MEMORANDUM

May 8, 2012

To: Members of the Cornell Faculty

From: W. Kent Fuchs
Provost

Subject: Strengthening Cornell’s Excellence in Public Policy

In the fall of 2011, I appointed a faculty committee to determine the desirability and feasibility of forming a School of Public Policy at Cornell. Attached is the committee’s final report and recommendations.

I want to thank the committee for their thoughtful and dedicated work on this report. I have discussed the recommendations with the committee and with the Academic Programs and Policy Committee (CAPP).

The academic and structural implications contained in the proposal require discussions across the faculty. The academic deans, Senior Vice Provost Ron Seeber, and I welcome input on this report and particularly on how to strengthen Cornell’s excellence in public policy from all members of the Cornell faculty.
FINAL REPORT

Provost’s Committee on a Cornell School of Public Policy

Submitted by:
Rosemary Avery (Chair)
Antonio Bento
John Cawley
Kieran Donaghy
Steve Hilgartner
Ravi Kanbur
Dan Lichter
Suzanne Mettler
Norman Uphoff

February 2012
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .......................................................................................................... iii

COMMITTEE CHARGE, COMPOSITION AND ACTIVITIES ....................................................... 1

RATIONALE .............................................................................................................................. 4

EVIDENT AREAS OF CORNELL STRENGTH IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS ..... 6

  Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy ............................................................... 7
  Health Policy .......................................................................................................................... 17
  International Program Areas .............................................................................................. 26
    International Development ............................................................................................... 27
    International Cooperation and Security ........................................................................... 29
  Politics and Governance ..................................................................................................... 32
  Social Policy ........................................................................................................................ 40

CORNELL STRENGTHS IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION .......... 49

  Existing Programs ............................................................................................................... 49
  Proposed New Programs .................................................................................................... 55

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ....................................................................................... 64

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE ............................................................................................... 68
LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Academic Units Responding to Survey .......................................................... 72
APPENDIX B: Groups Targeted for Special Listening Sessions ........................................ 74
APPENDIX C: Institutions Contacted .................................................................................. 75
APPENDIX D: International Development: Centers, Institutes and Programs .................. 76
APPENDIX E: Information Regarding CIPA ....................................................................... 79
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RATIONALE

Cornell’s strengths in public policy are spread across the University, with the result that (i) the many synergies required for successful engagement of such problems remain dormant, and (ii) the full range and magnitude of Cornell’s contributions are not projected to a national and global arena.

The School envisioned will provide a vibrant intellectual environment in which Cornell scholars doing research, teaching, and outreach in the areas of public policy and public affairs can find synergies in their efforts to conduct cutting-edge research that informs public policy.

Our recommendations are focused on building on and enhancing currently existing excellence in public policy and public affairs at Cornell such that the School will be ranked in the top 10 schools nationally within 10 years. More important, it is intended to strengthen the social sciences at Cornell and to make Cornell more widely recognized as a preeminent center for new and innovative ideas for navigating our communities and country through the challenges faced in the decades ahead.

EVIDENT AREAS OF CORNELL STRENGTH IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The committee identified six areas of programmatic strength in public policy/public affairs at Cornell. The committee undertook an in-depth examination of the research, teaching, and outreach/engagement strength in these six areas, including the identification of faculty working in each of these areas, the academic units they are in, and challenges faced in maintaining Cornell’s strength in these areas in the future. These six areas include:

- Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy
- Health Policy
- International Development
- International Cooperation and Security
- Politics and Governance
- Social Policy

Each of these areas of policy strength at Cornell is described in separate sections of this report.

CORNELL STRENGTHS IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

Cornell currently offers four Masters-level teaching programs closely aligned with the vision and mission of the proposed new School: a university-wide Masters in Public Administration (MPA) offered by the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA); a Masters in Health Administration (MHA) offered in PAM; and two Master of Professional Studies (MPS) degrees offered in CALS, one in Environmental Management and the other in Global Development (with a focus
on either International Development or International Agriculture and Rural Development). Each of these programs are reviewed in the report, and we propose ways to strengthen and transform them within the CSPP/A.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Key Objectives**

Key objectives as we sought to design a structure that would be appropriate to the CSPP/A included the following:

- **The school should be a *university wide initiative*, one that is both cross-unit and cross-discipline**
- **The school should build synergies and enhance collaboration between faculty doing research, teaching and outreach in the area of public policy/affairs, i.e. the whole should be more than the sum of its parts.**
- **The school should *not significantly disrupt* the missions and strengths of currently existing colleges/departments.**
- **Building the school should contribute add to faculty strengths both in the school and the core social/physical/life sciences at Cornell through *coordinated/cluster hiring* and other types of faculty appointments**
- **The school should be able to support and service a select number of *high quality general and specialized Master’s programs***
- **The school should facilitate the development of *new interdisciplinary programmatic opportunities* through currently existing and newly developed centers/institutes**
- **The school should facilitate the *transfer of applied research* into outreach programs, and serve as a central place for policy dialogue**

**Overarching Principles**

We adopted a set of overarching principles to guide the development of a CSPP/A:

- **The CSPP/A should be an independent entity, separate from all existing colleges, with its own dean.**
- **The CSPP/A should be strongly connected to other units across campus, including the core social science departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and other applied physical/natural and social sciences department on campus through joint hires, joint appointments, and affiliated faculty.**
- **The CSPP/A should have a sufficient number of dedicated faculty lines to ensure continued growth in its core areas of program strength.**

**Specific Recommendations**

**Proposed Structure of the School**

- From the outset, the CSPP/A should be an independent entity, separate from all existing colleges, with its own dean.
The CSPP/A should build on Cornell strengths in the six identified program areas.

The structure of the CSPP/A should include a well-balanced mix of scholars from the disciplines that address matters of public policy and public affairs.

The sizes and orientation of the program areas should be adjusted over time according to changing circumstances.

Early appointments must be aimed at achieving the desired disciplinary mix.

Mechanisms should be put in place to establish strong connections between the CSPP/A and key social science departments and relevant departments in the sciences and engineering.

The committee envisions a school with 65-75 FTEs with (a) a diverse disciplinary mix; (b) strengths in the 6 program areas outlined above; and (c) a balanced mix of domestic and international policy. Some of these faculty are expected to hold joint appointments with other units.

Faculty with regular appointments in the SCPP/A should be willing to make a substantial time commitment to the School.

Interaction among the program areas will be encouraged and will contribute substantially to the strength of the School.

Management, Oversight, and Implementation Process

A Faculty Steering Committee should be appointed by the Provost. It should include balanced representation across 6 areas of program strength and across disciplines.

The Dean should be selected through a national/global competitive search.

The Faculty Steering Committee will make recommendations to the Provost about the composition of the search committee for the dean.

At least 15 new lines will be needed at the outset, in order to begin to build a School with the structure described above.

Some of the hires based on new lines should be joint appointments with social science departments and other units across the university.

Internal transfers of faculty should be made following review of individuals by a committee appointed by the dean, consisting of the Faculty Steering Committee and relevant specialists from outside Cornell.

In some cases, new lines may be used to compensate units outside the CSPP/A for FTEs transferred into the School.

The Inclusion of the Department of Policy Analysis and Management (PAM)

The Committee recommends the inclusion of PAM in the School, assuming a total School faculty size of 65 to 75 FTEs, and assuming that the principles and disciplinary and substantive mechanisms for balancing described in the rest of this proposal are put into place.

Implementation timeline

The committee provides a detailed time line for implementation of its recommendations.
COMMITTEE CHARGE, COMPOSITION AND ACTIVITIES

In August 2011 Provost Kent Fuchs appointed a special committee to access the feasibility and desirability of forming a School of Public Policy at Cornell. This action was prompted by the report of the 2009 Social Sciences Task Force, which provided a strong endorsement for such a school. The constituted committee consisted of a representative group of faculty from social science disciplines and units around campus with public policy research, teaching, and outreach/engagement expertise and interests. In addition, the Dean of the Faculty, Bill Fry, provided Provost Fuchs with a list of suggested names for the committee submitted to him by the Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections Committee. One additional faculty member from that list was invited to serve on the committee.

The committee consisted of the following faculty members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Other Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Avery (Chair)</td>
<td>Policy Analysis &amp; Management</td>
<td>CIPA Field Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Bento</td>
<td>Applied Economics &amp; Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cawley</td>
<td>Policy Analysis &amp; Management</td>
<td>Economics, CIPA Field Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Ehrenberg*</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Labor Relations</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Donaghy</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning, Chair</td>
<td>CIPA Core Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hilgartner</td>
<td>Science and Technology Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi Kanbur</td>
<td>Applied Economics &amp; Management</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Lichter</td>
<td>Policy Analysis &amp; Management</td>
<td>Cornell Population Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Mettler</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Seeber (Vice provost)</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Labor Relations</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Uphoff</td>
<td>Government &amp; International Agric.</td>
<td>Acting Director, CIPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to personal health issues Ron Ehrenberg was unable to play an active role on the committee but indicated his willingness to respond to written materials produced by the committee.

The Provost charged the committee as follows:

To provide a proposal to the Provost by December 31, 2011 for the establishment of School of Public Policy at Cornell University. The proposed School should encompass the successful achievement of the following goals:

- To educate enlightened public scholars and leaders, and to generate cutting-edge, research-based ideas that provide constructive responses to the world’s most challenging public-policy problems;
- To offer distinctive educational programs (MPP, MPA, and PhD) emphasizing disciplinary and cross-disciplinary theory, analytic skills, and substantive knowledge of a wide variety of specific policy problems;
- To provide an intellectual environment in which faculty will conduct world-class research and produce knowledge on which sound public policy can be based, particularly in collaboration and influencing agencies making public policy decisions; and
To position Cornell University as one of the world’s recognized leaders in public policy research and education.

To provide the Provost with a specific plan for the establishment of a School of Public Policy/Public Affairs, including recommendations for:

- Institutional structure, including oversight and management of the School;
- Core faculty composition and affiliation structures;
- Core teaching and degree programs;
- The identification and prioritization of core concentrations of public policy/public affairs research, teaching and outreach, in both the short and long-run;
- The specific resources required, and the sources of such resources, to enable the long-term success of the School; and
- The specific time frame for the establishment of a School, including immediate steps that should be taken as well as longer-term organizational changes.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The committee began its activities in August 2011. The first phase of committee activity focused on broad and inclusive engagement with the Cornell faculty through listening sessions with departments, units, centers, and individual faculty, as outlined below.

Faculty Identification

In an effort to identify all faculty on the Ithaca campus with research, teaching, or outreach/engagement interests related to public policy/public affairs, Vice Provost Ron Seeber sent an email to all department chairs, deans, and directors asking them to identify faculty within their units fitting the criteria identified above (Appendix A). Contacted individuals were asked to submit the names of faculty and their area(s) of expertise related to public policy/public affairs though a survey administered through on a secure website. Of the 77 departments/units contacted, 33 chairs responded, rendering a 43 percent response rate and providing the names of 185 faculty with policy interests on campus. These names were grouped into: (a) administrative units, and (b) areas of policy interest, to assist the committee in identifying the breadth and depth of policy expertise on the Ithaca campus.

Targeted Listening Sessions

From the list of names generated by department chairs, deans, and directors, the committee identified a set of departments, units, and other policy-related groups for in-person meetings. The groups targeted for special listening sessions are listed in Appendix B. Each of the groups was contacted, and meetings scheduled. The purpose of these meetings was to obtain feedback from interested faculty regarding the concept of a school of public policy and their potential interest in being engaged in its activities should it be formed. Feedback from these listening sessions was brought back to the committee and entered into their deliberations.
External engagement:

In an effort to gather information regarding how other top policy schools around the national are organized, financed, and how they position themselves in the policy arena, the committee identified a set of academic public policy schools/leaders invited to participate in phone conferences with the committee. The ten identified leaders are listed in Appendix C.

Vice Provost Ron Seeber contacted these individuals via email. In his communication Seeber asked that the deans be prepared to address the following information with the committee:

• The structure and organization of their school;
• The academic and policy niches of their institution which set it apart from other programs and schools;
• Any recent changes in direction or focus of their program;
• Information regarding faculty appointments and funding models; and
• The degrees offered by their institution, and the market demand for their graduates.

Five deans responded to the request, and 30-minute conference calls were conducted with the following individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Deans Contacted</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Bruce Kuniholm</td>
<td>Sanford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Susan Collins</td>
<td>Ford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>Christina Paxson</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>Jack Knott</td>
<td>School of Policy, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Virginia</td>
<td>Eric Batashnik</td>
<td>Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Interactions Focused on Teaching

The Director of CIPA, Norman Uphoff, met with the CIPA core faculty to discuss the MPA program, its core requirements, its concentration courses, its strengths, and challenges it faces, considering how it might relate to a possible new School. Our committee met with a PAM ad hoc committee charge by their Chair to investigate Masters of Public Policy (MPP) programs around the nation with the intent of gauging the feasibility of launching an MPP program at Cornell. The PAM ad hoc committee report was reviewed by our committee and informed its deliberations.

Committee Interactions Focused on Outreach and Engagement

The committee met with John Eckenrode; Director of the Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research; Richard Kiely, Director of Cornell's new Center for Community Engaged Learning and Research; and Karl Pillemer, Director of the Cornell Institute for Translational Research on Aging (CITRA). Helene Dillard, Director of Cornell Cooperative Extension was also informed about the committee’s activities.
RATIONALE

As a society we are confronted by problems of great seriousness and complexity. Consider that:

- The incidence of poverty worldwide remains unacceptably high, while the need to live sustainably within our natural environments has never been more urgent.
- Because of changing demographics, populations in developed and developing countries alike need more and better health care and other basic services, while meeting this need is becoming increasingly infeasible.
- Globalization has increased prosperity of many countries and has reduced inequality between many of them; but it has also increased their exposure to financial crises and other hazards, also engendering greater inequalities within them.
- The foundations of civil society seem to be threatened by growing social inequality, by a decline of ‘good governance’ practices, and by waning tolerance for differing cultural perspectives.
- Weapons of mass destruction are becoming more widely available to nation states and to non-state actors, increasing the risk of their use and threats from accidents or hostile acts.

Problems such as these are particularly vexing because they are interdependent or arise in the context of interdependent systems of behavior that have evolved in a historically contingent manner. They challenge us to work across borders, across private, public and non-governmental sectors, and across academic disciplines to understand their causes, formulate appropriate public policies, and take appropriate actions.

To understand how policies and actions must evolve to address these problems effectively -- i.e., to bring about necessary changes in behaviors, institutions, technologies, industries, and political and environmental relationships -- will require qualitatively different types of public policy analysis than are commonly conducted today and a different type of school of public policy/public affairs to support it. They will also require postures and modalities for engagement by universities with the public-sector, private-sector and other actors who can achieve desired changes.

The type of analysis needed -- the analysis of interdependent complex adaptive systems -- will require the close cooperation of physical and social scientists, engineers, experts in computation and visualization, legal scholars, and community outreach specialists. It will entail new protocols of public education and stakeholder engagement to be developed alongside new protocols of multidisciplinary research. It will entail model legislation be drafted and new institutions be designed to guide successful development, implementation, assessment, and modification of public policies. The type of school needed must enable issue-driven engagement by theoreticians, applied researchers, and practitioners from across disciplines.

Cornell’s faculty members are already addressing problems of the type identified above through their research and teaching, whether individually or collectively through many centers of excellence. Cornell has notable strengths in bridging the natural and social sciences that enable it to address a range of issues in policy, planning, domestic and international development,
environmental and economic sustainability, and public-private partnerships. However, Cornell’s strengths in public policy are spread across the University, with the result that (i) the many synergies required for successful engagement of such problems remain dormant, and (ii) the full range and magnitude of Cornell’s contributions are not projected to a national and global arena.

As a land grant institution that construes its mandate for service to extend beyond New York State, Cornell University has a vested interest in promoting the development of a qualitatively different and distinctive type of school of public policy in a manner that at once makes best use of existing institutional resources and leverages or augments them with new resources adequate to its purposes. In this report, we propose a School of Public Policy that will build on Cornell’s already significant strengths to position the University as one of the recognized leaders in public policy research and education.

The School envisioned will provide a vibrant intellectual environment in which Cornell scholars doing research, teaching, and outreach in the areas of public policy and public affairs can find synergies in their efforts to conduct cutting-edge research that informs public policy. It will offer distinctive, high-quality educational programs for undergraduate, Master's and PhD students emphasizing disciplinary-based and cross-disciplinary theory, analytic skills, and substantive knowledge of a wide variety of specific policy problems. It will provide an administrative structure through which the work of Cornell’s diverse scholars, located in different colleges and units across campus, can be coordinated, enhanced, and promoted.

Our recommendations are focused on building on and enhancing currently existing excellence in public policy and public affairs at Cornell such that the School will be ranked in the top 10 schools nationally within 10 years. More important, it is intended to make Cornell more widely recognized as a preeminent center for new and innovative ideas for navigating our communities and country safely through the anticipatable turbulence and hazards in the decades ahead.
EVIDENT AREAS OF CORNELL STRENGTH IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The committee identified six areas of programmatic strength in public policy/public affairs at Cornell. The committee undertook an in-depth examination of the research, teaching, and outreach/engagement strength in these six areas, including the identification of faculty working in each of these areas, the academic units they are in, and challenges faced in maintaining Cornell’s strength in these areas in the future. These six areas include:

- Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy
- Health Policy
- International Development
- International Cooperation and Security
- Politics and Governance
- Social Policy

Each of these areas of policy strength at Cornell is described in separate sections of this report. Throughout the report we abbreviate the term Cornell School of Public Policy/Public Affairs as CSPP/A.
SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

There are multiple trends and challenges in society that require a deeper understanding of the interactions between individuals, firms, public policy, and the natural environment:

Managing the Transition to a Green Economy founded on Renewable Energy:

The last few years have witnessed a massive ‘green’ technological revolution that has the potential to lead to a highly decentralized renewable-energy industry, create new ‘green’ jobs, and reduce the dependence on coal and foreign oil. However, if public policies that promote the adoption and diffusion of such technologies are not carefully designed, the benefits of such innovations may never materialize. The old engineering dream of moving green technologies “from the lab to the marketplace” will simply not occur unless this technological transformation is coupled with carefully designed public policy and communication strategies that increase the acceptability of new technologies. To manage the transition to a green economy founded on renewable energy, there is a need to develop new ‘systems-based’ and ‘problem-solving’ oriented research and teaching programs that combine our strengths in key Social Sciences: (a) Economics (Environmental and Energy Economics), (b) Political Science (Environmental Politics), and Environmental Law with our world-class Technology Programs in Engineering and the Physical Sciences.

Operating under a Carbon Economy Constraint at all levels of Governance

We are about to experience major changes in the regulatory environment in which firms operate. The immanent passage of state, federal, potentially even international, climate legislation will forever alter the relationship between individuals, firms and the natural environment and further trigger new technological innovations. When it comes to strategies for climate mitigation, we are only beginning to understand the economic and environmental trade-offs associated with various options available to meet the greenhouse gas emissions reductions expected under major climate legislation. The debates and controversies surrounding the economic costs and environmental benefits of bio-fuels, wind, solar, nuclear and geothermal and some of the potential unintended consequences of some of these options clearly illustrate some of the major gaps in academic knowledge. There is an urgent need to develop new empirical methods, including computational methods, that integrate the behavior of major economic agents with the complexities of environmental systems; methods that handle the non-linear interactions between these human and natural systems and capture the underlying dynamics, uncertainty, the potential for irreversibility, and ‘tipping points’ that characterize these systems. The solution to these complex problems requires highly quantitative and empirically-oriented teams of interdisciplinary researchers. The solution also requires knowledge of environmental law (both domestic and international), political institutions and political processes, including the challenges, and unintended consequences, of delegation of regulatory responsibility across different levels of governance, which often shape the regulatory process.
Adapting Cities, Agriculture, and Foods Systems to Climate Change

Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change is already one of the biggest challenges for cities, especially in growing mega-cities in the developing world. When it comes to mitigating greenhouse gas emissions in cities, city officials are already working with NGOs and Smart Growth Groups, to tackle these challenges. Examples include: introducing incentives for energy efficiency and conservation of buildings, developing plug-in infrastructure that can sustain the transition towards plug-in hybrid vehicles, green parking policies, and altering the zoning codes with the goal of creating more mixed-used communities that reduce their reliance on the automobile. Further, as the number of heating/cooling days will continue to increase, there are major climate change adaptation challenges that cities will have to address. For example, there is a need to plan and develop the infrastructure needed for increased first response to health, storms and fire emergencies. On the research front, our scientific understanding of the links between climate variability, local air pollution, health and other catastrophic outcomes in cities remains limited. There is a need to integrate innovative urban planning teaching programs that consider the adaptation of vulnerable cities to climate change with public policy programs that focus on social and environmental outcomes in cities, including health outcomes, and the well-being of vulnerable populations that are exposed to environmental damages (i.e. environmental justice concerns).

