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1. Committee Charge, Process and Proposal

The Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) of the Cornell College of Business (CCB) was charged with the following tasks (see http://business.cornell.edu/committees/#faculty):

1. Define program areas across three schools around common curricular and scholarly interests in order to build a unified College of Business faculty. Define principles that define program areas*. 
2. Define responsibilities/authorities of program area leaders* and school deans. 
3. Articulate promotion and tenure guidelines/standards for faculty and academic staff, including grandfathering arrangements for existing faculty, clock duration (six or eight years), and annual/biennial review processes. 
4. Define processes for faculty consultation on and governance over major policy issues. 
5. Identify areas that need further work and deliberation.

The Committee members are:
- John Siliciano, Deputy Provost, co-chair
- Chris Barrett, Deputy Dean and Dean of Academic Affairs, College of Business, co-chair
- Rob Bloomfield, Noyes Professor and Chair, Faculty Policy Committee (Johnson)
- Steve Carvell, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (SHA)
- Mike Fontaine, Acting Dean of the Faculty
- Sachin Gupta, Louis Professor and Director of Graduate Studies (Johnson)
- Vrinda Kadiyali, Noyes Professor and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Johnson)
- Harry Kaiser, Gellert Family Professor and Senior Associate Director (Dyson)
- Ed McLaughlin, Tobin Professor and Senior Associate Director (Dyson)
- Pam Moulton, Associate Professor of Finance (SHA)
- Max Pfeffer, Senior Associate Dean (CALS)
- Helene Schember, Launch Preparations Manager (CCB)
- Mike Sturman, Blanchard Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Development (SHA)

In order to incorporate the valuable perspective of non-tenure track faculty, for several meetings the following individuals joined the deliberations and contributed substantively to these recommendations:
- Zeshawn Beg, Assistant Professor of the Practice (Dyson)
- Dale Grossman, Senior Lecturer (Dyson)
- David Lennox, Senior Lecturer (Dyson)
- Mark Milstein, Clinical Professor (Johnson)
- Barbara Mink, Senior Lecturer (Johnson)
- Risa Mish, Senior Lecturer (Johnson)

* The Committee has dropped the “Program Area” and “Program Area Leaders” terminology and replaced them with “Area” and “Area Coordinators” in the recommendations below.
To fulfill this charge, the Committee met frequently throughout the first four months of 2016 and received and incorporated substantial input from the faculties of the three Schools comprising the Cornell College of Business. This document describes the Committee’s proposal for key principles, responsibilities, and processes affecting faculty governance for the CCB and its component Schools.

Our proposal is structured as follows. We first present foundational principles that reflect our understanding of the intent of Cornell’s Central Administration and Board of Trustees and governance principles that provide a strong faculty voice in achieving that intent. We then describe the specific policies and processes we recommend. In Appendix A, we outline authorities and responsibilities of School Deans and Area Coordinators. In Appendix B we depict our proposed promotion and tenure review process graphically.

2. CCB Foundational Principles

The CCB was proposed by President Elizabeth Garrett and Provost Michael Kotlikoff and unanimously approved by the Board of Trustees.

The CCB was created with an explicit intent about the mission of the College: that “Each school will maintain its own identity and mission, while their collective capabilities will be strengthened by bringing together faculty, curricular offerings, and programs within a cohesive College.” Versions of this statement have appeared in all public statements about the formation of the CCB, including the initial announcement on December 14th, 2015 and announcement of approval on January 31st, 2016.

The formation of the CCB also carries an implicit intent about its structure, and particularly the structure of relationship between the CCB, its component Schools, and their faculties. At Cornell, Colleges encompassing multiple units (Schools, in this case) follow a standard process for tenure and promotion: the unit’s faculty vote on tenure or promotion, after which the unit’s leadership makes a recommendation to the College Dean, who in turn forwards a recommendation to the Provost. In this specific instance, School Deans, following a vote of the School faculty, make recommendations to the CCB Dean, who then forwards recommendations to the Provost. Because the Dyson School is a shared unit between CCB and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS), in the case of Dyson faculty, the Dean of the CCB (DCB) will serve as the Lead Dean but will consult with the CALS Dean, as per the January 2016 MOU agreed between the Provost and the Deans of CCB and of CALS.

