

# International Dual Degree Programs: Background

University Faculty Committee

May 10, 2021

## 1. Senate Deliberations

The subject of International Dual Degree Programs (IDDPs) was discussed over a sequence of Senate meetings during the S21 semester. Below is a summary. Chat and audio from a meeting are available by clicking on the date.

### [February 10](#)

A [proposed IDDP](#) between the School of Hotel Administration (SHA) and Guanghua School of Management at Peking University (PKU) was presented. ([slides](#)).

### [February 24](#)

A second [presentation](#) of the SHA + PKU program was given with this [additional background](#).

### [March 10](#)

This was a special meeting devoted entirely to the topic of IDDPs. It featured a panel discussion led by four faculty members who provided background and answered questions:

[Eli Friedman](#) (ILR, [background](#))

[TJ Hinrichs](#) (History, [background](#) , [notes and outline for follow-up](#))

[Carmen Moraru](#) (Food Science, [background](#))

[Connie Yuan](#) (Global Development, Communication, [background](#))

Posted in the [chat](#) are links to articles ([R1](#), [R2](#), [R3](#), [R4](#), [R5](#), [R6](#), [R7](#), [R8](#), [R9](#), [R10](#), [R11](#), [R12](#), [R13](#)) and Wikipedia ([W1](#), [W2](#), [W3](#)) that help expose the complexity of academic engagement in China.

### [March 17](#)

The Vice Provost for International Affairs [Wendy Wolford](#) gave an [overview](#) of [Global Cornell](#) and the [Cornell China Center](#) and answered questions.

### [March 31](#)

Two IDDP-related resolutions were presented and a [Sense-of-the-Senate](#) vote was taken regarding the proposed SHA+PKU program. (17 Yes; 39 No; 20 Abstain; 52 DNV). An eVote was taken on the two formal resolutions:

[Resolution 160](#) Regarding Vetting of International Dual Degree Programs (72 yes; 6 no; 12 abstain; 38 DNV)

[Resolution 161](#) Regarding Joint or Dual Degree Programs Involving Other Academic Institutions (78 yes; 6 no; 7 abstain; 37 DNV)

## 2. References

The design of an effective IDDP approval process requires familiarity with these docs and statements:

### [University Bylaws](#)

Article XIII, Section 2 specifies when the Senate can be involved in an educational matter:

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

The basis for possible Senate involvement in the IDDP approval process is that such programs are “general in nature.” Justification of Senate involvement based on the “more than one college” argument is not convincing since the IDDP’s were unknown at the time Article XIII was written; it is not plausible to count the external unit as a “second college”.

An alternate “bylaw point of view” says that degree programs located entirely within a particular college are the business of that college:

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

Finally, to make matters even more ambiguous, the following bylaw passage suggests that the Graduate Faculty should have a role to play if the program is at the Masters or PhD level:

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

### [Cornell University Core Values Statement](#)

Two of the six stated values have particular relevance to IDDP approval:

**Free and Open Inquiry and Expression.** We are a community whose very purpose is the pursuit of knowledge. We value free and open inquiry and expression—tenets that underlie academic freedom—even of ideas some may consider wrong or offensive. Inherent in this commitment is the corollary freedom to engage in reasoned opposition to messages to which one objects.

**Changing Lives through Public Engagement** As the land-grant institution of New York, with our main campus within the ancestral homelands of the Cayuga Nation and a long history of national and international connections, we value engagement in our community, our state, and the broader world, learning about their needs and strengths, and applying the knowledge we create for the benefit of society.

The [University Statement on Academic Freedom](#) and well as the discussion of that topic in [Cornell’s Middle States Self-Study](#) (p. 30-31) shed further light on the “IDDP dilemma”. At what point do free speech concerns in the partner environment rise to such a level that we must turn away from doing work that benefits society?

## [Ethical Guidelines for International Collaboration](#)

This (11/14/2019) memo from the Provost and Vice Provost for International Affairs offers six guidelines that “are intended to help faculty members collaborate with research partners in areas of the world where certain forms of speech and expression may be prohibited or limited, while still protecting academic freedom.”

## [Academic Program Registration](#)

This questionnaire-type document is “owned” by [Institutional Research and Planning](#) and the Graduate School. It is critical to the approval process for both IDDP’s and various new programs that are solely within Cornell. (Central to the proposed approval process is the addition of five additional questions to this form.)

## [MOA Registry](#)

Global Cornell maintains a [Registry of Memorandums of Agreement](#) that lists 100s of recent and ongoing international collaborations. The MOA’s are not public but they always include academic freedom protections. This [template document](#) that is used for developing a MOA includes this text:

Generally accepted principles of academic freedom will be applicable to all educational and research activities undertaken by, or under the direction of, faculty who participate in the projects contemplated by this MOA.

## [Committee on Academic Programs and Policies \(CAPP\)](#)

The charge for this standing committee of the Senate includes says that it “concerns itself with academic programs and policies which are independent of or extend beyond the single or joint jurisdiction of a school or college faculty. It initially screens formal proposals for new academic programs, degrees, or policies.

### **3. Addressing Inconsistencies**

The last time the Senate approved an IDDP was in 2004. It was Masters-level and involved the SHA and Nanyang Tech University in Singapore. See the [resolution](#), this [background document](#), and this [discussion](#) (pages 3-6) at the Oct 13, 2004 Senate.

Two IDDPs are currently in operation:

1. The [Cornell-Tsinghua Finance MBA](#) has been in existence for some time. There is no record of Senate involvement in the approval process.
2. There is a recently launched undergraduate IDDP between Food Science and the Chinese Agricultural University. [Details](#). The programs was discussed in the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies (CAPP) but not in the Senate proper.

This [protocol](#) was developed in 2012 to determine when the Senate should be involved. Unfortunately, the document has not kept up with recent changes that have been made to many of our professional degree programs that now “answer” to their college instead of the Graduate School.