The challenges of adaptation to climate change are also likely to become central to agriculture and food systems. It is well demonstrated that yields of major crops could be severely affected with climate variability and that pests could present increased risks in agricultural production. These concerns are particularly troublesome in a world with a growing population where part of the land must be used to sequester carbon (forests) or allocated to the production of energy (biomass). There is a need to better understand the challenges of agriculture and food systems to adapt to climate and prepare the next generation of professionals working in these sectors. This requires coupling ‘agricultural systems’ scientists (including crops and soil scientists, and plant breeders, food science experts), climate-scientists, with applied social scientists to shed light in the development of public policies that promote sustainable agriculture and food systems to feed a growing population. In turn, new teaching programs in this area should reflect the coupling of ‘agricultural systems’ sciences, climate science and modern agricultural and resource economics and policy.

Develop Public-Private Partnerships to Address Global Environmental Problems

As individuals become more aware of the various environmental and energy challenges, they tend to respond to green-marketing campaigns, reveal extra-willingness to pay for green/sustainable products, demonstrate altruistic behavior in conservation, and demand greater corporate environmental responsibility. The explosion of green business and sustainable enterprises reflects a modern entrepreneurial vision of the private sector that voluntarily protects the environment as part of a profitable and creative business strategy. In times when government loses the trust of the population, there is a unique opportunity for public policy schools to serve as a credible facilitator of dialogue amongst different stakeholders. Such dialogues can promote strategic public-private partnerships that can become effective tools of addressing environmental and energy challenges. A School of Public Policy/Public Affairs can facilitate a better link to our
research strengths in Energy and Environmental Economics and Policy and Science with novel outreach programs to better inform and guide public policy, as well as provide an infrastructure that promotes dialogue amongst stakeholders.

*Train a workforce for new “Green Jobs”*

With the booming of green business in a new carbon constraint economy, there is also a need to develop new applied research with a regional and local focus; research that can serve as the basis to re-direct our outreach and extension programs that assist local communities and NY State to maximize the potential economic development associated with green business and renewable energy markets. Such applied research and outreach programs, traditionally housed in urban planning and CALS with a focus on economic development can be redirected and coupled with labor policy programs housed in ILR to contribute to the training of the workforce that will transition towards these new ‘green’ jobs. Such research and outreach programs should also translate into innovative teaching programs.

**VISION FOR A SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROGRAM IN THE CCSPP/A**

Our vision is that a new CSPP/A and its program area in Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy, will serve as Cornell’s intellectual focal point that contributes to the development of public policy solutions to these energy and environmental challenges. Our vision is to develop a highly flexible and evolving institutional structure that spans across the key units of social sciences, physical sciences and engineering, consisting of at least 15 FTEs, some of which will have 100% appointments in the CCSPP/A:

- **A Core Faculty of Social Scientists (10 FTEs)** – Scholars focusing on Environmental and Energy Economics, Environmental Politics, and Environmental Law to be housed in the new CCSPP/A (in some cases re-enforcing disciplinary units through joint appointments with varying time allocations);
- **Affiliated faculty with Joint Appointments (5 FTEs) between the CCSPP/A and the College of Engineering, College of Architecture, Art and Planning and various Physical Sciences Units**;
- **Affiliated Practitioners**, including Outreach and Extension Faculty, Associate Researchers and Clinical Professors (on terms appointments).

Few other institutions in the world have the breadth and depth of research spanning across disciplines and colleges at Cornell that can contribute to the solutions of these challenges. Further, with the launching of the Atkinson Center for a Sustainable Future (ACSF) and President Skorton’s commitment to Sustainability, Cornell has already gained major visibility in sustainability and made a tremendous attempt of developing mechanisms and incentives to bring interdisciplinary groups of researchers together. A CSPP/A will facilitate bringing some of these scholars together. Additionally, it will go one step further and develop novel professional masters programs in Environmental Policy and Science that truly integrate the key social sciences (environmental and energy economics and environmental politics) and physical sciences.
(earth system sciences and climate science) with Engineering and outreach programs that reflect our unique research strength.

Potential New Integrative Center

Our vision is that the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Program in the CSPP/A will capitalize on the success of ACSF and will complement and strengthen its activities by establishing a new Institute for the Study of Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Solutions that will provide the intellectual basis for this program area and bring together scholars and practitioners working in these complex problem areas to promote public-policy dialogue amongst stakeholders, and developing a series of new and innovative interdisciplinary programs in Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy at all levels.

Potential Undergraduate Programs in the CSPP/A

A group of faculty is developing a campus-wide minor in “The Science and Public Policy of Climate Change”, which could be attractive to majors in business, Engineering and Public Policy; the logical home for this minor is the new CSPP/A. Another group of faculty is working on a campus-wide minor in “Sustainable Energy Systems and Policy” that could be attractive to majors in business, Engineering and Public Policy. This program could be a joint program between the CSPP/A and the college of Engineering;

Potential Graduate Programs in the CSPP/A:

*From the existing MPS to a New Master’s in Environmental Policy and Science:* There is a possibility to revitalize the MPS in Environmental Management and have this program evolve towards a world-class Masters in Environmental Policy and Science with concentrations in Climate Change Policy, Renewable Energy Policy, Sustainable Cities and Urban Environmental Challenges

*Joint or Collaborative Master’s with the College of Engineering:* There is also a possibility to develop strategic partnerships with the college of Engineering to develop joint highly specialized programs, or trade courses where the CSPP/A offers basic courses in microeconomics, political institutions, energy and environmental economics to Eng. Masters students and the Eng. Faculty offers “energy systems’ courses to policy students; Early conversations with colleagues in Engineering reveal a tremendous amount of enthusiasm for these partnerships.

*Joint or Collaborative Masters with Cornell Law School:* the new CSPP/A can facilitate the hiring of faculty with interests in Environmental Law and contribute to the development of joint programs;

*Re-enforce the disciplinary units through more comprehensive PhD level sequences* in Environmental and Energy Economics, Environmental Politics, and Environmental Planning and new sequences that blend the pillars of the CSPP/A: Interface of Health and the Environment; Interface of Climate and Poverty, etc.
Potential link to new outreach/Engagement Initiatives

The Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Program in the CSPP/A also will contribute to existing Outreach Programs in the areas of Renewable Energy and Climate Change and develop novel outreach programs that better communicate research strengths to specific audiences.

CURRENT STRENGTHS AND THREATS TO EXISTING CAPACITY

In the following sections we identify current areas of strength in energy and environmental policy at Cornell, both by discipline and college, and by thematic areas as well as methodological background.

Strength coming from the Applied Social Sciences

Strengths in the Applied Social Sciences come primarily from units located in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS) including the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management (AEM), Development Sociology (DSoc), Natural Resources (NR), and Communication (Comm).

Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management (AEM)

The Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management evolved from an old agricultural economics department to the house of a top-ranked undergraduate business program. In the tradition of Agricultural and Resource Economics departments at major Land Grant Institutions, AEM is recognized as one of the leading institutions in the areas of Environmental, Energy and Resource Economics and Policy, and Food and Agricultural Policy.

At the present time, AEM has a rather diverse group of 8 faculty members covering several of the sub-fields of environmental, resource and energy economics. These include: Bento (Environmental Regulation, Market-Based Mechanisms, Climate and Renewable Energy Policy), Bills (Emeritus faculty, Land Use Management and Policy), Boisvert (Environmental Policy in a focus on Agriculture), Conrad (Dynamic Optimization Modeling of Natural Resources Management), Gomes (Computational Sustainability), Li (Climate and Energy Policy) Mount (Electricity Markets and Energy Policy), Poe (Environmental Valuation and Water Policy), Schulze (Experimental and Behavioral methods, Climate and Electricity Policy). This group is responsible for offering the core courses in environmental and resource economics at the Undergraduate, Masters and PhD levels. The undergraduate courses serve the AEM undergraduate business major, the Science of Natural and Environmental Systems (SNES); the Masters courses serve the graduate fields of AEM, Regional Science, and CIPA; PhD courses serve primarily the field of AEM and Economics. As documented in a recent departmental external review and the NRC rankings, this group has produced a large number of PhDs and placed them in top academic institutions.

Several members of the Environmental, Energy and Resource Economics faculty group have extensive engagement in public policy. Bento, for example, frequently serves on panels for the
National Academy of Sciences, the Science Advisory Board of the EPA, and collaborates with well-known researchers at major think-tanks and international institutions including Resources for the Future and the World Bank. Both Bento and Mount recently served on the NY State Climate Change Action Plan committee to NY’s governor and NYSERDA’s Bio-fuels roadmap initiative; Bento, Schulze and Mount advised the Northeast in the establishment of the regional cap-and-trade program for GHG emissions. Li comes to Cornell from Resources for the Future, a major research think-tank in environmental policy and both Li and Bento participated in public policy discussions surrounding the reform of CAFE standards for passenger vehicles and trucks.

Members of the Environmental, Energy and Resource Economics group have also been instrumental in campus-wide interdisciplinary groups. For example, Bento and Conrad are co-PIs of a multi-million NSF grant on Computational Sustainability that brought together environmental and resource economists and computer scientists to develop novel computational methods to address environmental and resources problems. Gomes is the PI. Bento is either PI, Co-PI or Senior Investigator in several major projects that include Soil Scientists and Engineers on topics related to climate policy and renewable energy. In addition, Bento currently leads the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Economics and Policy Program, which includes faculty from City and Regional Planning (Michael Manville), Civil and Environmental Engineering (Ricardo Daziano), Applied Economics and Management (Shanjun Li) and the School of Hotel Administration (Howard Chong). This program together with other programs in urban planning can serve as a basis to form a New Institute for Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Solutions. Mount and Schulze over the years have been key players in the Electricity Engineering and Economics Program at Cornell housed in the college of Engineering.

*Food and Agriculture Policy Group*

There are at least 8 faculty members in the Food and Agricultural Policy Group. Gomez (Sustainable Food Systems), Kaiser (Food Policy), Lesser (Food Policy), Novakovic (Agricultural Policy), Rickard (Agricultural Policy and Sustainable Food Systems), Schmit (Agricultural Policy and Economic Development), Tauer (Production Economics), Wayne Knoblauch (Agricultural Policy and Farm Management) and Joshua Woodard (Agricultural Policy and Farm Management)

These two groups face major challenges and threats that the new CCSPP/A would address:

(a) Several faculty contributing strength in these areas within CALS are likely to retire within the next five to seven years. Indeed some are already in the phased retirement stage. It is not clear whether these lines will ever be replaced upon retirement, given the current financial situation of CALS and the change in focus of AEM away from its traditional areas of strength (e.g., environmental, energy, agricultural and development economics) to business-oriented areas (e.g., finance, accounting, entrepreneurship). The need to sustain the undergraduate business program – a major source of funding to CALS - will further exacerbate this problem and contribute to the deterioration of graduate programs that depend on environmental and energy economics and development economics, including the AEM graduate program, the Econ graduate program, Regional Science, and other programs in Engineering.
(b) Several other land grant institutions are phasing out Agricultural Economics departments, as the role and support for agricultural economics research has been substantially reduced; the eminent retirements in this area provide the opportunity to re-direct resources to newly and more prominent areas of research better aligned with other university-wide strengths. Within the CSPP/A strategic decision could be made regarding the filling of these lines to address growth and development of faculty in energy and environmental policy.

(c) In Energy and Environmental Economics – a growing area of research in prominent Economics Departments, Schools of Public Policy and Business Schools - competing institutions, including MIT, Harvard, Yale, Duke, and UC-Berkeley, continue to make aggressive investments through well-structured cluster hires in environmental and energy economics that re-focus historical areas of research to new areas that can take advantage of other unique strengths on campus. At MIT, for example, the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research brings together over a dozen researchers in the areas of energy and environmental economics and policy, whose tenure homes are in the Economics Department, the Sloan Business School and other program. Between the Business School, the School of Public Policy, the Agricultural and Resource economics Department and the Energy and Resources group, UC-Berkeley has made at least 8 new appointments in Energy and Environmental Economics in the last three years. If these threats are not addressed at Cornell, we could face a serious barrier to retain and attract productive faculty in these areas.

A recent cluster initiated last academic year called for four new faculty members in environmental and energy economics. Bridge funding for this campus-wide cluster sponsored by ACSF started to address some of these issues but more needs to be done. Just last academic year, under Bento’s leadership this cluster attracted two outstanding energy economists to Cornell: Shanjun Li (AEM) and Howard Chong (SHA). There is a potential to build on this cluster and assist colleges to re-direct investments towards the energy and environmental economics group to meet broader university goals, develop profitable specialized masters programs, and linking it better with some programs in Engineering and the physical sciences and promote interdisciplinary initiatives. The new CSPP/A could become the logical home for some of these new hires. Such hires, although appointed at the new CSPP/A will still make major contributions to core disciplines in AEM and ECON as they will improve the quality of PhD training in these areas and supervise PhD students.

*Development Sociology*

A small group of five faculty members in Development Sociology focus on environmental sociology (Joe Douglas Francis, Chuck Geisler, Philip David McMichael, Max Pfeffer, and Wendy W. Wolford). These researchers study issues related to community management of natural resources, economic development of rural areas, the role of agri-food systems in the making of the modern world, and land use policy and management. The majority of these faculty will retire
within the next ten years, so the policy strength in Development Sociology faces the same challenges as mentioned above.

**Natural Resources**

A small group of four faculty members in Natural Resources focus on Human Dimensions of Natural Resources Management. (*Daniel Decker, Barbara Knuth, Shorna Alfred Human, and Rick Stedman*). The human dimensions research unit strives to expand the understanding of academicians, students, and natural resources agency staff about the human behavioral aspects of natural resource management and policy. The focus is on wildlife management policy, forestry and water resources policy, and fisheries policy. Research from this group is used in the policy development, implementation, and evaluation processes of a wide array of policymakers, especially those in state and federal agencies facing natural resources management issues consistent with the mission of a Land Grant university. These faculty will no doubt play an important affiliated role in the new CSPP/A.

**Communications**

A small group of faculty in Communication focus on public communication of science and technology, and environmental risks. These faculty members are: *Bruce Lewenstein and Kathrine McComas*. Several additional faculty in the Communication department have research programs aligned with the other identified pillars of public policy to the new CCSPP/A;

**Government**

As described above, to address the complex energy and environmental challenges that society face, there is a need to better understand political institutions and political processes, including environmental politics and the challenges associated with delegation of environmental regulatory authority across various levels of governance. Currently, the Government department has only a few faculty members working directly in environmental policy, Ronald Herring and Kevin Morrison who works on political aspects of natural resources management, including the effects of nontax revenues – such as from oil and foreign aid – on developing countries. While we see Government and Political Science as a pillar of its own in the new CSPP/A, there is a unique opportunity to attract researchers working on Environmental Politics who can serve as a bridge between the Politics and the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Pillars.

**History**

Aron Sachs is an historian at Cornell whose work focuses on environmental history.

**Law School**

Unlike other top law schools (Harvard and Yale), Cornell currently doesn’t have a strong presence in the field of environmental law. Cornell Law School, however, is very fortunate to have Jeffrey J. Rachlinski, an innovator in both administrative law, and in social psychology and the law. In addition to a J.D, He has a Ph.D. in Psychology, which positions him to bring new
perspectives on the influence of human psychology on decision-making by courts, administrative agencies, and regulated communities. Some of his focus is on Environmental Law. We propose that a new partnership between the Law School and the CSPP/A be developed to hire new faculty in Environmental Law and develop new joint programs with the new school. Again, this is a case where the presence of a CSPP/A could increase the ability of the Law School to attract top researchers who may appreciate and benefit from the additional intellectual environment of a CSPP/A.

City and Regional Planning

The Department of City and Regional Planning is poised to contribute to the CSPP/A. CRP faculty are already contributing substantially to CIPA’s MPA program, and there is a non-trivial number of faculty members in CRP whose research programs have either a direct policy component or clear implications for policy. There are at least five CRP faculty members who could potentially play a central role in the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Pillar. These include Richard Booth, Susan Christopherson, Kieran Donaghy, Michael Manville, and Stephen Schmidt. This group is uniquely positioned to focus on at least one of the most important challenges identified above of adapting cities to climate change and examine the economic development associated with the transition to a green economy.

College of Engineering

The area of Energy, Environment, and Sustainable Development is one of the major research initiatives in the College of Engineering at Cornell. More than 50 faculty members — one fifth of the total faculty in Engineering — consider at least part of their research to be related to energy and sustainability in some way. Some Engineering faculty already work with Environmental and Energy Economics and faculty from CRP to tackle some of the thematic areas outlined above. Furthermore, the College of Engineering offers more than 50 courses related to these topics. For current areas of energy research, see: http://www.geo.cornell.edu/eas/energy/research_front_page/ The committee recommends the affiliation of several faculty members from the College of Engineering and the development of join specialized masters programs.

Crops and Soils, Horticulture, Biological and Environmental Engineering and Earth and Atmospheric Sciences in CALS

There are several faculty members in these departments working in different aspects of climate change, both mitigation and adaptation, and sustainable Agriculture. The committee recommends the affiliation of several of these faculty members and their participation in a new masters’ in Environmental Policy and Science.

PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE FOR THE SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROGRAM

Based on the challenges and strengths identified above, a potential institutional structure for the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy could consist of a core group of faculty, faculty
affiliates and practitioners. Below is a preliminary list of potential faculty members and resource needs to sustain critical mass in certain areas. In the section below we identify core Faculty by discipline and thematic interest and suggest critical FTE allocations to the CSPP/A to build needed strength in each area.

**Energy and Environmental Economics and Policy (10 FTEs)**

The Committee recommends a total of 10 FTEs be appointed to build strength in this area, 6 with a major research focus on climate and renewable energy policy and 4 with focus in areas that will complement the other program areas in the school (e.g., interface of health and the environment; interface of development and environment). Cornell has existing strength in this area with *Antonio Bento* and *Shanjun Li* (Climate and Renewable Energy Policy), but the committee recommends a minimum 8 new cluster hires/pre fills directly appointed to the school as replacement for retiring faculty in this area.

There are several other Cornell faculty with research programs on various topics at the interface of urban planning and public policy, including climate change, challenges in cities, and economic development. The committee recommends a minimum of 2.5-3 FTEs of faculty working in this area be appointed to the new school. Potential faculty affiliates include, but are not limited to, Richard Booth (Environmental law), Susan Christopherson (Economic Development; Green Jobs), Kieran Donaghy (Climate Change, Mitigation and Adaptation, Transitions to Sustainable Energy Systems); Michael Manville (Sustainable Cities and Transportation Policy), Stephen Schmidt (Sustainable Cities and Open Space).

**Additional New Investments – Environmental Politics and Environmental Law, jointly with the Politics and Governance Program Area (each program contributes (1.5 FTEs)**

The committee recommends attracting a minimum of three new scholars in the areas of Environmental Politics and Environmental Law. These scholars could be jointly appointed with the Government Department and the Law School. Such Scholars will also serve as important bridges between the Politics and Governance and Sustainable Energy and Environmental program areas.

**Potential Affiliated Faculty of the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy Pillar at the CCSPP/A (up to 5 FTEs)**

The committee recommends and inclusionary strategy regarding appointments and partial appointments to the new school, with up to an additional 5 FTEs from across campus. Many of these potential affiliates have been previously identified but could potentially include, but are not limited to, outstanding faculty such as: Ronald Herring (Government), Kevin Morrison (Government), Jeffrey J. Rachlinski (Law), Paulette Clancy (CBE), Al George (MAE), Peter Hess (BEE), Terry Jordan (EAS), Natalie Mahowald (ESA), Max Zhang (MAE), Oliver Gao (CEE), Linda Nozick (CEE), Ricardo Daziano (CEE), Susan Riha (EAS), Robert Howarth (EEB), David Wolfe (Hort), Aron Sachs (History), Howard Chong (SHA), Crocker Liu (SHA).
HEALTH POLICY

In the United States in 2009, health expenditures totaled $2.5 trillion, which equals $8,086 per person and represents 17.6% of U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). One of the foremost public policy problems, not just in the U.S., but worldwide, is improving public health while managing health care costs. Specifically, there are two major challenges:

- improving risky health behaviors (e.g., smoking cessation, avoidance of binge drinking, reducing drug use, reducing the spread of sexually transmitted infections, enhancing nutrition, increasing physical activity, prevention of overweight and obesity); and
- efficient and equitable provision of high-quality medical care (e.g., health insurance coverage, prescription drug approval policy, health care information technology, public vaccination programs).

Cornell has remarkable strength in both of these areas, and bringing together researchers in these areas into the CSPP/A would increase the visibility of existing research while creating synergies for future research and increased opportunities for student mentorship and participation in research. In the sections below we briefly explain the two challenges to improving population health, and provide an overview of the research in these areas being conducted at Cornell.

Improving risky health behaviors

During the 20th Century, the leading causes of death in economically developed countries ceased to be infectious diseases; the new leading causes of death are the result of risky health behaviors. For example, in 1900 the leading causes of death in the United States were pneumonia, influenza, tuberculosis and diarrhea. By 2000, the CDC reported that the leading “actual causes of death” in the United States were: tobacco, poor diet and physical inactivity, and alcohol. As a result, there is an urgent need to better understand the causes and consequences of risky health behaviors, and to design and evaluate public policies to moderate these behaviors. Cornell is a leader in studying risky health behaviors such as poor diet, physical inactivity and obesity (relevant researchers include John Cawley, Jeffrey Sobal, Sahara Byrne, Brian Wansink, and David Just), smoking and tobacco use (Don Kenkel, John Cawley, Michael Frakes, and Michael Lovenheim), and alcohol (Don Kenkel and Michael Lovenheim). Much research at Cornell focuses on specific causes of risky health behaviors, such as advertising of energy-dense foods and smoking cessation products (e.g., Rosemary Avery, Sahara Byrne, John Cawley, Don Kenkel, Alan Mathios), the impact of nutrition labels on diet and information on health behaviors (e.g., John Cawley, Don Kenkel, and Alan Mathios), and the neurobiology of decision making as concerns risky health behaviors (Valerie Reyna).