3. CCB Principles for Governance

This proposal reflects the Committee’s attempt to fulfill the CCB’s intended mission consistent with its foundational principles. To this end, we articulate four Principles for Governance designed to ensure that the CCB Dean’s decisions about promotion, tenure, reappointment and hiring are based on the best possible information concerning faculty views, that the CCB’s administration and faculty protect the unique identities of its component Schools, and that faculty candidates have the best possible information about expectations for their performance. The principles are:
• **Continuity of School Missions and Programs**: CCB governance will respect and maintain the distinct missions of its three Schools.

• **Continuity of Faculty Expectations**: CCB governance will respect and maintain the expectations that existing faculty have been hired to fulfill in support of their School’s distinct mission.

• **Cohesion of the College**: CCB governance will encourage and facilitate cohesion across the CCB, through integration of its faculties and coordinated use of its resources.

• **Fairness of Process and Outcomes**: CCB governance will encourage and facilitate fair decision processes and fair outcomes, through broad inclusion of informed views and as much transparency as is possible given the sensitive nature of the matters under discussion.

These principles prompt our recommendation to organize CCB faculty in three distinct, complementary ways:

1. **By School** – the pre-existing Schools form the heart of the CCB, serving as the core academic units of the CCB, the homes for faculty tenure and students’ degree programs, and the primary vehicle for maintaining historically distinct missions. Because the success of the CCB depends heavily on continuity of the Schools’ missions, Schools are invested with a great deal of authority over CCB governance.

2. **By Area** – the primary discipline-based vehicle for connecting faculty with similar training and research orientation and/or teaching focus across the three Schools. To foster intra-disciplinary strength and cohesion across the CCB without detracting from the continuity of the School’s missions, Areas are invested with many opportunities to inform and advise School and CCB Deans, but not with governance authority over them. Areas also provide helpful benchmarking against peer business schools and colleges outside Cornell.

3. **By Theme** – a highly visible group of faculty, who may come from multiple Areas and Schools, whose research and/or teaching interests address multi-disciplinary challenges facing industries, sectors and society more broadly. Because Themes are meant to be dynamic and flexible, they play a limited role in formal CCB governance and curriculum coordination but play a significant role in external communications and in strategic prioritization.
4. General Policies for Tenure, Promotion, Review and Hiring

The Committee proposes the following general policies for tenure, promotion, review and hiring. The Committee lists these general policies separately from the more detailed procedures below, because we conclude that these policies are essential in upholding the intent of the CCB’s formation and the Principles of Governance articulated in Section 3 and therefore must be observed regardless of whatever specific procedures are ultimately adopted.

• The determinations of all parties in the tenure process will be governed by the University’s single tenure standard – “excellence in carrying out the responsibilities of the position and unusual promise for continued achievement” (Faculty Handbook section 2.3).

• While “excellence” serves as the overarching tenure standard, the evaluation of excellence is explicitly conditioned on “the responsibilities of the position,” which are defined by the position description into which a faculty member was recruited, the appointment letter (and any subsequent revisions or reappointments), the mission of the school as a fundamental component of the strategic direction of the CCB, and the expectations conveyed to the candidate.

• Each faculty member of the CCB will have a primary appointment in one of its three Schools, which will serve as the formal tenure home. Existing faculty will maintain their current School affiliation, absent individual approval for a change of tenure home.
  o Unless formally amended, each School will retain its current tenure clock (6 years in Dyson & SHA, 8 in JGSM).

