

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2020

THE SPEAKER: Thank you, everyone. We are going to start the meeting. This is the call to order. My name's Sam Nelson. I'm speaker. I just want to say off the bat that there's a reporter here from "The Cornell Daily Sun," so we are all aware of that. She's in the back somewhere.

I want to remind the body that the senators have priority in speaking and that only senators or their designated alternates may vote; but we are not voting today, so that shouldn't matter. You need to identify yourself and your department when you speak, wait for the microphone. I would like to suggest a maximum speaking time of two minutes. I'll be holding up this big iPad with a clock on it. Of course, I'll be sane in the way I enforce it, but don't make me like Chief Justice Roberts in the impeachment hearings, admonish you for perhaps going over time. Some of the presenters will have, obviously, more time than two minutes at the beginning.

Given all those facts, I'd like to hand the meeting over to the Dean of Faculty Charlie Van Loan.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thanks. Is this working? Okay, thanks. And I just have a few slides to frame the discussion a little bit. This is a special meeting, but there will be a transcript. We'll approve the minutes in February. As is usually our custom in senate meetings, a sense of the senate resolution may emerge, which would then be presented in the February meeting.

As you know, there are two major recommendations that are part of the final report. The one that's attracted the most attention is the public policy recommendation. As you know, the committee was given two alternatives and to weigh in on them simply from the standpoint of what model would be better from the standpoint of public policy at Cornell. And the committee voted 6-4 in favor of that, so that's the big alternative that's being debated.

However, there's a second half to the final report, which has to do with super-departments. The proposal is to create three of them. That part seemed to garner universal or near unanimous approval, but that's also up for discussion here as well.

I want to just point out three little excerpts from the report, just so that we understand where it's coming from and where it's going, so to speak. The first one is the charge. Again, the charge was to look at those two alternatives and to decide which one is better. It's not to say which one is better for the university. To be clear, the committee was not supposed to weigh in or not asked to weigh in on that aspect.

Second, outside of their purview, although it certainly comes up, is the collateral impact; in particular, for four other departments in the college and what this choice means for them. Again, they talk about it and, if you look at the interim report, you will see pros and cons and things like that, but that was sort of outside of the charge to the committee.

Where does this go? It goes to the president, the provost and the deans and leadership who are involved. They are the ones who are going to look at all this data,

including what's said here, I assume, and then weigh in on what's best for the university. So those three things I felt would be useful to pull out from the report.

I'm not in Human Ecology, and most of you aren't, so just a little bit about what that college looks like. Here's some data, but the best person to tell us about that is someone from Human Ecology. As I mentioned, there are several individuals who will come up here, talk for a little bit and entertain questions, so you can introduce yourselves.

MARDELLE SHEPLEY: I'm Mardelle Shepley, chair of the Department of Design and Environmental Analysis, part of potentially the collateral damage. I know you have seen the numbers regarding CHE. Before my time starts, however, I was given the opportunity to give you a sense of what the mission of our college is.

I would like to read from our web site: "Whereas offerings in traditional liberal arts colleges tend to focus on historical and theoretical aspects of a subject, programs in the College of Human Ecology are more contemporary and applied in nature. Human Ecology exists to identify and address contemporary human issues from a variety of perspectives. We believe that the challenges facing individuals and societies today are generally too complicated to be understood from a single perspective, but they require consideration of psychological, sociological, economic design and scientific approaches, and we embrace this fully as a college."

So now to speak to my department, Design and Environmental Analysis, most people don't know what we do. We have faculty who are sculptors and faculty that are hard-nosed scientists. We have one common mission, and that's to improve health and

wellness. In spite of our different fields, we have a very collaborative, integrated department.

The next thing I'd like to read is part of the letter that was sent to the deputy provost in early December, and it lists some of the concerns for our department.

One concern is the renaming of the college, which has had a long history with regard to the role of women at Cornell. The dissolution of the College of Human Ecology, which is an international flagship college of human ecology and the only one in the Ivy League, represents a significant loss.

The word "ecology" is significant to us. Nearly all faculty scholarship is focused on the crucial importance of social and environmental context. This affects the questions we ask, the research we do, the data we gather, et cetera.

We are also concerned about the disruption of the really remarkable interdisciplinary activities between the CHE departments. We have very close relationships and collaborate frequently.

Please notice that we have not actually -- our college has not actually -- been polled on the topic. There was a statement in the report that came out recently that says -- and they are addressing the issue of from whom they have had feedback -- it says that, the feedback from non-policy CHE faculty, staff, students and alumni toward the idea of transferring CHE into a college of public policy was mostly negative, with a non-negligible share of stakeholders vehemently opposed.

I would say "non-negligible" might not be the right way to characterize that exactly. There was a significant percentage of the faculty who were vehemently

opposed. I say this while honoring the work that the committee put into this project. I understand how difficult their situation is.

Lastly, I should emphasize the situation with regard to those non-policy departments, this situation is crucial to carefully understand -- carefully consider and address, not only in order to achieve goals in public policy research, but also for achieving the broader university goals of strongly supporting the non-policy faculty who would not feel supported. This is possibly a majority of us; and with regard to design may impact, the broader design community.

I'm from a design department and there's one other in the college. Regardless, the word "design" only appears once in the recent statement, so we've been left to the side.

I'll step down now to give time to the many people here who want to represent this issue.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: People who are willing to come up and speak, they can handle questions. So are there questions for Mardelle that anyone would like to raise?

Okay, thanks. Next would be David (off mic) Applied Economics and Management

DAVID LEE: Hello, everyone. Can you hear me? Charlie told me I had ten minutes, so I'm going to take it. I'm in the -- for those of you who I don't know, I'm in the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, currently the Business School, formerly CALS. I have been on the faculty for over 35 years, during which I

conducted research, taught and done outreach work and advised many governments and international organizations in economic development policy.

First, I want to thank the Implementation Committee and its members for all their work on behalf of the social sciences at Cornell. Although I disagree with their final recommendation, I think we owe them all a debt of gratitude for the time and effort that went into their assessment of public policy at Cornell. I'm well aware that any organizational structure entails tradeoffs, and I don't think for a moment that I or any other single individual have all the answers.

I'd also like to assure my many friends in Policy Analysis Management and Human Ecology that my comments are meant in support of the other alternative, the university-wide school option, and not to disparage those units in any way whatsoever.

Why do I disagree? I think that while these reports do a good job in many respects, I think there's some deficiencies, at least three of which, to me, anyway, are striking. In part, I think they may be the result of an unnecessarily restricted mandate that they began with. Here I'll refer significantly to the interim report in November, which contains the substance that is only summarized in the final report. And those of you that looked at it, you know Appendix G includes the interim report.

I guess the key point here is inclusivity and leveraging. We have great expertise in many different policy areas throughout the university. Just in my unit, the Dyson School, we have roughly 30 faculty members doing research, teaching and outreach in economic development, international trade policy, environmental policy, energy, food and agriculture policy, financial market policy and ethics. Cornell has many other units -

- not going to name them, in the interest of time -- doing policy-related work both domestically and internationally.