Economically developed and developing countries face different challenges concerning risky health behaviors. For example, childhood obesity is a major problem in many developed countries, while childhood underweight remains a significant problem in many developing countries. As another example, there is an enormous disparity in the rates of HIV infection in Europe and North America compared to sub-Saharan Africa. A great strength of Cornell is that we have considerable strength in the study of health behaviors in both developed and developing
countries. For example, David Sahn and Chris Barrett are leaders in the study of health-related interventions in developing countries.

Efficient and equitable provision of high-quality medical care

Economic growth has led to widening disparities in not just wealth, but also health. Understanding the sources of these disparities and determining what magnitudes of inequality are acceptable remain important concerns in nations worldwide. Moreover, the health care marketplace continues to change rapidly in response to technological improvements and new government regulations. For example, in 2010, health care reform in the United States dramatically changed not only the incentives for health insurance, but overhauled regulation of health insurance companies and health providers, expanded eligibility of government health insurance programs, and encouraged provision of cost-effective preventive care. The implications of health care reform for population health and government spending are still unclear, and there is tremendous interest in improving the quality and efficiency of health care so that providers and payers get the greatest “bang for the buck”: the greatest improvements in population health for a given budget.

Cornell has a remarkably strong set of scholars studying issues relating to access to health care, quality of health care, and health insurance. For example, Cornell researchers are studying health care labor markets, such as whether hospitals have monopsony power in hiring nurses (Jordan Matsudaira) and the impact of labor union strikes on the provision of hospital care (Sam Kleiner). Others are calculating the social benefit of new therapies for cancer (Sean Nicholson and Claudio Lucarelli) and HIV (Bruce Shackman). Disability policy is another area of strength (Richard Burkhauser, Nicholas Ziebarth). Others study the impact of aging policy and long-term care policy on the well-being of the elderly (Karl Pillemer, Elaine Wethington).

Reducing the prevalence of risky health behaviors, and efficiently and equitably providing high-quality health care are critically important issues for every country in the world. Cornell has tremendous strength in this area, with its researchers engaged in translational research and actively advising government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Food & Drug Administration, Federal Trade Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For these reasons, health policy should be one of the major research foci of the CSPP/A. An additional benefit is that the health policy research area is complementary and synergistic with other proposed research areas for the CSPP/A, specifically: international development (e.g., health in developing countries) and environmental policy (e.g., the public health consequences of pollution).

Motivation for a Health Policy Focus in the CSPP/A

Given that health consumes over 17% of GDP, it is not surprising that peer institutions have made the study of health policy a primary focus of their schools of public policy. For example, The Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University has made a large investment in health policy research by forming its new Center for Health and Well-Being, which is a multidisciplinary research center dedicated to research and teaching on multiple aspects of health and well-being in developed and developing countries. The Center is also home to Princeton’s
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Center for the Demography of Aging. Affiliates include: Betsy Armstrong, Anne Case, Janet Currie, Angus Deaton, Noreen Goldman, Sara McLanahan, Christina Paxson, and Uwe Reinhardt. Harvard University has a large number of health policy scholars of various disciplines working together in the Kennedy School of Government and the Health Policy Ph.D. program (e.g. Katherine Baicker, Ernie Berndt, Daniel Carpenter, Amitabh Chandra, Nicholas Christakis, David Cutler, Richard Frank, Steven Gortmaker, David Hemenway, Michael Kremer, Brigitte Madrian, Tom McGuire, Michelle Mello, Joseph Newhouse, Theda Skocpol, Kathy Swartz). Duke University’s Sanford School of Public Policy has several health-related research centers, including the Center for Health Policy; the Center for Genomics Ethics, Law and Policy; the Global Health Institute; and the Program on Global Health and Technology Access.

Given the importance of health policy for population health, individual well-being and government budgets, it is fair to say that the CSPP/A cannot be credible without a strong focus on health policy. The productivity and visibility of Cornell’s existing health policy scholars would be improved by increased coordination and shared infrastructure. Thus, a CSPP/A with a health policy program would likely improve research, teaching/advising, and external visibility. Cornell’s health policy scholars are currently spread across many units, which is a barrier to greater success. Bringing health policy researchers together in the CSPP/A would yield the following benefits:

**Research:** A CSPP/A with a focus on health policy would make it easier for researchers to exploit synergistic opportunities. For example, those studying health in developed and developing countries tend to be in different departments at Cornell (e.g., PAM and AEM), and thus interact less than they would if they were colleagues. Moreover, different disciplines studying health are spread across different units, further reducing contact and exchange of ideas. A CSPP/A focused in part on health policy would increase the quality, quantity, interdisciplinary nature, and richness of faculty research.

**Teaching and advising:** By bringing together health policy researchers in the CSPP/A there would be a richer and more rationalized set of course offerings for students. Currently, curricula are frequently narrow and uncoordinated. A CSPP/A can ensure greater breadth and coordinate course offerings. For example, PAM currently has no offerings in government or political science for its health policy students. In addition, students studying development economics in AEM and health policy in PAM would benefit from taking classes with each other. Moreover, students would find it easier to build an interdisciplinary committee of advisors if health policy researchers were concentrated in the CSPP/A. This would have the benefit of students receiving more well-rounded and complete educations in health policy, leading in the long run to greater career success for Cornell students.

**External visibility and ranking:** With health policy researchers currently spread across campus, it is difficult for those outside of Cornell (e.g. prospective students, prospective faculty hires) to find potential advisors, collaborators, relevant courses, and appreciate Cornell’s strengths in health policy. Just as Cornell reaps important advantages from expanding its Economics Department, which makes it easier for prospective students and faculty to appreciate Cornell’s strength in economics (scattered across units). The CSPP/A would likewise better advertise to
outsiders Cornell’s considerable strengths in health policy, with the long run benefit of attracting more and better students, and increasing the success of faculty recruitment efforts.

**CORNELL’S EXISTING STRENGTH IN HEALTH POLICY**

One can categorize existing strengths at Cornell in terms of reducing the prevalence of risky health behaviors and efficiently and equitably providing high-quality health care. In this section we identify existing faculty who conduct policy-relevant research in health, as well as the research centers/institutes, and some of the relevant degree programs.

**Faculty**

While Cornell has a large number of faculty who directly study health; e.g., the entire faculties of Weill Medical College, and the Division of Nutritional Sciences, a smaller number of faculty focus on health policy more specifically.

- **Judith Appleton**, Veterinary Medicine: parasitic diseases and health
- **Rosemary Avery**, Policy Analysis and Management: advertising of pharmaceuticals
- **Sam Bacharach**, Industrial & Labor Relations: organizations and health care
- **Chris Barrett**, Applied Economics & Management: food systems, nutrition
- **Alaka Basu**, Development Sociology: fertility, woman’s and children’s health
- **Richard Burkhauser**, Policy Analysis and Management: disability policy
- **Sahara Byrne**, Communication: boomerang effects in public health campaigns, cigarette warning labels, advertising of pharmaceuticals and addictive substances
- **John Cawley**, Policy Analysis and Management: risky health behaviors, economics of obesity, public health policies, health insurance
- **Damon Clark**, Policy Analysis and Management: education and health
- **Benjamin Cornwall**, Sociology: aging, health
- **Ann Forsyth**, City & Regional Planning: community health
- **Michael Frakes**, Law School: legal/financial incentives affecting health care providers
- **Tove Hammer**, Industrial & Labor Relations: organizations and health
- **Stephen Hilgartner**, Science & Technology Studies: biotechnology, IP in genomics
- **David Just**, AEM: behavioral economics, overeating, child nutrition
- **Donald Kenkel**, Policy Analysis and Management: disease prevention, health promotion, risky health behaviors, cost-effectiveness analysis, public health policies
- **Samuel Kleiner**, Policy Analysis and Management: market power and efficiency in health care markets, returns to health care spending
- **Michael Lovenheim**, Policy Analysis and Management: tobacco taxation, alcohol policy
- **Claudio Lucarelli**, Policy Analysis and Management: industrial organization of health care markets, public health insurance
- **Alan Mathios**, Policy Analysis and Management: advertising and information disclosure in food and drug markets, effect of FDA regulation on consumer and firm behavior
- **Jordan Matsudaira**, Policy Analysis and Management: health care labor markets
- **Suzanne Mettler**, Government: health care reform and political involvement
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- **Sean Nicholson**, Policy Analysis and Management: value of new medical technologies, effect of financial incentives on physician treatment decisions
- **Jeff Niederdeppe**, Communication: effectiveness of anti-tobacco media campaigns, role of news coverage in shaping health behavior and policy
- **Ted O’Donoghue**, Economics: addiction, sin taxes
- **Anthony Ong**, Human Development: aging, resilience over the life course
- **Karl Pillemer**, Human Development: family caregiving, aging policy, long-term care
- **Valerie Reyna**, Human Development: medical decision making, risky behaviors
- **Brian Rubineau**, Industrial & Labor Relations: organizations and health
- **David Sahn**, Nutrition: determinants of, and solutions to, food insecurity, malnutrition and disease in developing countries
- **Vilma Santiago-Irizarry**, Anthropology: law and medicine, institutional culture
- **Bruce Shackman**, Weill Medical College: cost-effectiveness, evaluation of HIV testing and treatment, global health, substance abuse treatment
- **Jeffrey Sobal**, Nutrition: sociology of diet, nutrition and obesity
- **Bill Sonnenstuhl**, Industrial & Labor Relations: organizations and health
- **Rebecca Stoltzfus**, Nutrition: anemia and micronutrient malnutrition, in women and children in developing countries; director of the Global Health minor
- **Brian Wansink**, Applied Economics and Management: healthy eating, behavior change, consumer behavior, food marketing
- **Elaine Wethington**, Human Development: sociology of mental health and illness
- **William White**, Policy Analysis and Management: managed care, design of healthcare reimbursement systems, healthcare antitrust, health insurance reform
- **Michele Williams**, Industrial & Labor Relations: organizations and health
- **Nicolas Ziebarth**, Policy Analysis and Management: social security policy, population health, risky health behaviors

**Existing Research Infrastructure at Cornell in Support of Health Policy**

The Institute for Health Economics, Health Behaviors and Disparities

This institute supports and strengthens the intellectual community at Cornell studying topics in the area of health economics, in particular the economics of health behaviors such as smoking, drinking alcohol, diets and sedentary lifestyles that contribute to obesity, drug use, and risky sex. Activities of the Institute include a weekly lunchtime research seminar, course sequences at both the Ph.D. and advanced undergraduate levels, funding summer research assistantships for graduate students, supporting an undergraduate research lab, offering research grants to junior faculty, and hosting visiting scholars.

Cornell Population Program

The Cornell Population Center (CPC) serves as the intellectual hub for demographic research and training at Cornell University. The CPC supports demographic research relating broadly to three core themes: (1) families and children; (2) health behaviors and disparities; and (3) poverty
and inequality. The CPC is a university-wide program serving 90 affiliates from 24 different departments and is housed in the College of Human Ecology. Aside from the Institute for Health Economics (described above), another aspect of the CPP agenda that is especially relevant for the health program is the demographic research relating to health and aging, such as risky sexual behaviors and gerontology.

**The Cornell Institute for Translational Research on Aging (CITRA)**

The mission of CITRA is to cultivate and maintain close ties between Cornell researchers in social science, clinical research and mental health, with community-based practitioners from throughout the five boroughs of New York City. This tie between community based organizations, social scientists, and medical researchers provides a living learning laboratory where research is conceptualized, conducted, and disseminated with continuous feedback from invested stakeholders. Thus, CITRA’s mission is not only the origination of high quality research, but the creation of a dynamic infrastructure to support these research partnerships. CITRA is funded by the National Institute on Aging.

**Center for Global Health**

This center serves both Weill Cornell Medical College and the Ithaca campus of Cornell in Ithaca. The Center has three objectives: 1) To provide global health training, in the classroom, laboratory, and field, for Cornell students at all levels: undergraduates on the Ithaca Campus, medical students at WCMC, and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows on both campuses; 2) To provide reciprocal training programs at Cornell for colleagues at all levels from our network of international collaborating institutions; 3) To coordinate ongoing collaborations and to develop new programs among Cornell researchers to solve existing and emerging problems in global health.

**Center for the Study of Inequality**

The Center for the Study of Inequality (CSI) fosters basic and applied research on social and economic inequalities, as well as the processes by which such inequalities change and persist. The distinctive feature of CSI is its emphasis on developing theory-based and empirically-tested models of inequality that assist not only in understanding ongoing changes in inequality but also in evaluating public policy and social interventions. This research agenda is pursued by CSI affiliates through study of topics that include the impact of inequality, education, residential segregation, poverty, economic development and discrimination on health.

**Cornell Food and Nutrition Policy Program**

The Cornell Food and Nutrition Policy Program (CFNPP) conducts applied research and engages in technical cooperation and training on issues of poverty, human resource development, and food and nutrition policy in, developing countries and in transition economies of Eastern Europe.

**CONTRIBUTION OF HEALTH POLICY SCHOLARS TO CORNELL’S TEACHING MISSION**
Ph.D. in Public Policy (with concentration in health)

This is currently the Ph.D. in Policy Analysis and Management. Doctoral students trained at Cornell in health economics and policy have moved to prestigious positions in academia (both assistant professor and postdoctoral fellowships), government, and the private sector. Specific Ph.D. course offerings include a two-course sequence in health economics that is cross-listed between Economics and PAM. Examples of Ph.D.-level courses in health policy include: PAM/ECON 6410: Health Economics I (John Cawley) and PAM/ECON 6420: Health Economics II (Nicolas Ziebarth)

Sloan Masters in Health Administration (MHA)

The Sloan Program in Health Administration’s Master of Health Administration (MHA) degree prepares future leaders in health management with the knowledge and skills in management, health care organization, policy and public health to manage health care organizations and promote quality, access, efficiency and innovation in health care delivery and financing. The program curriculum combines rigorous coursework with a robust practical training component which includes a required summer internship, colloquia bringing industry experts to campus, an annual off-campus intersession program field trip to meet industry leaders, and a second-year capstone project. Sloan alumni serve in leadership positions in a variety of settings, including hospitals, long-term care, ambulatory services, insurance/benefits organizations, pharmaceuticals, management consulting, professional associations and government organizations.

Global Health minor

Cornell offers a Global Health Minor that is open to students in any major in any college. The Global Health Minor is designed around three specific educational objectives for students: 1) to learn more about the problems of global health in a classroom setting; 2) to experience the issues in global health firsthand in a field setting (in particular, in an 8-week field experience); 3) and to be exposed to the variety of careers available in global health by working with graduate and medical students and faculty who are currently engaged in the field.

Programs in International Nutrition

Primarily centered in the College of Human Ecology and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell has unique strength and reputation in food and nutrition policy, ranging from cross-cutting issues that impact the human condition such as obesity and malnourishment, to issues of international food policy and food systems. Malnutrition and hunger continue to be widespread in many developing countries, and chronic disease resulting from poor nutrition is an emerging health challenge. The causes of inadequate nutrition are many and complex as they encompass biological, economic, social and political issues. The Program in International Nutrition, located in DNS, trains primarily graduate students who are dedicated to eliminating hunger, malnutrition, and chronic disease. The Global Health Program offers an undergraduate minor that encourages a multidisciplinary approach to understanding and seeking solutions to health problems that affect the poor in less developed countries. Additionally, policy focused
efforts, such as the Cornell Food and Nutrition Policy Program and the United Nations University Food and Nutrition Programme for Human and Social Development (UNU-FNP) which is located in DNS, afford faculty and students additional opportunities to address food and nutritional problems through research, capacity development, applied nutrition programs in the community, and working directly with government and international organizations. CHE/CALS also offers an MPS program in International Development with strength in nutrition policy and is integrally involved in the Cornell International Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development (CIIFAD) and other efforts to encourage a broader food systems approach to solving health and nutrition problems.

B.S. in Public Policy (with concentration in health policy)

Health Policy is currently taught as a concentration (and university-wide minor) in the undergraduate program in Policy Analysis and Management. In addition to formal coursework, there is an undergraduate research lab that employs roughly a dozen undergraduates who are trained in data collection, data management, and data analysis, and who support a wide variety of research projects in the area of health policy. Specific undergraduate course offerings in health policy include: U.S. Health Care System, Fundamentals of Population Health, and various Health Policy courses. PAM also offers a two-course undergraduate sequence in risky health behaviors that is cross-listed between Economics and PAM: Economics of Risky Health Behaviors and Economics of Public Health.

TARGETED INVESTMENTS NEEDED TO BRING HEALTH POLICY TO ENHANCED PROMINENCE IN THE CSPP/A

The health policy program is complementary and synergistic with other proposed research programs for the CSPP/A, specifically: international development (e.g., health in developing countries) and environmental policy (e.g., the public health consequences of pollution), social policy (e.g., the interaction of demography and health, such as risky sex) and government (health policy, health care reform).

Below is an overview of resource investments needed to propel Cornell to greater prominence in the health area. We identify four categories of health policy scholars that should be prioritized for recruitment. The individual scholars listed are purely illustrative of the type of person who would be a good fit.

Health policy researchers who would contribute additional disciplinary perspectives; for example:

- **Medical sociology:** for an example of a scholar working in this area: Betsy Armstrong of the Princeton sociology department, who studies fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal personhood;
- **Political science:** for an example of a scholar working in this area: Dan Carpenter of the Harvard government department, who studies the politics of the FDA drug approval
process; and Andrew Whitford of the University of Georgia who studies the politics of public health, environmental policy, and the war on drugs;

- **Behavioral health**: researchers who would contribute to the study of risky health behaviors (e.g. smoking, drinking, risky sex, obesity), for example from the perspective of behavioral economics or psychology. For an example of a scholar working in this area, George Loewenstein of Carnegie Mellon and Kevin Volpp of the University of Pennsylvania use behavioral economics approaches to incentivize healthy behaviors such as weight loss, smoking cessation, and medication adherence;

- **International health**: in cooperation with the researchers studying international development, recruit scholars who study health care systems and organizations outside the U.S., and/or study health behaviors in the developing country context. For an example of a scholar working in this area: Michael Kremer of the Harvard Economics department studies randomized experiments in developing countries to improve health;

- **Environment and health**: in cooperation with the researchers studying environmental policy, recruit scholars who study the health consequences of environmental policies. For an example of a scholar working in this area: Matt Neidell of Columbia University School of Public Health was considered for a sustainability cluster hire a few years ago, and would be a great bridge between the environmental policy and health policy groups.

PROPOSED NEW CENTERS/INSTITUTES TO BUILD STRENGTH IN HEALTH POLICY

It is imperative that the CSPP/A offer advantages and resources to faculty that promote their research. It is important that the CSPP/A promote research in a wide variety of ways, including individual faculty research accounts and grants, strengthening existing research centers, and creating new research centers.

The exact set of research centers that should be created or strengthened depends on information not yet known, such as which faculty take appointments in the CSPP/A. Once the set of faculty appointed to the CSPP/A are known, then research centers most relevant to those faculty should be strengthened or created. For example, if many health economists end up having appointments in the CSPP/A, then a long-term funding commitment should be made to the Institute for Health Economics, Health Behaviors and Disparities.

Furthermore, it should be a priority to create incentives for collaboration between the health and each of the other policy areas (social policy, environment/energy, international development, and government/politics), in order to increase interdisciplinary communication and collegiality as well as to promote new and better research.
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM AREAS

Cornell’s self-description as “Land Grant University to the World” entails a commitment to engage with policy discourse and constructive activity in the international arena. Two broad challenges are currently, and for the foreseeable future, preeminent in this domain: (1) redressing poverty and inequality in the poorer countries of the world, and (2) cooperation and security among this earth's nations and peoples. These two sets of challenges are encountering both positive and negative effects from contemporary processes of globalization, which means that new knowledge is needed to deal appropriately with them. Poverty poses many threats to security, and global cooperation is essential for development in the poorest nations. Further, the challenges seen in the area of Energy and the Environment, addressed by a parallel program area of the CSPP/A, intersect with both of these focuses.

The committee recommends that the CSPP/A have two parallel, related program areas for the international realm: (i) International Development, and (ii) International Cooperation and Security. These are not distinct domains of policy and activity. Failures of international cooperation impact on poor countries through financial contagion, climate change, wars, and refugees. Similarly, the pace and pattern of development in the poorest countries in turn affects global conditions and cooperation. The value of Cornell’s contributions in either policy domain can be enhanced by complementary work in the other. Thus we want to see Cornell faculty, along with students, staff and alumni, contributing in these respective areas and at the same time having overall positive impacts on the international stage.

Cornell has a long history of engagement with less-developed countries to address poverty and inequality. We are mindful of President Skorton's call in his commencement address to the Cornell graduating class of 2007, for Cornell and other American universities to join in a new kind of 'Marshall Plan' to reduce worldwide poverty and inequality. The proposed program focus in this area will enable the university to contribute to achieving this goal as it has one of the best aggregations of knowledge and experience for reduction of poverty and inequality to be found anywhere in the country.