• Each faculty member will have primary membership in one discipline-based, cross-School Area.
  o In appropriate cases, where a faculty member satisfies the disciplinary norms of a second area, a secondary Area appointment may be made with approval of the School Dean (SD), the secondary Area Coordinator (AC) and the Dean of the CCB (DCB). Faculty members holding such secondary Area appointments can vote on candidates whose primary appointment is within that area, but faculty candidates holding a secondary Area appointment are to be reviewed only with respect to their primary Area.
  o In rare cases, non-tenure track (NTT) faculty who believe their responsibilities are unique to a School may petition the SD and DCB for exemption from membership in an Area, although the general expectation is that all faculty (NTT and tenure track (TT)) will have membership in an Area so as to maximize integration across Schools.

• Consistent with the model used in multi-unit colleges, the School faculty will vote formally on reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions regarding faculty in their School. This vote will inform the recommendation of the SD, which in turn will inform the recommendation of the DCB to the Provost. In the case of the Dyson School, the recommendation of the SD will inform the recommendations of both the CALS Dean and the DCB to the Provost.
5. Detailed Governance Processes: Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure Reviews

This section proposes detailed processes for faculty governance. We present these processes separately from the general policies articulated in Section 4.

5.1. Promotion and Tenure Review Processes

- As discussed in Section 4, the determinations by all parties in the tenure review process will be conducted according to the University-wide standard of “...excellence in carrying out the responsibilities of the position and unusual promise for continued achievement” (Faculty Handbook section 2.3).
  - In order to ensure appropriate attentiveness to School mission-specific dimensions of a faculty candidate’s appointment, all external reviewers, the Area faculty, and the Faculty Advisory Committee will be given a clear description of the “the responsibilities of the position,” as they are defined by the position description into which a faculty member was recruited, the School’s unique mission and identity, the appointment letter (and any subsequent revisions or reappointment), and the expectations conveyed to the candidate in annual reviews prior to a tenure decision.
  - Tenure recommendations will be based on those criteria. Faculty are not to substitute their own judgments regarding these responsibilities, and their input instead must be based on whether a candidate has demonstrated the required excellence and unusual promise for continued achievement in relation to those responsibilities.
Each School will appoint an Internal Ad Hoc Committee (IAHC), which provides input to the School faculty prior to the tenure vote.

- The IAHC, including its Chair, is appointed by the relevant SD. When possible, the Chair of the IAHC will come from the School and Area of the candidate. The Chair of the IAHC will always come from the School of the candidate.
- IAHC consists of 3 (or 4, if necessary) faculty of higher rank. Composition includes 2 from Area (at least 1 in School, 1 outside School, when feasible) and 2 from School (1 in Area, 1 outside Area, when feasible).
- The chair and members of the IAHC are to remain anonymous to the candidate, although they may (collectively or individually) choose to reveal their identities to the candidate. The SD is the medium of communication between the IAHC and the candidate.
- The IAHC creates a list of proposed external letter writers, informed partly by names proposed by the candidate, and forwards this list to the SD, with a copy to the DCB (in the case of Dyson faculty, the list is also copied to the CALS Dean). The SD solicits the external letters requested by the IAHC.
- The IAHC (1) assembles external letters, input from the primary Area faculty, and student and advisee input, (2) conducts its independent evaluation of the candidate’s performance, and (3) provides a summary assessment of the case to the School faculty.

The tenured faculty in the candidate’s primary Area will have full access to tenure review materials (dossier and external letters of review) from the IAHC in order to inform the Area’s recommendation to the School.

- After receiving access to all review materials, the Area tenured faculty will meet to discuss the case and will subsequently provide individual, private letters to the Area Coordinator (AC) casting and explaining their vote.
- To encourage informed input, the AC may choose to prepare and distribute a summary of the dossier prior to the Area meeting or assign an Area member to do so.
- After the Area meeting, the AC will forward to the IAHC chair all the individual letters and provide a summary letter, including reporting the Area tenured faculty vote outcome, separating the outcome between votes from Area tenured faculty in the candidate’s School and the vote in each of the other two Schools.

The tenured faculty in the candidate’s School consider the entire dossier, including the input from external letter writers, the tenured Area faculty and the IAHC, prior to the School vote. Each School tenured faculty member will provide a private letter to the SD casting and explaining his/her vote.

