

# **Social Sciences Implementation Committee Interim Report: Considering School and College Structures for Public Policy at Cornell November, 2019**

## **Preliminary Thoughts**

This document is meant to provide the university community with the current state of the Implementation Committee's (hereafter "The Committee") thinking around public policy at Cornell. This document represents our second communication around this topic, with our [vision statement on public policy](#) being the first. This interim report is not meant to be interpreted as our final word on the subject, as our thinking is likely to evolve based on internal conversations within the Committee and the various listening sessions happening over roughly the next month.

## **Interpretation of Our Charge and Information in this Interim Update**

The Committee has been charged by President Pollack and Provost Kotlikoff with making recommendations about how the university could best be restructured to create an academic unit that would elevate research, teaching, and outreach around public policy. The Committee was specifically tasked with reviewing the merits of two alternate options for doing so: (1) a cross-college school of public policy situated between the College of Arts and Sciences (hereafter "CAS") and the College of Human Ecology (hereafter "CHE") and (2) a college model in which CHE was focused and strengthened around public policy.<sup>1</sup>

Although the Committee intends to recommend which option will be best for public policy by the end of this semester, our committee, in consultation with the provost, has decided that it is beyond the scope of the Committee's mandate to make any recommendation around which of these options Cornell ultimately should pursue. This final decision has dimensions beyond strengthening public policy at Cornell, and therefore would require additional conversations and decisions beyond this committee among the trustees, president, provost, and CHE college leadership concerning the future of CHE. That said, we intend to highlight in our report possible implications for CHE and CAS and the broader university to provide context for their decision.

**We would like to emphasize however that we see these implications as a *preliminary list that would need to be expanded, vetted, and discussed among the broader community of relevant stakeholders and leadership.* We would also like to emphasize, as the provost has stressed in all of his discussions of the review, that neither of the models we outline here would result in job loss for faculty or staff.**

In this interim update, we do three things. First, we outline general points of agreement among committee members around what any public policy entity, whether a cross-college school or a college, would need in order to be successful. Second, we provide an overview of a model for the

<sup>1</sup> At the last decision point, the president and provost removed three options for a policy entity from the table: a virtual school; a school that was encompassed only in CHE; and a school that was encompassed only in CAS. As such, we do not consider these or other options for the policy entity throughout this document.

best possible cross-college school of public policy. In this section, we highlight both advantages and challenges of this vision, as well as identifying unresolved issues. Third, we provide an overview for the best possible College of Public Policy model and again highlight both advantages and challenges, as well as noting unresolved issues.

For each model, we focus on nine categories: (1) governance; (2) resources; (3) undergraduate training; (4) masters training; (5) doctoral training; (6) extension and outreach; (7) possible implications for CHE; (8) possible implications for CAS; and (9) implications for the university.

In this interim report, we have not attempted to provide exhaustive coverage in each area. Rather, we have tried to provide enough detail to make it possible for the university community to see some potential advantages and challenges for each model. Although this is not an exhaustive list of areas in which each of the models should be evaluated, the Committee felt that as combined they provide a clear idea of the possible implications and characteristics of each model.

The Committee was also charged with proposing models for super-departments in the disciplines of economics (involving the Policy Analysis and Management Department [hereafter “PAM”] in CHE and the Economics Department in CAS and School of Industrial and Labor Relations [hereafter “ILR”]), psychology (involving the Department of Human Development [hereafter “HD”] in CHE and the Psychology Department in CAS), and sociology (involving PAM in CHE and the Sociology Department in CAS). The existence of these super-departments would affect the structure, governance, and operation of each of the two possible policy entities. However, we are not yet far enough along in our committee work (in terms of the committee’s consultation with the respective departments) to make recommendations around super-departments. For the purposes of this update, we assume the existence of super-departments and will note issues around them where needed for each model.

We look forward to hearing feedback from the university community on these policy models. **We want to emphasize again that this interim update is just that – it is not our final report and instead reflects our current thinking about these issues.** As is evident, there are many unresolved issues that will require continued conversations. The main objective of the upcoming listening sessions and meetings is to hear feedback from faculty, students, and staff on these models and the advantages and challenges of each. We also hope to hear feedback on how we might propose addressing some of the unresolved issues we highlight. We will then be using that feedback to continue working on these issues through the middle of December, at which time we will make our final recommendation for a public policy entity.

### **Starting Points for An Excellent Policy Entity**

Before listing these general points of agreement, it is worth noting that we heard broad consensus in the university community (based on the feedback we have received) that the [policy entity vision](#) we articulated is strong and provides an outline for a bright future for Cornell in public policy. There were also some concerns and suggestions. We will address these along with other changes in the final report.

Additionally, we want to emphasize that either entity would unfold over a matter of years, and would depend on careful consideration by the stakeholders of all relevant issues.

