

Do you support the draft resolution titled, Resolution concerning overuse of temporary suspensions, excessive delays that violate due process in the conduct of disciplinary hearings, and the need for reform of the student code of conduct procedures?

80 Yes; 16 No; 15 Abstain; 24 DNV

Comments

This resolution is not about the treatment of any individual student or applying temporary suspension in cases of violent actors, but rather about revising the current procedures and policies in a way that recognizes the values of shared governance.

This was an excellent revision that now focuses on creating positive change

"Shared governance" has fallen out of favor with the central administration. This resolution is a small step toward righting the balance.

I am not especially convinced that temporary suspensions are being misused currently. I find the data supporting those claims to be highly cherry picked. But the administration is revising policy, and has invited us to do the same, and that's what this resolution will do at the end of the day.

I am abstaining on this resolution. I strongly support the principles behind it—fair and timely due process for students, appropriate use of temporary suspensions, and a transparent, representative approach to revising the Student Code of Conduct. These are values that matter a great deal to me.

However, the resolution as written feels one-sided in its presentation of the underlying cases, and the proposed plan for reform remains quite broad and vague. It identifies important problems but provides very little specificity about the solutions it envisions. For example, it does not outline:

- clear limits on temporary suspension use,
- defined due-process timelines,
- standards for appeals,
- definitions of imminent harm,
- standards of evidence,
- alternatives to suspension,
- considerations for visa-dependent students,
- guaranteed hearing timelines,
- restorative justice pathways, or
- guidance on when the administration can appropriately serve as complainant.

I would welcome a future version that continues to center fairness and due process but offers a more balanced presentation of facts and a clearer, more actionable set of reforms. I appreciate the intent of this work and look forward to contributing to a more detailed and constructive discussion as the process moves forward.

I trust the University's decisions in these matters, and I think that the Faculty Senate has been talking about these issues for too long and wasting all of our time.

This is yet another resolution that claims to care about our students but instead achieves the opposite.

The administration has fundamentally failed to make Cornell a safe place for Israeli students to study and work. They allowed people to violate campus rules and took almost no action against the perpetrators.

Now, we are faced with a resolution that completely ignores the facts about the damage caused by the students who violated those rules. Instead, it argues as if the administration somehow abused its power. This is clearly a political resolution.

We urgently need a deep change in the Senate to ensure we protect our students against all the violence and harassment that they have been subjected to.

I do not think it crucial to enforce that members of this newly constituted CPRC who are from the central administration and/or the OSCCS be non-voting. For committees at this level there is rarely an actual "vote", so making that distinction seems unnecessarily adversarial.

I think it makes sense to have one of the deans lead the committee (not from the Provost's office).

This is a much stronger resolution than the resolution initially presented to the Senate at a meeting earlier in the fall.

The argument presented is that the academic probations under discussion are for non-violent offences. But (1) we are not provided with the evidence to evaluate this claim, and (2) in any case this is not a sufficient excuse. We have the privilege of being in community at this phenomenal institution. It is not unreasonable to expect the level of conduct at a top tier university to rise above this baseline level. Harassment and bullying are non-violent offenses that deeply impact other community members. Depriving a Cornell student of a job opportunity by shutting down a career fair may be a non-violent offense but causes real life harm.

We are provided with decontextualized anecdotes and asked to believe the claims of faculty who consistently introduce resolutions that rest upon tendentious assertions. This is non-productive and wastes time at a time when research and scholarship are under intense scrutiny and threat. The faculty senate should be congratulating this Cornell administration and how well it is steering the university through unprecedented challenges and maintaining the commitment to free speech.

The CAPE Executive Committee feels that a more inclusive committee structure would benefit the discussion and outcome of the deliberations.

It is clear this needs to be addressed. Though this is not a perfect resolution it hits important parts of committee make up and modifying this process that is not meeting the needs it was designed to address.