Furthermore, Cornell is also well-placed to address the emerging challenges of cooperation, security and conflict resolution in a globalized world. The stresses and strains of global institutions designed for the last century have begun to show. Harvard economist Dani Rodrik has proposed "an 'impossibility theorem” for the global economy, i.e., that democracy, national sovereignty, and global economic integration are mutually incompatible: we can combine any two of the three, but never have all three simultaneously and in full.¹ The Rodrik 'trilemma' as it has come to be called is much debated. But it delineates significant tensions in global policy, and issues that regional and global institutions are grappling with, whether it is the Eurozone crisis, or the revision of the Kyoto protocol on greenhouse gas emissions, or a capital increase for expanding the scope of the International Monetary Fund. The 'trilemma' is made more difficult and confounding by the influences of environmental changes and constraints, which link to the CSPP/A’s program area for Energy and the Environment.

Although fewer faculty at Cornell are currently devoting most of their research, teaching and public service to dealing with issues of international cooperation and security than are working to advance economic and social development around the world, it has substantial strengths in the broad area of international cooperation, security, and conflict resolution. Several thematic and area programs of the Einaudi Center for International Studies, and in particular the Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies, speak to these challenges. Even with limited institutional focus and support, in its 2011 poll assessing institutional capabilities in the field of international relations, U.S. News and World Report ranked Cornell 13th nationally. At the same time, when it comes to making intellectual and practice contributions in the area of international development, Cornell is arguably to strongest American university. Over 250 faculty devote all or much of their research, teaching and outreach activity to development problems and opportunities, with full-time equivalents close to 100.

The following two sections discuss the respective program areas being proposed for enabling Cornell to be a more effective 'land grant university to the world.'

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

President Skorton in speaking to the Cornell community has noted that:

*International research and capacity building have a long history at Cornell. The Cornell-Nanking Crop Improvement Program, a cooperative agricultural exchange program, was carried out in China between 1925 and 1931 to improve the major food crops of northern China and train Chinese investigators in crop improvement techniques. That effort paved the way for many post-World War II technical assistance programs involving American universities and their counterparts overseas.*

This engagement and prominence continues to the present day. Cornell’s present faculty includes, for example, the current Chief Economic Advisor to the Government of India; the current Head of the Asian Development Bank’s Regional Integration Department; the former Head of the China Division of the International Monetary Fund; and the former Chief Economist for Africa of the World Bank. Overall, Cornell has a world-leading faculty in the broad area of international development. The faculty can bring together the strengths of the natural sciences and the social sciences to bear on the pressing problems of poverty and inequality, particularly in the areas of agriculture, food and nutrition, and natural resources. Further, Cornell is well-placed to make connections in terms of policy and practice between various kinds of development efforts and environmental suitability and sustainability.

In Appendix D we present a (partial) listing of faculty with international development research programs, and we identify relevant centers/institutes/programs at Cornell with international engagement as their focus, as inventoried from Cornell websites. The inventory lists around 75 faculty in social science departments, and 25 faculty in natural science departments who have particular interest in international development policy issues, with a still larger number engaged

---

with the substance of international development in its various aspects. These numbers, especially for natural scientists, are probably underestimates.

**Research Focuses for This Program Area**

We see research and teaching activities in this area, along with outreach efforts, grouped thematically to reflect and project Cornell’s strengths as well as to meet needs of public policy and action.

The persistence of severe poverty is a major concern in many parts of the developing world despite reasonably fast economic growth in some developing countries, with elatedly high and rising inequality. Rising inequality, in particular, may well threaten the poverty-reducing impact of economic growth, and the growth process itself. Further, a range of spillovers across nations -- from financial market contagion through greenhouse gas emissions to pressures from migration and refugees -- bind together the interests of developed and developing countries. Not addressing these problems collectively can derail development in the low-income countries, as it also affects the prosperity and security of high-income countries as well.

Two themes are suggested as of particular importance within the International Development domain:

(i) *Reforms of public policy and programs for reducing poverty and inequality.* This would involve detailed analysis of current policies and specific proposals for reform or ideas for new policies. One example is India’s National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. This is a major policy intervention, using a huge chunk of the government’s resources, and it raises fundamental analytical and policy questions (many of them addressed by Cornell faculty) for developing countries generally. This is just one example; there are many others, ranging from girls’ education through cash transfer programs to decentralization of government. Cornell has significant strengths in this area, as highlighted by the activities covered by the ISS theme project in poverty and social mobility.

(ii) *Uses of science and technology for promoting development and reducing poverty.* Cornell has many strengths in this area, particularly in agriculture, where economists, sociologists and production scientists have come together to evaluate alternative methods of raising productivity and incomes for poor farmers, to improve also food security in sustainable ways. Further innovative initiatives could be envisaged through engaging our engineers and computer scientists. This is where bridge-building between the social sciences and natural sciences in the service of development policy could be built upon and encouraged further.

**Proposed Teaching Contributions in International Program Areas**

International Development and International Cooperation and Security areas could together contribute to the CSPP/A’s Master’s programs at several levels: (i) providing elective courses in international development and international cooperation for the general MPP and MPA programs, (ii) developing concentrations in international development and international cooperation for both MPP and MPA degrees, and (iii) developing focused MPP degrees respectively in international development or international cooperation and security, or possibly
for a combined MPP in global affairs. These programs are discussed in more detail in a following section on Teaching Programs in the CSPP/A.

**Faculty, Resources and Appointments**

The faculty needed for these research undertakings and international degree offerings are spread across economics, political science, and the other social sciences and natural sciences. No policies will come to fruition without being adopted by institutions – whether of governments, international organizations, NGOs or agencies working with governments. In our International development teaching programs we should be teaching skills to operate within and to negotiate with such institutions. The Politics and Governance program area proposed for the CSPP/A should recruit scholars with expertise in their respective areas -- political scientists, historians, sociologists, etc.—who also have knowledge in development and other aspects of international affairs. In each social science discipline, there are some academics who have specialized on intersections with these different aspects of international relations and who could assist students in the CSPP/A to develop more sophisticated understanding of these intersections than provided by usual disciplinary degree programs.

A rough estimate of the resources needed for the international program areas would be 5 FTEs for each of the two program areas delineated here, or 10 FTEs in all. Considering the sub-themes, these might be distributed as 4 economists, 3 political scientists, and 3 other social scientists and natural scientists. These positions could be filled from outside Cornell or with shared appointments from within Cornell.

The 10 FTEs for faculty appointments could be used for external or internal appointments. Even most appointments made externally would probably be best appointed jointly with other departments. If half of the 10 are full-time in the CSPP/A and the other half are 50% appointments, shared with departments, this would lead to a complement of 15 voting faculty in the international programs. However, a reasonable framework may be to think of roughly half of the 15 voting faculty coming from among current faculty members at Cornell, and half from external appointments. There would also be a larger number of Cornell faculty who would become associated/affiliated with the CSPP/A's international programs in a variety of arrangements. The International Development program area, like the International Cooperation and Security area, will develop according to the needs identified for the research and teaching programs of each area.

**International Cooperation and Security**

Cornell is also well-placed to address the emerging challenges of cooperation, security and conflict resolution in a globalized world. Many things are changing across national boundaries, as information, capital, population, technology and other factors of production move in greater volumes and with greater speed, and often with less control by government agencies which see their regulatory powers waning or porous. Both opportunities and need for cooperation are growing, and the elements that make for a secure existence of individuals, families, communities, regions and even countries become more ambiguous or difficult to control.
Alongside these tensions at personal and group levels, and equally important, are issues of security in a world of asymmetric conflict and fluid alliances, increasingly more complex than in the decades when security was mostly a military matter. As always, economic and political factors are intertwined. The rising economic powers of China, India and Brazil are reshaping geopolitics, from the United Nations to ASEAN. The design and re-design of institutions and agreements to manage these tensions and to transform potential conflicts into cooperation is a leading global policy challenge of our time. Cornell faculty should be making contributions to the advancement of knowledge and practice in this area, and should connect with the other focus areas for the new School so that their research and engagement is informed by state-of-the-art thinking in this area. Intersections of this area with that of Sustainable Environment and Energy are particularly important to reckon with.

**Research Focuses for this Program Area**

Within this area the School would emphasize at least initially the following themes, in each of which Cornell has expertise and global profile that can be built upon:

(i) *Security and cooperation in a world of asymmetric conflict.* Security in the 20th century was framed mostly in military terms, reflecting the experience of two World Wars and a prolonged confrontation with the Soviet Union. In the 21st century, much new thinking is needed, starting with understanding better what is called 'soft power' and how to use it, in distinction from or in conjunction with 'harder' forms of military and economic power. States' power is increasingly challenged by the rise of non-state actors who may use physical force but who can also sabotage information systems or distort financial transactions in world markets, with fewer resources and with more impunity than in the past. The whole rise and spread of terrorist organizations has altered definitions of what is involved in 'security.' The doctrine of 'separatism' is repeatedly challenging what have been stable if not fully satisfactory institutional arrangements. New thinking and new frameworks are called for in the 21st century.

(ii) *Global and regional institutions to manage the new forms of interdependencies.* This focus area combines elements of international economics with international relations and the study of international institutions. Specific challenges include the design (or re-design) of global institutions to manage collective action on carbon emissions or financial contagion. Another issue is the role of foreign aid and investment in the coming decades, given the rapid growth of countries like India and China and the fact that these countries are themselves developing aid programs. This intersects with the focus area of International Development. Cornell faculty have had intensive interactions with international institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank, and are well-placed to build on this platform.

**Faculty, Resources and Appointments**

The strength of the network of interdisciplinary programs that operate under the auspices of the Einaudi Center for International Studies at Cornell is well-known and widely respected. Several hundred Cornell faculty interact under the Center's rubric, although not all of them frame their research and teaching in terms of public policy and public affairs. Informal conversations with
the current and past Directors of the Einaudi Center have indicated interest in having a mutually-supportive relationship with a CSPP/A. With International Cooperation and Security as one of its program areas in the CSPP/A, it would give encouragement and impetus to existing programs in the Einaudi Center like the Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies and the Program on International Political Economy. Furthermore, it could create more opportunities to the Program on Comparative Economic Development. Many faculty in the Cornell Institute for European Studies within the Einaudi Center have worked on issues of international and regional cooperation, and their knowledge could have more effectiveness in interactions with other thematic groups under the Cooperation and Security rubric.

The CSPP/A focus on these two international program areas would also give more visibility and opportunities to existing college/school programs like the Law School's International Legal Studies Program, CALS' International Programs, AAP's International Studies in Planning, and JGSM's Program on International Business Education. The CSPP/A would not be competitive with the Einaudi Center or these college programs; rather, they would work together to attract more attention for, and give more impetus to, these respective centers of international research, teaching and engagement on campus.

These programs and their associated faculty focus in different aspects of international cooperation. The Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies and the 25 faculty associated with it offer a strong inter-disciplinary capacity for the international security aspects of this program area. Exactly what kind of relationship would serve best serve the missions of the Einaudi Center and its affiliated programs would need to be discussed with Center faculty and leadership. Both the Einaudi Center's Director and the Reppy Institute's Director have expressed interest in some connection with the CSPP/A, seeing mutual advantages from an association that would create opportunities for appropriate degree programs, for example.

Cornell has much strength in the International Cooperation and Security domain, but the addition of about 5 new faculty to fill certain gaps and carry out bridging functions among current faculty and programs would make more productive and visible the investments that Cornell already has and makes in this area. Such supplementation could make Cornell a preeminent center for research and teaching in this subject area. Resources for this could be mobilized jointly with the Einaudi Center and the Development Office, as there should be friends and alumni of Cornell who would like to support such preeminence.

The current faculty membership of the graduate minor field of Peace Studies that is based in the Reppy Institute gives a good indication of the intellectual resources that are already available in the area of international security: Mabel Berezin, Sociology; Holly Case, History; Debra Castillo, Comparative Literature; Matthew Evangelista, Government; Ravi Kanbur, Applied Economics and Management; Karim-Aly Kassam, Natural Resources; Peter J. Katzenstein, Government; Jonathan D. Kirshner, Government (Director of the Reppy Institute); Ronald Kline, Science and Technology Studies; Sarah Kreps, Government; Odette Lienau, Law; Muna Ndolu, Law; Jens Ohlin, Law; Azis Rana, Law; Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies; Richard Schuler, Economics and Civil and Environmental Engineering; Barry Strauss, History; Kathleen Vogel, Science and Technology Studies; Henry Wan, Economics; Żellman Warhaft, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering; Christopher Way, Government; and Jessica Weeks, Government.
POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE

THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF POLICY

Scholarship, teaching, and public dialogue that promote understanding of the political, social, and cultural dimensions of public policy and governance should be a distinctive strength of the CSPP. These dimensions play a major role in shaping the conception, analysis, formulation, and implementation of policy, influencing the form it takes, its chances of success or failure, and its intended and unintended consequences. Expertise in these areas is essential for any school of public policy or public affairs.

We also consider a focus on these matters to be central to the mission of linking Cornell’s strengths in the social sciences to research and teaching in the CSPP/A. Such linkages will help to accentuate the value and distinctness of the school, and expand the breadth of its offerings and depth of its specialties. The CSPP/A should involve both a focal point for research and teaching on these topics and broader efforts to engage faculty from across the university in doing so.

This program area, which we will refer to in this document in shorthand as “Politics and Governance,” is different from the others, each of which pertains to a particular topical area of policy expertise. Politics and Governance could be considered more foundational and more central, and at the same time, more dispersed and fluid. Better images to portray its role in the structure of the CSPP/A might be the hub of a wheel that joins all of its spokes, or a matrix, the connective substance between areas or environment in which they all develop. This area, by its very nature, will provide synergy between the other areas, helping to integrate them together into a dynamic school.

We recommend that the Politics and Governance program area be institutionalized through two different types of activities and faculty appointments, one that is concentrated and one that is dispersed. In concentrated form, a few of the faculty in this area will be the primary members of a research center that will have a prominent role in the CSPP/A. In dispersed form, the remainder of the faculty in this area will belong jointly to the Politics and Governance area and one of the other topical areas (Energy and Environment, Health Policy, International Cooperation and Security, International Development, and Social Policy).

To summarize, the Politics and Governance area will contribute to each of the other areas of program strength as well as making its own independent contributions. As such, it should be structured somewhat differently, in part integrated horizontally across the topical areas of strength as well as concentrated in a center. Our proposal is for a structure and commitment of resources to enable the creation of the following:

1) A research center, possibly called the “Center of Public Affairs” (this name will be used throughout the remainder of this document) that highlights civic engagement, politics, governance, and public issues, and includes a number of core faculty members (approximately 6-9). At least half of these faculty will be new appointments in the CSPP/A; some of these new appointments will be linking appointments with departments outside the school, as described below.
2) Three courses of the basic MPP/MPA core for which this Center is responsible.

3) Selection of several additional faculty members in the Politics and Governance area by the
topical areas of policy strength (at least 20% per program area). In this way, faculty who
address political, social and cultural dimensions of public policy can be incorporated into
each of the topical areas. This should be accomplished through by making new hires and, in a
few cases, recruiting existing Cornell faculty. This approach will strengthen the CSPP/A by
building synergies across areas of expertise and by broadening those areas of expertise. New
hires, linked with the social science departments, will build Cornell’s strength in the social
sciences.

**POLICY RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE**

Policy expertise abounds in today’s public arena, and yet the challenges of politics and
governance perennially interfere with and complicate analysts’ proposals. For the better part of a
century, schools of policy and public affairs have produced experts with deep, technical
knowledge in specific topical areas, such that sophisticated proposals abound for addressing the
world’s pressing social, economic, and environmental problems. But often these plans are
developed without sufficient understanding of the political context in which policies must be
adapted and implemented if they are to succeed.

Even when policy entrepreneurs have ideas about how to address problems, they do not
necessarily succeed in doing so. They may labor in vain for years—even decades—to gain
traction for their proposed solutions in the public arena. Reformers and several American
presidents advocated for health care coverage for 80 years, struggling through many arduous
legislative battles that met with failure, before achieving some of their goals in 2010. Market-
based inequality has been on the rise across most OECD nations since the 1970s, but although
some countries have successfully mitigated such increases through changes in social and tax
policies, others have done much less, or even adopted policies that exacerbate inequality.

In some areas, policy experts themselves may disagree—even if only at the margins—about what
is the best or appropriate approach to address particular issues, and a political process ensues that
influences which views gain prominence. The current partisan divide in the United States
regarding the existence and severity of climate change exemplifies such dynamics.

Even when policies are successfully adopted by legislatures, implementation itself involves
inherently political processes. As practitioner of international development are well aware,
policies can mean something very different “on the ground” than what was intended by the
policy analysts and public officials who designed them. Local political, social, and cultural
practices can alter their meaning or actual outcomes dramatically, producing unintended
consequences.

The very concept of policy expertise often runs counter to the primary purposes of government.
Nations based on democratic principles aim to privilege ideas favored by majorities, and experts
who fail to understand such dynamics will achieve little. They must also consider what impact
their reform plans might have on the health of democracy itself. By the same token, those attempting to achieve reform in an authoritarian context, perhaps through non-profits that aim to circumvent the political system, need to comprehend how those political dynamics operate in such contexts, or they risk becoming associated in the public’s view with the dictators themselves, and thus mistrusted.

**ISSUES ADDRESSED BY POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE FACULTY**

Among the areas that Politics and Governance research and teaching will address are the following problems, each of which is broadly relevant to public policy in specific domains, including those addressed by the areas of substantive policy strength. This list is more suggestive than exhaustive and is intended to highlight why research and teaching on the politics of policy are fundamental to the mission of the CSPP/A and relevant to each of the topical areas of policy strength.

- **The processes of problem definition.** Human beings confront myriad circumstances in everyday life, and only some of those—in particular periods of time and historical contexts—come to be considered problems that should be addressed by public policy. There is nothing automatic or necessary about the processes through which these decisions are made; how the “problem” is defined; which policy alternatives are considered to be sound, appropriate, or feasible “solutions.” The Center of Public Affairs will showcase research that addresses these aspects of policy development. Its courses will introduce students to theories of agenda setting, frame analysis, and problem definition; educate them broadly in the history and social scientific knowledge of their particular contexts of interest; and challenge them to expand their ability to envision alternative ways to frame policy problems.

- **The context and processes of policy making.** Public policies are debated and forged through inherently political processes and in the context of particular historically and culturally situated governing arrangements with specific institutional characteristics and extant constellations of political power. These factors influence policy making processes at multiple levels, shaping whether policies can be enacted or not, and the form that policies take. The Center of Public Affairs will play a central role in connecting Cornell faculty expertise in specific political, social, and cultural contexts. Its courses will also introduce students of public policy to the political processes through which policies are fashioned. In a shrinking world, public policy professionals will increasingly require an appreciation of how cultural and institutional differences shape the formation and adoption of policies.

- **The process of implementation.** Once public policies are enacted, numerous factors affect whether they will actually be implemented, the specific forms they will take, whether they will prove sustainable, what their effects will be, and how they will in turn influence future demands for reform or for new policies. Scholarship that focuses on the challenges of implementation should be an important part of the CSPP/A’s research portfolio. The Center’s courses will introduce students to the politics of implementation, providing them with an appreciation of how institutional capacity affects outcomes, and how bureaucracies, non-governmental organizations, institutional routines, and political cultures influence the details of policy design, feedback processes, and other dimensions of policy development.
• **The effects of policies on the distribution of power and the extent and quality of citizenship and civic engagement.** Public policy is often framed, debated, and enacted in a context considered to be a democracy, and many specific policies are rationalized for their contribution to the public interest. The Center will ensure that research on participation, democracy, and the meaning of citizenship in different polities and social contexts are incorporated into the research agenda. Its courses will enable students to evaluate how policies may affect the power and influence of particular social groups and of individual citizens, and may alter or reconfigure their roles, identities, status, or authority. Students also will gain an understanding of citizen engagement and participation and how they may be affected by policy developments.

• **The political economy of public policy.** Markets and interaction among economic actors is inherently shaped by political choices, laws, and policies, and the distributions of power emanating from those relationships affect subsequent policy developments. Many social scientists at Cornell highlight research on the political economy in which public policy operates in a diverse array of settings around the world. Research on political economy is a distinct strength of scholars at Cornell and the CSPP/A should showcase this approach among others.

• **The politics of policy knowledge.** To advance the goal of improving the knowledge used to develop and justify policies, policy professionals need a capacity for critically analyzing the social and political dimensions of the methods, assumptions, and data underlying policy analysis. The CSPP/A should also highlight research on the social aspects of the process through which policy-relevant knowledge is produced, contested, and evaluated by different actors, examining how institutional structure shapes its production and selective uptake. Teaching in this domain will train students to appreciate the political choices embedded in social indicators, standards of proof, evaluation mechanisms, technical standards, and analytic tools, such as cost-benefit analysis. Given the centrality of technical knowledge in many policy areas, students also need to develop an appreciation for the nature of controversies involving the natural and social sciences.

