A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2018

1.   CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Charlie Walcott: "I would like to call the meeting to order and, of course, remind the body that Senators have priority in speaking; that only Senators, or their designated alternatives, may vote, though, there's nothing to vote on at the moment. Please, please, please identify yourself, your name and department -- you know, name, rank, and serial number, and wait for the microphone so that we can transcribe the minutes and get it accurate. I suggest a maximum speaking time of a couple of minutes to allow for more speakers.

"And we have two approvals we need, the April 11th minutes and the April 25th minutes. And hearing no objections, I hope, these are approved by consent.

"So Mr. Dean, sir?"

2.   ANNOUNCEMENTS WITH Q&A (slides)

Dean Charles Van Loan: "Okay. So a couple of announcements, and then we'll get into the main content, which is about the Social Sciences.

"So you may know that we had an election, and there were results. And we have a great group coming onboard. Melissa Hines will be the new Faculty trustee, replacing Mariana Wolfner. And Mariana is actually going to go to the UFC, and whatever. Anyway, so these are very important. Every year, we have elections, and we really need people to step forward like these folks to take on these responsibilities.

"It is amazing, we have all these bylaws with instructions that we don't pay attention to. So one of them is that I'm supposed to give a report, a very brief report, about FACTA, which is one of our most important Faculty committees which deals with tenure appointments.

"And there's a schematic that shows you the overall process, right. So at both the college and provost levels, there are committees that provide advice, and FACTA is the

one for the provost. Okay. And this is a very labor -- this group works really, really hard. And let me now give you the results or summary statistics from the last two years.

"Okay. So we get tenure cases. People who are hired coming in with tenure, don't go through the FACTA process. So these are all assistant professors, okay, whose dossier started in the department, went through the college, and now arrived at the provost office.

"And the FACTA committee consists of about 15 people totally across all the colleges. Okay. And each dossier is read by about four people. I say "about" because last year, we had a huge number, and we had to streamline the process a bit. But the key is that multiple people look at a particular dossier. And, of course, you know, you don't read anything from your college; and there's all kinds of things like that.

"If any of those four people have a concern, however minor, all right, then it goes what's called full FACTA. That means the dossier will then show up in a meeting of all 15 people, okay, where things are discussed. Each FACTA member writes a couple of paragraphs about their thoughts. You go around the table, you talk about it, and then a vote is taken. This is all advisory to the provost.

"So, anyway, like last year, we had kind of a record number of cases -- sorry, dossiers. Eleven of them got flagged for full FACTA; and of those, five walked out of the FACTA process with a positive recommendation; six, it was either negative or concern. Sometimes it's split, okay. So that was the case last year; this year, slightly smaller numbers.

"Anyone have any questions about the FACTA process? Yeah, Matt?"

Senator Matthew Evangelista, Government: "So those big numbers, 58 and 45, are the total number of cases put forward by departments with a positive recommendation for tenure?"

Dean Van Loan: "That is right. Like this year, 45 assistant professors went up for tenure across the University."

Senator Evangelista: "Thank you."

Dean Van Loan: "Yes? Name and microphone"

Senator Jack Zinda, Development Sociology: "What are the -- I may have misheard, but what are the triggers for a case to go to FACTA?"

Dean Van Loan: "Everything goes to FACTA; it's a stop along the way."

Senator Zinda, Development Sociology. "Or goes to full FACTA, then."

Dean Van Loan: "So there are four of us are going to read a folder, and maybe there's something that, you know, hey, I don't think the ad hoc committee did that right or I don't get the disconnect between this letter and that letter; anything whatsoever can trigger a full FACTA thing. Sometimes they are minor. You know, it's like if in doubt, throw it to full FACTA to make sure that the proper number of eyes look at the folder to ensure fairness and everything like that."

Senator John Brady, Food Science: "If the vote at the departmental or college level was negative, do they get included in this 58 or – "

Dean Van Loan: "Everything can go up through appeals and stuff like that, yeah.

"Okay. So, incidentally -- oh, Neil. I thought this is like a no brainer, but nothing is a no brainer in this group. There are no brainers here."

Senator Neil Saccamano, English. "I am just curious, are there any statistics about how many of these were positive recommendations by the ad hoc committee and the dean before they went to FACTA?"

Dean Van Loan: "That is not part of it. All I report are these stats.

"So your concern is what is the lay of the land in terms of disconnects between ad hocs. So we meant to get to this this year, but we're definitely getting to it next year, which is this process and looking at it, there is variation across the colleges. What are the criteria? What is the definition of a majority vote?

"There are tons of things. We are not going to get uniformity across the ten colleges, but we should be able to get guidelines. You know, often ad hoc committee problems show up, and that is a particular -- so, you know, that blue arrow is something we want to really look at hard."

Senator Saccamano: "Right. Just a quick follow up because I'm a little concerned that there's a full Faculty vote in favor, the ad hoc committee is unanimous in favor, the

dean passes it on, and one person out of four people who are initially looking at the dossier can say, wait a second, what's going on here? That seems a little odd."

Dean Van Loan: "To have such a low trigger point?"

Senator Saccamano: "Yeah, to have such a low trigger point."

Dean Van Loan: "Well, again, the key is that we want to make sure they all -- these are the most important decisions we make here, and you kind of want a low threshold to make sure, you know, there is no oversights. Anyway, so this is a topic that we'll spend more time on next year.

"Okay. So, like, what's next year's big thing? Okay. So it's going to be -- you have seen snapshots of it off and on. It has to do with how we schedule the week. This hasn't been looked at in decades, and there are various concerns. You have seen one of them concerned with classroom use. Remember the 20, 30, 30, 20 trying to get more classes at 8 o'clock in the morning to get off the prime times? That is one corner of this operation.

"Things have changed in 40 years. Do we have the right ratio of 75 to 50-minute slots? What do things look like over the week? Okay. Can we get creative? There is the 4:30 to 7:30 no-go zone. Okay. Everything is on the table. Let us look at all this stuff. There are practical facility related things which has to do with classroom use. How do we -- what's the algorithm for assigning courses to classes? Why isn't it near your office? Stuff like that.

"So over the summer, I'm going to get a lot of data, think about this stuff, and we'll start the ball rolling in September about this. So it's the week version of the calendar problem, right? Let us see if we can come up with something better.

"Okay. So the end game here. Let me just say a few things -- and happy to answer any question you want, subject to time constraints. Okay. So just to be super clear on how the end game was played, this was part of the charge which was announced to the entire campus in October, which is that we have these five -- six entities here who will vote and will pass along those votes and any attending commentary they want to the president. Okay?

"And we've done that really nicely. So we had, you know, 15 pages of really good comments from Senators gathered just last week and so on, and the votes. The other "

"So that's the process. So a couple of questions. So one is -- and we inverted this. In other words, instead of the committee wrapping things up and then showing things to these five assemblies, we inverted that. We sketched out some things, you responded; and then we responded.