My point here is that the number of policy-oriented faculty and units outside of PAM and Human Ecology far exceeds the number of faculty in those two units. I'm surprised this wasn't emphasized more in the reports. If the university seeks to create a new public policy structure, doesn't it make sense to leverage that wide expertise across the university to the maximum extent possible?

If we're really seeking to reinvent public policy at Cornell, shouldn't we strive to do what's best for the university as a whole, not just focus on one department or college? Here the mandate may come in question. To me, the likelihood of greater inclusivity and leveraging existing expertise under the university-wide policy school option trumps any possible benefit stemming from the more narrowly focused college option.

Relatedly, why not assert a greater role for affiliated faculty, especially in jump-starting a new school? There's a sentence in the interim report, quotes, hiring in data science and public policy and sustainability policy would need to happen relatively quickly to launch new tracks.

Why isn't the first option to look within, among affiliated faculty? Not only do we have great strength in numbers among affiliated faculty, but we know how much the provost's office has sought to minimize duplication of effort across the university. The virtues of starting by hiring new people in the same areas as we already have great strength are not apparent.

A challenge of the policy college option -- that is the recommended option -- that is noted in the interim report is to, quote, show the rest of the university that it is not just an insular college entity or re-branding of Human Ecology. Yes, that's a big potential problem and one that could be avoided by creating a university-wide policy entity from the get-go.

A major limitation of the university-wide school option is stated to be the challenge of management and administration. This figured very prominently in the reports, but these challenges would characterize both options, not just the school option. In fact, we have many examples of cross-college programs across the university that do work; Nutritional Science, Atmospheric Science, the environment sustainability major, Information Science. If biophysical science scientists can work together, why can't social scientists? I think we can. I'm more optimistic, I think, than some of the committee.

I don't know much about Information Science; but as I understand, it began as a program of zero percent faculty appointments and has since gone on to become its own department and part of its own college, along with two other departments. Steve Jackson made the point in the last listening session that Information Science would appear to be an excellent model for a university-wide policy school.

What about international-related public policy? The role of international policy barely appears in either report. Many of the most important policy challenges of the 21st Century are, in fact, international: Climate change, poverty and malnutrition, the digital economy and cyber security, government systems and non-state actors. And

many of Cornell's strongest programs are, in fact, international in nature. We have a world-class economic development studies program, international nutrition, migration studies that just -- a new minor was just announced, and so forth.

Human Ecology and PAMS expertise is primarily, and in some areas exclusively domestic. If a new policy school is to look beyond the borders of the U.S., as it presumably would and should, it would be especially important to bring in the international policy expertise of faculty in CALS, ILR, JB, Arts and Sciences and other units. Why not do this from the get-go through the school option, the university-wide option?

The so-called collateral impacts. I think that's a terrible term, because it sounds like collateral damage, which -- yeah, well, I'll let someone else speak to that. Not my language. The PAM Department, notwithstanding its many strengths -- and I mean that. It's a very strong department -- only accounts for 25% of the Human Ecology faculty.

The reports acknowledge the importance of avoiding negative collateral impacts in the rest of Human Ecology, but there are few details. The statement these details were beyond their mandate I don't think is good enough. Details matter, especially when recommending major institutional structural changes and potential major dislocation. I'm not on the Human Ecology faculty, but if I were, I would be hoping for a lot more careful and detailed analysis of options and what specifically would happen to 75% of the college's faculty and what I understand are 80% to 85% of its 700 students. Those numbers may be off. These collateral impacts would in all likelihood be lessened through a more holistic university-wide policy entity.

There are a number of second-order points that I believe the report doesn't do justice to. In the interest of time, I'm not going to go into them, but I just did want to just to say a snippet about each. What happened to the Government Department? Two disciplines, I think in everyone's estimation, are key to a policy school: One is economics, one is political science, or government here. I think the Government Department in either model would have to play -- if we are going to have to have a first-rate policy program, would have to play a key role, and it's really not developed in the reports.

Two of the proposed concentrations compete with or complement potentially existing programs, Sustainability and Data Science, Data Policy. Sustainability -- what is sustainability? I teach sustainability, and it means environmental sustainability. Does this mean something else? It's not spelled out. If it's environmental sustainability, we got it covered. In the Dyson School, we're a nationally ranked program, Top 5 program, we have a new development studies program in CALS, the ESS major. I understand an effort is underway to develop a university-wide sustainability program and so forth, so what will the new policy school bring to the table in sustainability? That's not spelled out.

And data policy is a different story. This is a technical field, by and large, one that's very hard, I think, to start from scratch. If you are bringing in new people, wouldn't it be better to start with what we have, build on that, then add as we go? That's not spelled out either.

I also think, just to conclude, that there's some overemphasized issues. You could call them straw men. Organizational problems, yeah; but you know, those characterize either option. Anything that's going to have organizational -- any option's going to have organizational difficulties. Is creating a new deanship really problematic? One more seat at the table, that's not convincing. Are NYSUT approvals really prohibitive? Yes, they take time, they take a year, year and a half, two years, but the graduate school's been dealing with that for years, and that can be worked out. So I think some of these issues that appear in the reports really are very much second- or even third-order questions that don't really address the heart of the issue.

Just a final comment. As Charlie mentioned, as appeared in the report, the policy college option was evidently -- it emerged from the committee, did so, was so recommended with a 6-4 vote. It doesn't take a lot of higher math to figure out that's one person, right? A change in one vote would leave us with a wash, would leave us with no recommendation, essentially, between the two. If we're going to reinvent public policy at Cornell, I think we have to do what's best for the university as a whole, not one department, not one college or base decisions that turn on one individual's vote.

Could either structure work? Yes, I think, possibly, depending on a number of circumstances. I personally think that kind of a hybrid approach between the two might have the best outcome; but as a starter, I think the university-wide school option is far preferable to the recommendation that emerged. Thanks.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Questions for David? Okay, very good. Thanks a lot.

Next, Jonathan Russell-Anelli from Soil and Crop Science.

JONATHAN RUSSELL-ANELLI: I'm not much of an extemporaneous speaker, as you just noticed, so I sort of wrote out some stuff. Not sure if I have the five to ten minutes as well, since -- we'll start, and you'll kick me off. I got it. So I think the question -- I am actually glad I am going after these two speakers, because I am very much in support of where they are coming from.

I think the real question we should be looking at is what kind of organizational changes, and this was the mandate, to advance excellence in scholarship and academic achievement and public policy in science. I think that's an important aspiration, I think it is a doable aspiration, and I would also like to support or thank the committee, as well as the provost, for doing that and allowing us to have comments and potentially listening to us.

Having read the various products, I got to say I'm pretty much disagreeing with the majority committee decision. There's a couple of reasons here. The number one reason that's totally outside of the mandate of the committee was the issue of the contract college. I think there's a big question here that hasn't been really addressed in any way; is that there's going to be potentially, not necessarily, potentially a significant loss in funding to the university from the contract colleges with the change of CHE, the College for Human Ecology.