The Committee agrees that any successful public policy entity, however it is implemented, must:

- Be a university-wide entity with true inclusion of faculty outside the units contributing most of the faculty lines (i.e., a core group of faculty from other colleges and schools should have non-zero percent-time appointments). For the “school” model, this would mean that a core group of faculty beyond CAS and CHE would be included; for the “college” model, this would mean that a core group of faculty beyond the College of Public Policy (hereafter “CPP”) would be included. These affiliations need not be present right at the beginning, but could be added over the initial early years as the entity takes shape and is implemented.<sup>2</sup>
- Have an autonomous leadership model that includes its own Dean and leadership and control of its own resources and lines. Although this would be by default the case for the College model, the Committee does not believe that a cross-college School would be able to achieve excellence in public policy without its own Dean with control of resources.<sup>3</sup>

In the sections that follow, we provide more specific insight into the two models. After listing the possible advantages and challenges, we list unresolved issues that require additional consideration by the Implementation Committee and then, subsequently, by university and college leadership. The two models have some elements in common, particularly as they relate to undergraduate, masters, and doctoral teaching, programming, and training. **As a result, there is some overlap in our analysis of the advantages, challenges, and unresolved issues in the Cross-college School and the College models.**

### CROSS-COLLEGE SCHOOL MODEL

A cross-college entity would likely be called a School of Public Policy, reflecting the naming convention used by most universities for their public policy units. The School would maximize existing resources and opportunities, between CHE and CAS, and be based on examples of successful cross-college units that are already in existence here at Cornell (e.g., Computing and Information Science [hereafter “CIS”]).

Because a School of Public Policy at Cornell would be starting something new--bringing together relevant units and individual faculty into a new School--rather than transforming an existing entity into a College of Public Policy, we see the steps leading to a successful School of Public Policy as relatively straightforward (whereas the College Option would likely involve significant ongoing negotiations). This is not to suggest, of course, that a School Option is not without potentially serious challenges, which we outline below.

<sup>2</sup> The phasing of the development of the Policy Entity is a management decision versus this committee’s decision. Early stages of the entity will depend on faculty who want to be centrally involved in the extensive initial planning around hiring, governance, outreach, and graduate and undergraduate training and curricula.

<sup>3</sup> As we note below, it is an open question whether the School would need to be an admitting entity for undergraduates to succeed. (Any policy entity would be an admitting entity for Masters programming.)

## **1. Governance**

To achieve the goals articulated above, a successful cross-college school of public policy would need its own dean (possibly one who reported directly to the provost) and would need to function with a great deal of autonomy from the two colleges that contribute the majority of lines to it (CHE and CAS) in order to succeed. This autonomy should include, maybe most crucially, decision-making around hiring in the School. If the School Dean does not have autonomy around hiring, the committee generally felt that the School was unlikely to succeed to the level of ambition that Cornell has in public policy.

There was a general sense that a shared dean model (CHE and CAS deans co-control the School) or a dependent dean model (CHE and CAS deans co-control the School with the dean of the School) was unlikely to make it possible for the School to achieve the level of prominence Cornell is seeking to achieve in policy, mostly because the dean would have to depend on and negotiate securing scarce resources from two other deans. There are examples at Cornell of this kind of negotiation working, but it is more complicated, and the committee generally agreed that this was not the preferred method.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Governance**

#### Advantages:

- Possibility for a new dean “starting fresh” to operate in collaboration with existing deans to form a new entity they would help create
- High coherence around public policy
- Inherent sharing and collaboration built into the structure from the start could make it easier to realize a university-wide entity
- Simple structure whereby governance handled by professors affiliated with school. For example, a professor in the Sociology super-department who wants to be in the School could be a Professor of Sociology and Public Policy and holds appointments in the School and CHE. School governance would be enabled by the affiliated Professors of Public Policy.

#### Challenges:

- Governance and coordination problems in a range of areas (including new hiring from across the university) because of the inherent complexities of coordinating with multiple deans
- Adds a new dean to the university, raising the ultimate decision making around complex allocation of resources to the provost level
- CHE/CAS deans may be unwilling to serve in a more limited advisory role to the School
- Coordination of super-departments across three units (for at least Sociology and Economics) could be challenging. For example, service obligations of faculty would need to be carefully articulated for each faculty member to avoid overwhelming service obligations to many units, i.e., to a college, a school, and a super-department, possibly leading faculty to provide minimal service to some or all units and harming research productivity

Unresolved Issues:

- There are a number of unresolved issues around governance, especially because the exact model we propose of a strong School does not have a perfect parallel elsewhere at Cornell (although there are some possibly relevant examples, such as CIS).

