get basic diagnostic care like ultrasounds. These off-campus referrals are especially an issue here at Cornell because we are relatively isolated in Ithaca and most MD gynecologists in the community focus on pregnancy which doesn't cover all of the needs of our student population. That means that folks who have had to drive to Cortland, Rochester or beyond to get care they should be able to get here. Having an MD gynecologist for students would enable quick diagnosis and better care for common chronic conditions like vulvodynia, PCOS, endometriosis as well as other common conditions fibroids and ovarian cysts. Part of the motivation for this resolution came from hearing over and over again from members of the pelvic pain association of Cornell who have had to drive to places like New Haven, Connecticut, or even the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota to get care for common gynecological issues. Others have told me that they had to wait for school breaks to get their gynecological issues addressed even when they felt
they needed care sooner. I'm also speaking from personal experience. I have endometriosis. It's a very common condition that affects around 5 to 10% of cis women. We don't have great stats for non-binary and transmasc people. Basically, uterine lining tissue grows outside your uterus and causes scarring on other organs. In my case the outside of my uterus and one of my ovaries and often intense pain and other symptoms. It took me about two years to get diagnosed. After months of coming into Cornell -- Cornell Health repeatedly I was referred out an MD gynecologist and went to almost every gynecological practice in town including Mid-Wifery Associates, Renaissance, Planned Parenthood, etc. finally, I went to a practice in Rochester where an MD gynecologist there told me I had classic endometriosis symptoms and gave me a clinical diagnosis so that we could start managing the condition and look into other options like surgery. I believe that having an MD gynecologist here on campus who could handle the most common conditions in our student population would have saved me years of physical pain and uncertainty. I just want to emphasize this is a very common condition. Now, let's consider that I experienced these things as a wealthy white woman, navigating this system. Imagine if I didn't have the financial means to afford a car or had dependents or campus job responsibilities that prevented me from driving to Rochester for regular appointments. One night there was a blizzard and I paid $250 to stay overnight in a hotel in Rochester so that I could make my appointment. That is over twice the maximum grad student's stipend per day before taxes. Also, as a white woman from a wealthy background most nurses and doctors took me seriously when I said I was in pain which studies show is not true for black women who have pelvic pain at many medical practices. I'm also cis gender and I don't experience the obstacles that gender non-confirming people face in trying to get care. I have effectively only been able to get good health care and continue with my degree because of my privileged position. I shudder to think about what's probably happening to other students right now if they're forced to leave their gynecological issues untreated. Having access to an MD gynecologist at Cornell Health is a basic equity issue for students. Thank you all for your attention and happy to take any questions.
Chelsea Specht: Thank you, Arielle. We have ten minutes for questions. We have a question online.

Denise Ramzy

Denise Ramzy Hi. Yes, thank you for that presentation. I don't have a question so much as just to sort of voice my support here. I think frankly at a school this size, this resolution seems like a no brainer at any time, but I would emphasize we are in a particular time, you know, where women's reproductive health is fraught in America, right, so this becomes even more important. I would also just note that Ithaca’s a very difficult place for anyone to get professional medical services. There are -- there's really a dearth of providers overall and specifically, you know, gynecological or obstetric providers. And, so, Cornell having this sort of capacity in house becomes even more important in a place that is as isolated as it is. Thanks.

Arielle Johnson: Thank you.

Chelsea Specht: We have a question in the chat. Jill Short is going to read that for us.

Jill Short: This question is from Evan Cooch from Natural Resources and Environment. I’m wondering if anyone -- excuse me just a moment.