The argument is well, we can probably overcome that, but I would make the argument that's probably not going to be the case; because in an era of depleting

budgets and Albany and competing issues, I don't think we're going to be able to make the case that this change is going to not be a loss to our funding from New York State.

Having said that, I want to return to what the key issue here is, and I think that key issue is excellence. The majority argument presented by all these documents is that putting them together, putting these units together will encourage excellence. The model here is bigger is better. I'm not necessarily a subscriber to the bigger is better model of excellence. I think there's a lot of real significant concerns when you go with that model. I think a better argument might be we want to increase communication and coalescence of expertise, and I'm not necessarily sure a college is the methodology to do that. I think a school is probably the better way to do that.

I also am fully aware there was some support for super-departments. And then, with that one -- of course, that's not one of the mandates we are talking about today. That one I don't think actually encourages excellence in the sense, because I think it makes it more insular.

In the interest of moving this along, bigger and better is not necessarily the way we should be going, I don't think. And I think from the College of Human Ecology perspective, that might actually be an example of what we shouldn't be doing for excellence because, with the college model, the non-policy units are going to be included in a school, or a college, I should say, a college that is for public policy. An argument later on about funding and things like that, the argument is well, we're not getting funding the way the model's set now. How is that going to impact these non-policy units that are part of the school?

Another component to this is one of the arguments that is being used for the college versus the school is that there's support for this. And this has already been addressed, and I don't really think there is support for it. Again, this is the committee vote. There doesn't seem to be a majority support, let alone total support for the college model.

Part of the mandate was how can we figure out a way, in the next 5 to 15 years, to be able to create a public policy program that is excellence. If you don't have stakeholder involvement, timely development is not going to necessarily happen. An argument to that is we have in the past put together units, and they have worked. I think that statement is actually fairly disingenuous. One is because when we do that, we never do any comparison of before and after when it comes to metrics of performance. It works.

And that's my second point here. The reason it works is because at Cornell, there are a lot of really awesome people who want the university to work. And even though the model, the system design is poor, we find ways to make it work. That is not the model for excellence. And I think we need to consider that when we're hearing that we put these people together and excellence will occur, that, in essence, is the only real argument that we are getting here.

Now, there's two other arguments that are somewhat legitimate. One of them, David addressed about the leadership, the deanship, there's provost positions that theoretically can meet this need.

The second one is funding. The arguments for funding given I think are somewhat specious because -- actually, let me read this. The argument for the funding sort of ignores how funding allocation occurs right now. Basically, funding allocation comes from Day Hall and goes to the colleges. And the colleges have some performance metrics that they use. Those performance metrics are primarily how well the system's program is operating, as well as student and faculty metrics. If you keep that in mind, just because you put groups together doesn't necessarily mean that they're performing well. In 5 to 15 years, that might happen, but that's not how funding works.

The other argument is we need to have a larger conglomeration so that we can have hires, whether it's a dean or faculty positions. And I think that's another very specious argument. The reason being is that if we go with a school rather than a college, a school will still act as that entity that becomes the home for the person that's going to be hired. The reality is, as faculty members, we are put into fields and departments. We are not put into colleges. We come to join colleges, but that's not where we're housed, in the sense. We are hired differently. We are wooed through colleges, and a school would do that.

I'm almost done, and I know I'm pretty close to my ten minutes here. I'm hoping that I made a case here. I think there's a number of things we really need to sort of reiterate on this one. One is potential loss of funding from New York State. And if we think that we are going to be able to get that funding changed, if there's any kind of screw-up here, we're going to lose that funding. There are plenty of other SUNY schools out there. Not that we're a SUNY school. There are plenty of other advocates for that

kind of money and, in this kind of environment, that money is not going to be coming back.

Two, there's a real lack of meaningful metrics or road maps on how this is actually going to work. Perhaps that might be beyond the metrics of their mandate, but there really isn't anything here other than put them together and it will happen. It's the build it, they will come sort of analogy, the meaningless difference between the two models when it comes to leadership and funding and hiring. They're really not that much different. The potential detrimental impact to the non-policy units, and the serious detrimental impact to the College of Human Ecology, if this does go forward, is somewhat problematic.

Finally, there's a lack of stakeholder support. If we want to have this happen in 5 to 15 years, stakeholder support's going to be critical. And if you don't have it, it's not going to happen. I would go back to the committee and provost's office and basically ask the question about excellence. This is where I started. If this is about excellence, how do we get to excellence? And I got to say, these ideas that are in front of us, these are just how we're going to run it. They're not really about excellence, so there.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Next, Ann Lemley, professor emeritus from the college.

ANN LEMLEY: I had not planned to be here. Actually, I asked Adam Schiff if he could talk, and he is otherwise engaged today, which is where I'd rather be paying attention to. I'm as an alternate senator for CAPE, and I had over 30 years in Human Ecology. I started a Ph.D. in chemistry, I did a four-year post-doc in applied and

engineering physics, which is an engineering college, then I came over to Human Ecology in 1980. So I am a convert to Human Ecology and its entire concept. The only college at Cornell founded by women, a college which is trying to improve lives by exploring and shaping human connections to the natural, social and built environments.

Alan, I do read -- this is on the back of my official card. I'm representing a couple other people. I'm representing CAPE. Brian Chabot and Chris Olson both hoped to be here and couldn't. We feel that this is really a very poor envisioning of the college -- that the recommendation is poor to re-envision the College of Human Ecology as the College of Public Policy.

The committee, over-represented by people who naturally are interested in public policy, and there's three members from the one department that would be the policy department, and only one member for all the non-policy departments. The vote was 6-4. I was department chair for over 15 years. Would you give tenure to anybody who got a 6-4 vote? No. No way. And as was pointed out, it would only take one vote to change it. And it really wouldn't unnecessarily disrupt the non-policy colleges.

I love the discussion of what is better for public policy and all the other things on campus, and thank you for the people who talked about that because that's really what you want to go for, but think about this analogy. Suppose that Physics and Chemistry and maybe some of the bio departments in Arts and Sciences said to the provost, we really need a College of the Natural Sciences.

And so they had a committee and they came up with a recommendation and they -- ah, Humanities and Social Science had only a few reps. They came out with this

recommendation to have the College of Natural Sciences, but the rest of you, Music and Art and History and Government, you can stay, but big stuff is going to be Natural Sciences. What would people think? I mean, and that's essentially what's being done. We have four very excellent departments who have really made strides.

In my little department of Fiber Science and Apparel Design, we have two named chairs that came just -- I take some kudos for it, because I was involved in helping to develop some of it, but the dean gets the most kudos. How would we attract faculty to these departments? How would we get funding? How would we attract undergraduates and graduate students? Do you realize the huge number of premed undergraduates in our college? It's incredible. They like the human aspect. We would probably lose many of them. We'd lose the whole concept of design. How are we going to get people in design? You'd wipe out a major alumni base, you really would.