**Building on Cornell’s Strength in Politics and Governance**

The “Center of Public Affairs” would occupy a prominent place in the CSPP/A. It would provide a means of linking together each of the topical areas of policy strength by offering high visibility events about public life that are of interest to faculty and students across these areas. It would promote and coordinate active public engagement and dialogue between students and faculty in the school, on the one hand, and practitioners, elected officials, leading scholars from outside the university, and citizens, on the other. It would also play a major role in connecting the CSPP/A to the rest of the university, integrating a variety of scholars concerned with political, social, and cultural phenomena into the CSPP/A’s activities. Even before the CSPP/A has a physical building, the activities of this Center should be able to begin to give students and faculty a shared sense of belonging to a school: it should help foster a common intellectual life for students through events tied to their interests in becoming agents of change and publicly
engaged professionals. The Center would also endeavor to build intellectual connections with existing centers and programs at Cornell, such as the Bovay Program in the History and Ethics of Engineering, the Center for the Study of Inequality, the Einaudi Center, Ethics & Public Life, the Law and Society program, and the Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies, to name just a few.

Several faculty in this area of strength should be located together in this Center. Besides organizing the programs of the center, they would be responsible for offering courses (described in section below) that provide a foundation in the political, social, and cultural dimensions of policy. The intellectual concerns of the politics area are foundational to the study of any area of public policy or public affairs. These should be embodied in the basic curriculum of the School through three courses that are part of the basic sequence for MPA and MPP students. Our examination of the curricula of prominent policy schools around the country reveals that such courses—commonly referred to as courses on the policy process, political institutions, and ethics and values in policymaking—are parts of the basic sequence required of all students.

Apart from this Center and the core courses, the remainder of the Politics and Governance area would be integrated with each of the other areas of strength in the CSPP/A. This would be accomplished by having the balance of faculty strength in politics and governance consists of individuals who belong primarily to the topical areas: at least 20% of the faculty in each topical area would be individuals who approach their scholarship and teaching in the ways associated with the Politics and Governance area. Such cross-cutting affiliations will help make the CSPP/A a more coherent and dynamic place, rather than a collection of silos. In addition, for existing faculty at Cornell with expertise in the topical areas, involvements with the relevant pillars is what will make affiliation with the SPP/PA intellectually interesting and compelling. The way to integrate Politics and Governance concerns in the CSPP/A is not through the creation of an entirely separate vertical silo, but rather by ensuring the inclusion of scholars addressing such matters horizontally across each of the topical areas, through both engaging existing faculty and through new hires—either lines fully in the school or appointments designed to bridge to areas of politics and governance strength, such as the Government department.

In what follows, we list these three domains and the courses connected to each one.

Political Institutions and Policy. This domain will focus on research and teaching on political institutions and political economy as they relate to policymaking and implementation. It would teach a course for the MPP/A students on “Public Policy and Political Institutions,” which would include aspects of the “policy process” course that is a standard, required offering in other MPP/A programs, while highlighting Cornell’s strengths in institutions and political economy. The Center would sponsor relevant workshops and other events on pressing issues; these will build linkages with faculty throughout the university, especially with political scientists, political sociologists, historians, legal scholars, institutional economists, and scholars in organizational studies. It will also include practitioners, elected officials, and policy experts.

Governance, Civic Engagement, and Public Affairs. This domain concerns research and teaching on questions about citizen involvement in policy processes, responsiveness and accountability of elected officials, participatory mechanisms, citizenship, and the effects of policies on the
distribution of power and the qualities of democratic governance. The Center would teach “Public Policy and Democracy” a major course for MPP/A students on the issues highlighted by this domain. This course would parallel the course on public leadership offered in programs elsewhere, as well as parts of the standard policy process course, but it would offer a distinctive approach that reflects both Cornell’s historic role in public engagement as well as scholarship on how policy relates to citizens and democracy. This domain would also bring policymakers and other practitioners to campus to share their experiences and insights and would foster active debate and deliberation about approaches to public policy and citizen participation.

**Study of Policy Knowledge.** This domain involves research and teaching on the social and political dimensions of knowledge in the policy process. Research areas might include studies of the creation and contestation of knowledge claims, the dynamics of technical controversies, the selective uptake of knowledge claims in policy processes, and the challenges that knowledge-making institutions face in contentious environments. Related to this domain, the center would teach a core course for the MPP/A students (our version of the ethics course typically taught in MPP programs) that cultivates an appreciation of the assumptions underlying policy knowledge and modes of analysis, with the goal of contributing to a professional ethics of self-reflection. The course would also consider the politics of uncertainty, the effects of social organization the production of policy knowledge, the role of knowledge in agenda setting, and historical change in knowledge-making institutions in the policy process, such as the increasing importance of think tanks in U.S. politics in recent decades.

**Challenges to be Addressed and Strategies for Addressing Them**

Many faculty from throughout the university have expertise on the specific contexts and institutions in which policymaking activities unfold and the political effects of policies. They include anthropologists, historians, sociologists, political scientists, area studies scholars, and others with context-specific expertise on particular institutions, topics, regions, and technologies. In addition, the university has a number of faculty interested in democratic processes, citizenship, and the distribution of power and in how institutional structures and social processes shape policy formation and the knowledge that informs policymaking.

Involving these faculty in the CSPP/A will pose challenges. Most are likely to be only informally or formally affiliated with the CSPP/A, still retaining 100 percent of their lines in their home colleges. It is unlikely that any existing faculty members at Cornell with expertise in these areas will have their full lines moved into the school—because doing so would damage their departments to the detriment of the social sciences at the university. The challenge will fall to the CSPP/A to: (a) attract several such faculty members who are already present on campus to become active participants in the School, and (b) make new hires supported by new endowed lines in fields of the social sciences that can contribute to the Politics and Governance program area but are currently underrepresented among existing Cornell faculty; presumably some of these would be joint appointments with departments in the relevant fields on campus.

We call the kind of joint appointments needed to attract the interest of social science departments outside of the CSPP/A “linking appointments.” These linking appointments should have the
following structure: A new line in the School would be dedicated to a linking appointment with, for example, the Government Department. A joint search committee with membership from the School and Government would be constituted and make the appointment; only scholars acceptable to both units would be appointed. The new faculty member’s line would be vested in the school, and the faculty members would be a full member of the faculty in both the School and in Government. Tenure and promotion should be handled only in one department. (One mechanism might be to have the tenure home be in either Government or the School and the new faculty member would choose which entity at the time of the offer.) Teaching would be divided among the school and the Government Department in an appropriate manner. This kind of linking appointment would produce a win-win relationship between the school and the Government department and would also serve as an intellectual bridge between these units.

Owing to the difficulty of interesting already over-burdened faculty members from existing social science departments in interacting with the CSPP/A, we recommend that the School develop mechanisms specifically designed to make affiliation attractive to individual faculty members and to compensate departments for the loss of faculty time.

Most important, the school needs to have resources to offer such faculty members. These might include course reductions or additional summer salary and research funds, any of which can help compensate for the additional time needed to prepare new courses for MA level students, the extensive amount of advising and other work involved in servicing such students, and the additional time spent serving on committees and in other governance in the CSPP/A.

In addition, the CSPP/A should offer any faculty who commit at least 25% effort to the School the status of full members of its faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of other members. There are also a number of faculty with expertise that is relevant to policy but who are unlikely to even be able to commit 25% effort to the School. Mechanisms for making it affiliation with the school attractive for these non-voting, less-than-25% affiliates should be developed.

Finally, we need to consider how to prevent existing social science departments from losing some of their faculty members’ time and commitment levels through engaging with the CSPP/A. The school is also likely to rely on course offerings in outside departments across the campus to provide electives for students. In effect, a large number of faculty in these departments will serve as its de facto faculty members in providing upper-level elective courses, and some particular departments—such as the Government Department—will bear a particularly large share of such responsibilities. In addition, faculty from these same departments are likely to make significant commitments of effort to the School. As a result, it will be important to find ways to include these faculty members in the governance of the School and to compensate these departments, in order to ensure a sense of fair “balance of trade” and to ensure good will.

**Targeted Investments Needed to Build the Politics and Governance Program**

For the core courses and Center mentioned above to be viable, new hires will be necessary. This is because some of the particular specialties that should be covered are not currently present among existing Cornell faculty. Therefore, in order to create a viable school that gives sufficient
attention to these areas, it will be necessary at the outset to have five new hires, four of which should be appointments designed to bridge with units outside the CSPP/A.

The Center of Public Affairs will require five new hires to cover essential areas central to the SPP/SPA and currently not existing among faculty at Cornell. Each of these should be made in a new line fully within the school, but the faculty member selected—in perhaps 4 of the 5 cases—should hold a linking appointment in an appropriate external department. In these cases, the school should be prepared to invest at least 3 of its new lines in linking appointments designed to connect the school with the appropriate outside department; this department should play a central role in making the hiring decision in conjunction with the school. In this way, the school will be linked in a productive and mutually beneficial way to an existing department, providing a link between them in the context of a win-win relationship. The new hires will each be responsible for research and for teaching a major course in the school (one of the core requirements for MPP/MPA students), as well as electives.

1. Scholar of American political institutions, focusing on Congress and legislative processes; an additional focus on political parties or interests groups would be useful. A new line to allow a hire in a linking appointment with the Government department. Would teach core course on institutions & policy process; also electives.

2. Scholar of American political institutions, focusing on U.S. presidency and bureaucracy/executive branch and public policy. A new line to allow a hire in a linking appointment with the Government department. Would teach core course on institutions and policy process; also electives.

3. Scholar of politics of implementation. This person could be 100% in the SPP/SPA, or linked with Government. They could be a hire in the social policy area or some other area. Needed to teach basic course on politics of implementation, which would be important for both MPP and MPA programs. This person could also teach the basic course on “public engagement, citizenship, and governance.”

4. Scholar of politics of policy knowledge. A new line to allow a hire in a linking appointment with the department of Science & Technology Studies. Would teach core courses on politics of policy knowledge, which would be our variant of the ethics/public values course taught in other MPP/MPA programs.

5. Scholar of public administration/organizational theory. A hire in this area would be important for elevating the stature of the MPA program. Would teach courses on public management and organizations.

The Center director could be recruited, in the near-term, either through (a) one of the external searches described above; (b) through appointment of an existing faculty member. A new endowed chair would permit the hiring of a high profile senior faculty member through an external search; this would allow us to attract the kind of high visibility scholar needed to lead such a Center. The Center director would provide leadership for programs, such as workshops and colloquia, to involve faculty and students not only from politics/governance but from other CSPP/A areas of strength and from the university more broadly. The Center should be provided with a budget to enable the hiring of a staff and program development.
SOCIAL POLICY

Many domestic and global problems – poverty, crime, immigration, adolescent childbearing, school dropout, racial and gender inequality, overpopulation, and war and conflict – require social, economic, and political solutions rather than strictly technological remedies. Social policy identifies and evaluates cost-effective policy solutions to chronic human problems that tear at the fabric of society and undermine societal wellbeing. For example, social policy research seeks both market and nonmarket solutions that address the uneven distribution of resources: food (food systems; food stamps; school lunch programs, etc.), income and employment (job training; income support programs, and community economic development, etc.), education (compulsory education; full-day kindergarten; school funding formulas, Head Start, Early Childhood Education Programs, etc.); health care (e.g., Medicare and Medicaid; Affordable Care Act); and other social support programs (Social Security, housing vouchers, child welfare services, etc.).

Cornell has developed significant intellectual strength in several core areas in social policy across many different colleges, departments, and programs. Cornell’s strengths in social policy research and teaching are nationally and internationally recognized in their respective fields, and represent a clear pillar of excellence at the core of the CSPP/A. To date, however, the development of core strengths in social policy at Cornell has been largely idiosyncratic, reflecting the uncoordinated strategic initiatives and hiring decisions of separate colleges and departments, as well as the peculiar strengths and interests of individual policy-oriented faculty. Cornell’s broad faculty and programmatic strengths in social policy are sometimes perceived, rightly or wrongly, as being less than the sum of its parts.

The CSPP/A will harness Cornell’s obvious faculty and programmatic strengths in social policy, while developing new synergies that build research capacity, broadly train students for the new policy environment, and provide a venue for effective outreach and public engagement. The CSPP/A also could more effectively communicate Cornell’s strength across many domains of social and public interest. It would elevate Cornell’s profile as a leading institution that promote state-of-the-art research on the design, implementation, and evaluation of social policy. A CSPP/A would provide a new home for scholars who straddle social science disciplines and policy arenas. It would provide new opportunities to create innovative training programs in public policy that are anchored by diverse disciplines (e.g., Government and Public Policy, Sociology and Public Policy, etc.) and linked to the policy world beyond Cornell.

The CSPP/A also would promote new research synergies (“big social science”), new multidisciplinary funding opportunities, and cutting-edge training for Cornell’s undergraduate and graduate students across the social sciences. Research, teaching, and outreach are enhanced by the coordination of hiring in key and emerging areas of social policy. Currently existing institutes and centers, located under the administrative umbrella of a CSPP/A, could be models of research translation (knowledge to practice) that serve New York State, the Northeast region, and a broader national and international constituency.
CORNELL’S EXISTING STRENGTHS IN SOCIAL POLICY

Cornell’s strength in social policy is broad and deep. Although faculty in the Department of Policy Analysis and Management (PAM) represent core faculty, several departments and multidisciplinary research centers across the Cornell campus also engage in research and training activities that are at the heart of social policy. Here, we describe Cornell strengths in (1) poverty and inequality; (2) educational policy; (3) demography or population studies; (4) decision sciences, and (5) labor policy.

Poverty, Inequality, and Social Support Programs

Much of the strength in social policy at Cornell University resides in rigorous theoretical and empirical research – both domestic and international – on poverty and inequality and on institutional responses (e.g., social security, income support program, such as welfare and food stamps, and job training) to economic dislocations, unemployment, and material hardship. These policy issues have been brought to the forefront over the past several years. The Great Recession brought the simultaneous collapse of the stock market, falling housing prices, high foreclosure rates, and rising unemployment rates. Economic impacts on labor market conditions, wage growth and dispersion, and GDP have been substantial. The current unemployment rate today still exceeds 8 percent, even though the Great Recession officially ended in June 2009. For America’s workers, the economic toll has been greater than any period since WWII. Recently-released Census estimates indicate a substantial uptick in poverty since 2007; over 46 million Americans were poor in 2010 – a record number. And, of course, there is evidence of growing earnings, income, and wealth inequality in America, and new concerns about the vanishing middle-class.

The breath and diversity of Cornell faculty in addressing poverty-related issues is substantial. For example, Cornell is home of the Center for the Study of Inequality (in the College of Arts and Sciences), which fosters basic and applied research on social and economic inequalities, as well as the processes by which such inequalities persist across generations. A distinctive feature is its emphasis on developing theory-based and empirically-tested models of inequality that assist not only in understanding ongoing changes in inequality but also in evaluating public policy and social interventions. This agenda is pursued by CSI affiliates through studies of such diverse topics as (1) labor market processes and earnings inequality; (2) educational attainment and adolescent development; (3) poverty and the life course; (4) residential segregation and spatially-concentrated poverty; (5) racial and ethnic inequality; and (6) gender discrimination in the workforce. CSI also offers an undergraduate minor in Inequality Studies.

Poverty and inequality is also one of the core themes of the NIH-funded Cornell Population Center. For example, social demographers in the Department of Policy and Analysis and elsewhere on campus have strength on interrelationship between recent family upheavals and economic outcomes. PAM faculty have examined the relationship between changing family structure and adolescent psychosocial development, as well as links between marriage and divorce and trajectories of economic well-being and welfare dependence. They have examined adolescent pregnancy and childbearing and subsequent transitions into productive adult roles,
which are strongly related to intergenerational poverty and persistent racial and ethnic inequality. They have studied patterns of concentrated poverty, in inner-city neighborhoods and in backwater rural areas of Appalachia. They have studied father involvement in so-called fragile families, and its implications for children’s schooling, economic wellbeing, and emotional and psychological development. Family change is a lynchpin in the reproduction of poverty and inequality, and Cornell researchers have been leaders in this policy area.

In CALS, the Community and Regional Development Institute (CaRDI) has a large research and policy outreach program focused on New York State and its communities. CaRDI is co-directed by Development Sociology faculty members David L. Brown and John Sipple. CaRDI faculty members assist local government, business, and nonprofit groups with strategies for community economic development, which provides a demand-side solution to local poverty and unemployment. For example, Joe Francis works closely with the NY State Economic Development Agency in providing data and expertise in developing state and county estimates and projections. John Sipple focuses on organizational responses to changing local, state, and federal educational policy and efforts to promote equitable learning opportunities and positive outcomes for New York State’s culturally and economically diverse school-age population. CaRDI’s recent “State of Upstate New York” conference is similarly illustrative of CaRDI’s many outreach and engagement activities.

Cornell’s clear policy strengths in poverty and inequality are not limited to the domestic arena. AEM is home to perhaps the nation’s most distinguished group of development economists. As one example, AEM professor Chris Barrett focuses on rural poverty and hunger in Africa – on so-called “poverty traps” – and connections between food systems, nutrition, and economic wellbeing. Barrett led the Institute for the Social Sciences multidisciplinary theme project (2008-2011) on “persistent poverty and upward mobility.” The Department of Development Sociology is also home to perhaps the largest group of sociologists in the country who focus on development-related issues, such as emerging capitalist economies (David Brown), agro-food systems (Phil McMichaels), population and development (Lindy Williams, Fouad Makki and Parfait Eloundou-Enyegue) and women and development (Shelley Feldman). The Sociology Department recently added to this university strength by hiring Parmita Sanyal, who is an economic sociologist who studies anti-poverty interventions, such as micro-credit programs in developing countries.

**Education Policy**

Education is central to building human capital and economic competitiveness in today’s global economy. The federal government has entered the picture with Bush’s “No Child Left Behind,” and President Obama has recently released funding for his “Race to the Top” program, which is designed to stimulate innovation and excellence in America’s primary and secondary schools. There has never been more policy interest in developing early childhood programs which, of course, will require implementation and evaluation. Affirmative action in colleges and universities continue to be a source of political controversy, along with differing claims about the effectiveness of diversity programs.
Cornell is well positioned to address such issues with its substantial faculty strength in *education policy*. PAM, ECON, ILR, SOC and CALS have a critical mass of policy scholars focusing on policy issues relating both to K-12 as well as higher education in the United States and abroad that could form the core faculty with >50% appointments in the CSPP/A: Damon Clark, Maria Fitzpatrick, Michael Lovenheim and Jordan Matsudaira from PAM, Ronald Ehrenberg and Richard Mansfield from ILR, James Berry from ECON, Stephen Morgan from Sociology, and John Sipple from DSOC, among others. Topics studied by scholars in this area include trends and underlying causes of disparities in college enrollment and completion across the socioeconomic distribution, the labor market returns to investing in different levels of education, the effect of government resources on educational outcomes, early childhood education, and issues pertaining to how education is “produced,” including the importance of such factors as teacher quality, school organization, and class sizes. Faculty have examined how the national and regional labor markets of teachers influence student academic achievement. They have also identified the effects of market-based interventions, such as teacher merit pay and charter schools, on student outcomes.

Other policy researchers working in related educational areas include: HD - Steve Hamilton (Youth development), COMM - Kathie Berggren (teaching methodology) and Dawn Schrader (social aggression, adolescent health and safety), Sahara Byrne (media and children policy), and Tarleton Gillespie (media and children policy), ILR - John Bishop (education policy), and Sam Bacharach (organizations and education).

Currently, a four-course undergraduate sequence in education policy is offered in PAM as well as in ILR, and both PAM and ILR contribute to a graduate economics sequence. Cornell is perhaps unique in the number of highly productive education policy researchers located across different departments of the university. Many of these faculty members are new hires, which means that Cornell is well situated in educational policy research for the foreseeable future.

*Social Demography*

The aphorism that “demography is destiny” clearly challenges notions of cost-effective social policy. In fact, the U.S. and global economic is being reshaped by recent domestic and international population changes, such as aging; immigration and global labor mobility; growing racial and ethnic diversity (e.g., affirmative action); rapid population growth and environmental degradation and economic development; changing family structure (i.e., non-marital childbearing, divorce laws, custody arrangements, etc.), and uneven regional population and economic growth. Demographic change is a key dimension of policy evaluation and effective interventions.

Cornell’s has considerable university-wide strength in *social demography* under the auspices of the Cornell Population Center (CPC). The CPC is a university-wide program serving approximately 90 affiliates from 24 different departments and is housed in the College of Human Ecology. Daniel T. Lichter (PAM) currently serves as CPC director. Oversight is provided by a “lead dean” (Alan Mathios, CHE), in consultation with office of the Provost and with input from Senior Vice Provost for the social sciences (Ron Seeber) and the CPC advisory committee.
CPC’s multidisciplinary activities focus broadly on the changing size, distribution, and composition of the population (both U.S. and international); on the components of population change, including fertility, mortality, and migration; and on the social and economic causes and consequences of demographic change. A broad goal is to promote multi-disciplinary, externally-funded research and training that involves faculty and students across departments and colleges. The CPC currently emphasizes three core population-related themes: (1) families and children; (2) health behaviors and disparities; and (3) poverty and inequality. Other cross-cutting themes include a focus on public policy, racial and ethnic diversity, migration and immigration, social and biological mechanisms, and domestic-international research. CPC encourages comparative national and international studies on demographic behaviors, provides seed funding for population-related research, and facilitates the implementation of state-of-the-art research designs, while providing a venue for translating research into meaningful public policy interventions.