"So the question that we have or saved is: How can you vote against the two assemblies who are most interested in this, which is the GPSA and us? And the reason is, you know, you don't want to have, like, an iClicker polling station for a committee. We thought about stuff. We looked at all the comments. We weren't -- our minds really didn't change as a result of the assembly votes.

"And so we're just one of those six folders on Martha's desk. We reasoned about stuff, like you did. We justified our things and so on.

"A few comments about some of the numbers there. So, again, I did an email after our meeting two weeks ago to make sure we got as many departments weighing in as possible. So we have really good stats this way. The grad students, I'm a little surprised. Compared to last year, they had talked about this issue in whole meetings, several of them. We showed up in the grad student and gave a presentation and whatever, but it was a lower profile. They had 50 percent sort of return on their polling and whatever, and with some comments and whatever. So, anyway... And then the other assemblies, you can sort of see the results there.

"So where is this right now? Okay. So, again, all this stuff is, quote, on Martha's desk. And you can see what the dilemma is, right? You know, she charged this committee, and we said X. And the assemblies -- you know, the Senate said: So how do you balance that?

"So that's what's going on right now, to find some kind of middle ground that guarantees that no one is happy. Okay? I can assure you that, no one is going to be happy with the final result. There will be some corner of it that you're going to disagree with. So it's not going to be A, it's not going to be B, it's going to be something in between. Okay? And what that something is is to be worked out.

"Now, there is going to be -- the final destination of all this is official University policy. So after Martha and her circle, or whatever, figure out what they want to do, then it goes to a drafting -- you know, policy drafting group, which will no doubt include

human resources and University counsel. But I'm lobbying very hard that we should be in that inner circle to make sure things are done in a way that's consistent with our views. Especially like this 6X office that you heard about, which is central to everything, and it has to be done right. Okay?

"Anyway, that's where things are. I just want to pause right here -- oh, and one very positive thing here. So, you know, we received a couple hundred comments over the last few months. Not one of them had to be censored or I didn't have to remove any, you know, bad language or anything like that. It was very high level discussion.

"When we started, people were saying you're going to get hate mail, you're going to get death threats. None of that happened! Maybe there is still plenty of time, but none of that happened. So I'm so much in favor of this open style. There is nothing to be afraid of. I like the debates we had. And, you know, if you're on the other side from me, I always think of you as you're sharpening my argument, and I hope I'm sharpening yours. That is the way it should be. So I think it was a really interesting exercise.

"Let me shut up and answer any questions you have about this. I know my fan base has been eroded, but any comments whatsoever about this?"

Senator Jery Stedinger, Civil & Environmental Engineering: "If you sub the columns for A and B, it drastically exceeds what's neither, so it seems to me you have a very strong consensus for at least B. And then, if you look between the two, the majority -- at least looking at the Senate and the graduate and professional, doesn't really want to go from B all the way to A. So I would think the President would come out with B."

Dean Van Loan: "Okay. Let us do a little math here. First of all, if you add columns A and B, the statement you emerge with, is that the undergraduate ban is a sure thing. And incidentally -- because that's in common with both of those and different than the "neithers". We will be the last Ivy League college to get that. Earlier this semester, Columbia and Penn instituted that; and now we'll be the eighth school, so that's a given.

"In terms of averaging here, B is not the compromise between A and neither. Here is the irony. The outside world -- the public, the trustees, the undergrad thing looms large; but, actually, the more sensitive and important thing is the grad student thing. Okay.

"So people who are in the A camp, you know, you have -- here's neither, here's A. B is quite far over this way. So it's not an averaging sort of thing. And then, it's not just the numbers, it's votes plus commentary. Okay? Votes plus commentary. And that's by no means uniform or cross the different columns there. So it's not a simple math problem of a majority rules sort of thing and whatever.

"But, anyway, it's on Martha's desk. And I don't know what the time line is -- hopefully, fairly soon there'll be some outline of a recommended policy.

"Any -- yeah? Oh, yeah. This is one more quick thing. I am sorry. Yeah?"

Senator Aaron Sachs, History: "Is there someone with a diagnosis of schizophrenia on the CRP committee?"

Dean Van Loan: "What does that mean?"

Senator Sachs: "I am just wondering about the decimals."

Dean Van Loan: "Oh, yeah. So we do this kind of thing, undergraduates and graduates are -- we're all busy, but undergrads and grads are busy with constraints. So what we say is, for example: hey, there are three seats for undergraduates. Here are six people. We don't care who shows up.

"So say five undergraduates vote, each of their votes count three-fifths. See how that works? Because there are three slots. I know it's complicated math. We can settle this offline. We have two math questions in the back there that are -- but it's not a -- sorry about the decimal point. I know it's... Okay.

"Just quick, Chris Schaffer is sick today, so I have to stand in for this part of the operation. Just a real quick note here. We have this idea that we want to explore, which is this: After a Senate meeting, we sort of digest what's happened. The UFC then formulates possible resolutions for the Senate to pass the next time. It is a real interesting idea. We are going to pursue it. Right now, it's a little tricky time wise. We are at the end of the year; and, also, the April 11th Senate meeting dealt with the Social Sciences and same today, so it's split over two weeks.

"So the UFC figured -- or recommends, and what we want to do now is sort of digest this meeting and combine it with the April 11th meeting, and then go forward with

perhaps some sense of the Senate resolutions. Anyway, small details. It is an idea. We will certainly pursue this more in the fall.

"Okay. So what we want to now do is talk about certain aspects proposed by the Organizational Structures Committee that have nothing to do with the merger. All right. The merger has nominated the campus discussion, and there's discussion in here a month ago.

3.   CONTINUED DISCSSUION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW WITH FOCUS ON THE FOLLOWING IDEAS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATIONAL STUCTURES – PROFESSOR KIM WEEDEN, SOCIOLOGY, PROFESSOR DANIEL LICHTER, POLICY ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT, SOCIOLOGY; PROFESSOR JEFF NIEDERDEPPE, COMMUNICATION, PROFESSOR JOHN CAWLEY, POLICY ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT

Dean Van Loan: "So we have four social scientists in the room somewhere who will speak to various parts -- maybe their favorite part of this committee's recommendation. So first is Kim and Daniel. Are you both here? They have lumped these two together because they're similar. It's like making bigger things out of smaller things and whatever. So the plan here is for each of our four guests to talk maybe for five minutes about some aspect of this. We will have sort of a chitchat, and I'm sure they'll be intermingling and circling back.

"So, Kim, why don't you start?"

PROFESSOR KIM WEEDEN, Sociology: **"**Sure. I actually think that Charlie put Dan and me together so you guys can see a boxing match actually live and in person here.

"So I think there is actually a little bit of false advertising. I wanted to speak mostly to the super department proposal, which in some sense is a type of merger; although, I think it's a much less aggressive form of merger than the one that's dominated the conversation so far about the ILR-CHE merger.