Chelsea Specht: I'll see if I can see it. [INDISCERNIBLE] unplugged from [INDISCERNIBLE] so I'll see [INDISCERNIBLE]. We're going to go to a couple of other questions and then you can bring that one back in. Harry Katz.
>> Harry Katz: I'm very sympathetic to your concerns but I guess I'm wondering, why it is given the need that you have articulated and also personally experienced the system isn't responding and, you know, it may well be that -- that what we have is a system failure and we're trying to put a Band-Aid on it in that maybe there are many other serious economic -- sorry, medical conditions that warrant attention on campus and people face just as you faced, serious difficulties getting those conditions addressed. And so, I'm wondering whether this is like the clock striking 13. It is telling us there's something wrong with the nature and extent of medical care we are providing to our students, and we need to have a systematic look at that rather than just single out one particular area as warranted as it may well be that shows the deficiencies in the current system. So that's what I'm worried about is -- is that -- if like why wasn't this addressed through our normal budget staffing process at the university and if it is not, maybe that tells us there's something fundamentally wrong with that overall system. Thanks.

>> Arielle Johnson: Yeah. So, we have been in dialogue with Cornell Health for over a year. When we met with them -- I want to say early 2022 or late 2021, they did tell us that basically they don't control the overall level of funding given to Cornell Health so there's several areas including, you know, gynecological care but also including things like, you know, dieticians where they do feel like they could - - they would benefit from having, you know, additional staff members to come -- to cover very specific medical areas but the budget for that is just not under their control so that was part of the motivation to address this through, you know, shared governments because we can't take this issue directly to Cornell Health because, you know, they're sympathetic but they don't control their own budget. We also -- initially before taking -- before writing shared governance resolution also approached our student elected trustee to see whether this was more of a, like, trustee issue and we're told again like it's not quite to the level of something that the trustees would control and that we -- we would be better off bringing it to the attention of the administration and specifically, you know, like deans and -- vice
presidents and people who actually more directly control the finances of Cornell Health. So, and in terms of like this being a systematic issue it is very true that will a lot of difficulty finding specialty medical services as folks have just pointed out in Ithaca but really the fact that, you know, approximately half the student population could benefit from having an MD gynecologist and just how common, you know, a lot of these pelvic pain conditions, both like chronic pelvic pain conditions and acute pelvic pain conditions are is -- and other conditions that require a gynecologist, you know, I think this is something that really would have a broad impact as opposed to, you know, hiring someone who -- who could on help a small fraction of the population. This is a very widespread need.

>> Chelsea Specht: I've got one from the chat. Okay.

>> Jill Short: So, this question is from Evan Cooch, Natural Resources and the Environment. I'm wondering if anyone involved with this request has reached out to Cornell Health directly to ask their perspective on this topic. Do you have data supporting need? Health care facilities everywhere need to make choices about their staffing and services. Typically, these decisions are data driven. It might be helpful for us to know more about the experience at Cornell Health and it related providers and if the community before voting on this resolution. And he added, real data beyond individual experiences as compelling as they might be.

>> Arielle Johnson: Yeah, so I already addressed this in part -- we did talk to Cornell Health. Some of the questions we asked Cornell Health is whether they collected patient outcome data that they like revisited and analyzed, specifically about gynecological care, and about like chronic pelvic pain conditions where students are going to be coming in, you know, multiple times and -- would be an opportunity to do that kind of analysis and the answer is no, they don't collect that type of data and they
don't have the capacity to do that kind of analysis. They also do not collect data on how successful referrals to the community were so basically, you know, if you get referred to a gynecologist in the community and then you have a bad experience that information is not currently generally making its way back to Cornell Health except in the form of a patient telling an individual care provider. So, there's not any sort of, you know, record keeping or database but, again, like -- we think that -- you know, like just because Cornell Health doesn't currently have the staffing to analyze this data like we think there is sufficient evidence that this is a widespread issue. If you look at, you know -- I just said -- you know, 5 to 10% of, you know, cis gender women have endometriosis. If you look at the numbers for PCOS and vulvodynia it's actually a higher proportion of those conditions than endometriosis so we're talking about, you know, potentially, you know, potentially and -- this is a very approximate number and different studies have different numbers but, you know, approximately like 25% of your cis women population of students like -- might have a need for gynecological care that goes beyond just like a routine checkup.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. Qiuming Yu?

