



ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE, 2011-2012

11 July 2012

The Committee on Academic Programs and Policies (CAPP) formally established one new policy, screened thirteen proposals for new academic programs/policies during the academic year 2011-2012, and continued its consulting/advising role to the Provost on behalf of the University Faculty regarding Cornell's proposal – now plans – for the CornellNYC Tech campus in New York City. Each of these is described briefly below.

I. Establishment of new policy regarding proposals to be routed to CAPP

On 31 May 2012, CAPP chair Cleland attended a meeting with Joe Burns (Faculty Senate), Bill Fry (Faculty Senate), Barbara Knuth (Graduate School), Jim Mingle (Counsel), John Siliciano (Provost's Office), and Stephanie Sechler (Counsel), to clarify the role of CAPP and the Faculty Senate on proposals related to the Graduate School. The report from this meeting (Appendix A) supersedes the meeting notes from 1 February 2002 that had previously governed this process.

Briefly, it was agreed that proposals for degree program creation, modification, or discontinuation that are wholly within the Graduate School shall no longer be sent to CAPP or the Senate for approval. This exclusion would include, by way of example, all proposals listed in section II below that have been marked with asterisks (*). Proposals to establish, modify, or discontinue *degrees* (as opposed to degree *programs*) will still come to CAPP and the Senate, as will proposals that span more than one school (such as the Graduate School plus another college or school).

II. Proposals analyzed by CAPP regarding academic programs and policies

- A. *June 2011. CAPP approved the request of the *Immunology* field to change its name to *Immunology and Infectious Disease*. Reported to the Faculty Senate in September 2011.
- B. September 2011. CAPP proposed in the Senate that the title Clinical Professor be established in the Johnson School, pursuant to their revised proposal of 16 December 2010. Approved by the Faculty Senate in September 2011.
- C. July 2011. CAPP received the request of the Veterinary College to establish the title of Clinical Professor. The proposal was presented by CAPP to the Faculty Senate in September 2011, subjected to a 60-day public comment period, recommended for approval by CAPP in November 2011, and finally approved by the Faculty Senate in December 2011.

- D. August 2011. CAPP is notified by Sr Vice Provost Ron Seeber of a planned consolidation of multiple Economics units at Cornell (Arts-Economics, ILR Labor Economics, and some economists from Human Ecology, CALS, and JGSM) into a single Economics department. This recommendation was made over spring-summer 2011 by a committee chaired by Michael Waldman (JGSM). SVP Seeber framed this as a notification, contending that CAPP approval was not necessary (CAPP disagrees). CAPP's request for relevant information from the Waldman committee was denied by SVP Seeber. SVP Seeber announced this merger at the Faculty Senate meeting in September 2011 after a courtesy introduction by CAPP.
- E. September 2011. CAPP announces to the Faculty Senate that a committee (chaired by Prof. Rosemary Avery) has been formed to study the possible formation of a School of Public Policy at Cornell.

CAPP met with Prof. Avery in April 2012 to discuss the Avery committee's upcoming (8 May 2012) final report to the Provost regarding establishment of this new School. In this, CAPP is acting "off-label" as an advisory committee, being a sitting faculty committee drawn broadly from across the University that is focused on issues related to trans-College academic programs. CAPP announced the publication of this report to the Faculty Senate in May 2012, and extended a broad request for comments on this proposal to all members of the Cornell faculty.

- F. *November 2011. CAPP chair Cleland authorized two noncontroversial intrafield concentration changes. Specifically, first, an "Aging and Health" concentration was added to both majors in the field of Human Development (to wit: Developmental Psychology and Human Development and Family Studies). Second, in the field of Design and Environmental Analysis (offering an MS degree in Human-Environment Relations) the name of the existing concentration "Applied Research in Human-Environment Relations" was changed to "Environmental Psychology". The Psychology graduate field was contacted by the DEA field and had no objections to the new name.
- G. December 2011. CAPP received a proposal entitled Business@Cornell from Sr Vice Provost Ron Seeber, consisting of a proposal for a "university-wide" minor in business coordinated among CALS (AEM), Hotel, the Johnson, and ILR. CAPP was informed by SVP Seeber that the proposal was still engaged in budget model discussions prior to seeking approval from the Provost's office. In January 2012, SVP Seeber sent a draft of the proposal to CAPP and attended CAPP's 2 February 2012 meeting to present and discuss it. CAPP subsequently provided SVP Seeber with a list of necessary revisions and clarifications. SVP Seeber replied via email on 27 February 2012 with a loosely structured reply to CAPP's comments and requests for additional information. CAPP subsequently (28 February 2012) requested a unified proposal for the Business@Cornell minor incorporating these revisions, as no clear document detailing program policies or planned governance had yet been offered to CAPP. As of 10 July 2012, no reply from SVP Seeber has been received. On 11 July 2012, CAPP sent an email to SVP Seeber requesting an update regarding the proposal's progress and our outstanding request for revisions.
- H. January 2012. CAPP met with Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School Barbara Knuth regarding Cornell's situation in which roughly 30 dual degree programs (e.g., MPA-MLA) were never properly registered with the NY State Education Department. Her office is

remediating this situation with all deliberate speed, and notifying CAPP because many of these programs consequently may come by CAPP for ‘approval’ over the next year or so (even though they already exist, in some cases have existed for many years).

- I. *February 2012. CAPP approved the request of the *East Asian Literature* field to change its name to *Asian Literature, Religion, and Culture*. Reported to the Faculty Senate in February 2012.
- J. *March 2012. CAPP approved the request of the *International Development* and *International Agriculture and Rural Development* fields to merge, forming a single Field of *Global Development*. Reported to the Faculty Senate in March 2012.
- K. *March 2012. CAPP approved the request of the *Policy Analysis and Management* field in Human Ecology to merge all of its existing concentrations into one: *Public Policy*. Reported to the Faculty Senate in March 2012.
- L. *April 2012. CAPP approved the request of the *Genetics and Development* field to change its name to *Genetics, Genomics, and Development*. Reported to the Faculty Senate in April 2012.
- M. May 2012. CAPP received two proposals from ILR: one to create a new executive MPS program and the second to add a distance education component to this program (ie., eCornell). CAPP did not have a quorum by the 9 May 2012 Senate meeting regarding the former, but approved it for presentation to the Senate in the fall. Additional information regarding the details of the eCornell proposal was obtained in late May 2012. CAPP expects to present both proposals to the Senate for approval in September 2012.