"And I wanted to sort of put forward a pitch. I should say that this is me, speaking for me as a sociologist member of the Sociology faculty here. I have not actually discussed this within my department. Our department mostly focused on the center of -- or the Social Sciences Center idea and came out in opposition to it. But I'm sure we can have that conversation after Dan goes.

"So what about the idea of a super department? I think the model here that at least I'm thinking about is something like Ecology and Evolutionary Biology or Molecular and MBG -- what does MBG stand for? But, basically, a department where lines are split across two colleges, but the department really acts as one department. And this, I think, is fairly crucial because I think that, so far, a lot of the efforts that Cornell has put into encouraging collaboration and solving some of the structural problems at Cornell in Social Sciences have really been halfway measures; and halfway measures, I think, get you actually less than halfway.

"So I'm going to circle around back to that, but first I want to talk a little bit about some of the benefits, as I see them, of this type of thinking about a super department. First of all, I'm going to give you a little bit of a Sociology lesson here.

"So we know from organizational Sociology that external evaluators in particular put less value on offerings that don't fit neatly into existing categories, right? If something doesn't fit into your cognitive map of how academia works, how academia is structured, you tend to put less value on that. What happens is that because Cornell has so many units that are really unique to Cornell, external evaluators don't know what to do with those things; they don't know how to evaluate the work that goes into them. And I would pause it that they actually contribute less to the overall reputation of Cornell Social Sciences than they could if they fit more neatly into the boxes that people are used to being able to check.

"Notice that this is absolutely independent of the quality of the scholarship that is going on in those particular units. Right? This is a sociological structural explanation, not an individual level quality explanation. Structures matter, but so do categories and so do labels.

"Second, I think that they're economies of scale. As the external committee noted, service demands don't scale down perfectly with the size of departments. A faculty member in a small department will end up doing twice as much service as a faculty member in a department that's twice as large simply because their turn is going to come around more often. This, of course, is a drain on productivity.

"I should also note that it's something for which some of the Cornell Social Sciences are known outside of Cornell as being a drain on productivity because there are so many

service demands at Cornell relative to other universities. This is not something that we want to be known for, particularly, I think.

"You can also have greater efficiency in the curriculum. I think you end up with a situation where there's less overlap in the curriculum if you have more coordination, essentially one department putting together a curriculum instead of two departments.

"Fourth, I think the smaller the department, the more volatility it experiences both internally and in the eyes of external evaluators and gatekeepers. If you have 20 FCE and you lose one faculty member to an external raid, that's, of course, 5 percent of your faculty body. It can create holes in the curriculum, but those holes tend to be pretty manageable, right? Life goes on in that department.

"If you lose one faculty member and you only have 10 FCE, that's, of course, a much bigger hit. That's 10 percent of your pedagogical and resource for sources. Small equals volatile, and volatility can itself hurt reputations.

"Finally, I think that larger departments -- first of all, they hire more often, there is more opportunities to refresh the faculty to bring in new ideas. In my own department of Sociology, we've been very successful at some senior hires, but the consequence is it's been about five years since we've even had a junior search. And this is very, very unusual among elite departments, in my discipline.

"I also think that if you have a slightly larger faculty body, you also tend to open up space for some more interesting hires. Right? There is less of a kind of, well, we have to protect the two or three areas that we're really, really good in; we don't have enough faculty lines to create a new cluster or a new area of strength, so we're just going to focus on those three. I think that tends to lead to some fairly insular hiring in a way that really disadvantages Cornell.

"And then, finally, I wanted to sort of conclude with a few principles that I think these super departments should follow. First of all, like any other form of merger, they really only make sense if there is a shared intellectual mission. I think that there's a tendency to look at units and say: Well, you know, I don't really understand what those people do, I don't really understand what those people do, let's put them together and then maybe then I'll understand what they do more.

"What I'm saying is that we really need to think carefully about what this shared intellectual mission is. And I don't mean what goes on in the mission statement, right? As chair of Sociology, I've written plenty of mission statements, usually in response to some administrator asking me to. They tend to be kind of fictions, I think. I would prefer to think about revealed preferences. So what types of journals are people publishing in in that field? What types of journals are they aspiring to publish in? That, I think, is a way that you can identify a shared intellectual mission that might be a little bit more empirically based.

"And then, finally, to circle back around to this idea of halfway measures, the Sociology department which, of course, is what I know best, we've tried courtesy appointments, we've tried voting joint appointments where people have a vote in our department but don't actually get paid anything by our department, we've had external search committee members that are shared, we do extensive cross-listing of courses, of course the field system itself creates some opportunities for collaboration.

"I think that all of these are really partial measures, at best. They have been tried over the last 20 years, they haven't really succeeded, I think, in all respects. And in some cases, they have unanticipated consequences. For example, when a faculty member with a joint appointment is expected to go to twice as many faculty meetings and serve on as twice as many committees, this isn't necessarily good for that faculty member's research or for the aggregate Social Sciences at Cornell.

"I also think that we need to think about shared location as being crucial. We know that a lot of collaborations come out of watercooler conversations, and we need to foster that in some way. And I also think that we need to think about shared standards within departments; recognizing that different colleges may have different missions, and we need to be respectful of those particular missions to the contributing units to the super departments.

"And then the last thing I want to say is that I think the idea of a super department is not incompatible with a lot of these other ideas. For example, you can think of the super departments, it doesn't prevent the idea of a policy school, as well. You could have a super department of sociologists in Sociology and PAM as kind of the natural partner with a shared intellectual mission, but have the policy school where the policy lines are held in -- or the lines are actually held in that department. This is essentially

the Princeton model for the Woodrow Wilson School, basically, that most of the lines for the Wilson School, as I understand it, are actually held by the disciplinary units themselves.

"There is a policy school that's sort of overlaid on top of stronger departments. This has allowed Princeton Sociology to grow from actually 16 lines to 20 lines, which is not a trivial type of growth in terms of size.

"So I'm going to stop there and turn over the floor to Dan."

[Professor Daniel Lichter](#), Policy Analyis & Management: "Hello, everyone. Thanks for coming. I am just going to start out by saying sort of where I come from. I am in Policy Analysis and Management. I also have one of these nonpaying lines, full voting member in the Sociology department; plus, I'm the ISS director -- current ISS director for the Social Sciences, for those of you who don't know. And I've been the director of the Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center before it became the Translational Center. And I was also one of the early members, or founding members, of the Population Research Center here -- the Cornell Population Center.

"And I guess I've been here for 13 years now. And I guess -- in response to the organization or the structure report, I guess my first reaction is, yes, I'm for change; and that is, I think it's time to think about a fundamental restructuring of the Social Sciences at Cornell. And I'll tell you why I think that's the case. I don't think -- as perhaps we had last time, maybe people will disagree with me. I don't think -- as we did at the last Senate meeting, I don't think we should start out by saying "no." I think we should start out by listening, regardless of what our situation is.