>> Qiuming Yu: Yeah, this is Qiuming from C&BE And so, after last Friday, one receive [INDISCERNIBLE] the email right so I share this with our faculty and then I had just reply say that, you know, yeah, please, you know, tell the senator you -- [INDISCERNIBLE] we want to increase the physician or, say, the doctors in the health center so I said is there -- any special -- special you know for this or just general and she just said of a woman's health so then, you know, I'm very glad to hear this today and this -- so I saw that yeah, there's -- has voice from the faculty as well.

>> Arielle Johnson: Thanks.
>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. We have time for one more. Betsy Glen -- sorry, Bihn.

>> Betsy Bihn: Yeah. Thank you. Really appreciate the work you guys did on this and the information you provided. I also think at a university that has a medical school attached to it, that maybe something could be explored in the sense of rotations in residencies because we do have a medical school and that might be a way to solve that and I don't know if you have thought about real medical or talked to them about possible rotations to get physicians here that can offer these services because I agree with you. You're talking in general about half the population and as you pointed out many of them do have these serious health concerns. Thank you.

>> Arielle Johnson: Yeah, that is a fantastic idea and it is one that we actually already asked Cornell Health about and we were told that just from their current perspective it is logistically infeasible to bring someone to Cornell's Ithaca campus for part of the week who is like mostly based at Cornell in New York. I'm not sure exactly what the mechanics of like bringing a resident specifically to Cornell Health would look like so that's definitely a really cool idea to explore but just in terms of like sharing residents or doctors with Cornell we were told that was not a possibility.

>> Eve De Rosa: I can just say I met with the director, Dr. Jada Hamilton, today.

>> Arielle Johnson: Oh great.

>> Eve De Rosa: And to give you a slight update, she is actually working on such a partnership.
Arielle Johnson: Oh, no way.

Eve De Rosa: It may not be with high frequency but that is something they are trying to work through the partnership.

Arielle Johnson: Okay, great. Our next meeting with Cornell Health is in two weeks so I’m sure we’ll get an update then.

Chelsea Specht: Okay, we are unfortunately at time for this one. Sure. If it’s a quick one.

Risa Lieberwitz: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. First, I want to thank you for bringing this and I want to thank everybody who worked on it. It's I think a really important example of how shared governance can really bring different groups together. I just took a quick look at the list of physicians on the Cornell Health website and there are several who specialize in sports medicine which is important but we have nobody who specializes in gynecological work. I mean, I just think it’s outrageous that we don’t have someone and -- to echo the first commenter this seems like a no brainer as a yes.

Chelsea Specht: Thank you for surviving the microphone and for that comment. I really appreciate you coming forward and thank you all for the discussion. As a reminder this will be available for voting tomorrow morning so, please check your inboxes and thank you for your participation in faculty governance and demonstrating how faculty governance can lead to important decisions. For our final agenda item before the good of the order is a resolution concern academic freedom in the global hubs. Eve De Rosa, Dean of Faculty, will provide background and context for this resolution followed by a presentation of the resolution by senator and professor of government, Richard Bensel. The senator will
have ten minutes followed by 15 minutes for senate discussion. The first two minutes of the senate discussion will go to Professor Mark Milstein, the director of the Center for Sustainable Global Enterprise and chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, and then we'll proceed with the remainder of the senate stuff. So, we'll start with five minutes for Dean De Rosa.