The CPC is in its fourth year of center grant support from the NIH/NICHD R24 Population Research Infrastructure Grant. Financial support and faculty hiring across the social science disciplines is essential to CPC’s successful renewal efforts. Four cores comprise CPC’s infrastructure to support its substantive themes: Administrative, Development, Computing and Data, and Statistics. During the 12 month period from June 1, 2010–May 31 2011, CPC affiliates had a total of 91 active demography-related grants. Many of them addressed issues of social policy. This includes 22 new research grants or contracts during this period. Many of these grants and contracts are interdisciplinary and cross-institutional collaborations.

The CPC coordinates a graduate minor field in Demography. CPC also developed a demography pro-seminar that was first offered in fall 2009. The pro-seminar is required of all demography minors.

Understanding U.S. and global demographic change is essential for developing, implementing, and evaluating sound social policy. Demography has a broad multidisciplinary perspective that draws heavily on theory and analytic tools from many different social science disciplines, including economics, sociology, geography, public health, and human development (e.g., child development and aging). As part of the CSPP/A, the CPC faculty would reinforce the obvious strengths and the shared affinity with Cornell’s many policy researchers and programs. Demographic data and techniques have proven to be highly useful in uncovering emerging social problems. CPC is positioned to play a central role in bridging diverse faculty, students, and programs across the Cornell policy research community.

Behavioral Decision Making

The marriage of the biological and social sciences is on vivid display at Cornell, yet not tightly integrated across public policy researchers on campus. Increasingly, researchers are combining biological data in social survey (e.g., collecting fluid samples to assay for stress hormones, such as Cortisol, that affect immune systems and health). Many large-scale social surveys also increasingly collect genetic samples (e.g., respondents with different degrees of genetic relatedness), recognizing that social behaviors, including risky behaviors, have both social and genetic origins. Policy interventions are unlikely to be successful if its goals (e.g., reducing risky
behaviors, such as smoking or drug use) are compromised by preexisting biological factors or complex interactions between environment and biology.

A truly unique strength of Cornell’s faculty has been its many new multi- and inter-disciplinary initiatives in behavioral decision-making and risky behaviors. The collaboration between faculty in psychology, human development, economics, applied economics and management, and the law school is perhaps unique at Cornell. Addressing contemporary social problems requires multidisciplinary approaches that cross-cut the biological and social sciences. Drugs and alcohol abuse, unprotected sex, and other risk behaviors require multi-pronged solutions that draw on many disciplines. Other policy research at Cornell focuses on dual processes in memory, judgment, and decision making, on how these processes change with age and expertise, and on their implications for risky decision making in law, health, and medicine. Furthermore, faculty in this area offer a PhD in Law, Psychology and Human development, the intent of which is to prepare scholars for careers in academia and in government agencies that are concerned with legal research, legal practice, and legal policy. Faculty in PAM (Emily Owens) also offers us strength in related areas such as crime and crime policy.

Labor Policy

Cornell’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations is recognized around the world as the leading intellectual home for the study of labor and labor policies. ILR faculty are grounded in the social sciences and their research explores human behavior through the lens of the workplace – a critical area of social policy (e.g., human resources, job discrimination, domestic and international trade, affirmative action, etc.) . The school brings huge intellectual strength to inform national and international education, employment and labor market policy issues, and to improve working lives. ILR studies many areas that shape the working world and contribute to societal success in a global economy. These include human resource management; labor-management relations; labor economics; organizational behavior; international and comparative labor; labor relations, labor and employment law and history; conflict resolution; management development; diversity management; employment and disability; and social statistics.

While Cornell enjoys a unique strength and recognition as the leading institution in labor policy, faculty expertise in this area is already organized and integrated into a school that maintains and directs school priorities in this area. For this reason the committee has identified select faculty in ILR whose research/teaching/outreach is closely aligned with the core areas of emphasis in the new policy school.

Employment, entrepreneurship, and job creation

Sarosh Kuruvilla – macro labor and human resource policies
Bob Hutchens – labor economics, social security
Marya Besharov – organizations, jobs and employment
Jack Goncalo – organizations, jobs and employment
Ed Lawler – organizations, jobs and employment
Pam Tolbert – organizations, jobs and employment
Safety nets and social security policy
Bob Hutchens—labor economics, social security

Health care – issues of access, management, technologies, ethics
Sam Bacharach–organizations and health care
Tove Hammer–organizations and health
Brian Rubineau–organizations and health
Bill Sonnenstuhl–organizations and health

Policy Centers, Outreach and Engagement

Housed in the College of Human Ecology, the newly-formed Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research (BCTR) addresses Cornell’s mission of public engagement and outreach. It provides an innovative vehicle for applying new knowledge generation to solving real world public problems. The mission of the BCTR is to extend research-based knowledge into policy and practice settings, and to incorporate problems from those domains into research agendas. Leadership of the BCTR consists of its Director, John Eckenrode (HD), and two Associate Directors, Stephen Hamilton (HD) and Rachel Dunifon (PAM). The BCTR could serve as an umbrella for translational research activities taking place in the CSPP/A, bringing together faculty, students and staff who seek to bridge the gap between research and practice. It could seek to enhance opportunities for translational research among faculty and students, and provide infrastructure needed to conduct such research. Ultimately, these activities will result in a stronger, more coherent set of translational research activities taking place in the CSPP/A. The BCTR could foster this outreach/engagement mission of the SPP/A by strengthening faculty expertise in translational research, developing methods and infrastructure for such research, and engaging students in such work. We therefore see the BCTR playing a key role in the new SPP.

The Center for Community Engaged Learning and Research fosters educational excellence and social responsibility. The center functions as the core academic unit that connects public engagement to Cornell's educational mission focused on public engagement and public service. The center was launched an integrated public service initiative that will place Cornell as a leader for engaged teaching, learning and scholarship. It provides seed funding for the study of broad networks of experiential learning and public engagement in support of Cornell students and faculty and seeks to create a more integrated, collaborative and networked approach to engagement on campus. The new center fosters "scholarship of engagement" in way that enhances the university's commitment to public engagement. The center's will focus initially on promoting community-engaged learning and research at Cornell, providing professional development, and identifying new funding and research opportunities. The center gives undergraduate and graduate students a guiding purpose and motivation for academic success through community-engaged learning and to strengthen faculty members' involvement in outreach and engagement.

The mission of the Cornell Institute for Translational Research on Aging (CITRA) is to cultivate and maintain close ties between Cornell researchers in social science, clinical research and mental health, with community-based practitioners from throughout the five boroughs of New York City. This tie between community based organizations, social scientists, and medical
researchers provides a living learning laboratory where research is conceptualized, conducted, and disseminated with continuous feedback from invested stakeholders. Thus, CITRA’s mission is not only the origination of high quality research, but the creation of a dynamic infrastructure to support these research partnerships. CITRA’s tie between community based organizations, social scientists, and medical researchers provides a living learning laboratory where research is conceptualized, conducted, and disseminated with continuous feedback from invested stakeholders. Thus, CITRA’s mission is not only the origination of high quality research, but the creation of a dynamic infrastructure to support these research partnerships.

**Social Policy in the CSPP/A: Opportunities and Constraints**

Social policy is the linchpin of any successful school of public policy. PAM’s faculty has considerable strength already in several key areas of social policy, but especially in education policy and demography (and its many dimensions, such as immigration, poverty, and family policy). It is unusual in providing both undergraduate and graduate programs. And, when combined with a diverse faculty in decision sciences and labor studies, Cornell is an exceptionally strong position to compete nationally with other elite public policy schools for talent – both students and faculty. The current challenge is to build new synergies with Cornell faculty in government, while recognizing that effective social policy – problem identification, policy development, implementation, and evaluation – are driven by political (and cultural) considerations. The other key challenge is to expand Cornell’s current strength in domestic social policy by promoting new initiatives in international affairs and social policy. The PAM faculty currently does not include political scientists, nor does it teach courses in politics and power, the legislative process, or program implement or evaluation. Building new linkages with Cornell’s government faculty is an essential first-step in building up and promoting its current strengths in social policy.

**Needed Targeted Investments in Social Policy**

Scarce resources must be effectively targeted in ways that elevate the national and international profile and stature of the social policy core in the CSPP/A. New faculty lines and cluster hires in our existing areas of strength, unconstrained by department research and training priorities, could allow the school to develop expertise in areas addressing complex societal problems at the intellectual boundaries of diverse social science disciplines.

For example, successful hiring of faculty in newly-emerging cross-disciplinary areas are essential for addressing complex societal issues that in the past have challenged unit-based programmatic hiring priorities. University- or college-sponsored cluster hiring initiatives have been successful in some areas but not others, and joint appointments are sometimes challenging for colleges and departments, especially in the case of untenured assistant professors. Each of the areas of excellence identified below has significant visibility and are nationally and internationally recognized in their own right.

It will also be important to bring Cornell’s many policy-related centers under the administrative umbrella of the CSPP/A. Many of Cornell’s current centers, such as the new BCTR are administratively and physically separated from the core research and teaching activities of the faculty. The Cornell Population Center, which provides a home for many of Cornell’s more
productive and grant-active social policy researchers, is a university-wide center, but it currently lacks a physical home that could promote new synergies that come with physical proximity and daily interaction. The Center for Study of Inequality (CSI) in the Sociology Department is underfunded and segregated in the Arts college, but nevertheless maintains a large and vibrant cadre of undergraduate students who minor in social inequality (which today is a politically important topic).

Finally, CISER is a campus-wide resource for data (including confidential data), high-end computing, and programming and training that provides a clear comparative advantage vis-à-vis other elite universities with public policy schools. At minimal additional cost to the university, CISER could be better integrated with the new activities of the social policy core of this university initiative. CISER currently resides off-campus, which represents a large barrier to the daily utilization of data and services. CISER should be co-located with the CSPP/A.
CORNELL'S STRENGTHS IN PUBLIC POLICY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

Cornell currently offers four Masters-level teaching programs closely aligned with the vision and mission of the proposed new School: a university-wide Masters in Public Administration (MPA) offered by the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA); a Masters in Health Administration (MHA) offered in PAM; and two Master of Professional Studies (MPS) degrees offered in CALS, one in Environmental Management and the other in Global Development (with a focus on either International Development or International Agriculture and Rural Development). In the following sections we briefly review these programs, highlighting their strengths and identifying areas for strengthening these programs within the CSPP/A.

EXISTING PUBLIC POLICY GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS OFFERED AT CORNELL

Cornell Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA)

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree program established in 1946 in the former School of Business and Public Administration (B&PA) has been administered by the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA) since 1984. The committee recommends that the CSPP/A have responsibility for administering this professional master's degree program as a keystone part of its academic offerings.

Renaming the Degree

The committee recommends that the CSPP/A apply to the SUNY Board of Regents to rename the degree, more appropriately and contemporarily, a Master of Public Affairs degree. The Master of Public Affairs designation is increasingly used for programs that provide graduate education for persons aiming for careers in public service/management of various kinds, whether within the public sector or with other organizations (not-for-profit, business, media, foundations, and others types), rather than for academic/research careers.

Most MPA degrees in the U.S. are still formally Master of Public Administration degrees, as noted below, even though their teaching and alumni careers have broadened beyond the original focuses on public sector management and performance. The term Master of Public Affairs refers to a broader scope of curricula and careers. For academic careers or for certain kinds of careers in the public sector, focusing on analysis and evaluation rather than on management and leadership, a more research-oriented degree program is desirable. As part of the CSPP/A’s educational program, it is proposed that there be established a new Master of Public Policy (MPP), described in a subsequent section.  

Both MPA and MPP degree programs are offered within a large number of universities in the U.S. and abroad, often with both degrees in the same institution (see Table 1 in Appendix E). Three national professional organizations serve the overlapping focuses on public affairs, public administration, and public policy: the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), and the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). We should note that in the ranking of educational programs periodically undertaken and published by *U.S. News and World Report*, the term 'public affairs' is used as the generic term for all of the programs in this area.

*Current Status*

While the quality of the Cornell MPA program was not considered very high or competitive in its early years, over the past 20 years, it has become very attractive to a growing number of high-quality applicants. Numbers of applications have been rising, particularly over the past five years, as seen in Figure 1 (Appendix E), while the selectivity has increased, shown in Figure 2 (Appendix E). The quality of the applicant pool has been increasing, as seen in rising average GRE scores, and this is reflected in the academic performance of CIPA Fellows taking the same courses as other Cornell graduate students (Table 3 in Appendix E).

The MPA program prepares its Fellows for both excellent internship opportunities to gain real-world experience, and for desirable employment opportunities after graduation (Tables 4 and 5 in Appendix E). The distribution and success in initial career placement of CIPA MPA graduates is shown in Table 6 (Appendix E). These tables and figures together give a summary overview of the current program.

*Strengths of Program*

The academic strengths and reputation of Cornell are obviously an important factor in attracting excellent graduate students. However, the design and flexibility of its program is another factor strongly indicated by Fellows as important in bringing them to Cornell. CIPA's offers of financial assistance are also an important and necessary factor, even though the MPA program cannot compete with certain well-endowed competitors, like Harvard's JFK School and Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School. Even though Cornell University has not made any substantial investment in the CIPA MPA program, and even though the program is not presently accredited by NASPAA and stands rather low in the *USN&WR* rankings (37th in the last listing), CIPA has been very successful in competing for top applicants.

The corps of CIPA alumni represents another strength of the program, assisting with lining up internships and in opening up opportunities for new graduates. Both students and alumni have taken a great interest in the suggestion of Cornell's forming the CSPP/A. They would like to see such an effort succeed, with Cornell's commitment to the mission of CIPA strengthened, not diminished or diluted.
It should also be noted that CIPA Fellows have opportunities, within the curriculum, for off-campus study experiences, in Washington, in Rome, and in Kathmandu, with current opportunities also in Barcelona, Budapest, and Mexico City.

Weaknesses of the Program

Since its inception CIPA has relied upon a higher degree of volunteerism among the participating faculty, particularly the core faculty (see Table 6 in Appendix E). This model of course delivery is less than ideal. It is not a mode of operation that should be projected indefinitely into the future. Core faculty members are not paid additional salary or their salary is not covered partly by CIPA. They or their departments are provided by CIPA with teaching and/or research assistance, which can make teaching larger number of students easier or can support their research work. Now that CIPA has some control over the revenues it generates under a new administrative arrangement, some of these revenues are allocated to the respective colleges of core faculty, in recognition of the additional teaching contributions being made. It would be the goal of the CSPP/A to have a certain number of core CIPA courses taught only to Masters students within the school, particularly those that serve more than one of the school’s Masters programs. This would strengthen 'the curricular commons' and make CIPA more eligible for accreditation.

Core faculty are very dedicated to CIPA’s mission of graduate education for public service careers, but their teaching and advising have to be meshed with their home departmental commitments, and NASPAA has not been willing to consider them as 'CIPA faculty' for purposes of accreditation. This position has apparently changed recently, which should help for gaining accreditation. The core faculty, because of their commitment to CIPA's mission, have an esprit that should not be lost by moves which make teaching and advising for CIPA Fellows a job rather than a commitment. With its placement within the CSPP/A structure, it is hoped that both the teaching and advising of CIPA Fellows can be better supported and coordinated, resulting in a high-quality learning experience for them.

The program has developed a coherent and easily justifiable structure for its curriculum, which has served Fellows well and is compatible with faculty teaching commitments; but the course offerings have depended on what can be fitted within departmental (disciplinary) definitions, and there are a number of subject areas what would be appropriate for CIPA Fellows preparing for public-service careers that are not offered, or are not offered with a focus and scope that is most appropriate. More faculty and lecturers within the CSPP/A who would be explicitly devoted to the mission of CIPA, and the prospective career needs of its Fellows could be better met to make the MPA program more effective.

The committee has identified a set of core courses within the CIPA curriculum that are synergistic with the new proposed MPP program and other more specialized Masters programs (see anticipated curriculum needs below). The flexibility of CIPA's curriculum, with a structuring of individual Fellows' education rather than requiring a fixed set of standardized courses, has made its MPA attractive for young professionals, or pre-professionals, with public service career objectives. But the program could benefit from a number of core courses designed
for meeting such objectives. This would require some faculty additions or arrangements for lecturers who bring both intellectual rigor and practical experience into the classroom.

Areas for Strengthening

Faculty and staff, based on interviews with Fellows and recent graduates and a review of the curricula of other MPA programs, have identified the following areas in which course offerings would make the CIPA curriculum stronger and more consistent within NASPAA. Some of these areas could best be taught by new faculty recruited for the school; some could be taught appropriately through agreements with existing faculty and their departments to get courses designed and taught to meet to CIPA Fellows' educational needs; and others would be best taught by lecturers hired for particular subjects, having good academic qualifications but also more practical experience than most regular Cornell faculty have. Some or many of these course offerings would be relevant and beneficial for graduate students in other degree programs under the CSPP/A:

1. Public Financial Budgeting, including the politics of the budgetary process
2. Public and Non-Profit Accounting and Financial Management. These two courses would parallel JGSM courses that are keyed to private-sector financial budgeting and management.
3. Intermediate Microeconomics for the Public and Non-Profit Sectors, and
4. Intermediate Macroeconomics for the Public and Non-Profit Sectors. These two courses would complement other offerings in other departments that are oriented to private sector considerations. These might be taught in special sections by agreement with departments.
5. Applied Statistics for Public and Non-Profit Sector Use, similar to some other statistics courses offered now by different departments or schools, but appropriately oriented to CIPA's mission.
6. Organizational Theory and Organizational Leadership. Some courses currently taught in I&LR serve this subject area reasonably well for CIPA Fellows, but enrollments in I&LR courses are limited.
7. Program/Project Evaluation, and Program/Project Planning and Management. This subject does not fall under any department's or schools' mandate, so it needs appropriate staffing.
8. Professional Research and Writing. These are essential skills for knowledge-based policy and implementation, not taught under any other program

These subjects cover skills that employers consider essential for effective performance in public service, complemented by other courses that overlap more with other course offerings in the Cornell graduate curriculum, including some set of substantive and analytical courses in concentration areas like environmental policy or social policy, which would intersect with cross-disciplinary focuses of the school defined in terms of research areas.

CIPA'S MPA program has grown from about 75 ten years ago to 220-230 now, with an improvement in student quality and with more revenue generated to contribute to Cornell operations. The CIPA staff has not grown proportionally, and it is currently a very 'tight' operation. Given the demand and the external need, a larger program could be envisioned with the quality of the student body maintained; however, this would require some restructuring and
some additional resource flows. A parallel MPP program could develop alongside the MPA program, attracting applicants who have somewhat different career tracks in view, with both programs benefiting from the other. The MPA program could have various analytical aspects of its education enhanced, while the MPP program could have added impetus for application in its curriculum and learning.

NASPAA is the organization that manages accreditation of the various MPA and MPP programs. A number of the most prominent MPA/MPP programs have chosen not to go through its accreditation process, e.g., Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, Princeton, and UC Berkeley. Cornell's MPA program has not applied for accreditation previously because its structure made it ineligible. But recent changes in NASPAA's accreditation criteria and the envisioned changes with a CSPP/A should make this possible. The committee recommends that CIPA begin the accreditation application process as this can take some time to complete.

**Sloan Program in Health Administration**

PAM offers a Master of Health Administration (MHA) degree, a dual-degree MHA/MBA program with the Johnson School at Cornell, and an accelerated 5-year BA/BS + MHA degree. The Sloan Program is accredited under CAHME and prepares professionals for leadership positions throughout the health care industry. The Sloan Program in Health Administration was ranked 14 among health care management programs by *US News and World Report* in 2011, up from No. 25 four years ago. The Sloan Program admits approximately 25-28 students per year, 20-23 into the 2-year program, and approximately 5 in the 5-year undergraduate/graduate accelerated program.

The program is built on a foundation comprised of training in management; a solid understanding of the health care system, health policy, ethics, public health and epidemiology; and hands-on learning in real-world settings. The mission of the Sloan Program is to prepare a new generation of leaders to apply management and organizational expertise to the advancement of the health and well-being of people, families and communities around the world. Cornell's Sloan Program has a long tradition of offering a mix of applied and theoretical courses.

Sloan attracts talented students from around the nation and abroad. Sloan’s recent graduates have made successfully transitions into positions in hospitals and health systems, management consulting, long-term care settings, medical group management, information technology, pharmaceutical companies, entrepreneurial firms, medicine, banking, law, health care associations, policy analysis firms, research, and academia.

Sloan core courses consist of: Microeconomics; Regression analysis; Finance I and II; Accounting; Organizational development/Human resources; Health care organizations; Resource management/Quality assurance; Health policy; Marketing; Health care ethics. Electives are offered in a variety of areas, including managed care, women's heath issues, comparative health systems, welfare policy, consumer behavior, social policy, human resource management, entrepreneurship, and management consulting.
Sloan students have to complete a summer internship and a Capstone project in their second year of study. They have to attend Sloan colloquia that bring leading health management practitioners to campus and take part in Sloan intersession programs in New York City and Washington, DC.