"I think there is a lot of reasons why we might want to rethink the way we're structured. In some ways, I think we're so 1950s in a lot of ways about how we've organized some of our one-off departments, one-off colleges; and I think it's time to think about a serious reorganization and restructuring to revitalize our brand. Now, I realize that's maybe not something that everybody agrees with.

"Let me start with the centers, which is one of the ideas. So I'm very much -- and I've argued this in other places I've been, is I like to see some kind of platform, Social Science structure, that works as kind of a clearinghouse, as an organizational

clearinghouse for other centers where it's the platform to create a collective vision around a number of different Social Science units.

"So I'm in favor, generally, in principle of the restructuring idea, and I think there's at least three reasons why I think it's an important thing to do. One is simply a marketing point. And I think a lot of the things that we're talking about in the report itself has to do with just marketing. How do we put ourselves in a best possible position to attract faculty and students as we move forward?

"The next 10 to 15 years is going to be a massive period of retirement. We have a lot of young people coming up. I was on the new Presidential Scholarship post-op program, and it was just amazing the amount of diversity in that group of people who were interviewed by our committee compared to what is going out and retiring over the next several years.

"So one is, simply, marketing. What are the new exciting things that put us in a position to be successful with our faculty over the next 10 or 15 years?

"There is also, I think, efficiencies here. I think my sense since I've been here is we give a little bit of money out to a lot of different centers, not enough for any of them. And I would like to see some sort of effort where we can be more efficient; where we work together on staff, physical infrastructure, space, computing resources, statistical resources, and so on where we buy into a particular platform that all of us share.

"I would also like to see us somehow, instead of being such a bottom, up kind of University, which has been what has characterized Cornell, I'd like to see leadership -- more leadership at the middle range and at the higher levels where there is some sort of way that we can think more carefully about a coherent plan for the future.

"What are the hot topics for the next generation? What are young people today in the Social Sciences thinking about? What are the new technological developments in the Social Sciences that will push us forward in the next 10 to 15 years?

"And there's a lot of things here that relate to radical collaboration I think that can do that. We can think about the Environmental Sciences, behavior response to climate change; or we can think about data science, big data and so on. I think we have some real advantages here. We have the Weill Medical Center, as well. So I think there are

some real advantages that we have to think beyond the things we've traditionally done at the University in Social Sciences.

"Again, there's lots of things going on here. I think in the case of super departments, I'll just say a few things. I almost agree with everything that Kim said. I think of this, again, as a kind of federation. I think that we should revamp probably the field system, where the fields really do mean something, where we have a common portal for recruitment, where we have a common training program in Sociology or Economics or in Psychology; those are the three most commonly mentioned departments that might benefit from some kind of super department.

"I think we have to work together to be bigger. I think, again, that can be an attractive thing. Again, just to say it again: I don't think we need a lot of one-off departments. I think these departments are being evaluated on a disciplinary basis. It seems to me we could do a lot of sensible things.

"I have been arguing, for example, to have a joint Ph.D. program, training program in Sociology and Public Policy. There are a lot of students out there now who are very much interested in Public Policy. So I think a lot of that relates, again, to sharing of resources, sharing of students, sharing of physical and staff infrastructure and so on. And I think that also can be something that will move us forward.

"And, again, a lot of this is simply a marketing thing. How can we attract the best students? How can we attract the best faculty who are doing some of the things that maybe aren't within in our current comfort zone?

"I don't do Environmental Science, I don't do Computational Science, I don't do Biosocial Behavior, but those are all things I think that are reshaping the Social Sciences. And the Social Sciences, right now, I think are at a point where many of our most important social problems are problems in society have to do with behavior and social change, technological change where the culture, where the social response or the economic response is responding to those rapid social changes in globalization, new technologies, and so on. So that's sort of where I'm coming from. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Okay. We are kind of a committee as a whole, so questions, comments to these? Yes, on the right there?"

Senator Cynthia Bowman, Law School: "Hello. Is it on? Yep.

"I came here from Northwestern University where there is a thing called the Institute for Policy Studies. And it wasn't so much as to make the Social Sciences great but, in fact, integrate -- and it does in a miraculously wonderful way -- Social Sciences and doing studies that are adduced to the Chicago community. They produce both sort of short white papers, and faculty get assigned -- they get course relief and get assigned to the IPS and write books about educational reform in Chicago, welfare reform, all different kinds of things.

"That is the kind of thing I would like to see here, and I don't see it kind of appearing in these sort of, well, this department will work with that department, and then we'll write better things and we'll look better."

Senator John Cawley, Policy Analysis & Management: "Can I speak for a minute? John Cawley. Public Policy School here, and I think –"

Senator Bowman: "Well, Public Policy School at Northwestern is, I think – "

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Public Policy School is Institute for Policy Studies, IPS, and I suggest it as [off mic]. Is that a degree granting public policy?"

Speaker Walcott: "Are there other comments, questions, concerns? Right behind you."

Senator Richard Bensel, Government: "So I have two questions, one for Kim and one for Dan.

"Kim, you describe the super department in many ways as having real and substantive advantages with the faculty members, reducing service obligations, so forth and so on. There were very few that's from the outside who said we need to do this. One of them was reputation; and, that, you can change with just changing the name of units if it's just categories that are recognized.

"But the real question is: If there are all these benefits for individual faculty members, why don't we let those individual faculty members decide whether or not they should merge? I mean, this looks a little bit like castor oil to me for children.

"And, Dan, a quote from you: We do not need a lot of one-off departments.

"What are you going to do with them? I mean, the one-offs, we don't need them, are we going to abolish them?"

: "So, I mean, I think these are great questions. With respect to the idea of the, you know, should this come from the top, down or the bottom, up, nothing that I had said today is actually new. So I have been fortunate enough to be here for 17 years, which means I think I've been through two evaluations of the Social Sciences already. I was part of that committee that actually talked a lot about super departments, and that eventually led maybe five years later to the Economics merger, right?

"So a lot of these ideas have been out there before. I think that -- there are two responses. Yes, I think that we do, of course, want to pay attention to the wishes of the faculty who are here now as the existing constituencies, to which I would add, also, the students who are here now and the alumni who have gone through the system before.

"But I also think if we really are thinking about a 15-year horizon here, we have to pay attention to the constituencies that don't yet exist. And I think that one of the problems is we tend to personalize these decisions quite a lot, "What's it going to mean for me," as opposed to "What's it going to be like for Cornell in 15 years" when, you know, I may not even be here, who knows.

"And I think that, yes, we want to be bottom, up. But I think when you have a bottom, up decision making, you tend to get a little bit more of the "What's it going to mean for me" or "What's it going to mean for the particular consolation of faculty members who are here right now," as opposed to that kind of longer-term vision."