I give to the college every year, and there might be something in that final legacy. I give every year, and had started it when I was a faculty member. I'm not giving to a college of public policy. And there are a lot of other people out there. I know this is kind of what the Hotel School did do, and they did do it and they are still giving money, but they kept an identity. This just wipes them out.

So whether it's grad students, undergrads, extension? Who cares about extension, right? I care about extension. That was a major part of my entire career, and it was one of the most rewarding things I ever did. As a straight chemist, I really, really felt that I made a contribution to New York State and the country, because Cornell leads in so many areas of extension. In nutrition, it's phenomenal.

The new focus, we've already heard discussed. I do think that the committee had a very difficult task. I think what they came up with was just not definitive, and I think that the land grant status of our university is exemplified by the College of Human Ecology.

And as a woman who came up through the hard sciences and then was greeted by so many women in Human Ecology and was completely supported when I had my children, in the days when we didn't get semesters off by the faculty and the dean, and it was very doable, this has an incredible tradition for women. And it's a slap in the face if we switch it in this significant way and de-emphasize the non-policy departments.

So how's that? Adam Schiff couldn't do any better, right?

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Are there any questions? Okay, Corinna Loeckenhoff from Human Development.

CORINNA LOECKENHOFF: I would like to thank the Implementation Committee for being so clear about what the proposed college model would entail. There's no question that it would pose a massive threat to the academic freedom for faculty members in Human Ecology that do not align with policy. It makes it clear that any new initiatives or new classes would have to be policy-relevant, and current faculty would have to conform or consider leaving the college.

However, the report does not capture the full scope of the disruption, because such collateral impacts were explicitly excluded from the committee's mandate. But maybe such impacts could be justified and maybe non-policy faculty, such as myself,

should take one for the team if a college model is truly the best structure for public policy at Cornell. But there's reason for doubt.

First, the college model poses a high threshold for policy scholars in other colleges to affiliate with the new entity, so it would not showcase the full breadth of public policy at Cornell. Second, four of five departments and three-quarters of faculty in Human Ecology do not have a significant policy tie, and this would diffuse the mission of the college model.

Third, the report says little about undergraduate education, but how would the College of Public Policy finance itself, since it would attract fewer premed majors, which form the majority of the current student body? Fourth, a college model would require the creation of multiple super-departments to offer non-policy faculty an academic home outside of the college. The implementation of these super-departments would monopolize faculty time with endless committee work and a need for physical relocation. There would be no time left to explore policy ties.

Finally, the threat posed by a forced shift toward policy is likely to create reactance and defensiveness. It has already created a climate of fear and uncertainty. Several of my colleagues told me they were glad I was going to speak today, because they were afraid to do so because they were afraid of possible repercussions. In contrast to the threat of a college model, the promise and invitation offered by a school of public policy would foster a climate of growth and exploration and encourage non-policy faculty to develop policy ties.

In closing, I urge university leadership to conduct a thorough evaluation of so-called collateral impacts on non-policy scholars and any potential negative impact for the success of a college model before making any long-term decisions. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Any questions? Okay, let's open up for general discussion. We'll try to keep a little structure, so let's start with -- so again, you can come up to the front.

YASSER GOWAYED: I'm Yasser Gowayed. I'm the chair of Fiber Science and Apparel Design. I'll do two things. I will present the department opinion and also I will read a statement of a faculty member in my department, who is unfortunately not able to come because of teaching commitments.

I appreciate the effort that the committee had put in with all the stresses and the very charged listening sessions, but I would like to highlight here an important parameter, which is what everybody called collateral impact, which I think is a collateral damage to other non-policy entities in the college.

By doing that, by the committee limiting its scope to not considering the impact, they missed an important chance of not only introduce a strong public policy entity, but also enhance the role of Human Ecology as it stands today. Would have had two birds hit with one stone, but unfortunately, what ended up with is what argued as a strong public policy entity, while causing a damage to the College of Human Ecology.

When you ask the question what's better, a college within the university, a college or a school, an autonomous college or a shared school, what would be the

answer? By limiting their scope, they forced themselves to an inevitable answer, and that is why we are here today. I think limiting their scope to not consider the damage that will happen to other non-policy entities is the road that they chose, and I disagree with this decision.

Having said my opinion, I will read the faculty member's statement. Professor Huiju Park said “the College of Human Ecology is the role model for a lot of universities in the U.S. and Asian countries. I learned the history of Cornell Human Ecology when I was an undergraduate student in South Korea and when I was a Ph.D. student at Oklahoma State University, because Cornell Human Ecology has been considered the pioneer of multi-disciplinary education, research and outreach, touching every aspect of human lives. This is really powerful heritage of Cornell's Human Ecology.

I understand that the Social Science Implementation Committee recommendation certainly have merits; however, I would like to take an opportunity to share my humble opinion about possible negative impacts of this proposal on the College of Human Ecology community. The loss of the current platform is likely to cause a significant portion of College of Human Ecology to face limited visibility and difficulty in recruiting and retention of students and faculty.

I hope the university leadership will consider ways to support the departments that are not directly related to public policy through communication with faculty and students, so the entire College of Human Ecology community can pursue further growth within the new structure.”

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Anyone else like to speak? Come on up.

KIM WEEDEN: Hi. Kim Weeden, chair of Sociology. I should say that I was also on the working group for the sociology super-department, so I have met the enemy, and he or she put themselves on my calendar, basically what's going on. I know there's been a lot of conversation about what this is going to do to the College of Human Ecology, this question of whether we should go for a college model or a school model.

I do want to simply emphasize and kind of point out for people who are maybe a little bit less familiar with the debates going on, the idea of super-departments is also not uncontentious. I read the Implementation Committee's final report, and I was struck by how much the emphasis was on culture rather than structure. You get a bunch of social scientists in a room, and we can debate culture versus structure for approximately 45 years and not come to an answer, but I do think there are real structural issues that were sort of downplayed in that final report that have the potential for really damaging the excellence and the strength in the disciplinary departments themselves.

This is not about the excellence of the faculty who are currently in the College of Human Ecology. I think many of them, the ones that I know best are extraordinarily strong scholars. I collaborate with them, I sit on committees with them, I organize talks with them, I have beers with them pretty often, so it's not about individual people.

But one of the proposals that's out there is really taking these disciplinary units that are in the College of Arts and Sciences and essentially saying okay, we are now going to increase the number of people who have a vote in your collective enterprise; in

our case, almost doubling it. Because of the size of our department relative to the number of sociologists in Policy Analysis and Management, it's not quite 50/50, but it's getting pretty close.

And you are basically saying we are going to add these people to your department and they are going to have some percentage of their commitment, whether it's 50%, whether it's 75%, whether it's 100% of their -- probably not 100% of their commitment to running an undergraduate major that is not your own, running a master's program that is not your own, doing service for a college that is not your own, and so forth.

So think about this structurally. This is a huge structural issue that is really kind of being waved away, I think, in that final committee report. I do think and I firmly believe there's a lot of potential in the super-department idea. It is not a new idea. I have been through at least two conversations about this in my 18 years at Cornell already. Nothing has happened. I think something is going to happen this time. I'm grateful for that. If, for no other reason, I don't have to sit on another set of committees.