III. Advice and consultation regarding CornellNYC governance

CAPP served in an advisory capacity to the Provost’s office regarding the CornellNYC Tech project, particularly those aspects that fall within the realm of academic programs and faculty governance. CAPP also served to reflect the voice of the Senate in consultations with the Provost, and later with the CornellNYC Tech administrative team; largely this constituted a continuing push for openness with the faculty and the broader release of information about the CornellNYC Tech project as it progressed. For example, CAPP negotiated the partial release of confidential project information to faculty (while protecting it from Internet dissemination) by asking for it to be available in hardcopy for examination in the Dean of Faculty’s office.

Prior to Cornell’s selection for development of the NYC tech campus, CAPP advised the Provost regarding possible governance structures and raised issues of interest or concern as they arose. In September 2011, CAPP presented a written report to the Provost on the topic of faculty hiring models for the new campus and related issues of governance (Appendix B), which also was made available for review in the Dean of Faculty’s office. CAPP also updated the Faculty Senate about milestones in Cornell’s application process, notably at the September 2011 and December 2011 Senate meetings. (More substantive presentations to the Senate regarding CornellNYC project development were made by Provost Fuchs).

After Cornell won the competition in late December 2011, CAPP continued in its role as advisory committee. Additionally, the prospect of CAPP review of CornellNYC Tech academic programs then arose. New degrees are being considered for CornellNYC Tech which will require

review by CAPP and the Faculty Senate. As of this writing, however, none of these planned degrees have been presented for consideration.

Presently, and separately, smaller changes are being proposed to CornellNYC Tech academic programs that are somewhat ambiguous regarding whether they fall within CAPP's purview; to wit, they consist of changes within College of Engineering M. Eng. degree programs (suggesting no CAPP involvement) but they also are changes affecting two separate campuses (undefined regarding a role for CAPP and the Senate). At present, the underlying questions are not resolved, but also are not generating conflict: CAPP presented the minor modifications to M. Eng. degree programs to the Senate in May 2012 as a "report of examination and concurrence", sidestepping the issue of whether we did so owing to Senate purview or pursuant to our off-label role as advisors to the Provost on behalf of the Senate. Informally, I do not expect CAPP to assert rights of refusal over Engineering department programs, but I do not yet want to establish a precedent of no authority in case unforeseen circumstances arise in which Senate oversight or involvement seems appropriate.

IV. Outstanding docket

As of this writing, CAPP's docket of outstanding issues reads as follows:

- The proposed ILR executive MPS program, continuing from May 2012 as noted above.
- The proposal by ILR to incorporate distance learning via eCornell into its executive MPS program. This requires revision of an existing limitation on the services that eCornell is permitted to provide; CAPP is examining removal of this limitation.
- The ongoing proposal for a university-wide Business@Cornell minor, as described above. The concept of "university-wide minor" is new and hence requires particular scrutiny.
- Two dual-degree programs that span multiple colleges have been presented for CAPP review, pursuant to Cornell's need to retroactively approve several such programs (cf. January 2012 entry above concerning VP/Dean Barbara Knuth). Note that, pursuant to the agreement described in section I above, dual-degree programs that do not span multiple colleges will no longer be sent to CAPP.
- The Johnson School has requested approval of a new, separate grading scale.
- A new undergraduate major in *Global and Public Health Sciences* has been proposed by the Division of Nutritional Sciences to be offered through the College of Human Ecology and CALS.



Thomas A. Cleland
Chair, CAPP

CAPP/Faculty Senate Role vis-à-vis Graduate School Academic Policies and Programs

Summary of Meeting May 31, 2012

Attendees: Joe Burns (Faculty Senate); Thomas Cleland (CAPP); Bill Fry (Faculty Senate); Barbara Knuth (Graduate School); Jim Mingle (Counsel); John Siliciano (Provost Office); Stephanie Sechler (Counsel)

The purpose of this meeting was to clarify the role of CAPP/Faculty Senate on issues related to academic program proposals and registration processes related to the Graduate School, and related matters of Graduate School educational and academic policy. This meeting supersedes the meeting notes (appended below) from the February 1, 2002 meeting of Faculty Senate, IRP, and Graduate School representatives.

We agreed on the following:

- Proposals to establish, modify, or discontinue a graduate degree should be handled first by the General committee of the Graduate School and then by CAPP/Faculty Senate. This concept does not apply to degree programs. For example, a Master of Engineering is a degree, whereas Master of Engineering degree programs are offered in Electrical and Computer Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, and a host of other graduate fields. Degree issues come to CAPP/Faculty Senate from the Graduate School only when a degree is being established (e.g., new degree that Cornell does not currently offer), modified (e.g., changing the name of a degree), or discontinued (e.g., Cornell ceasing to offer a particular degree).
- Proposals for degree program creation, modification, or discontinuance for degree programs that are wholly within the Graduate School should be handled by the General Committee of the Graduate School and then move through the next required approval stages (e.g., Provost, Board of Trustees) but should not be sent to CAPP/Faculty Senate.
- Proposals for degree program creation, modification, or discontinuance for degree programs that involve the Graduate School and another Cornell (or non-Cornell) college or school should be handled by the General Committee of the Graduate School and then move to CAPP/Faculty Senate. For example, 4+1 degree programs involving an undergraduate degree and an accelerated master's degree program should be referred to CAPP from the General Committee. Dual degree programs in which the duality involves a program external to the Graduate School should be referred to CAPP from the General Committee (e.g., MBA/PhD degree program proposal would be referred to CAPP; MRP/MLA degree program proposal would not be referred to CAPP).
- Issues of graduate educational policy should be referred to CAPP from the General Committee of the Graduate School only when those policy issues concern a college or school beyond the Graduate School.