"And I also think that, you know, some of these issues, because they would cross colleges, they're really not up to faculty members and individual departments to be able to solve some of the structural problems that come along with the super department itself. And I think that, you know, that really does require input by the central administration and in some cases resources that -- you know, there has to be resources that are attached to these things; and that's well beyond the individual departments or the faculty members within them to allocate."

: "I am not thinking about eliminating particular departments in the sense of eliminating factor. I am thinking about if there are psychologists scattered around the University, some in very small units, or sociologists that are in very small units, why can't they be incorporated into a larger field system that's inclusive of sociologists with a Ph.D. across the entire campus? Why can't they participate in a

governing structure to recruit in the entire Sociology field in a way that it's to the betterment of that Sociology field in terms of faculty, training and so on?

"When I talk about a one-off, what I'm really referring to is: What is the point -- and, again, this is a debatable point. What is the point of having a department that doesn't necessarily get evaluated in the national rankings, that people don't know about it except in a very tiny little area? What is the advantage of being the best of a declining or small lot? That is the question I've been asking some of my colleagues. What is the point of doing that?

"And we have a tremendous group of social scientists on campus, just a really superb group doing lots of things.   have been co-chairing this Ideas Panel. People are doing so many interesting things, but they're spread out thinly over a lot of different departments.

"And in the case of Sociology, if we would include those in the entire field -- we've got Development Sociology, for example. Development Sociology is one of the fastest growing sections of the American Sociological Association, yet, they're outside the main Sociology department.

"Policy Analysis and Management is another department that includes a lot of sociologists. Why not include them as part of the training program in Sociology? So that's what I'm thinking about."

[Senator Bensel:](#) "Is there time for a follow-up?"

[Professor Lichter](#): "Yeah, sure."

[Senator Bensel:](#) "So to follow up, I mean. To follow up Dan, again, you're repeating what was Kim's thing, which is if there are advantages for all these people, why don't they favor it? Why don't you ask them?

"There are two things about this that I'm really skeptical about. One is the ability to forecast in a major way the trends, and it sounds faddish to me; and it sounds like, as Kim said, it's marketing. And I'm not very interested in marketing, I'm more interested in intellectual diversity in an academic and university community. And I think Cornell does that very well right now.

"And I see the homogenization that comes from, you know, around the watercooler, or whatever these arguments are. I see that homogenization and kind of centralization, along with faddishness and along with empowering the central administration to decide these things for us; I see all those things as negative."

Speaker Walcott: "Okay. Are there other comments, questions? Do you want to add to that?"

Professor Weeden: "I guess I would say that it's not just marketing at all. And I think that -- you know, one of my problems about -- larger departments I think have more intellectual freedoms, make interesting hires, I actually think that that's an empirical fact. And it comes from the tenancy of small departments to -- you can't be good at everything.

"So in American Sociological Association, I think we're up to 55 sections. So there are almost as many sections as there are people who are members, which is pretty cool. You can have your own section and be president and vice president of it.

"But, you know, Cornell Sociology and the Arts College has really focused on maybe three areas, depending on how you slice things. And it's because with 11 faculty lines, or whatever, you can't be good at more than three areas. I think if you have larger departments, you can kind of hire more strategically. And there's also just a little bit more space. You know, the marginal value of that 20th line means that you have some freedom to be able to do something kind of interesting with it and hire somebody who maybe is a little bit different, start a new cluster that might build into a strength later.

"So I actually see these kind of super departments as actually being more intellectually nimble in some ways than a smaller department can be. Maybe that's -- you know, I think that's an empirical question. I'm not sure we know the answer to it. But I think that's an alternative to what I think you're saying.

"It is not just marketing. Marketing is part of it. I want really strong graduate students at Cornell, and I think that some of that comes from how the Cornell Social Sciences are perceived in the external world. So that's not irrelevant to my life as an intellectual, but it's certainly not all of it. I would agree entirely there. I mean, we shouldn't be just chasing US News and World Report's ranking. Which, incidentally, in Sociology, 32 people answered the survey on which US News and World rankings are based."

Speaker Walcott: "Charlie?"

Dean Van Loan: "This is a quick question for Kim. You brought up MBG and EEB, is it because they're cross college? What were the attributes? And how were they formed? Do we have Senators from those units? Was there -- did something happen like 20 years ago that we should know about?"

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, I can answer that."

Dean Van Loan: "Okay. And then Linda."

Speaker Walcott: "When I was a graduate student here in 1956, basic Biology was scattered throughout the University. And in about 1965 or so, it was brought together in a division of Biological Sciences with a bunch of sections underneath it. And it came with a big pot of money from the Ford Foundation from the National Institute of Health.

"And what it did was to bring all the basic biologists together in a group of departments which were from the various colleges, and they included entomology, which was -- and CALS and Arts and Sciences principally.

"And that worked very well for a great many years, as long as it had money. And then when I became director of the division, it had no money of its own and was totally subservient on the deans of CALS and Arts with a bit of input from Human Ecology. And the general feeling was that that administered mechanism didn't make much sense. And so these sections which had been part of the division of Biology, became independent departments. And because there were a bunch of molecular biologists and geneticists, they formed a group and became a department. And Neurobiology and Behavior, which I'm a member of, is another example of the same kind of thing.

"Sorry for the history."

Dean Van Loan: "Linda at the top there. "

Senator Linda Nicholson, MBG. "Charlie said it really well. The only thing I would add, I think it was around '99 or so -- 1999, somewhere around there, and I talk about it as a faculty revolt, basically when the division broke down and the departments were formed. It was definitely a ground movement, at least from what I could see."

Speaker Walcott: "Yes, sir?"

Senator Thomas Björkman, Horticulture: "You mentioned some numbers on faculty size. I wonder from each of you specific numbers on when does the department get too small to be intellectually vibrant enough? What is a nice middle size, and when does it become so big that it falls apart into sections?"

Professor Weeden: "So I can only speak to what I know about in Sociology, that's all I can say. So I know that the Cornell Arts and Sciences Sociology department is about 40 percent the size of our peers. We are maybe 70, 80 percent the size of our elite private peers, and much, much smaller than the public peers, right?

"But I also think, you know, Cornell is unique in many ways, and that the Arts College itself is a much smaller share of the faculty than there is at those other institutions.

"I would say that the Cornell Sociology department has gone through periods typically through rating by other departments where it's really become quite marginal whether it can kind of continue as a vibrant department. So I think shortly before I arrived, there was a period where I think we were down to eight faculty members, which is barely enough to keep the lights on, really.

"So, you know, I don't know that there is one answer, that it's going to vary by discipline and all sorts of other things. But I think that we want to be closer to the median."

Senator Björkman: "What is too big?"

Speaker Walcott: "If you had a merger and you ended up with 150 faculty, that wouldn't work."

