

# **Resolutions Related to the Final Report of the Social Science Implementation Committee**

**Professor David Lee**

At-Large member, UFC

Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, JCB

Dept. of Global Development, CALS

# Resolution 1

## 1. ***On “Super-departments”***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate endorses the Committee recommendation to pursue the creation of “super-departments” in Economics, Psychology, and Sociology;

*Be it further resolved* that there is strong agreement with the Committee’s wish, as noted in the Final Report, that there be “additional conversations among the respective units in the Spring 2020 semester, a commitment of resources to facilitate the re-organization, and continued attention to the issue of co-location.”

# Resolution on “Super-departments”

## ***Arguments in favor:***

1. Improve disciplinary interaction, collaboration, diversity of scholarship, and synergies
2. Improve recruitment
3. Increase national disciplinary profiles
4. Benefits to teaching, graduate training, service responsibilities, etc.

## ***Concerns:***

- Who decides who’s in a super-department?
- “Cultural differences” across units, “department identity and focus”  
*“...differences could presumably be solved with time and continued interaction and governance”*
- Balance across sub-disciplinary areas
- Hiring and promotion practices, etc., will need to be “equalized” across colleges  
*“Presumably, super-departments... can consider relevant solutions and strategies used in successful existing super-departments on campus.”*

## Resolutions 2 & 3

### **2. *On the Cross-College School Model (the “School option”)***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate supports the development of a Cross-College School of Public Policy;

### **3. *On the College Model (the “College option”)***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate does not support the “re-envisioning” of the College of Human Ecology as a College of Public Policy.

# Limited Mandate of Implementation Committee

- “... our committee was asked to specifically focus on creating the strongest structure for policy ***but was not charged with deciding which of these paths would be better overall for the university to pursue.***”
- “... it was ***beyond the mandate of the committee to address the collateral impacts any such organizational changes might have on the non-policy units and functions within CHE,*** though considering these effects was an inescapable part of our deliberations and a key part of our listening sessions.”

*Final Report, p. 3 [emphasis added]*

# Resolution 2 Concerning a Cross-College School of Public Policy (the “School option”)

## ***Arguments in favor:***

1. Greater inclusivity of full range of policy-oriented faculty university-wide, who far exceed policy faculty in CHE
2. Unclear impact and potential disenfranchisement of non-policy faculty, students and programs comprising ~75% of Human Ecology
3. Explicit inclusion of international policy scholars from strong programs across campus; CHE focus primarily domestic
4. Long history of successful cross-college collaboration across academic units at Cornell; management challenges exist under *either* option
5. “Greater coherence and singularity of focus” of School option; potential that the hybrid nature and diffused mission of College option may create “significant tension and uncertainty” (pp. 5-6, *Final Report*)
6. What is “value-added” of 2 (of 4) academic concentrations which are *already* strong programs at Cornell

# Resolution 3 Concerning a College of Public Policy (the “College option”)

## ***Arguments in favor (Final Report, p. 5):***

1. Cleaner, more autonomous organizational structure
2. Ability to recruit highest caliber Dean candidates

## ***Response:***

- Benefits of cross-college structures are cited as key justifications ***in favor of*** “super-departments” ...but cited as problematic for policy school
- A “new venture unique to Cornell and also highly influential and impactful in public policy” (p. 4) should be very attractive in recruiting a new Dean.

## ***Final note:***

- Split (6 to 4) vote of Implementation Committee in favor of “College option”
- Of 22 Senators and faculty speaking at January 22 Special Meeting, not one voiced support for this option.

# Three Resolutions sponsored by UFC

## 1. ***On “Super-departments”***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate endorses the Committee recommendation to pursue the creation of “super-departments” in Economics, Psychology, and Sociology;

*Be it further resolved* that there is strong agreement with the Committee’s wish, as noted in the Final Report, that there be “additional conversations among the respective units in the Spring 2020 semester, a commitment of resources to facilitate the re-organization, and continued attention to the issue of co-location.”

## 2. ***On the Cross-College School Model (the “School option”)***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate supports the development of a Cross-College School of Public Policy.

## 3. ***On the College Model (the “College option”)***

*Be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate does not support the “re-envisioning” of the College of Human Ecology as a College of Public Policy.

# Resolution 1, Call For a Vote

I **support** the [resolution on super-departments](#) that recommends the development of such units for economics, psychology, and sociology.

Yes

\_\_\_\_\_

No

\_\_\_\_\_

Abstain

\_\_\_\_\_

## Resolution 2, Call For a Vote

I **support** the [resolution concerning a cross-college school of public policy](#) that recommends proceeding with the development of such a unit.

Yes

\_\_\_\_\_

No

\_\_\_\_\_

Abstain

\_\_\_\_\_

# Resolution 3, Call For a Vote

I **support** the [resolution concerning a college of public policy](#) which recommends **NOT** proceeding with the development of such a unit.

Yes

\_\_\_\_\_

No

\_\_\_\_\_

Abstain

\_\_\_\_\_