The basis for these agreements stems from the university's bylaws. According to Cornell University bylaws:

Article XIII, The University Faculty

Section 2: Functions: "The functions of the University Faculty shall be to consider questions of educational policy which concern more than one college, school, or separate academic unit, or are general in nature; and to recommend to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the appropriate college or school faculty, the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of degrees."

Article XIV, College and School Faculties:

Section 2: "Subject to the authority of the University Faculty on all matters affecting general educational policy, it shall be the duty of each separate college or school faculty to determine the entrance requirements for its own students; to prescribe and define courses of study for them; to determine the requirements for such degrees as are offered to students under its jurisdiction; ... to enact and enforce rules for the guidance and supervision of its students in their academic work; and in general to exercise jurisdiction over the academic interests of students and all other educational matters in the particular college or school."

Section 4: "... The Graduate Faculty shall have jurisdiction over all graduate work and any degree beyond the first degrees given by any college or school except in the case, described below, of the Graduate School of Medical Sciences."

MEETING NOTES – FEBRUARY 2002 (as written at that time)

Summary of the field change meeting with Alison Power, Terry Plater, Kristin Canger (Walker), Terrence Fine, Robert Cooke and Kat Empson on 2/1/02.

Any major change need to go through all of the necessary internal committees.

All graduate level field change proposals must first go through the general committee. Once the proposal has been approved by the general committee we then have to determine whether or not it needs to go to CAPP/Faculty Senate.

CAPP/Faculty Senate wants to see anything that crosses college boundaries.

In order to determine whether or not it needs to go before CAPP/Faculty Senate, you must e-mail Dean Robert Cooke and his assistant Diane Lalonde informing them of the upcoming proposals. Dean Cooke will respond as to whether or not it needs to go before CAPP/Faculty Senate. Let Dean Cooke know that if you don't get a response within a week you will assume to go ahead with the proposal. If a proposal has to go before CAPP/Faculty Senate have Diane

Lalonde e-mail you regarding their decision. Once they have approved the proposal it then needs to go before the Provost (see the following attachment regarding CAPP/Faculty Senate guidelines).

The Provost will review the proposal before it goes to AACL/Trustees. The Trustees only meet 4 times a year so be sure to get the proposal on their agenda as soon as possible. Have Barbara Krause contact you once the Trustees have made a decision regarding the proposal. (We need to establish a formal reporting system). Once the Trustees have approved the proposal it will then be sent to Albany. Generally it can take 6-9 months to receive an approval from Albany.

Cornell NYC Proposal: *Assessment of faculty hiring models and related issues*
Committee on Academic Programs and Policies
10 September 2011

FINAL

At the request of Provost W. Kent Fuchs, the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies (CAPP) of the Cornell University Faculty Senate has reviewed the available information regarding Cornell's developing proposal for an applied sciences and engineering campus in New York City (herein referred to as *CornellNYC*). We here outline and assess some of the likely concerns and consequences for faculty regarding this proposal. We first consider three broad models of faculty governance that remain under consideration (though one is clearly favored; to wit, that faculty committees have been formed to develop its particulars). We then assess some implications of the CornellNYC teaching model, hub vs. departmental prerogatives, the nature of central leadership at CornellNYC, the roles of non-tenure track faculty, and some important issues regarding non-academic staff. We conclude with a few proposed strategies for success that arose from our discussions, most importantly the infrastructural bases for intercampus cohesion: videoconferencing, affordable short-term housing, and intercampus transportation.

Three Models for faculty and academic staff appointments

The presently favored model (Model #1) is to have all CornellNYC faculty primarily affiliated with an Ithaca-based academic department and to be full members of that department, yet also flexibly organized into a superstructure that is local to the CornellNYC campus and serves its mission (roughly, the *Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences* model). Alternative models under consideration include incorporating CornellNYC as a separate Cornell college (Model #2; roughly, the *Weill Medical College* model), or as an independent institution owned by Cornell (Model #3). Potential advantages, concerns, and disadvantages regarding each are presented here.

Faculty governance model #1: All CornellNYC faculty have primary affiliation with an Ithaca-based department. Local organization within CornellNYC is governed by flexible, applications-oriented "hubs".

Advantages

- This model maximizes academic collaboration and research interactions with Ithaca campus, enhances substantive interactions between basic and applied research laboratories, facilitates access of CornellNYC research groups to basic research on Ithaca campus, and improves access by Ithaca faculty to NYC commercialization and applications opportunities. This can, for example, enable biomedically-relevant engineering research to be performed at CornellNYC without the need to maintain wet labs or other biotech support on the CornellNYC campus.
- CornellNYC faculty, as full members of Ithaca-based departments, will clearly be full-fledged Cornell faculty. In keeping with this principle, CornellNYC faculty should be able to maintain offices in some form on the Ithaca campus, even if they are shared offices. CornellNYC faculty also should be able to move their laboratories and research groups back and forth between the Ithaca and NYC campuses when appropriate (issues of space allocation aside); examples include a research group that moves to NYC to participate in a hub and moves back when that hub is dissolved, or an CornellNYC applied-science laboratory that gradually moves into more basic research and consequently arranges to move to the Ithaca campus.

- The hub model facilitates a flexible and topical organization on the NYC campus. By enabling faculty hiring and tenure decisions to be administered within stable Ithaca-based departments, the proposed NYC organizational “hubs” can be shuffled, renamed, terminated and renewed as often as necessary to ensure that applied research on the NYC campus is oriented towards current needs and marketable trends without affecting the integrity of faculty positions per se.
- The leadership of the CornellNYC campus presumably will be strongly integrated into the senior leadership of Cornell University (in a manner comparable to the leadership of the Weill Cornell School of Medicine). This will facilitate intercampus coordination at multiple levels.