## **2. Resources**

The dean of the School of Public Policy should have a budget commensurate with the number of faculty, staff, and students engaged in public policy. This level of control over resources is necessary to achieve excellence in policy under the cross-college school model. The proposed [policy entity vision](#) would include all of the lines (full-time equivalents [hereafter “FTEs”]) currently in PAM (29) plus an additional number of joint FTE lines for the rollout of “traditional” policy programming, drawing mostly from the Department of Government in CAS (but also possibly from other interested units on campus such as ILR and Law), and an additional number of lines for the rollout of more cutting-edge programming covering a range of areas and new hiring. The total number of FTEs should be commensurate with teaching needs at both the graduate (e.g., masters’ programs) and undergraduate levels, and in line with projected new areas of strength in policy. The proposed School would be likely moderate in terms of size (of FTEs) relative to peer institutions.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Resources**

Advantages:

- A large share of the resources already needed to start a policy school exist, and much of the additional hiring would be relatively simple (i.e., adding more political scientists and in other disciplines as needed to fulfill the mission)
- If policy-minded faculty across the university choose to negotiate FTE involvement in the School, their home units could be compensated with FTE replacements. This would provide an opportunity to build in areas across Cornell that are not policy related, while still retaining the expertise of the policy faculty

Challenges:

- If the desired number of lines or replacement FTEs are not possible, the school would be small and hence limited in both its impact and its visibility (hence, will need clarity and assurance of extra FTEs beyond PAM faculty)
- Units sharing faculty FTEs to the School face adjustments in how they are characterized to constituents in home colleges

Unresolved Issues:

- The key unresolved issue when thinking about resources is where the lines would come from. Given the university’s planned increases in undergraduate enrollment and the substantial increases in masters training that a school would lead to, these could be truly new lines. The lines could also be seeded through a radical collaboration around public policy approaches to inequality, health, data and other identified issues.

## **3. Undergraduate Training**

The existing PAM major would be refocused as a cross-college major in public policy. Given the high concentration of health policy faculty, it may also be reasonable to include the existing CHE Health Care Policy major in the School. In line with the areas of innovation proposed in the vision statement, we imagine additional concentrations in Data Science and Public Policy, and Sustainability and Public Policy. Additional concentrations, such as business, technology, or human development, could be added based on the interest of affiliated faculty. There is currently a policy minor that exists in PAM and also one in Government. The School model might provide a way for these two minors to come together and reduce redundancies across the two degrees on campus.

Under the School model, other than the PAM major, all majors currently offered in CAS and CHE should remain within those colleges.

Given the innovative combination of proposed faculty in the school, it is likely that new (possibly cross-college) majors would develop within it over time, and this should evolve based on decision-making among key faculty members in the new entity. We think a smaller initial number of majors (roughly 75-100 per class) is a reasonable and realistic starting point but eventually this number might increase considerably over the next 10-15 years. This is based on current numbers of students across campus currently taking policy courses (even absent a coordinated public policy entity), the number of undergraduate majors at peer policy institutions, and planned enrollment growth.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Undergraduate Training**

#### Advantages:

- Four coherent tracks that could have a common point of entry and be advertised and administered easily (and additional tracks could be added)
  1. Public Policy
  2. Health and Public Policy (with pre-med option)
  3. Data Science and Public Policy
  4. Sustainability and Public Policy
- Reframing of PAM major as Public Policy major (with significant contributions from Government) would strengthen the major and better reflect the research of the PAM faculty (who do very little management research)
- Students could enroll in a chosen college based on their interest level in the general education requirements (similar to Biology majors)
- Classes relevant to data science and public policy, sustainability policy, health policy, could be offered by interested affiliate faculty in outside units as new tracks are launched and as the School grows, making it a truly university-wide endeavor

#### Challenges:

- Complications and questions around where the new majors would come from, despite projected growth of undergraduates at Cornell. Admission numbers would need to be negotiated/fixed to prevent competition and loss to other units

- Complications around budgets across colleges and key departments in CAS, especially if the School is not an undergraduate admitting entity
- Hiring or negotiating affiliations in data science and public policy and sustainability policy would need to happen relatively quickly to launch new tracks
- Need to distinguish new Public Policy major from Government major and determine possibilities of double-majoring in two related majors
- Need to figure out how the current Public Policy minor in Government is aligned with the current PAM minor in Public Policy
- Policy major requirements must be harmonized for CAS students (who enter without a declared major) and CHE students (who would continue to enter CHE having declared a Public Policy major).

#### Unresolved Issues:

- As noted above, there are many unresolved issues around undergraduate training for the School option. The two most significant issues are whether the School will be an admitting entity for undergraduates and how many majors would initially be offered in public policy.<sup>4</sup>

### **4. Masters Training**

Masters training is essential to virtually all policy entities. In a cross-college School model, it could be possible to offer Masters of Health Administration (currently housed within PAM), a Masters of Public Administration (hereafter “MPA”) (currently housed within CHE), and a Masters of Public Policy (hereafter “MPP”) (which would need to be approved by the state but would be core to this endeavor). The curricula and accreditation of MPA and MPP programs are distinct, as MPA programs focus primarily on the management of public organizations, while MPP programs focus primarily on creating and analyzing public policies and programs. Additional programs may develop over time (including, but not limited to, masters programs around data science and public policy and sustainability policy), and synergies between the current programs are likely (i.e., around admissions, recruitment, and methodological courses).

#### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Masters Training**

##### Advantages:

- Having a cross-college School of Public Policy house the various policy-relevant Masters programs would likely enhance the number and quality of applicants within those various programs (because of the coherence of the entity)
- Masters students would enter into a built-in structure to maximize on their education with faculty across colleges and fields
- Possibilities for economies of scale as the entity rolls out and grows
- An MPP program would strengthen ties to policy-making in the state, nation, and world
- Masters programs do not have the zero-sum issues inherent in undergraduate programs

<sup>4</sup> Projections for course-taking or majors could be developed based on current course-taking, with assumptions built in about how much more appealing a policy major would be when better named (i.e., not PAM), well-rounded (in the sense that it included extensive training in political science), and offered across two colleges (CAS and CHE).

- Having a School (or College) of Public Policy would allow for more direct involvement of tenure-track faculty in professional masters training than currently occurs.

#### Challenges:

- Difficulties inherent in getting state approval for new programs (especially the MPP, which would be core to any School or College)
- Need new faculty and staff to support a new set of masters programs
- New and current faculty would have to balance/coordinate teaching at the undergrad and masters levels

#### Unresolved Issues:

- A core unresolved issue is that a new MPP would need to be approved by the state. Although there is not currently a competing program—University at Albany, State University of New York has a Masters of Public Administration, which differs significantly from a Masters of Public Policy in many key ways—state approval of new degree programs can be a complex, lengthy, and sometimes unpredictable process.
- A second important unresolved issue is how many MPP students we could expect to attract in the beginning. Programs at peer institutions, some of which started MPP programs relatively recently, could provide good projections for enrollment.
- A third issue arises around governance of these professional degree programs. Typically, professional masters programs are governed by the school or college offering them. That model could be adopted for these professional masters programs. Whatever the governance structure of these programs is, consideration should be given to how best to support the excellence of the policy entity and serve the interests of the students of these programs. These considerations also include how to allow the programs to adapt to changing environments and connect students with tenure-track and instructional faculty with proven policy expertise.

### **5. Doctoral Training**

There is an existing PhD program in Policy Analysis and Management that could be broadened to reflect the new faculty coming together in the shared school (and the related teaching assistant needs that it will have). If there are super-departments of Economics, Psychology, and Sociology, it might be possible to offer joint programs of Economics and Public Policy, Government and Public Policy, Psychology and Public Policy, and Sociology and Public Policy, as other peer institutions do.<sup>5</sup> The target size for this program would depend on number of policy-affiliated faculty in these super-departments and graduate school (and CHE and CAS) resources, as well as whether any other current areas (e.g., Data Science) wanted to consider adding a Public Policy component to an existing field.

<sup>5</sup> It could also be possible to offer these programs absent super-departments, but the level of coordination needed across units would be significantly greater without super-departments, making this much more difficult.

## **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Doctoral Teaching**

### Advantages:

- Could prompt innovative new programs following a “discipline plus” training model already used by aspirational peers like Princeton and Harvard

### Challenges:

- Would need to secure new funding for any new programs and ensure they do not detract from existing disciplinary programs

### Unresolved Issues:

- There are some unresolved issues around doctoral training in a School of Public Policy. For example, a Field structure governing these programs would have to be created. Ultimately, we see these issues as relatively minor and relatively easy to resolve over time.

## **6. Extension & Outreach**

Extension and outreach would be an important part of any policy entity at Cornell. In addition to the broader extension and outreach programs currently run through CHE (and other contract colleges), which we do not discuss in detail here and about which we hope to hear additional feedback from the wider community, there are two relevant entities for policy already in existence: the Cornell Institute of Politics and Global Affairs (hereafter “IPGA”), which sits in the Provost’s Office, and the Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research (hereafter “BCTR”), which sits in CHE. It was clear to the committee that the IPGA potentially could fit within the School and would provide a key point of contact for the School in New York City. It was less clear how BCTR would engage with the policy entity. Some committee members thought the entire BCTR would engage with the School; others thought only some of the BCTR would engage with a School (i.e., the non-Human Development parts). The policy-related projects that identify more closely with other fields, such as Human Development, may not be interested in working under the umbrella of a policy school. There would have to be additional discussion about potential affiliations and engagement between the School and other centers on campus as well, such as the Atkinson Center for Sustainability and the Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies.

