



**Are you in favor of the pending Resolution Concerning Cornell Vice President Joel Malina's Violations of Faculty Academic Freedom?** 60 Yes; 40 No; 18 Abstain; 15 DNV

**Comments**

He is leaving the university, point moot. He did not have a fair hearing

I believe the content here is important, but the process was too convoluted to result in a clear resolution. It may be worth bringing a new, focused version of the resolution around academic freedom in the new year.

The policy covers the protection of academic freedom and the current discussion stands as evidence that the faculty will continue to hold administration to the University policy. Im not sure that this proposal will change anything.

Although he's leaving, so the point is entirely moot at this stage

We are looking forward to VP Malina's departure and hope that his successor is someone with high integrity and mindfulness

The deficiencies of this proposal were well illuminated during the Dec faculty meeting. It has been a frustrating loss of faculty senate time with no redeeming utility.

It is essential for the Cornell administration to publicly reject VP Malina's statements that violate faculty academic freedom, and for the Cornell administration to make clear public statements of commitment to academic freedom.

I tend to side with those who argued that this matter has been resolved, between Malina's letter, the provost's comments to the Senate, and then Malina's departure.

I prefer to see a resolution more focused on freedom of speech and expression instead of Malina himself, who is retiring.

This resolution is an inappropriately personalized vilification of a top Cornell administrator. It is measures like this that lead many to not take the Faculty Senate seriously.

Discussing Joel Malina's transgressions is starting to get embarrassing. I hope the Senate can move on from this next semester.

I am very worried about this resolution. The Senate's credibility is low because we vote on such resolutions. We should have invited someone from the administration to discuss the issue instead.

Passing a resolution based on a Cornell Sun articles would be an embarrassment to the Faculty Senate. - The resolution confounded "scrutiny" with "surveillance", which aren't the same. - Since Malina has left Cornell, this is unnecessary. - This is a continued effort to vilify anyone who tries to address community members' concerns, when people don't like what they are saying.

I would have greatly preferred to have heard VP Malina's own view of this private meeting and the context of his comments, rather than being presented with an accusatory resolution

**Are you in favor of the pending Resolution Concerning Increased Police and Security Cameras on Cornell's Campus?** 73 Yes; 39 No; 7 Abstain; 14 DNV

**Comments**

I do believe in increased security on campus, including buildings. Security should have major input, faculty some, but not to the point that our campus is left less safe.

I don't think it is particularly well written and still conflates 2 things, but I do think that the revision of the policy on use of video surveillance (and any surveillance for that matter) should be transparent and that the Faculty Senate (as well as Cornell staff and student governing agencies who we should be standing up for, too and often ignore) should be involved in the process. That is why i am voting in favor.

Department faculty differed in their views of the benefits and risks of different kinds of surveillance, but largely agreed that transparency about the university policy would be helpful.

Security is of utmost importance for our students, staff, and faculty, but "security" should not be misconstrued as taking liberty to surveil instructors, condemn students, or abused in any way; academic freedom must stay an integral part of our institution.

The resolution is based on willful misunderstanding, and we would be better served with a presentation of what is actually envisioned for security purposes.

The Cornell administration should provide information about their plans for increased police presence and security cameras. It is also essential for the Cornell administration to engage in meaningful consultation and negotiations with the Faculty Senate, CGSU, and other governance bodies about these plans.

I am voting no on this resolution because I agree with the Senators who spoke up at our last meeting suggesting that it is premature: we should first invite appropriate representatives from Cornell administration to speak to us about this issue, then draft a resolution only if we still have questions or concerns afterward.

I would favor the suggestion made in the meeting, namely that Dean De Rosa invite the campus security people to talk about what they are doing on cameras and why, without criticizing the plan before we know what the plan actually is.

The contents of this resolution are heading in the right direction, but it suffers from its association with the Malina resolution,. This should have been introduced independently, with adequate Senate discussion, rather than treating it as an afterthought. .

I think I need a bit more information regarding the current status of campus security cameras or any policies/proposals to increase their number. I'm not sure a combative resolution like this is the best way to go about this.

We first should have invited someone from the administration to discuss the issue.

We need more information, particularly about what's happening with Policy 8.1.

Passing a resolution based on a Cornell Sun articles would be an embarrassment to the Faculty Senate. -  
This is an unnecessary resolution. The DOF can instead invite the administration to present and discuss the security camera policy and implementation on campus. - This is part of continued efforts to vilify anything that people don't like

This seems a wise precaution against unbridled surveillance, though obviously it would be counter-productive to publish maps of camera locations.