Concerns

- The roles and numbers of CornellNYC-based non-tenure track faculty (clinical faculty, lecturers, research scientists) will need to be clearly defined. Specifically, are there going to be non-tenure track faculty hired at CornellNYC with the expectation that their appointments will be of a limited term – perhaps tied to a particular “hub” such that if that hub is revised or terminated, their appointments will not be renewed thereafter? This policy has clear advantages for the flexibility and timeliness of an institution that is substantially invested in current trends, and may even suit the personal goals of some prospective non-tenure track faculty members (e.g., inventors, entrepreneurs) who may plan to spend a limited number of years teaching at CornellNYC and then move on to other interests. However, such a policy also can exact a cost in terms of the stability and long-term institutional investment provided by a predominantly tenured faculty.
- Clinical faculty status often reflects a different educational/experiential background and a different set of responsibilities compared to tenure-track/tenured faculty, and colleges and departments hire clinical faculty accordingly to improve the breadth and value of their research and educational offerings. However, the position of clinical faculty member is susceptible to being reconceived in the CornellNYC context as short-term hires with minimal attachment to the parent departments in Ithaca. This is inadvisable. This concern may be mitigated by keeping hiring decisions for clinical faculty within (Ithaca-based) departments, and by offering other titles (senior scientist, senior lecturer, lecturer) to CornellNYC appointments that may be projected as more short-term in nature (options are discussed in the *Teaching at CornellNYC* and *Models for non-tenure track academic positions* sections below). Furthermore, departments may choose to require that their members maintain a certain level of interactivity with Ithaca – travel, participation in colloquia, students, etc.. It is recommended, though, that a clear and open hiring policy be generated to balance the stability and flexibility of the CornellNYC faculty.
- Appointments for faculty positions expected to be based on the CornellNYC campus should be made by a departmental hiring committee that includes representation by CornellNYC faculty, ideally from the hub with which the prospective faculty member is likely to affiliate. This in turn implies that hiring decisions into one department will need to be sensitive and responsive to input from (members of) other departments.
- The method by which hubs may be selected for dissolution and reformulated is not entirely clear. Under this faculty governance model, it will need to involve discussion among all relevant Ithaca-based departments as well as senior administration, and cannot be delegated solely to the CornellNYC local leadership.
- This suggests that space allocations at CornellNYC will need to be contracted to faculty members in consultation with their home departments on the Ithaca campus, so that all three parties – faculty member, department, and CornellNYC hub – are signatories to the same agreement, and

that such agreements must specify what will happen if and when hubs are reorganized. Depending on the specifics of each contract, this may or may not reduce the flexibility of resource allocations that are the primary advantage of the hub model.

Disadvantages

- The CornellNYC faculty may feel lack of involvement in important decision-making, perhaps sensing that they have responsibilities to a department with which they are not strongly engaged. The distance between the two locations makes this problem unavoidable. Cornell can look to several existing models, however; notably, the Geneva campus houses faculty who are members of Ithaca-based departments. A strong investment in advanced videoconferencing systems linking the two campuses is essential (specifically: systems capable of facilitating a meeting between *two groups*, rather than between two individuals, or one individual and one group).
- Reduced interactivity between Ithaca and CornellNYC faculty may result in unfavorable decision-making in hiring and promotion. For example, Ithaca-based departments may make faculty hires to be based at CornellNYC that are suboptimal for the CornellNYC environment, or CornellNYC faculty participating in the Ithaca-based hiring process may have limited information on which to base their decisions.
- Ultimately this problem must be mitigated by departmental procedures and practices. At the policy level, however, it must be made clear how and to what extent the CornellNYC hub leadership may play a role in the selection, hiring, and promotion of tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, and other NTT faculty (e.g., senior scientist, senior lecturer) by Ithaca-based departments. It is probably most effective to have this authority relegated solely to the departments, with hub leadership serving an advisory role.
- In the same spirit, friction may arise between departmental leadership and “hub” leadership over resource allocations. If a CornellNYC faculty member from Department A who is a member of Hub X retires, how is her/his space at CornellNYC to be reallocated? Is it reserved for Department A to offer to its replacement hire irrespective of whether that hire will be a plausible member of Hub X? Is it to be allocated by the hub leadership at CornellNYC irrespective of the Ithaca-based departments and available lines? Basic issues of resource control need to be firmly defined from the outset. It is probably most effective to have authority for space allocation (for example) rest in principle with the CornellNYC administration, subject to explicit contract with Ithaca-based departments and affected faculty members.
- An example: A hub chair may feel that hiring in area X is important, but the “natural” home department for area X is not willing to devote additional lines/resources to that area of research. How do these disconnects get resolved? *How can a hub leader succeed in developing a strong hub without substantial authority in hiring?* While it is not reasonable to give hub leaders final authority over departmental hiring, this quandary does present a strong argument for allowing a certain amount of local (within CornellNYC) hiring of non-tenure track faculty at the lecturer, senior lecturer, and research scientist levels, as discussed further in the *Models for non-tenure track academic positions* section below. As detailed therein, lecturer/senior lecturer/research scientists hired directly by the CornellNYC hubs may or may not also be affiliated with Ithaca-based departments.

Faculty governance model #2: CornellNYC constitutes a separate College, with its own departments.

Advantages

- This model makes lines of authority and organization maximally clear. Issues of faculty hiring, tenure, and space/resource allocation all will be determined by the NYC-based departments and College. Relationships with Cornell University at Ithaca will be at the higher administrative levels; research collaborations will be informal and opportunistic (comparable to those currently existing between Ithaca and Weill Medical College faculty).
- Information flow within departments (e.g., for hiring and promotions) is maximized, as all faculty of a given department will be located in the same geographic area.