## **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Outreach**

### Advantages:

- Extension and outreach mission, BCTR, and IPGA would lead to a uniquely community-engaged policy School for an elite university
- School could facilitate additional programming at all levels of training
- Potential for coordinating extension aspects of CHE (e.g., BCTR) with new School and coordination between School and other outreach and extension programs on campus

#### Challenges:

- Possible dilution of core missions of these centers, which could be seen as doing work both in and outside of policy (i.e., BCTR)
- Unclear how the School would engage with extension units in other Colleges/Schools that do not have extension mandate
- Aligning of expectations for Policy-focused faculty rostered in CAS, in which extension is non-existent and outreach may be understood in radically different ways

#### Unresolved Issues:

- Core unresolved issues around extension and outreach involve how decisions around existing centers and programs would be made, as well as what the natural home might be for those programs.

### **7. Implications for CHE**

A strong cross-college School would have implications for CHE, potentially some positive and some negative. There would have to be careful consideration by university and college leadership of these potential implications. These considerations are especially important because the committee felt that a “weaker” School, in which the Dean of the School had less autonomy, would not allow Cornell to fulfill its ambitions around public policy.

#### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for CHE**

##### Advantages:

- The CHE dean potentially could create a vibrant vision that includes the School as a new strength of the college, integrating it with existing CHE units (or, the CHE dean potentially could create a vibrant narrative around the remaining 4 departments in CHE, thus strengthening non-policy components)
- Policy is strongly aligned with the current CHE and land-grant missions for interdisciplinary, basic research and translational scholarship geared toward addressing real-world problems

##### Challenges:

- If 1/3 of the faculty in CHE become mostly involved in the School, it could mean that CHE is left with fewer faculty and resources to carry on the work of the college.
- If the School is treated as a strong component of CHE, there could be competition between the two deans for resources.

##### Unresolved Issues:

- There are unresolved issues around the implications of a strong School for CHE. We look forward to hearing input from the university community, and especially members of CHE, on these issues. As we have mentioned elsewhere in this document, both of these policy models have important implications for the future of CHE.

### **8. Implications for CAS**

A strong cross-college School would also have implications for CAS. These too would obviously need serious consideration from university leadership as they make decisions.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for CAS**

Advantages:

- Gives CAS a direct stake as a college in public policy teaching and research
- Provide an opportunity to build out additional strengths in the core social science disciplines (political science, economics, and sociology) within CAS
- Encourages cross-college collaboration between CAS social scientists and their policy-focused counterparts elsewhere at Cornell
- Prevents potential balkanization of political science faculty across multiple colleges, because (presumably) all political scientists hired by the school will have appointments (full, partial, or zero-time) with Government.

Challenges:

- Additional demands on faculty of core departments like Government
- Uncertainty in reporting (around governance; leadership) for policy faculty in CAS
- Added administrative complexity with faculty in new super-departments.

### **9. Implications for the University**

A strong cross-college School would also have major implications for the university. These too would obviously need serious consideration from university leadership as they make decisions.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for the University**

Advantages:

- Other units on campus might more easily adjust to the idea that the new entity is truly university-wide and be more interested in developing affiliations (although both models would encourage these affiliations)
- Branding and messaging and development efforts around a School focused on public policy could be easier than a multifaceted College, and would align more closely with that of our peers
- School might be a way to start “smaller” and build out as opportunities and challenges become clearer

Challenges:

- Adding a complicated structure that sits across two colleges might introduce organizational difficulties (e.g., curriculum coordination, competition for resources, and faculty obligations)
- If the physical footprint of the school is in CHE (or CAS), might be seen as insular to CHE (or CAS). Not likely to be housed elsewhere.
- School might not be seen internally as a structure that is as visible as a college; could downplay the internally perceived importance/visibility of policy at Cornell

- School is dependent on viability, longevity, and resources of the two other colleges unless it is very independent (i.e., an admitting unit)

#### Unresolved Issues:

- There are many unresolved issues around the implications of a School of Public Policy for the university. Many of these issues might be resolved by choosing specific combinations of possibilities (i.e., an admitting unit with 100 majors per year initially and 40 initial lines).

### **Conclusion**

A strong School of Public Policy that sits between CAS and CHE and has a dean who is able to function with a high degree of autonomy represents a promising avenue for public policy at Cornell. There are a number of core benefits of this model, though it also has key limitations.

### **COLLEGE OF PUBLIC POLICY MODEL**

Refocusing CHE into CPP could take numerous forms. This transition could involve anything from an abrupt transition to a narrowly focused policy college (that approximates what we summarized in the School Model) to a mere relabeling of CHE into CPP (or even a College of Human Ecology and Public Policy or a College of Public Policy and Human Ecology) with virtually no changes in focus, curricular activities, or faculty.

Because we do not see either of these extreme options as viable or consistent with our charge, we have instead opted to outline a middle path. We see this decision as creating a CPP that is both a logical evolution of CHE that honors its legacy and that is immediately recognizable as a policy entity. This model would involve a refocusing of CHE into CPP in line with the Committee's draft of a [policy entity vision](#), but in a way that (a) directly acknowledges the core ways in which nutrition, design, and the life-course interact with policy and (b) highlights the key role that basic science as well as translational research play in policy design and implementation.