>> Eve De Rosa: Hi everybody. I am now the chair of the UFC, University Faculty Committee. So, when we brought this resolution to the University Faculty Committee and we were discussing how to bring this to the senate, it was a recognition that we have many new senators who were not part of the conversation over the last few years, and so there was a request from members from the UFC to bring some context and I guess our goal is to educate our senators before they go to their -- their -- their constituents so that everybody is having an informed conversation. There are blanks in the spreadsheet -- in the slide deck for everyone so you can click onto certain resolutions through the senate and so hopefully this is helpful. Little bit of context. And so, I want to take you ten years ago to 2012, and president Skorton had a position paper bringing Cornell to the world and the world to Cornell. This started the conversation about internationalizing Cornell. And, I want to mention there was a task force and I want to give the definition of internationalization cause in doing my research in trying to understand where all of this came from I thought that was helpful, hopefully to the senators and so the definition is for one, was the task force had a call to reassert global leadership and academics research and engagement and the internationalization definition is a commitment confirmed through action -- actions to infuse international and comparative perspectives in to teaching, research and engagement. Then, there -- sort of in response to this Call to Action the -- vice provost of international affairs at this time convened yet another task force -- I think we're really good at task force but also an action and implementation. And so, this was called the global -- Cornell Global Presence and Partnership Task Force. And, what came out of that were five sort of initiatives to sponsor and foster student engagement --
that's okay. To -- one more, go back one more. So, student engagement to foster the [INDISCERNIBLE] center. To build more international partnerships, funding for those international partnerships and the creation of the Internationalization Council so the IC which still exists okay, next slide, now I'm ready. So, we are now sitting here with a system called Global Hubs and for those senators who were not part of the conversation a few years ago -- and I also wasn't part of the conversation -- just researching what the Global Hubs are. They are too build -- it's the student component and so, taking faculty partnerships that are preexisting and creating relationships and partners between Cornell and partner institutions. And the ideas for Cornell students to now be sitting with student peers in this partnership university at places around the world and I have a little link there so that you can go learn as much as you want about these different partnerships. And the idea is that it's an exchange. It's a student exchange that those students that are in the international institution will come to Cornell for a semester or a year and the infrastructure is there so -- as I understand it -- the Global Hubs -- it's building that -- that infrastructure in order for a student exchange to happen. And these are generated by faculty who are already in partnership with particular institutions around the world. I have given three resolutions in maybe -- you know those of you who have been part of the senate over the last two years when a lot of these conversations started in 2020, there might be other resolutions that you feel like we should add, please let me know and I will make sure that that's part of it. The three that I thought probably are most relevant are Resolution 161 regarding dual and joint degree. I put that in there even though Global Hubs isn't going to provide any degrees. The relationship between institutions and degrees seems to be coloring the conversation and so, I think, Global Hubs is distinct. It is not a degree conferring kind of program, but, still, let's put it there so that new senators can know. The other resolution specifying the rights and responsibilities of the senate in respect to collaborative agreements and with other academic institutions and corporations and then the last Resolution 179 consultation of the faculty senate. That one I was present for and I can say that Mark Milstein who will be the first person to speak, sits on the
Internationalization Council and he is also the chair of our Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, senate committee and so that’s the liaison to the faculty senate. Thank you.

>> Chelsea Specht: I didn’t get a green light on my microphone, so it doesn’t want me to speak. Next, we will have a presentation by Professor Richard Bensel. Ten minutes.