Concerns

- The administration of non-tenure track faculty positions will have many of the same pressures on it as detailed for governance model #1. However, the effects of these pressures (positive or negative) will be confined to the CornellNYC College, and hence might be more effectively managed, in part because there are fewer parties involved that may have divergent interests in the outcome.
- The faculty at CornellNYC would be “CornellNYC faculty”. Whether they are considered of the same stature as Ithaca faculty over time would depend on a number of factors not entirely foreseeable or controllable. This may create tensions between the campuses.

Disadvantages

- This model increases duplication and redundancy among Cornell departments. This leads to greater administrative costs (all else being equal) and competition for scarce resources, as well as reducing the interactions among faculty with similar interests.
- The redundancy of departments also complicates the efforts of students to select a major or a field of study. For graduate students, Cornell’s field system could mitigate this disadvantage, though it is non-trivial to administer a graduate field across geographically separated campuses (one successful example is the Tri-Institutional Computational Biology and Medicine program based at Weill Medical College, which supports graduate students who can select a research advisor in either Ithaca or New York City; however, this program’s success may depend in large part on its uniquely generous funding for graduate students).
- Under this model, the PhD program at CornellNYC may be weakened owing to the limited numbers of faculty and the focus on applied research. CornellNYC might then tend towards becoming more of a terminal masters’/continuing education institution, particularly if the links to Ithaca-based basic research are weakened. The field system could mitigate this effect in principle, but as a practical matter fields are often strongly rooted in departments.
- The research programs at CornellNYC would be less integrated with the basic research programs at the Ithaca campus, and the two faculties would interact less. Collaborations could of course still be developed between laboratories, as is presently done between Ithaca and Weill Medical College. Similarly, Ithaca faculty would have somewhat less access to the applications research and technology transfer capabilities of CornellNYC.
- Hiring into CornellNYC-based departments would eliminate the flexibility of the “hub” system to respond to changes in contemporary needs. In contrast, relying too heavily on non-tenure track

appointments would likely reduce the institutional investment, stability, and stature provided by long-term tenured faculty.

- May result in lack of equal procedure and standard for hiring and promotion between the two campuses.
- May be perceived by the New York City administration as a less competitive alternative because the NYC campus would be less attached to the existing talent and operations of Cornell University.

Faculty governance model #3: CornellNYC constitutes a separate institution, owned and operated by Cornell.

Advantages

- The administrative organization of CornellNYC can be developed from the ground up, optimized for its own benefit without the need to integrate with the Ithaca campus institutions. This could include partnering with third-party institutions other than Cornell University.
- The local CornellNYC leadership can respond with maximum flexibility to current research trends and funding sources.

Concerns

- From the perspective of the CornellNYC institution itself, this model retains many of the advantages of the “separate College” model while avoiding burdening Cornell University per se with its disadvantages. For example, it can maintain flexibility by hiring only non-tenure-track faculty without setting precedent for Cornell University proper. This practice would of course make the new institution much less like a university. Ties with Ithaca research laboratories and programs would likely be sparse, unless specifically solicited and supported by inter-institutional programs.
- To the extent that the CornellNYC institution acts like a university, it will require parallel administrative infrastructure. There would be no expectation of equal procedure or hiring standards between the two institutions.
- Correspondingly, any degrees that the CornellNYC institution would grant would be unrelated to Cornell University degrees. This would require the development of an entire academic support infrastructure, and the value of these degrees would depend on the performance of the new institution.

Disadvantages

- The disadvantages of governance model #2 regarding reduced interactions between the Ithaca and CornellNYC campuses would remain, and perhaps be even greater under this model.
- There would be very limited flexibility for faculty to move between campuses, impairing collaborations with respect to the other two models.
- Recruiting additional partner institutions would reduce Cornell’s governing authority.
- It is uncertain what benefit Cornell University would derive from founding an institution under this model. If the creation of an independent “CornellNYC” institution provides no benefits to Cornell programs, faculty, students, or stature, then it might be asked why Cornell would

undertake the burden of establishing it. Clear and practical benefits to existing stakeholders would need to be elaborated in order to make this model viable.

- May be perceived by the New York City administration as a less competitive alternative because the NYC campus would not really be “Cornell University.”

Teaching at CornellNYC*

**Under faculty governance model #1. Under models #2-3, CornellNYC will constitute a separate College or institution and as such will be responsible for course development under a traditional model.*

The details of the proposed “hub” organization emphasize research rather than teaching. CornellNYC will also be a teaching campus, presumably including PhD students (drawn from existing Cornell fields) as well as terminal master’s degree and professional students who, depending on their program, may be either part of Cornell-wide majors or attached to specific CornellNYC-only programs. These options remain to be developed.

- To the extent that there are academic programs specific to CornellNYC, and in any event because of the courses that will be taught at the CornellNYC campus (whether or not they are versions of courses also taught at Ithaca), there likely will need to be a local Registrar’s office to regulate these programs and course offerings. This is relevant to the present charge because it affects faculty contracts as negotiated with their home departments in Ithaca. For example, if applied-engineering courses are to be taught on behalf of professional programs specific to CornellNYC, how and to what extent will these satisfy a faculty member’s teaching responsibilities to their home department? These are ultimately determined by faculty appointment contracts as negotiated with home departments.
- Alternatively, some courses may be offered by the CornellNYC campus specifically, not directly associated with any host department (roughly comparable to the interdepartmental BIOG courses of Cornell’s introductory and general biology curricula).
- The need for new courses at the CornellNYC campus – particularly new, CornellNYC-specific courses on applied topics that are not part of the central mandates of Ithaca-based departments – will need to be negotiated among relevant departments, the Engineering college, and the CornellNYC leadership.
- It is unclear whether the new degree programs at CornellNYC will need to be separately accredited, or whether this question depends on the particular governance model chosen.
- Some relevant issues are presented below in the “Models for non-tenure track academic positions” section below, notably regarding the mechanisms for hiring lecturers/senior lecturers at CornellNYC for purposes of teaching CornellNYC-specific courses on applied topics.