Senator Björkman: "That is a dream."

Professor Weeden: "No, it's not; it's a nightmare."

[LAUGHTER]

Speaker Walcott: "I think we need to move along to the next speaker. Is Jeff Niederdeppe here?"

Professor Jeff Niederdeppe, Communication: "Let me see if we can find me."

Speaker Walcott: "Go to the end."

Professor Niederdeppe: "I have ruined everything here. Mostly I want to see this because I really like the look of "Professor Jeff Niederdeppe," not associate professor!

[LAUGHTER]

"So thank you very much for the promotion.

"So I'm Jeff Niederdeppe. I am in Communication within CALS. My work is on the role of media and strategic messages in shaping health behaviors and social policy. And I thought I'd talk today about my views on the Organizational Structure Committee report section on the potential for creating a structure to organize and promote health related scholarships at Cornell.

"I guess the big question I'm going to ask is: What are the problems we're trying to solve? And I'm going to articulate some problems, and then leave it to you to question whether organizational restructure or other things are better or worse solutions to those problems.

"So I'll begin by saying that I agree with the committee's central premise, that there's tremendous strength and widespread interest in health related Social Science scholarship here at Cornell. But I want to focus my comments on various policies and practices here that act as barriers. It is three different things.

"One, cross college collaborations on educational programs related to health; two, interdisciplinary health related research collaboration that involves social scientists; and three, greater external funding for health related Social Science research.

"So, first, on barriers to cross college educational programs. As noted in the report, there are at least four different public health related educational programs at Cornell that span at least four colleges. I have spent my entire career doing collaborative interdisciplinary research on public health issues. I have post doctoral training in Population Health Science, and I teach two courses on Public Health Communication. And I have no connection to any four of these entities, and the reason is there is absolutely no incentive for me to do so. And, in fact, there are very strong disincentives for me to do so. And I think that this is because the budget model that supports these programs delivers financial returns only to the colleges that host them.

"Let me give you an example of my experience in this realm. I was part of early-stage discussions about the MPH program. And one version of this -- of these discussions considered having my graduate seminar course to serve as one of the Social Science requirements for the program.

"So we had some discussions about this, and I learned through these discussions that offering my course in this capacity would have quadrupled the number of students in my seminar, would have also brought a much higher likelihood of being asked to serve on student committees, and almost certain to supervise many thesis projects. And these commitments sort of come without any sort of compensation whatsoever. No TA line, no discretionary money, no salary support but, obviously, very clear costs to my time and efforts.

"So I guess the first thing I want to say is that a business model that builds new educational programs without sufficient funds and instead relies on existing structures and volunteered time and effort is not a sustainable model for cross department, cross college educational programs. They require substantial investment, and they require incentives to faculty who might be involved in them.

"Second, I want to say a few things on barriers to interdisciplinary health related research collaboration that involves people like me, social scientists. And I'll say that I personally have found there to be very few such barriers for collaborative work in my department and my college, but I know that they exist in other units; and they're quite strong.

"So in my ten years here, I've been involved in research collaborations involving faculty in PAM, in Natural Resources, in Nutritional Science, even the law school. And I've met almost all of the social scientists who've spoken in these three Ideas Panels that Dan and Valerie have put together, so it's not like I don't connect to Social Sciences.

"However, despite all these personal connections, I've been involved in far fewer collaborations with researchers here. I have been involved with lots of researchers in departments that we have faculty here, but not with members of these actual faculty.

"So I have collaborated with sociologists, with political scientists, economists, psychologists, public health, medical professors at other institutions. And I'm comfortable doing this because my department in college, Communication in CALS,

value and incentivize publishing in interdisciplinary journals, as well as securing grants with large interdisciplinary teams.

"I guess I would argue that we're not going to solve the pressing health issues of our time without an interdisciplinary approach; yet, it's pretty difficult to collaborate if members of a research time are told that in order to get tenure and promotion, that they have to publish in discipline-specific journals or that interdisciplinary grants and publications are nice, but, you know, they don't actually count.

"I would argue that these kind of publications absolutely contribute to the stated goal of the Social Sciences report, creating conditions where major discoveries are made at Cornell. And it's not yet clear to me, at least, how restructuring or reorganizing departments and units is likely to address this particular issue.

"Finally, I'll say a few things on barriers to greater external funding for health related Social Science research. And I guess I'll start with the premise that there is pretty widespread recognition that social, economic, and behavioral factors matter far more for health and wellbeing than to medical care; yet, you know, our federal funding priorities don't really recognize this fact. I have to say, I'm not super confident in the current administration or political world to sort of move on from this.

"So my view, it's foundations and NGOs who tend to support research on the social, economic, and behavioral determinants of health. But, again, there's pretty strong disincentives to pursue this kind of research at Cornell.

"So one version of this disincentive is the requirement which I know exists in multiple colleges, if not all, for researchers to spend their own discretionary funds to offset the difference between foundation and NGO indirect costs and whatever is termed the break-even rate, which is driven by federal rates. In other words, to the individual researcher, I have to pay money to bring in money for the institution.

"So in my world, efforts to promote health related research in the Social Sciences here need to account for the fact that foundations are -- the infrastructure costs associated with Social Science health related research is way lower for Social Science projects, and that's why these indirect costs are lower. The foundations don't need to pay for the synchrotron to incentivize or to fund Social Science research.

"So I guess I'll close by saying that I worry a bit that some of the debated options have more potential to further exacerbate these problems than to directly address them. And I would suggest, instead, that we focus our efforts on creating incentives, financial or otherwise, to encourage widespread faculty participation in these cross college educational programs, to recognize or dare I say celebrate interdisciplinary scholarships in tenure and promotion, and to cultivate non-governmental sources for research funding. Thanks."

Speaker Walcott: "Comments, questions, reactions? When you go down the list of all the options, maybe I missed it, is there one that has some potential for your concerns?"

Professor Niederdeppe: "On the one hand, I think the idea of overarching sensor structure has potential to bring people together and, you know, that costs -- it's not resource neutral, I guess is a problem with it. So we're talking about more administrative costs, so I worry about that.

"And, frankly, I don't know what that's going to do to change incentive structures. So I think, ultimately, the organizational structures might matter less than do the kind of built-in budgetary incentives and budgetary models that underlie how money is allocated to colleges more generally."

Dean Van Loan: "Kim, in the back row."

Speaker Walcott: "I am sorry, I didn't see you."

Professor Weeden: "So I actually have a question, and that is: Why is the public health school in the vet college? Does anybody know? This is just -- I think it's a fairly unusual organizational structure, and I'm sort of curious why it came about."

Senator Doug Antczak, Microbiology and Immunology: "The school is spearheaded by faculty in the vet school -- the program. It is an MPH program, it's not a school. And it was just spearheaded by people in the vet school. They just took the initiative.