>> Richard Bensel: Yeah. That -- let me begin with two very slight corrections. I am a member of the -- the field in the Department of History but I’m actually in the Department of Government so, that first slide was incorrect. The second one, is -- we got Courtney down there twice and -- very happy to have her and twice as good but the second one should be Louis Longchamps rather than Courtney. I think that one is my fault in relying on the slide. And thank you, Eve for a very helpful background on the resolutions. I would probably add two things to your -- to your list. The first is that, you know, the sense -- the sense on March 31st, 2020, the faculty senate rejected a dual degree program between the hotel school and Peking University and that should probably be included there, and I'll talk about why that should be included in a moment. The second is that we did have a resolution -- 160 which I don’t think was in your list requiring vetting of international dual degree programs, and, that one of course has been carried through in all the resolutions that the faculty senate has passed. But I do -- I want to take my time -- this time here really to address some of the questions that have come from you the senators about this resolution and what it is implications might be for Cornell and for faculty. One of the most important questions that have come up and it’s actually one that -- that I've thought about a lot, why should Cornell including the faculty senate, take a stand on the policies of any foreign country? And I think a very strong argument can be made that Cornell should not take public stands on these policies. The problem is there -- there are two problems that are presented to us and -- we try to walk between in these -- in this resolution. The first one is Cornell has taken stands. In March -- March 2nd, 2022,
President Pollack denounced Russia’s deplorable and unprovoked invasion of the sovereign nation of Ukraine. She went open to say we do not have any academic programs currently operating in Russia. Now the juxtaposition -- there are two things about that. One is if you take a position on one country, Russia, that does deplorable things, and you’re silent on another country that does deplorable things, you created an imbalance in which the silence looks like the consent or legitimization of that second country’s policies. For Cornell this looks even worse because Cornell does have dozens of programs in China. And, because it has dozens of programs and it has many, many students and programs at Ithaca -- in Ithaca, it looks like Cornell is silent in part because of its material commitments and -- to China and China’s commitments to us. So the -- what we’re doing is if -- if the central administration finds it not politic to condemn say, what the United States government calls genocide in Xinjiang then we as the faculty senate -- we can still express our horror, our misgivings, our strong condemnation of the suppression and punishment of political dissent among its citizens, both at home and abroad and abroad -- these are becoming more and more important as you know. So, this is really to -- to redress that imbalance. Second set of questions that has come up regard the -- revolve around the implications for individual faculty in conducting research or teaching in authoritarian nations. This resolution and nothing -- none of the other resolutions have ever impinged or in any way limited the faculty in their teaching or research. We would never do that. We are absolutely, abhorrently opposed to such things. However, the resolution does remind us -- and it should remind us, faculty senate should be in part the moral conscience, the moral authority, spokesperson for the faculty and for Cornell University at large. The resolution does remind us that academic freedom and freedom of speech are fundamental values wherever Cornell creates or maintains an academic program. But -- it’s important to say this too. It does not -- this resolution does not nor could it -- but it doesn’t -- self close any program whether in China or anywhere else. I should say -- an addendum to that question. Some of the comments -- questions coming from faculty have been, well, you know, in my home country, meaning naming a country not the
United States and not China, there are programs that inhibit academic freedom and freedom of speech and you're not naming them in this resolution. And that's true. I don't go through those. What I would like us to see is to reorient Cornell's involvement abroad around the protection of academic freedom and freedom of speech, but we shouldn't be in the game of naming countries. China is just an extraordinary example or instance. Another Question, concerns the history of faculty senate resolutions on China and global hub system generally and Eve did a pretty good job of recounting that history. Those resolutions have not been obeyed by the central administration. They did not bring, for example, the Global Hubs system before the faculty senate for a vote. Many of the programs abroad that are part of the Global Hubs system -- and you can look them up. They're online. Go under Global Hubs and you'll see it's much more extensive than just the exchange of students. As most of you know, the -- and I just recounted, that the faculty senate rejected the program between the hotel school and Peking University. That was the program that when described to us was offered -- the justification that was officered was that it would bring in something like a million dollars a year in funds to Cornell University. After a long discussion we rejected it. On commencement day, in May, event spring, the central administration announced they would go ahead anyway with the program. And then address to the China Center last December vice provost Wendy Wofford announced that there are now -- and I'm quoting, 25 active agreements with Chinese institutions involving Cornell University. Only one of those has come before the faculty senate for a vote and it was rejected. All the others have been created, maintained, are operating without faculty senate discussion and votes. This does not include -- which we found out during the discussion on the hotel school -- this does not include the many, many, quote, commercial agreements -- that's the term that the -- that the Office of International Affairs of Cornell uses for them -- this does not include commercial agreements between Cornell University and the Marriott corporation for training programs in which Cornell awards certificates -- in other words distinction between a certificate and a diploma or whatever -- we can make that distinction but it is also a way that -- of involving -- what's -- compromising
the integrity of Cornell's teaching responsibilities. One of the most important of these is in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. These -- let see. That's -- those are the questions that have come up. We've distributed --

>> Chelsea Specht [INDISCERNIBLE] puts you right at ten minutes so you're perfect --

>> Richard Bensel: -- right -- we're wrapping up.

>> Chelsea Specht: Perfect.

>> Richard Bensel: They -- we've distributed the -- the materials to almost all of you so you know what they look like any way. But I thought that these questions because they come up during our deliberations were important to address. Thank you very much for your time.