CornellNYC hub leadership*and departmental prerogatives and responsibilities

**Under faculty governance model #1. Under models #2-3, internal academic groups within CornellNYC will presumably be departments.*

The details of the proposed “hub” organization for CornellNYC under faculty governance model #1 are described in other documents (and remain under development). Briefly, all CornellNYC faculty will be

members of an Ithaca-based academic department and hold their positions within that department while spending some or all of their time on the CornellNYC campus. On the CornellNYC campus itself, research laboratories will be organized into “hubs” devoted to specific research topics of contemporary interest. The advantage of this model is that these topical hubs can be relatively easily reformulated to address current problems in applied research without the complexity of a departmental reorganization. During such reformulations, individual faculty researchers may join a new hub or, presumably, move into space with their department in Ithaca.

Hub leaders (*Chairs*) will presumably be appointed to coordinate hub business, drawn from the ranks of the senior faculty – i.e., tenured or clinical faculty. Some of the business of hubs may conflict with traditional (Ithaca-based) departmental prerogatives, such that the responsibilities of hub versus departmental administration should be clearly specified in advance. Among these concerns is the issue of resource allocation, notably space allocation.

Advantages of hub chairs/CornellNYC administration regulating space/resource allocation

- Whenever hubs are reformulated, available CornellNYC resources must be redistributed accordingly among them. This model ensures that the optimization of hubs and research resources are consonant with the current applied-research goals of CornellNYC and coordinated among the existing research hubs. Ithaca-based department chairs are unlikely to have a comparably sophisticated understanding of the relationships among hubs (all of which will likely include faculty from multiple different departments) and the relative needs of each.
- Decisions about the allocation of resources will be made by people who are personally familiar with the space, available resources, and the needs of the different research groups.
- The respective responsibilities of hub chairs and the CornellNYC central administration regarding resource allocations to faculty should of course be specified.

Disadvantages of hub chairs/CornellNYC administration regulating space/resource allocation

- Resource allocations at CornellNYC may be decoupled from faculty needs and performance as judged by the home department. Typically, space allocations are part of a faculty member’s contract as developed with their home department. If the department does not have authority over the research space/resources in question, then in principle space and resources at CornellNYC could be withdrawn from a given faculty member/research group (perhaps owing to hub reformulation) without provision for its replacement elsewhere. This could violate a faculty member’s contract as agreed with her/his department by no fault of the department per se.
- This suggests that space allocations at CornellNYC will need to be contracted to faculty members in consultation with their home departments, so that all three parties – faculty member, department, and hub – are signatories to the same agreement. It further suggests that such agreements need to specify what will happen if and when CornellNYC hubs are reorganized. Depending on the specifics of each contract, this may or may not reduce the flexibility of resource allocations that are the primary advantage of the hub model (i.e., of faculty governance model #1). Clearly the nature of such contracts may differ among faculty who are appointed full-time at the CornellNYC campus versus faculty initially appointed in Ithaca who move to CornellNYC for a limited term of appointment.

CornellNYC central leadership and relationship to Ithaca

The nature of the top leadership position(s) at CornellNYC is a central issue with major implications for the principle of faculty governance of Cornell academic programs. Due to the applied nature of CornellNYC and the emphasis on technology transfer, the top leadership is likely to be heavily called on to engage outside the university with potential donors, business partners, patent licensees, and other parties on matters more legal and financial than academic. However, the top leadership position at CornellNYC also has been discussed in the context of an academic leader, responsible for hub (or department) organization and coordination, educational and outreach initiatives, research collaborations, and academic leadership. It may be difficult for one person to hold both positions simultaneously.

One possibility is to divide responsibility into “president” and “provost” analogues, noting that different skill sets and leadership qualities are often optimal for these two types of positions. This design also could both make the workload associated with each position more manageable. For comparison, the Weill Medical College is led by the Provost for Medical Affairs/Dean of the Medical College, with a distinct position for the Dean of the Weill Graduate School of Medical Sciences; both of these positions also convey membership in the central administration of the University at Ithaca (the Provost/Dean within the ranks of the senior administration and the Dean of the Graduate School within the Office of the Provost respectively). By analogy with the Medical College, for purposes of this document, these potential positions will be referred to as *CornellNYC Provost* and *CornellNYC Dean*, respectively.

The need for a full-time appointee to the position of *CornellNYC Provost* is obvious, to engage with the City, potential donors, etcetera. This position should hold substantial rank within the Cornell central administration in Ithaca, as does the Provost/Dean of the Medical College. An additional important reason for ranking the *CornellNYC Provost* equally to the Provost/Dean of the Medical College would be to demonstrate that Cornell’s commitment to CornellNYC is equal to its commitment to the Weill Cornell School of Medicine, and that the faculty and programs of CornellNYC carry weight comparable to those of the faculty of the medical and Ithaca campuses.

The position of *CornellNYC Dean* could be conceived in several ways. As a distinct position, it could be jointly held by the *CornellNYC Provost* (the model of the Medical College proper), it could be a separate full-time position (the model of the Weill Graduate School within the School of Medicine), or it could be a position held by one of the hub (or department) leaders (here called *Chairs*) as “first among equals” in a council of Chairs that collectively would be responsible for the academic governance of CornellNYC. In all cases, the *CornellNYC Dean* also should hold rank within the Cornell central administration in Ithaca, presumably within the Office of the Provost by analogy with the Dean of the Weill Graduate School.

Advantages of a CornellNYC Provost/Dean jointly held by one individual

- This model enables the positions of CornellNYC Provost and CornellNYC Dean to be combined while building the organizational structure needed to easily separate them if and when that becomes necessary or appropriate.
- This model has the virtue of clarity in that top leadership is centralized in one office.

- This model also could also be a temporary organization during the early stages of CornellNYC, with a devolution of the *CornellNYC Dean's* responsibilities to a second individual occurring on a scheduled date.