The Sloan program requires a total of 60 credits to graduate. Sloan courses are taught by a combination of PAM faculty, adjunct professors, and faculty attached to other units on campus: the Division of Nutritional Sciences, the Weill-Cornell Medical College, the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management, the Johnson School, and the Department of Design and Environmental Analysis. Approximately 30 of the required 60 credits to graduate are taught by PAM faculty (10 courses), and financial arrangement for the teaching of the other required program courses come out of the program’s tuition revenue. The program is staffed with a Director (PAM faculty), an Executive Director, and an Associate Director (both professional staff), and a half-time administrative assistant.

**MASTER OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES (MPS) IN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT**

Jointly offered by five departments in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (AEM, BEE, DevSoc, NatRes, and CSS), the MPS in Environmental Management aims to prepare graduates to work as multidisciplinary team members in environmental management professions.

The program has the following requirements:

- 30 credit hours (at least 24 credits in courses numbered 400 or higher);
- 20 of these credits must be taken in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS)
- A maximum of 6 credit hours may be earned through a problem-solving project;
- A maximum of 6 credit hours may be earned outside CALS, either in another college at Cornell or elsewhere; these credits must be related to the subject of study and have been completed not more than 5 years before admission.

Although Masters programs in Environmental Science, Management and Public Policy continue to attract large number of students at other institutions, the MPS in Environmental Management has attracted a relative small number of students, typically less than 10 or so a year. The committee has identified several constraints affecting this program:

- CALS has made no investment in the program, including the typical resources needed to recruit and place students;
- The program has no dedicated faculty or courses, partly due to poor incentive structures (even after the recent CALS review for MPS programs)
- Unlike other professional masters degrees where students benefit from cohort interaction, typically students admitted into this MPS program operate in isolation;
- There are no set of well-identified concentrations which are marketed as part of the program

The committee recommends that this MPS evolve toward a higher-quality Masters in Environmental Policy and Science housed in the CSPP/A, managed by faculty in the Sustainable
Energy and Environmental Policy area. Below we describe the proposed structure of the evolved program.

**MPS in Global Development**

The Master of Professional Studies (MPS) degree programs in the fields of International Development (ID and International Agriculture and Rural Development (IARD)) had separate origins but have been managed jointly since 1990, and are in the process of being combined into one MPS program in Global Development, with two concentrations: ID and IARD. The MPS/IARD is formally a concentration under the MPS (Agriculture) degree administered by CALS through its various departments, with the MPS/IARD managed by CALS' Office of International Programs, while the MPS/ID was until recently supported by CIIFAD. (The MPS/ID degree program was established under the Einaudi Center for International Studies in 1973, and moved to CIIFAD when it was created in 1990.)

The courses of study for MPS/IARD students have been entirely individually tailored (24 credits minimum) with a project paper (6 credits) as a final requirement. The MPS/ID has required students to focus half of their coursework (12 credits minimum) on a chosen concentration (International Population; International Planning; International Nutrition; Science and Technology Policy; or Development Policy) with equal credits in complementary coursework and a similar project paper requirement. There has always been considerable overlap between the two interdisciplinary graduate fields of ID and IARD, between 30 and 40%. While the MPS degrees could be completed in 2 semesters with due diligence, on average most MPS graduates took 3 semesters to complete the program.

Both MPS degrees have had similar purposes being designed for individuals with professional experience in the developing world, giving Cornell-quality education to mid-career or early career (minimum of two years of experience required) to persons aiming for careers in supporting economic and social development in the less-advantaged countries. The combined interdisciplinary degree program, based in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), has the flexible design that attracts development professionals from diverse disciplinary backgrounds who want to update their knowledge, to fill in any gaps in their previous education, or to 'retool' for new directions of work in development practice.

The MPS program is suited for students who want some graduate training but without disciplinary limitations or emphasis on research methodologies. This is a program for persons who want to undertake studies in a broad range of interrelated subjects that is aligned with the interdisciplinary challenges found in developing countries. The program suffers from the same problems identified with the MPS in Environmental Management.

The committee recommends that this MPS evolve toward a higher-quality Masters in International Development housed at the CSPP/A and managed by faculty in the International Development area. Below we describe the proposed structure of the evolved program.

**Proposed New Programs**
Masters Programs

The committee proposes three new Masters teaching programs for the CSPP/A, which would complement the existing MPA and MHA programs currently offered. These include:

- **Masters in Public Policy (MPP)** – with policy concentrations in Social Policy, Health Policy, and Education Policy;
- **Masters in Environmental/Energy Policy and Science** – an interdisciplinary program that combines core physical sciences, engineering and policy with concentrations offered in Climate Change Policy, Renewable Energy Policy, and Sustainable Cities and Environmental Planning;
- **Masters in International Development** – a new interdisciplinary program that combines core physical sciences and policy analysis with concentrations offered in Sustainable Agricultural Development, Poverty Alleviation, and Development Policy (the latter would have specializations available such as natural resource management, gender and development, and participatory development).

Undergraduate Programs

Furthermore, the committee recommends that the current undergraduate major in *Policy Analysis and Management* taught in PAM be moved to the CSPP/A, and that a new undergraduate minor be offered in Science, Technology and Public Policy of Climate Change and Renewable Energy to be offered jointly with the College of Engineering.

PhD Programs

The committee recommends that the CSPP/A house the current graduate *PhD field in Public Policy* and maintain its concentrations in Social Policy, Health Policy, Education Policy, and extend its concentrations to include Environmental and Energy Policy, and International Development; and, that the school offer a series of PhD-level concentration courses in, for example, Health Economics, Environmental and Energy Economics, Demography, etc.

For each of these recommended new programs, we briefly describe the proposed curriculum, resource needs, and potential demand. The program descriptions below are meant to provide a broad understanding of what would be the teaching needs of these programs. The committee anticipates that the Provost will appoint a Steering Committee with programmatic subcommittees to flesh out these recommendations and teaching demands in more detail prior to the formation of the CSPP/A.

**Masters in Public Policy (MPP) with concentrations in Health, Social, and Education Policy**

*Curriculum*

Following standard MPP programs offered by peer institutions, the curriculum of such program should include:
• A 2-year residential program
• A requirement of 16 courses (4 courses/ semester)
• Courses dedicated to Masters' students (e.g., not jointly taught to undergraduates)
• A required set of first-year core courses
• A group project
• Policy concentration in Social, Health or Education Policy

Table 1 shows a typical plan of study to complete the requirements in 2 years, and the implications for faculty resources. The next section provides more discussion of resource needs, including faculty, staff, and financial aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics I (microeconomics)</td>
<td>Economics II (public economics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis I</td>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Ethics and Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Public Management and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SECOND YEAR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td>Concentration course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/ Group Project</td>
<td>Thesis/Group Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipated Demand for the MPP

Reports from an APPAM publication indicate that the general demand for professional master’s programs in public policy, public affairs, and public administration is strong. The more difficult question is to forecast demand for an MPP program at Cornell with the specific features described above. In order to assess the likely demand, we considered two factors: the size of MPP programs at other universities comparable to Cornell, and the types of placements those students received.

The Committee concluded that there is likely to be strong demand for a Cornell MPP degree. This is based in part on the assumption that Cornell would admit approximately 50 students per year. This is similar to, or smaller than, several comparable programs. Harvard graduates over 200 students in its MPP class. Chicago’s Harris school is about 70 per class. The 2011 class size

---

4 These data are drawn heavily from a special ad hoc committee report produced in the PAM Department in fall 2011.
for Michigan’s Ford School for the MPP and MPA combined was 110. Duke’s Sanford school admits between 55 and 65 students per year.

Based on data reported in Table 2 below, three sectors account for the large majority MPP student job acceptances: (i) national or federal governments; (ii) non-profits and non-governmental organizations; and (iii) the private sector, including consulting and law. These three sectors are likely to be the primary demanders of Cornell’s MPP graduates as well. The committee believes that Cornell’s “market niche” will be in meeting the demand for MPP graduates who have rigorous statistical and analytical training in policy analysis. Although it is likely that all three sectors value such training, we cannot tell which sector is most likely to display the greatest demand for our graduates.

Regarding student placement, the committee also notes that each of the comparable schools examined, including Harvard’s Kennedy School, Chicago’s Harris School, Michigan’s Ford School and Duke’s Sanford School, have a Career Services office that is staffed by at least two full-time personnel. With the possible exception of the Harris School, these schools keep detailed records of students’ career tracks after graduation.

Table 2. Student Placement in Three Top MPP Programs for Class of 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Sector</th>
<th>Michigan Ford</th>
<th>Duke Sanford</th>
<th>Harvard Kennedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National/federal government</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/local government</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector/consulting/law</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit/NGO sector</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-governmental organizations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee also considered likely international versus domestic demand for a Cornell MPP. The committee believes that the majority of the demand for Cornell MPP graduates will be domestic, mirroring other programs. However, we also believe that a non-trivial fraction of students will be international, with international students representing an array of countries. This is based on the experience of several other MPP programs. For example, Harvard reported that of the 217 MPP graduates of the Kennedy School in 2010 (which had a total class of 576), 72 percent were U.S. citizens, while the remaining 28 percent were from 31 different countries. Chicago’s Harris School reports that international students represent between 20 and 30 percent of each class. We expect Cornell’s program to have roughly similar appeal across domestic and international students. The committee recognizes that the location of Cornell could be a disadvantage in terms of attracting MPP students. Many prominent MPP programs are on campuses located in state capitols, Washington, DC, or large metropolitan areas. Such locations are especially advantageous for part-time and non-traditional students, for example, civil servants pursuing a professional master’s degree. However, Cornell’s locational disadvantage is less relevant for the 2-year residential MPP program that we are proposing. In addition, it should be possible for the MPP program to take advantage of Cornell’s established ties and educational programs for undergraduates in Albany, New York City, and Washington, DC.
Masters in Environmental Policy and Science (MEPS)\textsuperscript{5}

Rationale

The proposed MEPS program is a two-year interdisciplinary professional degree program designed for individuals who plan to enter or re-enter the workforce upon graduation to contribute to environmental conservation and management. The program combines the foundations of physical sciences or energy systems with rigorous training in public policy needed to address the pressing challenges of society associated with climate mitigation and adaptation, and the transition to sustainable energy systems.

Based on the data collected regarding the structure of peer programs, Cornell is poised to become the top-ranked Masters program in environmental policy and science in the nation. According to the latest \textit{U.S. News} rankings, the top 10 schools of public policy with an environmental policy and management concentrations are: Indiana University, Syracuse University, Duke University, UC–Berkeley, University of Washington, University of Michigan, Harvard University, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Columbia University, and Carnegie-Mellon University.

None of these programs has \textit{simultaneously} the strengths in energy systems (Engineering), earth system sciences (CALS and Engineering.), and environmental and energy economics (CALS) that currently found at Cornell. In Engineering, more than 50 faculty and courses focus on energy systems and sustainability; AEM/CALS has also been the home of some of the most distinguished environmental economists in the nation. However, Cornell has only recently started to re-direct the investments in environmental and energy economics to better align them with our programs in Engineering. With a few more investments to complement the recent ACSF-sponsored cluster hires in environmental and energy economics, the MEPS program can become a trademark of the CSPP/A.

Curriculum

The proposed curriculum combines features from programs offered at Schools of Public Policy and Schools of the Environment, resulting in a novel and balanced interdisciplinary program. The proposed program relies more heavily on public policy training relative to programs in environmental sciences and management offered at Schools of the Environment. The program also provides deeper training of earth system sciences or energy systems than any other standard Masters in Public Policy. The structure is as follows:

- Residential 2-year program
- Requirement of 16 courses (4 courses/ semester)
- Courses dedicated to Masters' students (e.g., not jointly taught to undergraduates)
- Required set of first-year core courses
- Group project

\textsuperscript{5} This Masters program would replace the current MPS in Environmental Management; a similar structure with a focus on international development could serve as a basis for the Masters in International Development.
Concentrations on Climate Policy, Renewable Energy Policy, and Sustainable Cities and Environmental Planning

Table 2 shows a typical plan of study to complete all requirements in 2 years, and the implications for faculty resources. The next section provides a more complete discussion of resource needs, including faculty, staff, and financial aid.

**Table 2: MEPS - Typical Plan of Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECOND YEAR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALL SEMESTER</td>
<td>SPRING SEMESTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Economics I (microeconomics)</td>
<td>Economics II (environmental Economics)</td>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis I</td>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis II/or Environmental Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis I</td>
<td>Research Methods and Data Analysis II/or Environmental Modeling</td>
<td>Earth System Sciences I or Energy Systems I</td>
<td>Earth System Sciences II or Energy Systems II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Environmental Law and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Size of the Program and Group Projects**

Most master's degrees in Environmental Science and Management offered by Schools of the Environment (e.g., Yale's School of Forestry and Environmental Sciences, Duke's Nicholas School of the Environment, UCSB's Bren School of Environmental Sciences and Management) typically have entering classes of about 100 students. In our interviews with Deans of Schools of Public Policy, the concentrations of Sustainable Energy and Environmental Policy were identified as top areas of increasing demand. We propose in Phase I to admit 50 students each year. In Phase II, we propose to scale up the program to 100 students. With 50 new students, the core courses will have enrollments of about 50 students each, and about 17 students per concentration. If thesis/group projects have 3-4 students each, there will be roughly 5 group projects per specialization, and a total of 15 group projects a year. Each group project should count as a full teaching course.
Masters in International Development

As the two international program areas are parallel and similar, we discuss how the International Development and International Cooperation and Security areas could together contribute to the CSPP/A’s Master's programs at several levels: (i) providing elective courses in international development and international cooperation for the general MPP and MPA programs, (ii) developing concentrations in international development and international cooperation for both MPP and MPA degrees, and (iii) developing focused MPP degrees respectively in international development or international cooperation and security, or possibly for a combined MPP in global affairs.

Below a model is sketched out for an MPP degree in International Development, based on a similar degree offered at the Kennedy School at Harvard, proposed as a two-year course. Most of the teaching resources for this degree are already available at Cornell, so it could be started fairly quickly and at low cost. A comparable MPP in International Cooperation and Security with similar structure could also be set up fairly easily, but given the greater faculty strength in International Development at present, an MPP/ID could be more readily established. An MPP/ICS degree would require some new faculty resources.

Table 1: MPP-ID - Typical Plan of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Microeconomics I</td>
<td>Microeconomics I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macroeconomics I</td>
<td>Macroeconomics I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Methods: Statistics</td>
<td>Quantitative Methods: Econometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions and Development</td>
<td>Economic Dev: theory/Policy/evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applications and Cases in International Dev</td>
<td>Applications and Cases in International Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNSHIP</td>
<td>Preferably in a developing country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND YEAR

Management in a development context

Second year policy analysis seminar

Case workshop in international development

Democratic governance

Six electives, (3 in a concentration area)

Demand for the MPP-ID Program

It is difficult to predict demand for a program such as this. Taking into account the intakes at other public policy schools in the country, a figure of 35 students per year (70 in a 2-year program) seems reasonable as a target. This would be half as large as the 70 students per year (140 in all) in the Kennedy School's MPA/ID. Cornell's outstanding and long-standing reputation in international development studies should attract a strong pool of capable applicants.
It should, of course, be emphasized that this is only an illustration, offered to give some specific idea of what an actual MPP would look like, and to get a sense of what student numbers might be. The MPP discussed here is focused on International Development, not on International Cooperation and Security. An MPP focusing on the latter would likely have fewer economics courses and more courses on international relations and governance. One possibility would be to have a set of core courses that are common to both programs, with students selecting electives to define their MPP degree in International Policy (or International Affairs) as focused on either International Development or on International Cooperation and Security.

**Synergies in Core Courses Offered to Support Master’s Programs in the School**

The chart below indicates potential synergies in course offerings through the school that could lower the cost of offering the recommended Master's programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>MPA</th>
<th>MEPS</th>
<th>MPP-ID</th>
<th>MHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Methods II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Res Methods II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Policy Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implement I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Implement I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>Mgt &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These synergies will results in a lower cost to offer the core courses in the five Master's programs in the school. Obviously, class size is an issue, and it is anticipated that more than one section of each of the overlapping core courses will have to be offered. These synergies have been factored into the rough program costs and revenues identified below.

**Undergraduate Major/Minor in Public Policy**

Two units contribute to most of the policy-oriented undergraduate education on campus: PAM and AEM. The dispersed nature of academic units at Cornell has prevented us from offering a well-structured major in public policy that combines concentrations in key areas. Instead, students with interests in public policy have to search for courses and concentrations across various departments in different colleges. As a consequence, Cornell programs are not as visible as they would be if they were located in a single school.

PAM currently offers a policy-oriented undergraduate program on campus. While strong in health and social policy, this major lacks concentration courses in other key areas of public policy to be compared against top undergraduate public policy programs at competing institutions. Offered in the College of Human Ecology, the program supports approximately 230-240 undergraduates. The program admits approximately 30 freshmen each year and admits approximately the same number of internal and external transfers into the program each year, with a graduating class of approximately 50-60 students annually.
The PAM undergraduate major offers a set of 4 core courses, two required methods courses, and approximately 24 concentration courses in health and social policy taught every year as part of its program’s requirements. Some of the core and methods sequence courses are offered in multiple sections per year. All of these courses are taught by PAM faculty/adjunct faculty in the PAM Department.

AEM faculty contribute to several policy and management-oriented undergraduate programs on campus. AEM faculty in environmental and natural resource economics provide 6 courses for the environmental economics concentration to the undergraduate major in Applied Economics and Management, and to the major in the Science of Natural and Environmental Systems. Some of these courses have 70+ students in them. Similarly, faculty in international development provides courses that could support an International Development concentration for the undergraduate major in Applied Economics and Management.

**NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC POLICY**

With the formation of the CSPP/A, the Provost has several options regarding undergraduate education in public policy. The School can continue to offer a 4-year undergraduate public policy degree; it can offer a 2-year (junior/senior) joint degree program with other departments; or it can consider the possibility of an undergraduate minor in public policy, consisting of upper division courses that form public policy ‘concentrations’ for other majors on campus. Concentrations could include: social policy, health policy, education policy, energy and environmental policy, and international development policy. To complete a minor, a student could be required to complete 4 concentration courses, suggesting that at least 3 courses should be offered per concentration per semester. The concentration in energy and environmental policy could continue to serve the needs of the majors in the Science of Natural Resources and Environmental Systems.

**PhD PROGRAMS AND CONCENTRATIONS FOR DISCIPLINARY GRADUATE FIELDS**

The committee recommends that the current PhD program in PAM evolve towards a fully developed PhD program in Public Policy. Relative to other existing graduate fields, the committee expects this program to be small, with about 10 PhD students a year.

In addition, faculty in the SPP/PA will also contribute to PhD course concentrations for various disciplinary graduate fields. For example, currently PAM faculty offer a sequence of two PhD courses in empirical methods/econometrics for a wide variety of graduate students on campus. PAM faculty also offer a PhD-level demographic techniques course jointly with Development Sociology, and staff one of the Economics Public Finance PhD courses and the entire sequence in health economics. In AEM, faculty staff the entire sequence in environmental and natural resource economics and most of the sequence in development economics. AEM faculty also contribute to the new Earth and Energy Systems graduate education program. Similarly, new hires for the politics and governance program area can contribute to instruction in the graduate field of Government.
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

KEY OBJECTIVES

From early on in our deliberations as a committee, we agreed on some key objectives as we sought to design a structure that would be appropriate to the CSPP/A:

- The school should be a university wide initiative, one that is both cross-unit and cross-discipline
- The school should build synergies and enhance collaboration between faculty doing research, teaching and outreach in the area of public policy/affairs, i.e. the whole should be more than the sum of its parts.
- The school should not significantly disrupt the missions and strengths of currently existing colleges/departments.
- Building the school should contribute add to faculty strengths both in the school and the core social/physical/life sciences at Cornell through coordinated/cluster hiring and other types of faculty appointments.
- The school should be able to support and service a select number of high quality general and specialized Master’s programs.
- The school should facilitate the development of new interdisciplinary programmatic opportunities through currently existing and newly developed centers/institutes.
- The school should facilitate the transfer of applied research into outreach programs, and serve as a central place for policy dialogue.

OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

As we carefully considered where Cornell’s strength in public policy/affairs currently lies, and learned about the structure of other successful public policy schools around the country, we adopted a set of overarching principles to guide the development of a CSPP/A:

1) The CSPP/A should be an independent entity, separate from all existing colleges, with its own dean. The dean should have independent authority and resources to: encourage and enhance robust research programs in public policy/public affairs; ensure the offering of consistently high quality teaching curricula; and, to coordinate active and meaningful outreach and engagement programs in the public arena.

2) The CSPP/A should be strongly connected to other units across campus, including the core social science departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and other applied physical/natural and social sciences department on campus through joint hires, joint appointments, and affiliated faculty.

3) The CSPP/A should have a sufficient number of dedicated faculty lines to ensure continued growth in its core areas of program strength. It is the opinion of the committee that a school without dedicated core faculty lines would not be effective in creating national visibility or have sufficient core research strength to be a credible player in the policy arena.
SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

After considerable consideration that involved the drafting of numerous documents, extensive discussions, and multiple rounds of revisions, our committee arrived at agreement around a set of specific recommendations regarding the CSPP/A’s structure, management, and oversight. We voted on each of these, presented as separate planks, at a meeting on December 13, 2011; we agreed to all of them, some with slight modifications in language that is presented below. The remainder of this document contains these agreed-upon principles and features.