But do think we need to be a lot more cognizant about the potential structural impacts to not just the non-policy units in the College of Human Ecology, but also to the non-policy units that are kind of being -- whether it's Government, whether it's Economics, whether it's Psychology, whether it's Sociology. Government is in a slightly different position, not because of the super-department issue, but because of sort of

having this policy existence that in some ways excludes them. So I really think we need to take a little more care on that.

I also wanted to comment briefly on the mandate issue. I think that the current administration has done an extraordinary job of providing lots and lots of forums for these conversations. The downside of this is this is a process that is now going on for what, four years, I think, more or less, which is a long time to have this sort of uncertainty in the air.

At the same time, I do think there has been a little bit of a sense of we're going to have lots and lots of very abstract conversations, but the details are kind of going to get all worked out a little bit later through these memorandums of understanding. That makes me very, very nervous, frankly, as somebody who's been here at Cornell for a long time.

So I just want to conclude by saying that I think there's enormous potential in many of these ideas with respect to the super-departments. I think that the collaborations across units are -- is already very strong, and there are ways we can make them stronger, but I do think we don't want to simply say well, nobody's talking about the super-department idea, so it must be a good idea, let's go ahead and do it.

Okay, that's all I want to say. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

MIKE THONNEY: I'm Mike Thonney from Animal Science. I'm not really going to comment either pro or negative, although I'm very negative about this report. I would like to know if we are in a meeting of the University Faculty Senate.

Okay, who is running the meeting? Is the speaker running the meeting?

SPEAKER NELSON: Yes.

MIKE THONNEY: And is there a question on the table to talk about?

SPEAKER NELSON: This is an informational meeting. We announced at the beginning of the meeting that we wouldn't be voting today.

MIKE THONNEY: What would we be voting on?

SPEAKER NELSON: We are not voting.

MIKE THONNEY: In the future, what would we vote on?

SPEAKER NELSON: A sense of the senate has been announced by the dean of the faculty for perhaps next year, how they feel -- there will be a specific motion --

MIKE THONNEY: What will that motion be; do you know?

SPEAKER NELSON: I don't know. It hasn't been raised at this point.

MIKE THONNEY: That seems very disconcerting to me, as a deliberative body, that we don't even know what we're going to be doing.

SPEAKER NELSON: Yeah. I think the reason that you're concerned is you are thinking that there's a motion and we're having --

MIKE THONNEY: No, I'm trying to find out if there's a motion. I'm trying to find out what the next steps are going to be.

SPEAKER NELSON: Go ahead, Charlie.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So sense of the senate, the mechanism we established last year, it works like this: We have a meeting --

MIKE THONNEY: I understand that. Okay, you don't have to talk to me about that. I think everybody understands that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay.

MIKE THONNEY: Go ahead and explain it to people.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: To capture the mood of the body here, formulate something into a sense of the senate, and then that would probably show up in February. So we're just trying to find out how people think. That's all we're trying to do here. And to educate one another. That's the --

MIKE THONNEY: Okay, I'll just make the point that it's much more effective to have something that you're debating, a policy in this case that you're debating that the faculty senate talks about. So far, I haven't seen that.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Well, it's the 11-pager that is the front end of the report that we're talking about, I believe.

MIKE THONNEY: That's not a formal resolution of the faculty.

SPEAKER NELSON: You're correct. That will happen in the future.

VAN DYK LEWIS: Hello. My name's Van Dyk Lewis. I teach in Fiber Science and Apparel Design. I've been here for 18 years. Every year, students talk about the lack of an immersive education in design, and that's because our department is split between science and design, and it's dominated by science in every which way, whether it's going through tenure or it's committee meetings, faculty meetings and so on, or even the number of faculty who are designers, employed as designers in the department.

So it would be wrong to say that everybody wants to be a part -- not be a part of the future. I think many of us, few faculty, lots and lots of students and lots of alums would vote to leave, so I think it is very wrong to put forward this idea that everybody is talking in concert and wants to remain. Sounds like a Brexit speech, but what I feel I want to hear from the university is the future. And in terms of being one of those areas, units that would suffer collateral damage, I think we need to know a lot more, and I think that's what I would ask Day Hall to do, to offer the detail.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So a lot of you have been through changes. There's CIS, College of Business, there have been repackagings and Jonathan's department, the integrative unit. Renaming simple things, Chemistry changed its name, Electrical Engineering changed its name. If any of you want to share your thoughts about these sorts of changes and what they meant with hindsight and so on, it would be useful, but anyone who wants to speak -- we've got someone right here.

RICK GEDDES: Ready to go, ready to grab the mic. So my name is Rick Geddes. I'm a professor in the Department of Policy Analysis and Management, or PAM, and founding director of the Cornell program in infrastructure policy, and I've been a big advocate of Cornell creating a school of public policy for probably the past decade. So I'll be at Cornell for 18 years this summer, taught at Fordham in the Bronx for ten years in the economics department prior to that. And I want to make two points.

I really have super appreciation for my -- over time, my colleagues in the College of Human Ecology, and the work that they do is tremendous. And there's multi-

disciplinary activities that are -- Denise Green and I are thinking about a transportation and fashion exhibit that would link infrastructure with fashion, for example, so there's a lot of that going on. But I want to make two points that I think are sort of underappreciated.

I'm in favor of the school of public policy model, rather than the college. One point is just under discussion of what our peers are doing. There's the Harvard Kennedy School, there's the Woodrow Wilson School, there's the Lyndon Johnson School at the University of Texas, there's a La Follette School at the University of Wisconsin. So we could go on, right. Sol Price School at USC.

So there's probably a reason why a lot of the other institutions are doing school. A college model, I think, just automatically would be an unusual sort of thing that we should think about, and maybe it's the school model enhances the ability for affiliations across the university, like my colleague in Dyson stressed. That's point number one.

Point number two is just -- I'm a trained economist, so you always think about the size of the pie versus the division of the pie, the slices of the pie and how you divide up a fixed pie. And it seems like this discussion, the report -- I know most of the members of the committee. Tremendous admiration for the amount of work that they put in, but focus is on how the pie is divided up, rather than making the pie bigger. My view was always Cornell is ideally positioned, if we just get it right, to create a public policy school that will make the pie bigger, and that will be by bringing in external money from alumni, from foundations, from government, et cetera.

One thing I think I have learned, you got to have a shtick, right. And I'll just make this pitch now. I think our shtick at Cornell should be technology and policy. And I think that would help us bring in a lot of money. Doesn't mean everybody, faculty member has to do that. It's just that would be the shtick. We have the tech campus, we have a technical reputation, we have a great computer science department, we have a great engineering college, physics, applied physics, I could go on down the line.