Advantages of a CornellNYC Dean as a separate full-time position

- This model maximizes the administrative capacity of the *CornellNYC Dean*, as it provides CornellNYC with two full-time top administrators. This model may be favored once the academic and outreach programs of CornellNYC have expanded to the point where their oversight requires such a full-time position.
- A full-time CornellNYC Dean also has maximum capacity to work together with the CornellNYC Provost and/or the University administration in Ithaca to develop and maintain larger-scale academic and outreach programs.
- Full-time in this context suggests that the CornellNYC Dean is not simultaneously conducting an active research program as a CornellNYC faculty member; if s/he is also conducting active research, that would be a variant of the third model, below.

Advantages of a CornellNYC Dean as first-among-equals in a council of hub/department chairs

- Under this model, the administrative responsibilities of the *CornellNYC Dean* position per se will presumably not require full-time devotion, such that s/he also could conduct the duties of a hub/department Chair and maintain an active research program. Consequently, an advantage of this model is that the CornellNYC Dean would be actively engaged in the programs that s/he administers.
- This model minimizes redundancy and does not add separate layers of administration that may be unnecessary. However, the CornellNYC Dean under this model would still hold rank within the administration on the Ithaca campus (presumably in the Office of the Provost by comparison with the Dean of the Weill graduate School).
- A variant of this model is that the CornellNYC Dean would be the leader of a council of chairs, and maintain an active research program as a faculty member, but would not also herself/himself be the chair of a hub/department. This variant model might be the easiest to gradually transform into the separate full-time *CornellNYC Dean* model (above) as CornellNYC and its academic and outreach programs grow.

Models for non-tenure track academic positions*

**Under faculty governance model #1. Under models #2-3, CornellNYC will constitute a separate College or institution and as such all faculty and staff positions presumably will be managed locally.*

The role of clinical faculty members

- By virtue of enabling legislation of September 2002, and subject to the founding legislation of the CornellNYC campus, clinical faculty positions can be created for the CornellNYC campus. Under this legislation, the number of clinical professors in a department cannot exceed 25% of the number of tenure-track faculty (There is no such limit on the number of other non-tenure track faculty such as lecturers, senior lecturers, and research scientists).

- Clinical professorships exist at the Cornell Law School, presently are being implemented at the Johnson School, and have been proposed for the Veterinary College. Given the applied mandate of the NYC campus, clinical professorships are particularly appropriate, as they attract accomplished professionals with expertise highly relevant to the mission of CornellNYC.
- Subject to the founding legislation, clinical faculty members are likely to have similar prerogatives to tenured/tenure-track faculty members, including primary appointments within Ithaca-based departments, though their individual contractual rights and responsibilities may differ. This maintains the “one Cornell” model of faculty governance.
- In particular, some clinical faculty may have greater personal interest in a particular CornellNYC hub and its immediate goals than to their Ithaca-based department. In this case, any expectations in the event of dissolution of the relevant hub should be specified in their hiring contracts.

The role of lecturers and senior lecturers

Teaching faculty who are not appointed as Clinical Professors may be appointed as lecturers or senior lecturers. These teaching positions may be particularly appropriate for instruction in applied subjects of current interest and can draw from a pool of experienced practitioners with or without PhDs. As many of their skills and teaching responsibilities may be directly related to applied topics and applications-based courses, it may be advantageous for them to be hired directly and solely by a CornellNYC campus office, outside of the Ithaca-based departmental structure. An existing rough analogue is the Office of Undergraduate Biology, which organizes the undergraduate biology curriculum among multiple biology-related departments but itself stands apart from academic departments. That said, however, all introductory biology faculty, including course directors and lecturers in introductory biology courses and labs, do hold appointments within Cornell departments (notably Neurobiology & Behavior).

Advantages of Ithaca-based departmental affiliations for lecturers/senior lecturers

- Retains current model in which all faculty, including lecturers, are hired into departments and have departmental affiliations.

Advantages of lecturers/senior lecturers being appointed locally at CornellNYC

- Lecturers hired for instruction on applied topics in service to the emphases of CornellNYC hubs may have minimal attachment to Ithaca-based departments. Pro forma adherence to the departmental hiring model for short-term lecturers may simply impair the efficiency of their hiring and assessment while being of little interest to Ithaca-based departments.
- Hiring independent non-tenure track faculty at the ranks of lecturer, senior lecturer, and research scientist directly and locally into CornellNYC hubs may be necessary to develop strong hubs able to conduct timely instruction and competitive research. Without this authority, hub leaders must convince Ithaca-based departments to devote substantial lines and resources to the hub’s goals, which may not strongly match the interests of the relevant Ithaca-based department(s). It may be a good balance to require tenure-track, tenured, and clinical professor positions to be hired by Ithaca-based departments (with CornellNYC hub appointees on the hiring committees), but to enable a number of lecturer/research scientist positions to be hired by the hubs directly.

- Lecturer/senior lecturer/research scientists hired directly by the CornellNYC hubs would not have the same rights or responsibilities with respect to Ithaca-based departments as would CornellNYC faculty (of any rank) who are hired by Ithaca-based departments. Direct CornellNYC hiring under this model should be kept to a modest level so as not to dilute interactivity between Ithaca and CornellNYC.
- The NYC-based office established to manage non-academic staff appointments could in principle do the work of managing the appointments of lecturers/senior lecturers.

An intermediate position would be to have these positions formally associated with Ithaca-based departments, or with the Engineering College at large, but to have the hiring and assessment of these positions contractually delegated to an appropriate CornellNYC entity (e.g., hub chair, council of hub chairs, *CornellNYC Dean's* office, or a specific academic oversight office or committee). In this case, non-tenure track faculty directly hired by the CornellNYC hub would also have an affiliation with one or more Ithaca-based departments.