Proposed Structure of the School

- From the outset, the CSPP/A should be an independent entity, separate from all existing colleges, with its own dean.
- The CSPP/A should build on Cornell strengths in six program areas: Health Policy; Energy and the Environment; International Cooperation and Security; International Development; Politics and Governance; and Social Policy.
- The structure of the CSPP/A should include a well-balanced mix of scholars from the disciplines that address matters of public policy and public affairs, including (1) economics, (2) political science and public administration, and (3) other fields (e.g., anthropology, communications, history, legal scholarship, science & technology studies, and sociology, as well as natural/physical science and engineering.). None of these three groups should dominate the School and none should be marginalized.
- The sizes and orientation of the program areas should be adjusted over time according to changing circumstances.
- Disciplinary distribution is a fundamental part of the structure of the School. This implies that early appointments must be aimed at achieving the desired disciplinary mix. Correcting any temporary imbalances should be a priority.
- Mechanisms should be put in place to establish strong connections between the CSPP/A and key social science departments and relevant departments in the sciences and engineering. For example, a standing advisory committee consisting of representatives of key departments should be constituted to advise the dean of the CSPP/A on issues pertaining to ongoing linkages between the CSPP/A and relevant departments.
- The committee envisions a school with 65-75 FTE with (a) a diverse disciplinary mix; (b) strengths in the 6 program areas outlined above, and (c) a balanced mix of domestic and international policy. Some of these faculty are expected to hold joint appointments with other units.
Faculty with regular appointments in the SCPP/A should be willing to make a substantial time commitment to the School, and must have an ability and desire to cooperate with a diverse set of colleagues and students in a multidisciplinary environment.

To encourage a broad and diverse array of faculty to make contributions to the CSPP/A, it should also facilitate the active involvement of scholars with public policy interests who are able to devote 25% or less of their time to the School. The goal will be to involve natural scientists and engineers, as well as scholars in fields such as anthropology, communication, law, and others. These appointments will be term appointments reviewed every five years.

In the case of the Politics and Governance program area at least five appointments will operate within the Center for Public Affairs (described in document on this program area) to create a critical mass. The remaining appointments in this “cross-cutting program area” may overlap with the other five program areas.

Interaction among the program areas will be encouraged and will contribute substantially to the strength of the School. It is expected that some faculty will want to be active in more than one program area, which will spark synergy among these domains. Examples might include a faculty member appointed in the Energy and Environment program area who specializes in the politics of environmental policy also participates in the Politics and Governance program area; or a faculty member appointed in International Development who works on global health policy issues and is also active in the Health Policy domain.

Management, Oversight, and Implementation Process

A Faculty Steering Committee should be appointed by the Provost. It should include balanced representation across 6 areas of program strength and across disciplines.

The Dean should be selected through a national/global competitive search. The successful launch of the School depends on the appointment of a dean who is visionary, who has superlative credentials and high visibility.

The Faculty Steering Committee will make recommendations to the Provost about the composition of the search committee for the dean.

At least 15 new lines will be needed at the outset, in order to begin to build a School with the structure described above. Initial investment of these new lines will need to be concentrated in International Cooperation and Security; International Development; and Politics and Governance. In addition, at least 10 pre-fills will be needed at initial stages of the school in Energy and Environment given the vulnerabilities of this area of scholarship to retirements.

Some of the hires based on new lines should be joint appointments with such departments as Government and the Cornell Law School.
Internal transfers of faculty should be made following review of individuals by a committee appointed by the dean, consisting of the Faculty Steering Committee and relevant specialists from outside Cornell. Internal transfers should be arranged through a process of negotiations with the individual faculty member and his or her department chair and dean.

In some cases, new lines may be used to compensate units outside the CSPP/A for FTEs transferred into the School.

**The Inclusion of the Department of Policy Analysis and Management (PAM)**

Cornell has considerable strength in public policy, but this strength is distributed among a number of units. None of these units alone has the depth and breadth needed to be elevated to the status of a School of Public Policy/Affairs. New resources will be needed to build a highly-ranked public policy school. PAM brings valuable strength in health and social policy to the table, with a large number of economists and sociologists. However, a School consisting of PAM plus a small number of additional FTEs is not a viable model for a top ranked public policy school, which must also include strength in energy and the environment, international issues, and politics and governance.

We are enthusiastic about the inclusion of PAM in the School, assuming a total School faculty size of 65 to 75 FTEs, and assuming that the principles and disciplinary and substantive mechanisms for balancing described in the rest of this proposal are put into place.

The moving of PAM and other large groups of existing Cornell faculty into the School, while planned from the beginning, should only occur:

- After a Faculty Steering Committee is appointed and spends two years developing teaching programs, holding events, forming groups of interested faculty likely to affiliate, etc.
- After selection of a new Dean for the School.
IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

SPRING 2012

Announcement of implementation plans for the School

- Provost makes announcement of implementation plans for a new School

External Advisory Committee

- Provost appoints an External Advisory Committee for the new School

Search for a Dean

- Provost appoints a search committee and launches a national/worldwide search for a new school Dean
- External Advisory Committee members provide feedback to the search committee for the new Dean

Implementation Committee for the school

- Provost appoints a Faculty Steering Committee as indicated in the fall 2011 Committee report.
  The provost charges the Faculty Steering Committee:
  o To engage in campus-wide listening and information sessions regarding the new school
  o To plan a series of highly visible public policy-related initiatives, to commence in Fall 2012, that will attract campus-wide interest (e.g., public lectures with distinguished policy scholars or policy makers; position Cornell as the ‘place’ for public policy dialogue, through the organization of dialogues that bring to campus various stakeholders interested in addressing major public policy challenges);
  o To accomplish this goal, the committee recommends that seed funds in the order of 150K a year will be made available to each of the core program areas (overseen by a member of the Steering Committee) in order to get colleagues excited about the new school and help get the word out.
  o To appoint multidisciplinary/multidepartment subcommittees, chaired by a Faculty Steering Committee member, in each of the five program areas identified in the Provost’s fall 2011 committee report to:
    ▪ Determine the interest of Cornell faculty in affiliating with the School

---

6 Note: the document on Committee Recommendations provides more extensive information that is relevant to specific matters noted in the timeline below.
engage with related Centers and Institutes to ascertain potential affiliations with the school
- Develop concrete recommendations regarding teaching curricula for the school
  - Together with the Development office, develop a fundraising plan, including the development of promotional materials for the School, its programs, and its centers

**FALL 2012**

*Public Policy-Related Initiatives Are Held on Campus (as planned in Spring 2012)*

**Developing the School’s teaching programs**

- The Faculty Steering Committee and its subcommittees work to develop curricula for the new Master’s level teaching programs identified in the Provost’s fall 2011 committee report
- The Faculty Steering Committee and its subcommittees work to get the internal and external approvals for the new Master’s level teaching programs identified in the Provost’s fall 2011 committee report
- The Faculty Steering Committee and its subcommittees work with the CIPA and the Sloan Program Directors to identify synergies in the core course offerings of their programs and needed resources for strengthening their existing programs as part of the School’s teaching portfolio.
- Develop a plan for how new research centers would interact/cooperate with Cooperative Extension and existing centers on campus

**Secure initial funding for the research centers**

- Launch a selected number of highly visible research initiatives that will facilitate branding the new research centers of the School

**SPRING 2013**

*Appointment of a school Dean*

- Provost appoints a new dean to the school

*School Administration and Teaching Support Staff*

- The Dean, in consultation with the Faculty Steering Committee, makes recommendations to the Provost regarding administrative and professional staff needed
for the school and launches searches to fill these positions in support of School functioning and in support of the school teaching programs.

School Facilities

- The Provost identifies physical space on campus to house the new School

Initial Internal appointments to the School

- The Dean, in consultation with the External Advisory Committee and the Faculty Steering Committee makes recommendations to the Provost regarding initial internal faculty appointments to the School

Initiate Search Process for External Appointments to the School

- The Dean, in consultation with the External Advisory Committee and the Faculty Steering Committee makes recommendations to the Provost regarding strategic pre-fills for internal faculty at eminent retirement stages
- The Dean, in consultation with the External Advisory Committee and the Faculty Steering Committee makes recommendations to the Provost regarding new external hires for the school that serve to build initial strength in areas of research and teaching not currently existing at Cornell but needed for delivering the School’s mission
- The Provost and new Dean appoint multidisciplinary/multidepartment search committees, chaired by an Faculty Steering Committee member, to develop position descriptions and initiate searches for ~10 new external hires and the ~10 externally hired pre-fills for retiring faculty to be appointed to the school, some of which will have joint appointments in the School and a social science department

School support staff

- Administrative staff and professional staff are hired to support School functioning

Advertising and recruitment for the school’s teaching programs

- State approval is obtained for the School’s new teaching programs
- Advertising materials are developed and recruitment efforts launched for recruitment of students to the new Master teaching programs

Campus-wide appointments to the School

- The Dean, in consultation with the External Advisory Committee and the Faculty Steering Committee makes broader internal faculty appointments to the School
FALL 2013

*Making external appointments to the School (as commenced above)*

- ~10 new external “pre-fill” appointments are made to the School through external hires
- ~10 new appointments are made to the School through external hires

*Consolidation of the School’s teaching programs*

- MPA/CIPA, the Sloan, and the PAM undergraduate and PhD program come under the administrative leadership of the Dean of the School
- The MPP, MEPS and MID programs start file review and admissions to their programs for fall 2014 (the sesquicentennial class)

SRING 2014

- Naming of the School to coincide with the sesquicentennial celebrations kickoff
- PAM faculty moved into the new School
- Target date for School admitting its first new Master’s students

FALL 2014 – SPRING 2015

- Formal opening celebrations for the School during the sesquicentennial celebrations

Target date for first class to begin studies
## APPENDIX A
### Academic Units Responding to the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africana Studies &amp; Research Center</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied &amp; Engineering Physics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Economics &amp; Management, Dyson School of</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Institute of Animal Health &amp; Feline Health Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Statistics and Computational Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical &amp; Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Chemical Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop &amp; Soil Sciences</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU Ag. Experiment Station (Geneva)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Sociology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Nutritional Sciences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology &amp; Evolutionary Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology (Ithaca)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Science &amp; Apparel Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science (Ithaca)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture (Ithaca)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Dept. of Extension</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Human Resource Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: International &amp; Comparative Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Labor Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Labor Relations, Law &amp; History</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR: Social Statistics &amp; Statistical Sciences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Genetics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurobiology &amp; Behavior</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Research &amp; Information Engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Breeding &amp; Genetics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology &amp; Plant-Microbe Biology (Ithaca)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre, Film &amp; Dance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B
Groups Targeted for Special Listening Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>Development/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment/Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AEM/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFS</td>
<td>Frank DiSalvo, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Human Development, Design &amp; Environmental Analysis, Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR</td>
<td>Full faculty meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Sciences Deans' Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Targeted individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Full faculty meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Targeted individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Kathryn Boor CALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Kleinman, AA&amp;P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIC C
Institutions Contacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Deans Contacted</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Bruce Kuniholm</td>
<td>Sanford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Chicago</td>
<td>Bob Michaels</td>
<td>Harris School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>John Palmer</td>
<td>Maxwell School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>David Elwood</td>
<td>Kennedy School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Susan Collins</td>
<td>Ford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>Christina Paxson</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>Kingsley Haynes</td>
<td>School of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>Jack Nott</td>
<td>School of Policy, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Mark Peterson</td>
<td>Luskin School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Virginia</td>
<td>Eric Batashnik</td>
<td>Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
International Development: Centers, Institutes and Programs

Social Science Departments
Note: many Cornell faculty have multiple affiliations. To avoid double counting, they are listed under their primary affiliation. Inclusion in this inventory is based (mostly) of information provided on departmental websites. Emeritus and visiting faculty are excluded here, but they could be an important additional resource for the international programs.

Applied Economics and Management (Dyson School), CALS
The following Faculty in the Dyson School can be said to have primary international development research interests: Christopher Barrett, Garrick Blalock, Nancy Chau, Ralph Christy, Mark Constas, Ravi Kanbur, Steve Kyle, David Lee, Eswar Prasad

The following have secondary interests in international development: Antonio Bento, Vicki Bogan, Harry de Gorter, William Lesser, Gregory Poe, David Ng, William Schulze Calum Turvey

City and Regional Planning, AAP
Iwan Azis, Susan Christopherson, Jeffrey Chusid, Kieran Donaghy, William Goldsmith, Neema Kudva

Development Sociology, CALS (primary and secondary mixed)
Alaka Basu, David Brown, Parfait Eloundou-Enyegue, Shelley Feldman, Charles Geisler, Fouad Makki, Philip McMichael, Lindy Williams, Wendy Wolford

Economics Department, A&S and ILR
This year the Economics Department in Arts and Sciences and the Labor Economics Department in ILR merged to form one department, with joint recruitment and a joint graduate program. From the website of the new department, the following faculty have a primary interest in international development (joint appointments already mentioned elsewhere are not included): Kaushik Basu, Jim Berry, Gary Fields, Thomas Lyons, Henry Wan

Government, A&S
Valerie Bunce, Matthew Evangelista, Gustavo Flores-Macias, Ronald Herring, Mary Fainsod Katzenstein, Peter Katzenstein, Jonathan Kirschner, Sarah Kreps, Andrew Mertha, Kevin Morrison, David Patel, Thomas Pepinsky, Kenneth Roberts, Norman Uphoff, Nicolas van de Walle, Chris Way, Jessica Weeks

History, A&S
Holly Case, Fred Logevall, Mary Roldan, Barry Strauss

Industrial & Labor Relations—International and Comparative Work Place Studies
Rose Batt, Lance Compa, Maria Elena Cook, Sarosh Kuruvilla
Provost’s Committee on a Cornell School of Public Policy

Johnson Graduate School of Management
Stuart Hart, Mark Milstein

Law
Odette Lienau, Muna Ndulo, Jens Ohlin, Aziz Rana, Annelise Riles

Natural Resources, CALS
Karim-Aly Kassam, James Lassoie, Steven Wolfe

Nutritional Sciences (International Nutrition), CALS and Human Ecology
Patricia Cassano, Jere Haas, Joann McDermid, Saurab Mehta, David Pelletier, Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Kathleen Rasmussen, David Sahn, Rebecca Stoltzfus

Science and Technology Studies, A&S
Kathleen Vogel

Sociology, A&S (primary and secondary mixed)
Douglas Heckathorn, Stephen Morgan, Victor Nee, Paromita Sanyal

Natural Sciences
Professors of International Agriculture
George Abawi (Plant Pathology and Plant-Microbe Biology)
Robin Bellinder (Horticulture)
Robert Blake (Animal Science)
Dan Brown (Animal Science)
Ronnie Coffman (Plane Breeding and Genetics)
John Duxbury (Crop and Soil Sciences)
William Fry (Plant Pathology and Plant-Microbe Biology)
Stephen Kresovich (Plant Breeding and Genetics)
Johannes Lehmann (Crop and Soil Sciences)
Susan McCouch (Plant Breeding and Genetics)
Rebecca Nelson (Plant Breeding and Genetics)
Alice Pell (Animal Science, Vice Provost)
K. V. Raman (Plant Breeding and Genetics)
Susan Riha (Earth and Atmospheric Sciences)
Syed Rizvi (Food Science)
Norman Scott (Biological and Environmental Engineering)
Anthony Shelton (Geneva Entomology)
Margaret Einarson (Plant Breeding and Genetics)
Tammo Steenhuis (Biological and Environmental Engineering)
Janice Thies (Crop and Soil Sciences)
Harold van Es (Crop and Soil Sciences)
Michael Walter (Biological and Environmental Engineering)
Chris Wien (Horticulture)
Cornell Centers and Institutes with Significant International Development Engagement

Atkinson Center for a Sustainable Future
Center for Sustainable Enterprise
Center for the Study of Inequality
Cornell Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development (CIIFAD)
Cornell Global Labor Institute
Cornell Population Center
Einaudi Center for International Studies
Institute for African Development
Institute for the Social Sciences
Polson Institute for Global Development
Cornell Food and Nutrition Policy Program
Latin American Studies Program
Population and Development Program
South Asia Program
South East Asia Program
Table 1: Listing of U.S. Institutions with Degree Programs in Public Affairs and/or Public Policy or with Other Designations, e.g., Government, Public Service, Citizenship, Leadership

(*USN&WR rankings for programs ranked 1 to 25 are shown in brackets with bold-facing; names given to schools of eminent public figures or donors are shown in parentheses*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC AFFAIRS</th>
<th>PUBLIC POLICY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Chicago (Harris) [10]</td>
<td>Brandeis (Heller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia [14]</td>
<td>Cornell (PAM)</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (CIPA)</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Harvard (Kennedy) [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY</td>
<td>Duke (Sanford) [10]</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana-Purdue</td>
<td>George Washington [14]</td>
<td>NYU (Wagner) [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (Humphrey) [14]</td>
<td>Kentucky (Martin)</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri (Truman)</td>
<td>Maryland-College Park</td>
<td>Southern Maine (Muskie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Michigan (Gerald Ford) [7]</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M (Bush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State (Glenn)</td>
<td>Pepperdine</td>
<td>USC [7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>UC Berkeley (Goldman) [6]</td>
<td>Virginia (Bratten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Albany (Rockefeller) [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse (Maxwell) [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (Johnson) [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth (Wilder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Evans) [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin (LaFollette) [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Number of Applications to CIPA MPA Program, 2002/03-2011/12

% of Applicants Accepted: 2007-10 = 70%; 2010-11 = 53%; 2011-2012 = 45%
Figure 2: Number of CIPA Fellows Enrolling in MPA Program, 2002/03-2011/12

Yield rate on offers of admission: 2008-09 = 38%; 2009-10 = 48%; 2009-10 and 2010-11 = 52%
Table 2: Academic Performance of CIPA Fellows, and Average GRE Scores of CIPA Applicants, 2008/09-2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median GPA</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Class with GPA ≥ 4.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility for National Honorary Pi Alpha Alpha GPA ≥3.7</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Total GRE Scores</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Quantitative GRE Scores</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Verbal GRE Scores</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Representative Summer Internships of CIPA Fellows, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accenture</th>
<th>NYC Department of Small Business Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFL-CIO</td>
<td>Partnership for Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Business Information Bank</td>
<td>Revenue Watch Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of Teachers</td>
<td>UN Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Council of the United States</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka</td>
<td>UN Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bain and Company</td>
<td>UN World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of China</td>
<td>US Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>US Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia Initiatives for Local Development</td>
<td>US Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Rural Strategies</td>
<td>US Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Foundation</td>
<td>US Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Budget Office</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Research Service</td>
<td>Washington National Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Associates International</td>
<td>The White House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Suisse</td>
<td>Winrock International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Public Schools</td>
<td>Women’s World Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte and Touche</td>
<td>he World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grameen Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Lynch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organization for Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2010-2011 Summary Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public:</th>
<th>44%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private:</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit:</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad:</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Representative Employment Offers for CIPA Fellows, 2010-2011
(* Asterisk indicates multiple offers to Fellows)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banyan Global</td>
<td>IREX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booz Allen Hamilton*</td>
<td>JP Morgan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Strategic and Intl. Studies</td>
<td>LEXISNEXIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bank of Brazil</td>
<td>Luce Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevronics</td>
<td>New York State Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Complaint Review Board</td>
<td>One Acre Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of 100</td>
<td>Pew Charitable Trusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern Worldwide</td>
<td>PriceWaterhouse Coopers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Jazz Festival</td>
<td>Roland Berger Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte and Touche</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoAgriculture Partners</td>
<td>Technoserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst and Young</td>
<td>UN World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Society of America</td>
<td>US Agency for International Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian Development Bank</td>
<td>US Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve Bank of New York</td>
<td>US Dept of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI Consulting</td>
<td>US Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
<td>US Department of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Pelton</td>
<td>US Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover Research Council</td>
<td>US Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoku Corporation</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Institute</td>
<td>US Food &amp; Drug Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Consulting Group</td>
<td>US Office of Management &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Economics</td>
<td>Vietnam Education Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Center for Energy</td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plus selected in national or state competitions:**
6 Presidential Management Fellows
1 Congressional Hunger Fellow
1 Luce Scholar
1 New York State Senate Fellow
Table 5: Analytical Breakdown of CIPA Fellow Employment, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Statistics @ 9 months</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Nonprofit</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further grad study (Ph.D., JD)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-month employment rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPA Class of May 2011 @ 6 months</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit sector</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further graduate study</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Current Core Faculty of the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA)

Norman Uphoff, Government & Intl. Agriculture (Director)
Nancy Brooks, City & Regional Planning (Director of Graduate Studies)
Richard Booth, City & Regional Planning
Nancy Chau, Dyson School of Applied Economics
Ralph Christy, Dyson School of Applied Economics
Kieran Donaghy, City & Regional Planning
Gary Fields, Industrial & Labor Relations
Bob Harris, Africana Studies
Neema Kudva, City & Regional Planning
Peter Loucks, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Theodore Lowi, Government
Kathryn March, Anthropology
Per Pinstrup-Andersen, Nutrition & Applied Economics