- An individual tenured faculty member can participate in every vote pertaining to her/his role (e.g., can vote as an Area faculty member and then again as School faculty member). However, votes will be grouped and identified so they can be evaluated accordingly at subsequent levels of the review process.

The SD writes a recommendation letter to the DCB (and in the case of Dyson, jointly to the Dean of CALS). In formulating the recommendation to the DCB, the SD should
expressly address any difference in opinion between the Area and School tenured faculty.

- The DCB will request review of the dossier by the CCB Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to ensure the tenure process was appropriately followed, and in particular that the individual’s position responsibilities are being appropriately recognized in assessing whether the candidate meets the high standards of ‘excellence’ required for a positive tenure decision. The FAC will consist of two full Professors from each School appointed by DCB and will be chaired by the CCB Dean of Academic Affairs (DAA) as a seventh member. FAC appointments will be for three years, with staggered terms to ensure continuity of coverage. The FAC’s role is:
  o To ensure respect for both high standards of excellence and the particular responsibilities of the candidate’s position in the School- and Area-level processes, with due consideration of the principles of governance described above;
  o To provide institutional memory and advise the DCB on the quality of the process and the dossier, particularly as regards consistency in decision-making across Areas and Schools, much like FACTA at the Provost level; and
  o To advise the DCB on the functioning of the promotion, tenure, and reappointment processes and propose refinements if and as necessary.

- The DCB, in collaboration with the CALS Dean for Dyson faculty, writes the recommendation letter to the Provost.

5.2. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The process for promotion from associate to full professor for tenured faculty members will follow the general university guidelines for promotion and the same procedural steps as for granting of tenure. For the promotion process, all references to “tenured faculty” in the above procedures are to be replaced with “faculty with the rank of Full Professor.”

5.3. PROMOTION (NON-TENURE TRACK CANDIDATES)

Processes concerning NTT faculty with half-time or greater appointments will be similar to TT faculty to the maximum extent appropriate. Differences include the following:

- The composition of the IAHC largely mirrors that for the tenure review of TT faculty but should include at least one NTT faculty member at the appropriate NTT rank (Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, Senior Extension Associate, Senior Lecturer, or Senior Research Associate, depending on the category of NTT faculty under review).
- For NTT faculty without extension or research responsibilities (e.g., lecturers, senior lecturers, professors of practice), no external letters will be solicited. External letters are required for NTT faculty with extension or research appointments.
- There will be no formal review by Area if the DCB has approved the candidate’s request to opt out of Area membership.
• For NTT faculty members who have achieved terminal rank (Clinical Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Extension Associate, Senior Research Associate, Professor of Practice) and have been reappointed once at that rank, the School, with approval of the DCB, may adopt more streamlined processes for subsequent reviews, provided that such processes provide a reliable substantive basis for the reappointment decision with sufficient faculty involvement to fulfill Cornell’s tradition of shared governance.

5.4. REAPPOINTMENT (TENURE AND NON-TENURE TRACK CANDIDATES)

Reappointment at the same rank generally follows the same process as promotion review with the following exceptions.

• For Assistant Professors and NTT faculty with extension or research appointments, reappointment reviews follow the same process as tenure review, except that external letters are not required.
• For reappointment of NTT faculty at the highest rank (Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Associate, Senior Extension Associate, Professor of Practice, Clinical Professor), all members of the IAHC should be of at least the same rank as the candidate. The IAHC Chair will always be of higher rank.
• The DCB, in consultation with the SD (and for Dyson faculty, with further consultation with the CALS Dean), makes the final determination on reappointment.

5.5. FACULTY PERIODIC REVIEWS

The Committee’s proposed processes for periodic faculty reviews are designed to be inclusive and transparent mechanisms that encourage excellence in faculty performance, respect and maintain the position responsibilities that new faculty members are hired to fulfill, and provide a basis for subsequent fair and appropriate tenure and promotion reviews. In order to foster cohesion within the CCB, annual reporting for all CCB faculty will follow a common protocol that will include reporting on CCB-level activity outside the faculty member’s School.