I think our competitive advantage to beat out and vault us to the top to compete with Harvard, Princeton, on down the line would be for the 21st Century -- we don't want to redo what was done in 1970 -- would be to focus on technology and policy and make that our shtick, and bring in all these units, make it a truly cooperative venture that is central to what Cornell University does, central to what Cornell has become known for, frankly, over the past 50 years, and just lever that. So I'm a fan of the school model for those reasons, and that's my pitch.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: When we do the transcript, you're going to have to tell me how to spell shtick. Someone came up at the beginning of the meeting and said they want to speak. I haven't seen that person. Yeah, yeah, come on.

CYNTHIA LIN LAWELL: Hello, everyone. My name is Cynthia Lin Lawell. I'm an associate professor at the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management. Thank you, Charlie and everyone, for giving me the opportunity to speak here. I wanted to echo some of the sentiments that my senior colleague, David Lee, presented in his presentation.

I wanted to acknowledge the work of the committee in trying to enhance public policy at Cornell and also enhance disciplines of economics, psychology and sociology, and of social sciences more generally at Cornell, which was part of its charge. And also, I appreciate that, sort of throughout, in parts of its reports and interim reports, they use some terminology such as recognizing that it is important to avoid a zero-sum game. For example, when they're discussing an expanded economics department, they said they would try and avoid zero-sum environments.

Many faculty throughout the university conduct research relevant to public policy, as David Lee mentioned, and this includes faculty not currently in the College of Human Ecology, and including faculty at Dyson, at the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, to name a few.

In one of the interim reports, I thought the committee did a good job sort of highlighting some of the tracks they wanted or considered as concentrations for the graduate and undergraduate programs, and the reason those tracks stood out to me was that these tracks tend to be areas of strength throughout the whole university. So these tracks were public policy; health and public policy; data science and public policy; and sustainability and public policy.

For each of these areas, there are already-existing programs, faculty and courses that are relevant to each of these areas. For example, for health and public policy, at the University-Wide listening session on December 12, it was expressed by faculty from the Vet School, for example, that they had interest in health and public health.

For data science and public policy, for example, in addition to many of the programs that some of you have mentioned, there's a program, Cornell Initiative for Digital Agriculture, for example, which is both policy and outreach and also is making important advances in data science.

In the area of sustainability and public policy, which is one that's particularly near and dear to my heart, there are a lot of existing strong programs throughout the university, including the Atkinson Center for Sustainable Future; as David mentioned, the cross-college major, environment and sustainability, which is a cross-college major available in both the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; as well as the Dyson School of Applied Economics, where we have faculty expertise, as well as courses in sustainability and policy.

I guess I have two sort of main points. And so my first one was, just as David mentioned, I think it is important to create synergies with these existing programs, faculty and courses, including from colleges, schools and/or departments that are not explicitly mentioned in the committee's interim and final reports.

And this is especially because, as they're making some of these entities even larger and expanding them, the public policy entity, the super-departments, while they're larger than the existing administrative structures for these fields, they're not all-inclusive, and there are many strong existing programs, faculty and courses relevant to public policy that won't be sort of included in these structures.

And those are already strong, as they mentioned, in Cornell. We want to make sure they continue to be strong. And to use terminology that David used, and I think it

is important to leverage and capitalize on our common strengths and interests across Cornell in public policy, sustainability, data science and health and other fields, technology, these are strengths throughout the university, and not just sort of think about what we want to do more narrowly in these created entities.

Just as the committee was cautious about trying to avoid a zero-sum environment within aspects of their proposed structure, so when they talked about avoiding zero-sum, they're worried about having a zero-sum situation with their economics super-department and their public policy entity. Just as they were concerned about these zero-sum sort of environments, we want to be cautious about any zero-sum environments that we might be creating across the university. And instead, we want to actually increase the size of the pie, as Rick Geddes said, and not be doing things that are competitive, rather than synergistic.

My second point is I think along those lines, we want to carefully consider opportunities for synergies, involvement of existing programs, faculty and courses in the newly proposed entity. So think carefully about ways for faculty to be affiliated, for cross-listing courses. And also I think it would be important to consult existing faculty, including faculty and members in the Atkinson Center and the Dyson School, when developing these programs. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, yeah.

SHARON TENNYSON: Hi, everybody. Thank you. I'm Sharon Tennyson. I'm a professor in Policy Analysis and Management. I'm also director of graduate studies for

the field of public affairs, which offers the current Master of Public Administration, MPA degree. So I'm from the College of Human Ecology, but I actually want to speak from a more general perspective, echoing some of the comments that were just made by Cynthia, and by David earlier.

And I'm actually very grateful that we have this central question left up here to remind us of this bigger issue, as we have this discussion. I find the spot we're in now to be kind of weird, given where this process started several years ago, as Kim Weeden pointed out. This is a process that's supposed to strengthen social sciences at Cornell. That was how we started on this path; how do we strengthen social sciences at Cornell.

There was a lot of discussion about utilizing resources better, bringing people together, having some focus, coordination, right. And the discussion around public policy, as I recall, was that public policy is one mechanism which the earlier committees in this process identified as a likely path for strengthening social sciences at Cornell. That doesn't seem to be where we are with this implementation report.

Discussion about public policy entities now seems to be something, in and of itself, completely separated from this question of how do we strengthen social sciences at Cornell. I would hope that this body, I guess, bringing it back to the question of what are we all doing here today; I guess we're really trying to influence senators' views for your February vote. Is that our purpose?

So addressing the senators, I would encourage you to think about the question and the recommendations of the committee in that original broader context: What vehicle for public policy, if any, would be best to strengthen social sciences at Cornell.

And my view was that isolating it in -- a college in the particular way that this report proposes to do, like I think a college or a school is neither here nor there.

What I find strange about the current proposal of the college is that we're just sort of re-branding a college that doesn't, in and of itself, do public policy as a whole. We're going to say okay, we're going to call this a school of public policy and cross our fingers and hope for the best is kind of my take on this report, and I just don't see how that fits with the original mission or charge of how do we strengthen social sciences at Cornell and how can we use public policy as an organizing theme to do that. That's my two cents, or four cents, I guess.

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Are you coming up or are you leaving? Okay. Any more people who would like to come up and offer comments? Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I wonder how is this affecting the staff members, how it would bring an umbrella of modern administration to the whole department. And I'm Plant Biology, and we were in the School of Integrated Plant Science, so I know that that is a huge factor. It really affected all the departments, sections now there.

So I think if it was discussed in the document, I will read it and apologize, because I didn't have time to do that, but I think it's important to consider that, how it would be affecting the staff of all the departments and also how would be the administration umbrella that would be over all these departments or super-departments, or school or whatever you want to call it. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So your question, in a nutshell, is how would the restructure affect staff. Is there anyone who can speak to that or would like to speak to that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's in the report.

Thank you.

WENDY WILCOX: I actually have another question. Wendy Wilcox from the library. Would the school option be more palatable if it wasn't across two colleges? Because when I read the report, that seems to be the sticking point. So it seems like we're letting kind of barriers associated with it being across two colleges limit our options for how we might structure this.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: My understanding, like there's a school of ILR, there's a school of electrical engineering. We use the word in different senses, so your question is the fact that it's spread across more than one college is a complicated factor, but someone want to speak to that? I think the report says that's a strength, right, that it transcends a particular college, but I'd like someone in the know to respond to that, if possible. Okay, anything else? Here we go.