Models for non-academic staff appointments

- The presently favored model is for non-academic staff (custodians, groundskeepers, administrative staff, etc.) to be locally hired and administered within CornellNYC. This model is generally favored under all three of the academic models described above, in that these staff will be concerned with matters largely local to the CornellNYC institution (grounds and upkeep, hub-based business and organization, local financial and tax matters). Most of this is outside the purview of CAPP's advisory review, except to the extent that it interrelates with faculty roles and departmental administration.
- Under faculty governance model #1, some CornellNYC administrative staff would have responsibilities to Ithaca-based departments and institutions along with their local responsibilities (e.g., local human resources (HR) representatives, CIT staff, patent administrators, Graduate School administrative staff). Their supervisors/governing bodies will need to be made clear, as well as the budget(s) from which their salaries/wages are drawn. For offices with substantial portfolios, clear relationships and responsibilities will need to be defined and established between counterpart Ithaca and NYC offices. For example, HR in NYC might be subsidiary to that in Ithaca, whereas the Cornell technology transfer office might be headquartered in NYC with a subsidiary branch in Ithaca.
- The potential role of a distinct CornellNYC registrar's office is briefly discussed in the section "Teaching at CornellNYC" above.
- From the faculty perspective, CornellNYC administrative staff will need to have the same range of competencies as their counterparts affiliated with Ithaca-based departments, as well as the competencies associated with local hub organization. Among Ithaca-based departments, some divide their administrative staff by faculty member (an administrator works on behalf of a given list of faculty) and others divide them by portfolio (a given administrator works in grants applications, or hiring, or undergraduate education), or by a mixture of the two. At CornellNYC, this range of administrative portfolios will be further complicated by the need to interface with multiple Ithaca departments and across multiple NYC hubs. It will be very important to get this right from the outset.

Strategies for success

Infrastructure

Three infrastructure solutions stand out in terms of their critical importance to intercampus cohesion, the maintenance of cross-campus research collaborations and the cohesiveness of cross-campus departments. Their importance has been recognized by virtue of existing analogues, such as multi-campus departments spanning the Ithaca and Geneva campuses and research collaborations between the Ithaca campus and Weill Cornell Medical School laboratories. They are:

- (1) Reliable, advanced, and readily available videoconferencing links between the two campuses. Importantly, these video links must include systems capable of group-to-group meetings (as opposed to group-to-individual or individual-to-individual meetings). This implies multiple cameras including (a) room-to-room visualization as well as visualization of (b) a speaker and (c) the contents of a whiteboard or Powerpoint presentation, in either direction. These should be to some extent simultaneously viewable. Audio coupling also must source from both the room at large (central table or audience) as well as from the speaker and from the speaker's computer.
- (2) Inexpensive short- and medium-term housing for intercampus commuters and collaborators. This is critically important. Graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and faculty often need to travel to a collaborator's laboratory to work for a day, two weeks, or six months' time. Ithaca-based department chairs may need to visit the NYC-based laboratories of department members. Faculty may need to travel to the other campus to attend important talks or meet with visiting scholars. Affordable housing options for the time frame of weeks or months, in particular, are severely limited; indeed, the absence of such options has materially impaired intercampus research collaborations in the past. If intercampus collaborations and concrete interactions are a goal of the CornellNYC initiative, then affordable housing must be made available for timescales including days, weeks, and months.
- (3) Efficient intercampus transportation. This is already provided by the Campus-to-Campus bus service, which presumably will be extended to include the CornellNYC campus.

Departmental cohesion

It is unavoidable that Ithaca-based department chairs and other senior professors will have less opportunity to engage with new faculty based in NYC than if they were based in Ithaca (for purposes of judging performance, promotions, etc).. Departments (in Ithaca) that choose to hire tenure-track faculty with full-time CornellNYC appointments need to take responsibility for fairly assessing their progress and promotions. This could be facilitated by any of the below, which could be mandated centrally or left up to departments' judgment.

- CornellNYC faculty may be expected to offer occasional short courses at the Ithaca campus (e.g., during summer or winter session). While not greatly interfering with their semesters' responsibilities in NYC, these courses would improve NYC faculty's links to their Ithaca departments and also would help identify top student candidates in Ithaca for recruitment to

NYC for applied postgraduate work. This requirement could apply only to tenured/tenure-track faculty, or also include clinical faculty.

- Annual “NYC Research Events” or combined symposia on the Ithaca campus could serve much the same purpose, highlighting faculty research on the NYC campus and recruiting Cornell students to CornellNYC after graduation for postgraduate work and/or the incubation of their startup plans.
- Ithaca departments should supply NYC-based faculty with departmental office space in Ithaca, even if it is shared space. This will of course incur a cost in space and money.
- Ithaca departments should schedule major departmental meetings (e.g., annual self-evaluations) for times when NYC-based faculty can attend. For routine meetings, remote-meeting video/interaction links should be used to enable full participation by NYC-based faculty.
- Department chairs and other senior faculty should be expected to visit the NYC-based laboratories of department members occasionally, particularly prior to important evaluations such as tenure review.
- Have at least one CornellNYC-based faculty member serve on the review committee for hiring or promotion decisions.

Intercampus cohesion and interactions

Intercampus interactions beyond issues of departmental administration are likely to be based in research interactions – e.g., Ithaca’s strength in basic research coupled with NYC’s intended strength in practical/commercial development and technology transfer, or Ithaca’s strengths in biomedical engineering supporting NYC’s applied engineering work, given that the latter will lack its own biomedical facilities. Such interactions are likely to extend beyond the departments with affiliated faculty in NYC.

- Temporary, affordable housing (single nights/few days/weeks/months) for faculty, graduate students, and postdocs working on intercampus collaborations, department chairs visiting NYC laboratories, etc., will facilitate intercampus interactions and departmental cohesion significantly. Both Ithaca and NYC housing are indicated. This is a serious limitation at present (with Cornell-Weill interactions), especially in the weeks-months timeframe.
- NYC-based short-term housing could also support Ithaca-Weill Cornell interactions, particularly if the Roosevelt Island site is selected.
- Actively recruiting faculty with joint-campus appointments, or whose work is likely to involve spending substantial time at both the Ithaca and NYC campuses, will improve interactivity between the campuses.
- Small grants supporting time in NYC (to pay for travel, housing, development costs, etc.) for graduate students and postdocs interested in transforming their research work into practical/commercial applications.