Although a full articulation of this vision is beyond the scope of our committee at this stage, we believe that a CPP at Cornell could be aligned with our policy vision but also provide opportunities for building on the rich traditions of CHE. This broad policy space could combine policy scholars and basic scientists (in the social and life sciences) whose work has implications for policy-making and policy implementation, including those who do translational research (broadly defined), those whose work focuses on development over the life-course, those who focus on nutrition, and those who study how design is shaped by--and shapes--policy.

An example that illuminates CHE's rich traditions may be in order here. As a scholar of child development, Urie Bronfenbrenner was a focused basic scientist who deeply understood how our environment (including our schools, homes, neighborhoods, families, and a range of other policy-driven factors) shapes us over the life-course. Yet he applied his contributions not just within his field as a basic scientist, but also to the broader policy community by spearheading Head Start, a nationally recognized policy intervention that has shaped the lives of hundreds of millions of children. Because much of CHE fits under this broad umbrella of work that is not

directly public policy but either directly informs public policy or its implementation (and, hence, is directly policy-relevant), there is much to be said for this middle ground model.

Although we see this broad vision for a CPP as encompassing much of what CHE currently does, we understand that some individuals may not feel aligned with this vision and may feel that their scholarship and teaching could not thrive in this environment. Although our hope is that this feeling is rare with the broad vision of policy we have articulated here, the possibility that some units or faculty might want to move out of the college could be discussed with the respective faculty, college, and university leadership. As noted at the outset of this report, it is beyond this committee's mandate to resolve these important considerations.

**We would like to reiterate that this model would have many implications beyond strengthening public policy at Cornell. This model therefore requires additional conversations and decisions beyond this committee among the trustees, president, provost, and CHE college leadership and stakeholders concerning the future of CHE.**

## **1. Governance**

A College of Public Policy would have its own dean, and that Dean would have to enthusiastically advocate for the college in the policy arena (given the college's transformation into a new policy entity and also according to the unique CHE-aligned components of policy). All policy-relevant faculty would have some form of full or joint appointments with the College. Collectively, that group of faculty would be responsible for decision-making around policy scholarship, hiring, teaching, training, and outreach. The exact nature of the governance model in this version of a College model would have to be carefully considered.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Governance**

Advantages:

- Dean could have a prominent and visible platform from which to advocate for policy at Cornell
- Dean would have significant autonomy and resources to focus the college around policy
- Could foster a distinctive and strong policy brand, which could set Cornell apart from other policy schools
- Faculty would need to provide service only to their college and a super-department (similar to existing super-departments)

Challenges:

- Dean would need to lead and govern a diverse college with a combination of faculty who work directly and indirectly in policy into a more policy-aligned college
- Would have to negotiate with CAS dean (and other units) for shared lines and hiring (e.g., joint appointments)
- Would have to show the rest of the university that it is not just an insular college entity or rebranding of CHE but a university-wide policy entity

- Would need to formalize systems to integrate the research and teaching of faculty whose work is more indirectly related to policy, while also focusing the mission of the college more centrally around policy
- Pool of potential deans who could represent such a unique policy school may be small

Unresolved issues:

- The largest unresolved issue that our committee discussed at length was how to gradually move the college toward a more policy-focused entity, given that there are some units or individuals who may not see their work as core to the policy mission.
- The exact nature of the policy governance structure in the College still needs to be carefully considered and articulated.

## **2. Resources**

The dean of the college would have a budget commensurate with the number of faculty, staff, and students currently in the college. The total number of lines in the College of Public Policy (~100 now plus additional FTEs shared with Government, plus other relevant units across campus such as ILR and Law), in addition to new hiring, could make the College one of the largest policy entities in the country. (These additional FTEs outside of CHE would still be needed under the College model, as the faculty expertise to teach a number of the core courses required for accredited public policy degrees are currently located outside of CHE.) Although this designation would depend on the total number of College FTEs, some number of these FTEs would be only indirectly related to policy.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Resources**

Advantages:

- The college already has a budget for ~100 faculty plus staff and infrastructure. Because of this, much of the additional hiring and undergraduate curricula would be relatively simple in terms of adding or sharing lines (i.e., adding more political scientists and in other disciplines as needed to fulfill the mission) and adding majors
- No need to share the majority of lines across two other independent units, as would be the case in the School model
- College would be seen externally as having a large number of FTEs (second largest policy entity in the country)

Challenges:

- Would have to figure out how to fairly spread resources across areas directly and indirectly engaged with policy
- Although number of FTEs likely would make it very large policy entity externally, not all FTEs are directly related to policy and this could undermine branding and external and internal comprehensibility

Unresolved issues:

- The largest unresolved issue with this model of the College of Public Policy is that there is a tension around resources needing to be distributed in line with the policy vision but also in a way that supports all faculty.