MIKE MAZOUREK: Michael Mazourek, at-large, and also from one of the plant sections in the school. One question, the staffing, but for new faculty hires and the composition, one thing that can accompany a reorganization is target selective hires to be able to move towards new directions.

But also what can accompany that is maybe those target hires do not keep up with attrition rates and you end up with a reduction, finding new balance of how many

faculty are in a unit. And I haven't really heard it discussed or seen in the report if -- what the plans are for ideal faculty numbers of this new group and if it would change and how the -- the faculty in these new units would feel about fewer, but new colleagues.

ANN LEMLEY: I was department chair when PAM was founded. And for at least a year, if not two, all available faculty slots within the college went to PAM to build it, and we now feel they want to take the rest. Not that they want to take the rest, because I don't feel that way at all, from what Sharon and Rick said; but seriously, yeah, that is a very, very interesting idea.

And Rich Burkhauser never believed me, but we were told that as chairs before he came to Cornell, and we all lost -- it happens. That's the way it is. And consequently, they are the largest department in the college, and they've grown beautifully and they've done very, very well. But if we start doing that, collateral damage is only a minor way of describing what would happen to the rest of the college.

STEVEN ALVARADO: Hi. I guess I do have a question.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: So you're not leaving?

STEVEN ALVARADO: I was cramping up.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: State your name and where you're from.

STEVEN ALVARADO: Steven Alvarado, senator from Sociology. I just have a question, I suppose, something that just dawned upon me that I haven't read about yet or heard about in reference to the policy school. Heard a little bit about the economic costs potentially, loss of funding from the state, et cetera, but I haven't seen or heard

anything about any potential benefits with this new school bringing in any revenues that could actually enhance the excellence of social sciences across Cornell, through tuition and fees and other things they would be charging the master's students potentially coming in over time. I don't know. I haven't seen anything about that, so just wondering.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you.

PETE WOLCZANSKI: Pete Wolczanski, Chemistry and Chemical Biology.

Everybody keeps saying the committee did a good job here. I don't see that, honestly. I got ten pages into that report. I was as confused as at the start. I had no idea what the goddamn objective was.

Apparently, the committee was asked to choose between A or B. Every time an administrator asks me to choose between A and B, I say no, tell me what your objective is. If A or B happens to be one of the reasonable answers, we'll get back to you on that.

And I find this whole thing to be as much of a joke, perhaps not quite as much of a joke as the curriculum redistributing of two years ago, which is a colossal waste of everybody's time to come up with the same thing that we effectively had in place, okay. Anything that harms the College of Human Ecology would be terrible. That place is a gem for this university, and we should appreciate that.

(APPLAUSE)

And if some administrator tells you to do something, the first thing you should say, look him in the eye or her in the eye and say, you know what; why don't you tell me

what the damn objective is, so we can figure out what might be the best way to solve the problem.

RHONDA GILMORE: Rhonda Gilmore, Human Ecology, Department of Design and Environmental Analysis. So I'm curious if the objective was not explicit, but that in the administration, there is the potential for a naming opportunity of a school and that an alumni has approached this university to say I will give you \$50 million, \$100 million if you'll name a school after me. And I'd be curious if someone could answer that question for me. Thank you.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Additional comments from the floor?

RICHARD BENSEL: Richard Bensel, Government. The last two comments really struck me, because I've been thinking the same thing: that much of the restructuring of a college of public policy should be guided by the principle that you should not force people into places they don't want to be.

If you're pursuing excellence, you start with a pot of money, and you really need that. And then you attract a dean from the outside, who helps design that program. And then at that point, that dean, having that pot of money, attracting some of the faculty to initially staff it with, at that point, you ask people in public policy whether or not they want to join that program. It's voluntary. It's not coercive. You don't force people into something they do not want.

You start with that kind of base-- you're not going to get anywhere with excellence on the cheap. You don't take existing organizations and move them around and force people into places they don't want to be. You wait until you have a good

opportunity to found the College -- I think \$100 million is still cheap. I think you're really talking about \$200 million or so, but you only start with a real program, a real opportunity, attracting real talent, both from outside and inside the university, and the recruitment of faculty is voluntary.

And then at that point, once all of this shakes out and you've got that up and running, then you figure out how you should rearrange existing programs. Some of those may not exist anymore, because the migration to the new college is total. Others will have a changed identity that they have to justify and figure out. But you don't found a new college on the cheap. This is a disaster in the making.

(APPLAUSE)

NEEMA KUDVA: Neema Kudva, Associate Dean of Faculty. I've always wondered about the difference between super-departments and fields, and was wondering if you could talk a little bit more about that. I like the idea of this session, where we're thinking about options, discussing issues and hoping to influence and persuade all of you to make sort of the right decision when it comes to a vote.

And so to the senator who was very irritated with us because we didn't have a resolution, the idea here is to really have a conversation, and I think -- I'm trying to reflect back what I've heard from some folks, which is we don't understand this difference between super-departments and fields. So if you could just discuss that for a second, that would be great.

KIM WEEDEN: It's not on, is it? It is. What do you know? A joke answer, and both of them are entities that are unique to Cornell and nobody else in the entire

universe knows what they are. But the field system is really about graduate education. The field system does not have a budget, so there is no money in the field, with the exception of whatever graduate fellowships you may get by virtue -- comes to the field from the graduate school. The graduate fields have nothing to do with undergraduate education. They really have nothing to do with research, they are really about graduate education.

Super-departments are sort of, in theory, more like what a disciplinary department would do, and has all the functions thereof, of hiring faculty and so forth. But I think what you really may be getting at is how does the super-department structure, as a way of bringing people together, differ from the field, which has been Cornell's long-standing idea of how you bring people from different units together who have a common mission.

That, I think, is a really good question, and I've been here 18 years. Some of my colleagues have been here much longer, long enough to know that nobody really knows what a field is. At some points, we've expanded the field as a way to bring people in. At some points, we've shrunk the field as a way to maintain more coherence and more collective identity.

It never seems to make any difference whatsoever, partly because nobody outside of Cornell thinks about the world in terms of fields, and partly because fields don't have any money, so you can't do anything with a field that would really enhance excellence. I think it's a useful placeholder, but it's useful primarily in the sense that it gives graduate students and prospective graduate students a list of people on a website

who are also sociologists who are outside the core disciplinary department of sociology. But other than that, it's not an effective organizational structure for kind of real and lasting change, I think, of the sort that is under discussion today.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: David Delchamps, Electrical and Computer Engineering. Just a couple questions. Do super-departments have chairs? Is there a chair of a super-department? No, I'm totally curious. Yes, Mike says, okay.

Say there's a super-department of statistical sciences, and it includes people in ILR who are in ILRSTAT, includes people in other departments. So do those folks have two chairs they answer to?