>> Chelsea Specht: Excellent timing professor, so we have now 15 minutes for senate discussion and I would like to open the floor to Mark Milstein from the -- chair of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies. Mark? It does show up. [INDISCERNIBLE] at another time. At this point we are open for comments and questions. I do see Ken Birman [INDISCERNIBLE]

>> Ken Birman: Yeah, Ken Birman, Computer Science. And, let me start by just thanking Richard for a passionate and very detailed presentation. I want to express a small concern about the resolution as worded and I generally have to say I support this type of resolution. And the concern is I feel that the wording goes in two direction at one time. That first, it talks about -- in fact maybe we could go back to the resolution, it wouldn't hurt, during the Q&A to actually look at the thing that we're talking about. Yeah. So, you know we're talking here in the whereas the first one about academic programs in China
and other nations with authoritarian regimes, presumably Qatar and others, but then focuses on China and then we have a series of resolutions -- one of which is focused on China but the others on other points. Now I've been very concerned to hear about harassment of our Chinese scholars, sometimes by people on campus. We have all been reading about the country setting up apparently police stations in other countries and threatening Chinese citizens abroad. I know of cases where relatives of Cornell faculty have been -- I don't want to use the word harassed but, you know, have had encounters with police back in China. This is all very disturbing and I'm wondering if we would be better off to have a resolution that was more pointed and focused more on the relationship with China and perhaps this should split into two resolutions, one focused on all of the programs and one focused on China to get the -- the benefit of making a clear statement that disruption of our researchers and harassment of our researchers is absolutely unacceptable. Thank you.

>> Chelsea Specht: We have Charlie Walcott down here At the --

>> Charles Walcott: Charles Walcott -- Department of Neurobiology and Behavior. I'm very much in favor of the general resolution because it seems to me that we ought to defend academic freedom throughout all of Cornell's activities. I'm worried about this -- partly for the same reason that we just heard that this aims at China whereas we just heard that Cornell has efforts in many other countries. So, it seems to me that the second resolution is the one that we really ought to be thinking about and I'm worried about the last resolution here that we should take all the administration -- the administration should take all necessary steps to ensure -- I think what we need to say is I don't see how they can do that. It's unenforceable in a way, but it seems to me that we should advocate for the administration to do all it can to preserve and to recommend academic freedom in all of its programs, not just in China.
>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. [INDISCERNIBLE] you were next in line. Provided that you're coming down and getting in line, yes. All right, you're next.

>> Risa Lieberwitz: Risa Lieberwitz, ILR. I'm one of the co-sponsors for resolution and I strongly support it and I appreciate the comments that people have made in terms of, you know, the questions about the focus on the -- on China and the -- particulars with regard to the PRC. And I think that -- it makes sense to have this single resolution. This does in the exclude the possibility of other statements about other countries that -- where there are authoritarian regimes. I also want to point out a couple things. One is just how important the connection is between academic freedom and faculty governance that these two go together here and how important it is for the faculty through the shared governance process to take a stand and I wanted to point out to you that this is more than symbolic for the faculty to view this as a collective governance matter given our role in these sorts of programs. What I wanted to remind you of is that in October 2018, Cornell faculty were central to Cornell's decision to suspend the Cornell ILR Renmin university research and exchange program due to violations of student's academic freedom which included Renmin University's punishment of student activists calling for labor rights and Renmin's complicity in detaining students against their will. So, this can have real impact and real teeth. I think we should recognize that. You know the other thing I wanted to do is to address what Charley Walcott just raised about the word ensure. and I wanted to remind you that the Cornell policy statement on academic freedom and freedom of speech and expression which is linked in the resolution has the following paragraph, under the heading responsibilities which states that the Cornell community including university assembly and other elected governance bodies have a responsibility for protecting freedom of speech and academic freedom. Towards that end, the president and the presidents -- or the president's designee shall consult with the shared governance bodies, the elected shared governance bodies -- they're all listed here, and I'm not going to name them all, but that the president or the
president's designee shall consult with the elected campus governance bodies on a regular basis to ensure that the community's fundamental commitments to free expression, academic freedom and respect for others are safeguarded so that -- that is a term that we use in the policy and I think it belongs here as well.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. We have a couple of online questions. First, we have Courtney.