### **3. Undergraduate Training**

The existing PAM major would be refocused as a major in public policy, and could possibly transition into a cross-college major with CAS. Given the high concentration of health and health policy faculty in CHE, the existing CHE Health Care Policy major will be a key part of the undergraduate curricula. In line with the areas of innovation proposed in the vision statement, we imagine additional concentrations in Data Science and Public Policy, and Sustainability and Public Policy. Additional concentrations in policy, such as business, technology, or human development, could be added based on the interest of affiliated faculty. There is currently a policy minor that exists in PAM and also one in Government and in this College model these two minors may be able to come together and reduce redundancies across the two degrees on campus.

Other than the PAM major, all majors currently offered in CHE could remain within the college, provided the faculty in those units were willing to embrace the new vision for the college. Faculty could initially expect to continue teaching their undergraduate and graduate courses. Faculty who want to create new courses that would align with policy would be welcome to do so. Over the next 10-15 years, there would have to be discussions among College leadership and faculty about how to manage evolving undergraduate demands, faculty expertise and interests, and curricular offerings in the new policy structure.

Given the new combinations of proposed faculty in the College, it is likely that new majors would develop within it over time, and this should evolve based on decision-making among key faculty members in the College. We think a smaller initial number of majors (roughly 75-100 per class) is a reasonable and realistic starting point but this number might increase considerably over the next 10-15 years. This expectation is based on current numbers of students across campus currently taking policy courses (even absent a coordinated public policy entity), the number of undergraduate majors at peer policy institutions, and planned enrollment growth.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Undergraduate Training**

Advantages:

- College already has infrastructure and staff to handle undergraduate teaching and curricular changes and additions, so startup could be faster
- At least four coherent majors (or tracks) in policy that could have a common point of entry via the College and be advertised and administered easily (new tracks could be added in other emergent strengths)
  1. Public Policy
  2. Health and Public Policy (with pre-med option)

3. Data Science and Public Policy
  4. Sustainability and Public Policy
- Reframing of PAM major as a Public Policy major (with significant contributions from Government) would strengthen the major and better reflect the research of the PAM faculty (who do very little management research)
  - Additional (currently existing CHE) majors are still available and allow flexibility and breadth for students in College (not all students would need a strong policy component)
  - Classes in data science and public policy, sustainability policy, and health policy could be cross-listed or outsourced to interested affiliate faculty in outside units as new tracks are launched.

#### Challenges:

- Complications and questions around where the new majors would come from despite projected growth of undergraduates at Cornell
- Would have to discuss policy requirements for students in college, and how those align with the teaching and scholarship of faculty who are not in policy
- Hiring in data science and public policy and sustainability policy would need to happen relatively quickly to launch new tracks
- Need to distinguish new Public Policy major from Government major, and determine possibilities of double-majoring in two related majors
- A cross-college major and minor in public policy may be more difficult to realize under the College model than in the Shared school model because it would not be immediately clear how students from other colleges could major and minor in the College model relative to the School model.
- Admission numbers would need to be negotiated/fixed to prevent competition with other units

### **4. Masters Training**

Masters training is essential to virtually all policy entities. CHE currently houses two professional masters programs related to policy: a Masters of Health Administration (currently housed within PAM), a Masters of Public Administration (currently housed within CHE). We also envision a new Masters of Public Policy (which would need to be approved by the state but would be core to this endeavor). The curricula and accreditation of MPA and MPP programs are distinct, as MPA programs focus primarily on the management of public organizations, while MPP programs focus primarily on creating and analyzing public policies and programs. Additional programs may develop over time (including, but not limited to, masters programs around data science and public policy and sustainability policy), and synergies between the current programs are likely (i.e., around admissions, recruitment, and methodological courses).

#### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Masters Training**

##### Advantages:

- Existing infrastructure in college to support masters' programs
- An MPP program would strengthen ties to policy-making in the state, nation, and world

- Masters programs do not have the zero-sum issues inherent in undergraduate programs
- Having a College of Public Policy would allow for more direct involvement of tenure-track faculty in professional masters training than currently occurs
- The unique mission and faculty under the College model would set Cornell apart from public policy entities at other institutions

#### Challenges:

- Difficulties inherent in getting state approval for new programs (especially the MPP, which would be core to any School or College)
- Need new faculty and staff to support a new masters program
- New and current faculty would have to balance/coordinate teaching at the undergrad and masters levels
- Possibility that the attraction of students to these new masters programs could be undermined by a college that does not resemble most other policy entities
- May be more challenging to attract faculty from across the university to teach in professional masters programs offered in another college (relative to a shared school)