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Don't look at me. These are all questions that will be -- if anyone knows the answer --

DAVID DELCHAMPS: Some of these exist. Okay, that's a question.

Another thing, you asked for comment on previous administrative kind of reshufflings and whatever. I just want to comment on the CIS thing briefly. I've been here for 38 years at Cornell, so I've been here longer than a lot of you guys.

Anyway, when I came, there was EE and there was CS. CS was a department in the College of Engineering. They had majors from the Arts and Sciences College, but Department of College of Engineering, that's where the tenure home of the Computer Science professors was. And later on, we became ECE, Electrical and Computer Engineering. And around 2000, I think it was, CIS, Computing and Information Sciences, was formed. And I thought this is a really interesting idea.

And I had a colleague in my department, since retired, who didn't think it was such an interesting idea and was very upset about it, and he thought this is some way for them -- for CS to short-circuit the route to the provost and blah, blah, blah.

And so it was weird, because they established this thing called Computing and Information Sciences, and it was emphatically not a college, but it had a dean. He wasn't the dean of Computer Engineering -- Information Sciences. He was the dean for Computing and Information Sciences, and everyone wonders what does that exactly mean. Like does tenure decision go through that dean or through the dean of Engineering. And it actually goes through the dean of Engineering. It's really complicated, and I've never quite understood what CIS is, in that way.

Some of my colleagues still joke well, when it comes to resource allocation in the College of Engineering, they want to be part of the -- Computer Science wants to be part of the College of Engineering. When it comes to obeying rules, they want to be part of CIS, which is kind of like their own college, so there's a sarcastic view of the world.

The bottom line, I guess, of these rambling comments is when you create these interesting entities, whether they be schools of public policy that overlap -- I was an undergrad at Princeton. I'm very familiar with Woodrow Wilson School of Public International Affairs. That is tied firmly to the Government Department or what they call Politics at Princeton. And I was surprised, as you were, about the sort of lack of talk about the Government faculty in the report, when they were talking about the school option.

But anyway, these strange entities, a lot of us don't really understand what they are and whether they have chairs or whether they have deans or whether they have -- where the budget lines go. I'd love to have all that clarified at some point, so this is really just -- I'm asking for that. I don't know if anyone else agrees, but --

(APPLAUSE)

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Thank you.

KIM WEEDEN: I can answer the chair question quickly. The idea of the super-department is basically just to have some label that differentiates it from the department that already exists currently at Cornell; but eventually, a super-department would have one chair. It would make hiring decisions as a department, it would allocate resources as a department, like a normal department does.

But I think the idea of calling it a super-department -- by the way, I think this actually came out of the 2006 subcommittee that I was on that talked about super-departments, so some things never change. The idea of differentiating it was simply to acknowledge that this isn't, say, the Department of Sociology absorbing or overtaking the sociologists in PAM. It really is designed to be a new entity that really has a collective, shared mission to do the discipline -- do research in the discipline of sociology, teach in the discipline of sociology.

Effectively, you could think about it as a placeholder name, and hopefully one that will disappear eventually. It's just a department. Just like EEB is now department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. At one point, it was two departments split across

two colleges, as I understand it. It became a super-department, but then shed that name. So lines would still be held by colleges, yeah.

DAVID DELCHAMPS: This is something I've never fully understood.

MIKE KOTLIKOFF: I sort of feel like I'm lurking here a little bit. I wanted to stay out and just listen, and I've been listening very closely to the comments. Just a few comments. Super-department is, I think, one of those genius evolutions that Cornell has developed.

I gave this example, I think, the last faculty senate meeting: Before 2000, we had Biology in CALS and we had Biology in Arts. Imagine if we still had competing Biology departments in CALS and Arts. Before 2000, people got together -- I'm sure there were people opposed, people in favor, but they decided to create one department, Molecular Biology and Genetics, which is roughly half composed of CALS faculty, half composed of Arts faculty, one chair, a lead dean. 20 years later, you've got a department culture that it self-defines where they're going, what excellence is, et cetera. They're not competing with each other, they're collaborating.

Cornell is seen as a strength because it is the combined effort of those biologists, not separate. We have this in Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, we have it in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, we have it to a certain -- a little different flavor in CIS, we have it now in Computational Biology. We just started a department of Computational Biology that used to be wholly housed in CALS and was limited by the fact that it was wholly housed in CALS, and that now is a shared department with Arts and CIS as well.

So it is a solution, I think, that creates the kind of plasticity and brings people of like disciplines together. I agree with Kim's statement; it does something that the field structure just can't do because it combines it in a more holistic way.

I just want to say one other thing. I am listening and hearing these views. I want to go back to what we started -- and this is a little frustrating because I've been in front of the faculty senate maybe three or four times discussing this. We started with how to strengthen the social sciences.

We've got two proposals and we've adopted one effort. One is to create a center for the social sciences. Two very strong faculty have stood that up, we've got a proposal, we've funded that. That's a real effort to try and improve the social sciences. This isn't just about policy, but policy is a big part of the social sciences.

The second area is this idea of super-departments or multi-college departments, how to connect faculty that are of the same discipline and bring them together and not have them competing for students, competing for faculty, try and present the best face to recruiting faculty that Cornell can probably present.

Richard's comments about starting something up de novo when asking people to join, well, in a practice, I think you want to create the most attractive proposition for the best faculty to be recruiting the most exciting younger faculty, the most exciting junior faculty, if you so choose. That's the idea of the super-departments discussion.

And yes, there's lots to do around how to make that work and how to make that really deliver, and all those answers aren't there. And then policy is a distinct component of that. And I've been listening, and this discussion really is designed, I

think, to get views about what's the best way to create excellence in public policy.

That's all I'll say.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: We're over, but one more comment from the back row there.

KATHY RASMUSSEN: It turns on, okay.

Kathy Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences. I want to thank the provost for that excellent description of how two college departments came together, be very successful. And I ask you why are we not talking about combining Government and PAM, to make such a department, because they create just the excellence that you want for the gentleman from Government -- or I guess maybe I don't have the department correct, but why is that not the nucleus we're working from, instead of trying to take a college apart? It just makes no sense.

MIKE KOTLIKOFF: To just answer that briefly, there have been many discussions with Government. I'm speaking now for the committee, but they have had many discussions with Government, as well as with PAM. Any implementation of this, I completely agree, has to build on the excellence that's the policy faculty within Government. That's not all the Government faculty, but that has to be a critical component of this, as many people have said, whatever model we choose. If we don't do that, we won't succeed to the highest degree.

CHARLIE VAN LOAN: Okay, we're going to have to end here. I just want to say a few things. First, we always produce a transcript, and we always give you a chance to

edit it, make sure it captures what you said. It's sort of extra important this time. This will show up in four or five days, so please pay attention to that.

As I mentioned, the UFC always has the responsibility to look at a session like this one and extract sense of the senate motions. You should also be aware, there are mechanisms -- four senators can propose a resolution. All that stuff is out there for any group that wants to put that forth. And the last thing I have to say is there's a bar down the end of the corridor here.