>> Courtney Roby: I'm Courtney Roby, the senator for classics. The person who is listed twice as a co-sponsor but I do very strongly support this resolution so I'm happy to be on there twice. Yeah, I mean I just -- I also would like to respond to Charley's point which, you know I take your point about the wording. I do think that substituting preserve in order for something to be preserved it has to exist in the first place which I think we have seen is not guaranteed throughout the systems that we are talking about. So, and -- coupled with that the excellent point that Risa just made, ensure is good wording here. And, you know as far as Charley's other point, you're absolutely right. This is, you know this is asking a lot of the administration in terms of, you know, working to ensure, preserve, however you want to model this but this is indeed a really important opportunity for us as an institution to think about not only the -- the power that the central administration has to define what kind of institution we are globally, what our footprint looks like globally but it's, you know, what is the responsibility that the administration has? What responsibilities do the faculty have and thinking about how we can -- better harmonize those goals and serve the academic freedom not just of our own faculty but also of the faculty abroad that we're collaborating with. So, thanks again to all the people who put this resolution together and shepherd it through the senate.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. We have a comment from Rachel Beatty Riedl. Rachel.
Rachel Beatty Riedl: Thank you so much. So, I just wanted to take up a few of my colleague's concerns with the way this resolution might conflate several different issues. There is the naming of China. There's an issue around academic freedom more generally and how we might support that and then taking kind of all necessary steps in other parts of the Global Hubs system. There's a number of different potential conflated components I think in that resolution that cause me some concern about what it is that it's actually expressing. I would also just want to highlight that due to the conflation of -- or the combination of covid and geopolitical tensions, actually the first line that says that Cornell has been rapidly expanding academic programs in China is -- I think just factually incorrect over the last several years the university has significantly reduced the number of agreements, programs and other faculty to faculty collaborations due to a variety of reasons. But I also wanted to say from personal experience just to expand on Dean De Rosa's original point around student mobility and extensive nature of what the Global Hubs can provide. I wanted to just add a few personal thoughts about the kind of infrastructure that they're meant to provide across a range of different countries. Of course, they’re meant to provide our students an opportunity to have a more international perspective to know different ways of thinking, being and existing in the world and to be exposed to partners who are doing research that's related but not necessarily redundant to what we do here at Cornell University. So, for example, just last week I was visiting one of our partners -- our strategic Global Hubs partners at university of Ghana and I was able to meet with several of our Cornell alumni who are now department chair in crop sciences, and leading lectures and professors in food sciences and institutive African studies and so -- and climate studies and so just an array of long term partnerships and strategic collaborations that’s allowing not only student mobility but also really path breaking research around food security and climate resilience and I think that’s the nature of the Global Hubs as well that take up different types of research areas and allow our faculty to partner and reduce barriers to student mobility to be able to gain from varied perspectives
around the world and I this I that's really part of our goal of creating global citizens and also I can say
that as a Cornell faculty member when I was there and meeting with our Cornell alumni who are really
pushing boundaries in this research around food security I couldn't have been more proud of our
university and the work that we are doing in training scholars and the ongoing relationships and partners
that allows. Thank you.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you, Rachel. We have Connie and -- I remind people that I know -- I'm reading
names as I'm calling but please state your name and your affiliation.