#### Unresolved Issues:

- A core unresolved issue is that a new MPP would need to be approved by the state. Although there is not currently a competing program— University at Albany, State University of New York has a Masters of Public Administration, an MPA differs significantly from a Masters of Public Policy in many key ways— state approval of new degree programs can be a complex, lengthy, and sometimes unpredictable process.
- A second important unresolved issue is how many MPP students we could expect to attract in the beginning. Programs at peer institutions, some of which started MPP programs relatively recently, could provide good projections for enrollment. It is less clear how the masters training programs' enrollment could be projected.
- A third issue arises around governance of these professional degree programs. Typically, professional masters programs are governed by the school or college offering them. That model could be adopted for these professional masters programs. Whatever the governance structure of these programs is, consideration should be given to how best support the excellence of the policy entity and serve the interests of the students of these programs, including how to allow the programs to adapt to changing environments and connect students with tenure-track and instructional faculty with proven policy expertise.

### **5. Doctoral Teaching**

There is an existing PhD program in Policy Analysis and Management that, if expanded significantly to a Public Policy program that better represented the breadth of policy at Cornell, could collaborate with other doctoral programs in the policy college to reflect its unique mission. If there are super-departments of Economics, Psychology, and Sociology, it might be possible to offer joint programs of Economics and Public Policy, Government and Public Policy, Psychology and Public Policy, and Sociology and Public Policy. The target size for this program would depend on the number of policy-affiliated faculty in these super-departments and graduate

school (and CHE and CAS) resources, as well as whether any other current areas (e.g., Data Science) wanted to consider adding a Public Policy component to an existing field.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Doctoral Teaching**

Advantages:

- Could prompt innovative new programs following a “discipline plus” training model already used by aspirational peers like Princeton and Harvard

Challenges:

- Would need to secure new funding for any new programs and ensure they do not detract from existing disciplinary programs

### **6. Extension & Outreach**

Extension and outreach would be an important part of any policy entity at Cornell. The broader extension and outreach programs currently run through CHE could be immediately positioned to support the new College entity in Public Policy. There would have to be additional discussion about potential affiliations and engagement between the College and other centers on campus as well, such as the Cornell Institute of Politics and Global Affairs, the Atkinson Center for Sustainability, and the Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies.

### **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Outreach**

Advantages:

- Extension is already a vibrant part of CHE’s mission, and leadership in the college could use the new policy focus to leverage even greater extension and outreach activities
- BCTR already inside college, with the potential to connect faculty to extension and outreach

Challenges:

- Non-policy extension and outreach could be complicated by attachment to policy college
- It may be harder to attract faculty from around the university to affiliate with policy outreach efforts if they are located in a different college rather than a shared school.

### **7. Implications for CHE**

Obviously, the College model would have implications for CHE, as it would change the focus, vision, mission, scholarship, and teaching of the college. A discussion of the possible advantages and challenges of this model for all CHE units is beyond the capability of this committee, and will lie with university and college leadership and stakeholders.

## **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for CHE**

### Advantages:

- The policy mission could be distinctive to Cornell and broader than peers because it includes existing faculty whose work is policy-relevant but not always externally recognized as policy
- Policy is strongly aligned with current CHE and land-grant mission for interdisciplinary, basic research, and translational scholarship geared toward addressing real-world problems

### Challenges:

- Serious questions around how existing faculty and majors would fit within a policy college (faculty hiring and support, space, resources, undergraduate majors and training)
- Would need to consider how undergraduate and graduate students, and faculty, interested in areas not always considered policy would be recruited and attracted to policy college
- Current Human Ecology mission would be changed, with possible implications for its legacy with potential alumni and development consequences (though this may be mitigated by focusing on how the ecological model is tied to the new policy college)

## **8. Implications for CAS**

A college model would have implications for CAS. These would need serious consideration from university and college leadership.

## **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for CAS**

### Advantages:

- Little competition with CAS for resources and low organizational difficulty due to the policy entity being its own college/entity with its own governance and resources

### Challenges:

- It is possible CAS might have a more limited role and influence in the new policy entity

## **9. Implications for University**

A college model would have implications for the university. These too would need serious consideration from university and college leadership.

## **Possible Advantages and Challenges Around Implications for the University**

### Advantages:

- High external and internal visibility of a major new policy structure
- Branding and messaging (and development efforts) around a college could be easier
- Physical footprint becomes easy with this model

#### Challenges:

- Policy mission might be undermined by an entity with heavy presence of faculty and teaching whose work is policy-relevant but who would not usually fit under a policy umbrella at many peer institutions
- College is dependent on viability, longevity, and resources of a policy structure with major components that are indirectly related to policy
- Risk of balkanizing political scientists at Cornell, with two major units now hiring political scientists and raising questions of how best to avoid downstream problems analogous to those that the super-department discussion is trying to solve in other social science disciplines.

#### **Conclusion**

A College of Public Policy represents a promising avenue for public policy at Cornell. There are a number of core benefits of this model, though it also has key limitations and major unresolved issues.