The committee has reviewed its charge and agreed on a variety of protocols and issues already.

We have agreed that we each serve as delegates from our respective Schools (Mike Fontaine and John Siliciano excepted) but equally need to function in the interests of the University and CCB more broadly. As such, we need to be judicious in sharing information about internal committee deliberations with others, but need to maintain open channels of communications with the faculty in the three Schools. Each School’s delegation has developed and shared with the committee its plan for maintaining active, transparent two-way communication with its School’s faculty.

We agreed on a set of operational principles for the committee:

- **Aspirational:** Build an integrated faculty that builds on the existing strengths of the three Schools. Tap economies of scale and scope to advance the academic reputation of Cornell’s business programs to the highest ranks globally, consistent with the CCB brand.

- **Preserve uniqueness:** Maintain each School’s distinctive and unique programs that motivate students, faculty and alumni.

- **Prioritize:** Work first on building coordinated new programs, and on defining the collective comparative advantage around which CCB strategy built. Then focus on adjustments to existing programs so as to reinforce existing strengths and achieve greater efficiency/impact.

- **Transparency:** Make information widely and quickly available as we craft key details of CCB.

- **Participatory:** Engage faculty, staff and students in a consultative, deliberate process.

- **Mutual respect:** Each School has a strong, richly-deserved reputation that merits respect. Focus on recognizing and building on strengths.

- **Efficiency:** Realize efficiencies and quality enhancements in services provision based on observation and experimentation, not speculation … favor slow consolidation.

We agreed that because there are parallel CCB graduate and undergraduate student synergy committees, for the time being we will assume that the former will tackle issues of graduate fields, but we must be prepared to engage that issue in due time if the CCB graduate student synergy committee does not.

We agreed to gather benchmarking information on appropriate peer schools.

We agreed to invite some non-tenure stream (NTS) faculty from each School to join our discussions once we have made a bit more progress on definition of structures.
Representatives from the three Schools took turns describing their School’s mission/vision/values, what they perceive as the School’s strengths and weaknesses, along with key benefits its faculty hope to derive from unification under CCB. Several prospective synergies emerged from that discussion:
- College-level MPS programming.
- Online and mixed online/residential executive education and non-degree programming.
- Integrated PhD curriculum and matching of grad students to TA/RA opportunities.
- Career services (readiness and placement).
- Entrepreneurship.
- Sustainability.
- Strengthening centers/institutes/programs, etc.

The common refrain was that we aim to become better, not just bigger.

Without trying to craft a precise CCB mission/vision/values statement, we did spend time envisioning together CCB’s functions so as to guide the design of CCB’s internal academic structure and the faculty review procedures that derive from the structure. Themes that emerged repeatedly include:
- Cornell writ large is central to CCB’s comparative advantage. Leveraging the broad research strengths that distinguish Cornell among elite universities (e.g., engineering and sciences) and connecting business/economics to non-business research (Cornell Tech, Weill, agricultural and environmental sciences, psychology and behavioral sciences) has been a source of success and holds great further potential.
- All three Schools place great value in high quality teaching and emphasize student engagement and satisfaction.
- Whether or not one uses the ‘land grant tradition’ descriptor, all three Schools celebrate long-term external relationships founded on faculty commitment to achieving impact in target private and public sectors. Those relationships lead to deep engagement through alumni and corporate partners that provide access to data, funding and jobs for graduates.

Upcoming Discussions
The next major task is identifying the principles that define cross-School areas. We think of the areas as the “horizontals” that connect faculty across schools, in a matrix structure in which the three schools (Dyson, SHA, and Johnson) are the “verticals.” Then identify the areas that satisfy those principles.

After that, we aim to agree on faculty review processes appropriate to the matrix management structure and grandfathering policies suitable given whatever change in review processes is to take place in steady state.

Comments and suggestions are invited. Please contact your School representative or the co-chairs (cbb2@cornell.edu, jas83@cornell.edu) or visit http://business.cornell.edu click the “Feedback” tab and send us your contribution or query.