>> Connie Yuan: My name is Connie Yuan, senator for Global Development. Actually, -- so Richard, I send
your email, everything to faculty and Global Development. As far as their feedback I didn't get any but,
given my background right now -- just want to make it clear I'm just speaking for myself as a faculty, not
a representative in Global Development. I think about your resolution -- yeah, I came from China so
that's a part of the background and I'm American citizen right now and I think for your resolution I have
the -- I'm not sure singling out a country is -- is a fair. You know I -- want to mention -- I think -- including
the administration. Me myself, I think what is happening in China is a concerning but is this the way to be
constructive? That's a part I'm not sure. And I think -- I can easily name many other countries that's also
authoritarian. Do not respect freedom of speech to so after this resolution what I propose resolution to
the similar to -- other country. I would not because I don't think this constructive and I think the
university, how they handle the collaboration with Peking University, thinking -- you know speaking as
someone from China I think that's visionary decision but how it happen is very frustrating too. As a
senator I feel like we voted, you know I voted as that -- you know -- based on global development
collective opinion but if we -- the senate has spent so much time debating and the resolution is no and
then the administration still go ahead. I can understand what that process is not constructive for building
trust so that is something -- I think a bigger question what's the role of the senate and how -- what's the relationship, you know, which one's decisions we can make. I think that's a bigger issue, so I understand the frustration but on the other hand I think, you know, what's more important is constructive. I just want to mention, you know, for the -- what's happening in China there's multiple ways to solve the issue and -- this resolution may be one. The administration, you know and also other faculty collaborating with China is a possible other solution. Maybe we share the same goal but on the other hand it is a means of difference. I just hope that's -- you know, understood.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. [INDISCERNIBLE]

[Unidentified Speaker]: [INDISCERNIBLE] Cornell community support the freedom -- fundamental value, you know but I do want to mention a concern which also -- my understanding of the role or value of Global Hubs, so actually right now [INDISCERNIBLE] in the situation for Cornell's academic exchange with China is becoming very complicated, very hard even in areas that really need collaboration between U.S. and China. I see the service and the effort by the Global Hubs is actually when it's difficult -- the service has a value to individual faculty's work to mitigate risks and also up holding the -- our core value and especially I want to mention my concern is actually for what kind of support we provide for our students to have the willingness and then being able to do something to have first -- first person experience to explore a different culture, develop some basis for cross culture understanding and communication so the way I see it -- I have a pretty pessimistic view of the future because many, many crisis and reasons. We really need our -- you know, next generation of professionals and leaders to have the willingness to see through the difference and then develop some collaboration that's not sort of given. We need to help them to view the capacity to work together. That's -- I see how as a university -- as a faculty member to [INDISCERNIBLE] to the future of a shared future in the world. Thanks.
>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you very much. So, we are at time and we kind of used the good of the order to proceed through this period of time so we are at 5:00 right now.

>> Richard Bensel: Could I respond just a bit? As the presenter of the resolution?

>> Chelsea Specht: We would need a motion to extend the meeting for five minutes in order to allow that to move on. I have a motion and I have a second so, yes.

>> Ken Birman: I so move.

Motion by Risa Lieberwitz to extend the meeting by 5 minutes, seconded by Buz Barstow and others.

>> Chelsea Specht: Go head and proceed.

>> Richard Bensel: Thank you all for your very good and concise comments. I -- there's a lot of work to do. That's what all of you are saying. One resolution isn't going to solve all of these problems at once. We -- we tried the best we can but this -- I agree. This is not complete -- and we need to do more. One of the things we need to do more is some global hub system in the partnership with the different institutions in Singapore and India, Japan and so forth. We need to know what those agreements and what those -- how they operate. They need to come before the faculty senate for description so it could -- we can craft the kinds of resolutions that Ken and Charles were talking about. I must say, listening to Rachel, the vice president offered -- did embrace in her presentation to the China Center the expanding collaboration and partnership with China. She did note that the -- that the pandemic had inhibited some of that, but there is no sign at all in her comments to the China Center which -- by the way never mentioned
anything about academic freedom or freedom of speech -- I will note at Cornell these programs are expanding. So, the Master of Public Administration and the public policy school, almost half of all of those students who pay almost -- almost all of them paying full tuition -- there's a slight scholarship program but it's a huge money maker for Cornell and it's expanding. In fact, we cannot conceive the School of Public Policy without those students and their tuition contributions to its running. So, yeah, there's a lot of work to do. We should do another resolution that -- that captures the things that were said. This is the best we can do right now. Thank you.

>> Chelsea Specht: Thank you. With that we will adjourn the meeting. Thank you all very much for your presentations and your participation today and, meeting is adjourned.