

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