"It is another structure of the kind we're trying to fix in all these restructurings, but they keep happening; and I hope they will continue to."

Senator Anthony Hay, Microbiology. "I don't know about the vet school, but in CALS, the deans were pushing MPH programs: Create one, it's going to be a cash cow for

your department. But you have to enroll ten students before you get any return on investment.

"So there is incentivization from our dean, at least; I don't know if yours incentivized it, as well."

Senator Antczak: "I don't think it was incentivized. In fact, it's an expensive undertaking, as been mentioned before. It is difficult to run these programs. It was undertaken for altruistic reasons to increase the one health programmatic offerings in the vet college, but not necessarily to make a lot of money."

Speaker Walcott: "Kim, in the back row. Okay. There in back, please?"

Professor Lichter: "I mean, this is just another example of: What if we worked together as a University and had a collective vision about the MBA? The Public Health?

"As I say we have one of the best groups of health economists in the country; we have a world class nutrition program; and as far as I know, we have sociologists who are doing issues on Medical Sociology. We have a really good group of cultural anthropologists who are doing Anthropology in medicine, why aren't they included in as part of that? Why weren't -- this is the kind of decision-making I think where a collective vision -- and why I think we need to stop doing so much bottom, down and competing with each other, but work together around a commission vision about where we want to be in the Social Sciences. And I think the Social Sciences, as it relates to Public Health, are enormous. Again, I'm just making the same point again."

Speaker Walcott: "Any more comments? Okay. Why don't we then have Professor John Cawley?"

Professor & Senator John Cawley: "Hi, everybody. Good afternoon. I am John Cawley from Policy Analysis and Management and Economics, and I wanted to talk to you about the possibilities for a school of Public Policy. I think that this is one of the most important and also radical collaborations that we can do to promote the Social Sciences at Cornell.

"I have appreciated in the past when proposals have come out to improve the Social Sciences that people have asked: What problem is this fixing, or is this just change for change's sake, or just marketing?

"There are two problems that a school of Public Policy would solve. The first is that it's been recognized time and time again, as has already been mentioned today, that the Social Sciences are balkanized across Cornell. There are many different people across different units and, as a result, the whole is less than the sum of the parts. This exact problem has been pointed out by the 2018 Organizational Structures Committee report, the 2017 External Social Sciences Review Committee report, the 2012 Provost Committee on Public Policy report, the 2009 Social Sciences Task Force; and you can keep going back further and further.

"This matters because, first of all, we have research synergies that are not being fully exploited. If you think of what the Institute for the Social Sciences does with its theme projects, it's often letting social scientists that are scattered across campus come together and say: Look, we want to be working together, and it's hard to do that the way Cornell is currently structured.

"As has been mentioned, our strengths are less visible to outsiders; and as a result, we don't get the reputation and rankings that arguably we should, and that matters for attracting the highest quality faculty and highest quality students.

"The second problem that a school of Public Policy could help solve is that it would help us catch up to our peer institutions. If you look at the rankings of the top Public Policy institutions in the country, it's the schools that we consider to be our peers, or aspire to have as our peers. Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, for example; Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School; Berkeley's Goldman School; Michigan's Ford School; University of Chicago has Harris School; Duke's Sanford Institute; Wisconsin's La Follette; and, again, you can go on and on.

"In the 2017 External Review of the Social Sciences at Cornell, they encouraged us to consider a major Public Policy initiative. And they said: Given Cornell's long history of engagement with public outreach, we were surprised that there's no school or institute of Public Policy at the University.

"And they want on to say: We believe that Cornell would benefit from creating a highly visible institutional home to leverage and make more visible the strengths of Cornell's widely scattered Public Policy scholars.

"They also later in the report describe the absence of a school of Public Policy at Cornell as a glaring hole in Cornell's Social Science constellation. They got a little poetic there with their language.

"And then just this morning at the Ideas forum that Dan and Valerie organized, there were three different scholars who got up and advocated for a school of Public Policy at Cornell. It is widely recognized as an obvious thing for us to do. Which really begs the question: If all these different reports, both internal and external, across so many years have recommended that we do this, why haven't we already done it?

"One problem is concerns about cost. For example, the 2012 report called for 15 new faculty, which I think may have led to it being shelved as maybe too ambitious at that time. And our 2018 Organizational Structures Committee set the proposal for a school of Public Policy aside because they were told to consider only zero-cost options.

"The second possible reason that it hasn't already happened, there are concerns about taking people out of departments, breaking up departments, breaking up colleges or merging others. And people like where they are; that is why we are where we are. We chose these jobs because we like our current environment, our current departments and units. There were very legitimate concerns about weakening existing units to go and create a new one. And, of course, there's always that distinction between statutory and doubt that makes things a little bit more complicated.

"The third reason I think it hasn't happened is because people who wanted to stay in their units and not be part of a new school were concerned that the few people who were willing to move to a new school, wouldn't be representative and it would be an idiosyncratic group of scholars, it wouldn't be a comprehensive school of Public Policy and wouldn't have much credibility either inside or out of Cornell.

"There are a lot of different ways that we could structure a school of Public Policy at Cornell, but I just want to suggest one possible way just to make this a little more concrete and that is to make it a virtual school. Everybody's line stays in their current department, in their current unit. It doesn't require breaking up any departments or colleges; but at the same time, it doesn't preclude breaking up any departments or colleges, if that makes sense for other reasons.

"I think this is exactly what Kim was referring to earlier when she said, you could have super departments with or without a school of Public Policy; these are not in conflict.

"I would envision it being something that's completely voluntary. No one's arm would be twisted to be part of a school they didn't want to be part of.

"And the departments in the school could be organized by topic. So we could have a department of Health Policy that would bring together, the people in Government who study Health, the people in Sociology, Economics, Policy Analysis and Management and so on. There could be departments for Environmental Policy, Social Welfare policy.

"These are things that we can define based on our current research strengths. And by doing this, we would be basically creating theme projects that are always in existence around these strengths, around these topics that faculty at Cornell want to be working together on.

"We would have increased visibility to outsiders. So if someone in another institution wanted to know, who is there in Health Policy at Cornell, they could go and see the faculty in that department of Health Policy. And that might be faculty we're trying to recruit, who are wondering what colleagues they would have; it might be students who are wondering should I come do a PhD at Cornell, who could be my advisors and so on.

"And then, finally, these departments could serve as hubs for future cluster hires when those resources do become available.

"And, to me, one definite advantage of doing something like a virtual school at first is we can do this immediately and with no cost. And by doing so, we would maintain the flexibility to modify the structure in the future.

"So, again, I'm not saying that this has to be the model for our Public Policy school, I'm just offering a suggestion and way that we can overcome some of the obstacles and find a way to do what so many different committees, both internal and external, have recommended over so many years, which is put together a school of Public Policy to strengthen the Social Sciences at Cornell. Thank you."

Speaker Walcott: "Comments? Yes? I am sorry."

Senator Robert Thorne, Physics. "I have always felt like we have some fraction -- it's a small fraction -- of students in Physics and Engineering who have real interests in getting involved in Science Policy, Science Education Policy, Public Policy, where the understanding of how the world works that scientists and engineers have would be beneficial. And I personally think that's something this country desperately needs.

"And as an advisor to those students, I really have had no idea, you know, what they should be doing at Cornell, how they can go about it. And telling them, oh, you should go to PAM -- I mean, "PAM" just does not have a lot of cachet, I'm sorry, you know, especially with our students, I mean, you know, as a subject. Whereas going to Public Policy, Cornell Institute of Public Policy, would have a lot more cachet with our students.

"And, you know, I know it's marketing, but marketing matters sometimes. And so I would like us -- I'd like to have a structure in Cornell that makes it easier for STEM students with those interests to get the credentials they need to move up higher into Policy positions."

Speaker Walcott: "Okay. Yes?"

Senator William Sonnenstuhl, ILR. "I actually like your notion of a virtual school. I find it intriguing because it's voluntary. And the question I have is: As you've thought about this and you've thought about departments of Health Policy and Environmental Policy and whatnot, have you actually identified faculty who would like to volunteer and be part of a virtual structure like this and to begin to move towards this as a reality?

"I think that one of the advantages is that this is not a forced marriage between anybody, which really gets everybody's hackles up. It does provide, I think, one-stop shopping because you can have a virtual school that has a website where everybody's work is noted, you can cross list classes. There is a lot of advantages to this."

Speaker Walcott: "Are there other comments? Yes, sir? The microphone is coming right up."

Senator Saccamano: "Yeah, I'm intrigued by the proposal, too. I just have one question, just for some clarification. I was wondering what the relationship would be between

the departments that you're proposing -- Health Policy, Environmental Policy -- and the departments that already exist within the college, if those other departments that already exist are not to be broken up or merged?

"And the reason I'm asking this is because in Arts and Sciences and in my field in Humanities, we tend to multiply programs in order to solve that problem. So we would have a program in Health Policy, rather than a department because departments are responsible for tenure. And so I was wondering if you had given that any thought."

Professor Cawley: "A little bit. I go back to something that Kim said earlier, which is that it's really helpful to keep names and structures familiar so outsiders can easily interpret what we're doing. So, for example, rather than having a committee on Public Policy, or something like that, I think it's helpful to use the structures and language that people expect us to use."

Speaker Walcott: "Kim?"

Professor Weeden: "The mic appears from heaven. So I want to kind of introduce a little bit of a note of caution, not about the policy in school in particular, but this sort of general notion that we can take our existing structures and overlay more structures without incurring a cost. And the cost that I see -- and this actually relates to the center or center proposal, as well -- is that it's not just kind of administrative staff that creates costs, it's also a huge cost on faculty time and energy. So every center needs a director, it needs a faculty advisory board.

"And also what happens is that if you have departments and you have centers and the same pool of faculty -- exactly the same number of faculty are involved in both, what tends to happen is that either both are weaker because they can only draw on half the faculty energy -- right? So the faculty have a fixed amount of time and energy, and they either have to allocate that to the department or to the center; they have to split it in some way.

"But the problem is that in a very strong center-based university -- I was actually at the University of Chicago before I came here --- the departments tend to become sort of this residual faculty who don't fit into centers. There is no "their" there anymore. It weakens the undergraduate program. And actually, ironically, there is less conversation between faculty members within a discipline but across areas within that

discipline. Right? So everybody kind of fragments off into their own little centers, and that just reduces energy in the departments.

"And I think that, you know, you see the same sort of thing happening throughout Cornell where people are just spread really, really, really thin. You add another organizational structure on top of that, you're basically multiplying the amount of committee work the faculty members are doing, and you're forcing them to kind of select one identity or the other which can be at the expense of both unit.

"So I guess what I'm saying is that I think all this sounds great, if indeed we were in a world where there were 15 more faculty lines that went along with this; then, it's not a net kind of balanced amount of faculty, time and energy. But I'm really, really nervous about kind of just overlaying structures on structures on structures, because it creates more work for everybody."

Speaker Walcott: "Right over here, please."

Senator Hay: "I was also director of ICET, Institute for Comparative and Environmental Toxicology, for a number of years. And it was one of these orphaned centers that had no money, and it relied on the good will of numerous departments. And while it had a training grant and a Superfund grant, we were able to attract faculty that knew they would be getting funded graduate students. But as soon as those monies dried up or the grants were not renewed, we were left with no TA-ships to offer, very little faculty support, administrative support that was at the good will of the department that housed the institute.

"So, I mean, there are examples where exactly what you're saying -- it's not a zero-sum gain. There is only so many resources. And it served a purpose for 20 years while it was funded externally, but it wasn't sustainable without that external funding. So I think there are a number of examples on campus that should look at when you try to consider what the actual costs of a virtual department are."

Senator Evangelista: "I am curious how the virtual school relates to the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs; and as a school, does it have a curriculum? You mentioned PhD students seeking advisors, would they be getting PhDs or Masters degrees at the virtual school?"

Professor Cawley: "I think this could work multiple ways. But various reports have seen a school of Public Policy as a way to exploit synergies between different Masters programs at Cornell. So the aforementioned, MPH, SEPA, Masters in Public Affairs, the Sloan Program in Health Administration, so they could work, you know, more closely through such a school to, you know, share courses and achieve efficiencies to offset some -- ."

Senator Evangelista: "And I would just follow up in the spirit of the previous two comments and also Professor Niederdeppe's comments that for us in Government, SEPA is basically something that asks for us to volunteer space in our classes, volunteer to supervise Masters degrees. It sounds a bit more of the same, that we would be -- without new faculty lines associated, it would be the same people just doing extra work.

"I am very supportive of having a Public Policy school, but one seriously funded with a commitment from the University."

Dean Van Loan: "When I look up there at the slide, you can almost -- that's what a graduate field almost looks like. Can you explain, is there a graduate field in Public Policy? And how is it different from a -- it looks like a field that has money."

Professor Cawley: "The purpose of a graduate field -- at least as I understand it as a former DGS -- is that you've got responsibility for certain curricular programming. It's not a department. This, instead, is structured around our research strengths to promote Social Sciences at Cornell, make it more visible to outsiders what we're doing here. Outsiders do not understand the field system.

"To give you an example of, Health Policy, I know the researchers in Government who do Health Policy, the ones in Sociology, the ones in Economics, we're not all in the same graduate fields. And I think that's what the ISS -- the Institute for the Social Sciences -- is trying to do with a handful of theme projects each year. There is a clamoring of people who want to work together across the University who aren't facilitated in doing that with the current structures."

Speaker Walcott: "Other comments? Well, seeing none, I suggest that we adjourn."

Meeting adjourned.