The processes run as follows:

**Untenured faculty**

• All untenured faculty (TT & NTT) file annual reports each year following a CCB protocol and undergo annual reviews.
• TT faculty
  o School faculty meet to discuss each TT candidate and invite input from Area faculty, represented by the AC. Areas and Schools will typically meet separately.
  o Annual reviews are conducted by the SD, based on input from both the School and Area faculty of higher rank (FHR).
  o A written review is provided to the faculty member following the individual meeting. Both the reviewer and the reviewee sign off on the review (cycling
back and forth for revision as necessary) or note why they refuse to sign off, after which the review is filed with the DCB (and Dean of CALS in the case of Dyson School faculty).

- NTT faculty
  - Full-time equivalent (FTE) of 50% or more: process follows untenured TT faculty review.
  - NTT faculty with less than 50% FTE are reviewed by a School-specific program committee and have annual reviews conducted by the SD (or designated representative).
  - Every third year, all terminal rank NTT faculty (Clinical Professor, Professor of Practice, Senior Extension Associate, Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Associate) will undergo reviews by the SD jointly with the DAA, drawing on input from the relevant AC.

Tenured Associate Professors
- All tenured Associate Professors will file annual reports each year following a CCB protocol. School and Area Full Professors then meet (separately or jointly, as appropriate) to discuss each candidate. The candidate then undergoes annual review by the SD, based on input from both the School and Area Full Professors.
- Written reviews are provided following the individual meeting and filed with the DCB (and Dean of CALS in the case of Dyson School faculty).

Tenured Full Professors
- All tenured Full Professors will file annual reports each year following a CCB protocol and will undergo triennial reviews by the SD jointly with the DAA, drawing on input from the relevant AC. At the request of either the faculty member or the SD, a formal review can be held annually.
- Written reviews are provided following the individual meeting and filed with the DCB (and Dean of CALS in the case of Dyson School faculty).

5.6. Special Considerations Relating to Current Faculty

The Committee is fully aware that the formation of the CCB creates special concerns relating to current assistant professors – and other faculty seeking future promotion – within the three Schools. These faculty members were hired before the formation of the CCB and therefore they, and their senior colleagues, reasonably deserve assurance that the CCB tenure process will accurately account for the expectations regarding research, publication, teaching, outreach and service under which they were hired.

These issues typically have been framed in terms of the need to “grandfather” current faculty below terminal rank. After extensive discussion, the committee concluded that the term was not particularly useful in clearly defining the issue or structuring a useful solution. It is critical to note that the concerns stated above – relating to the possibility that faculty from one School
who now have a role in the promotion and tenure decisions for a faculty member in another School may not adequately understand or respect the School-specific dimension of that faculty member’s appointment – apply not only in the context of current faculty, but also can be present for faculty hired at any point in the future.

Thus, the need to insure that faculty members are fairly judged by appropriate standards is a structural issue generic to the creation and ongoing functioning of the CCB rather than simply a temporary worry that can be ameliorated through mechanical grandfathering provisions. The general tenure procedures described in Sections 4 and 5 above provide a number of important checks against this risk. These procedures emphasize that the university-wide tenure standard already defines “excellence” as the common criterion for all tenure reviews, thus negating the possibility of grandfathering any other metric for evaluation, but at the same time the standard explicitly requires that such evaluations be conducted in accordance with the “responsibilities of the position.” This firm tethering of the tenure evaluation to the specific expectations of a particular appointment obviates the need to grandfather any different substantive tenure standard for current untenured faculty. The procedures the committee has defined expect, and indeed require, that all participants in tenure processes hold to the principles of continuity of School missions and the specific expectations upon which individual faculty members are hired.

The committee does recognize, however, that there are several temporal factors that raise some concerns for current faculty below terminal rank. In particular:

- Each School will need to articulate and document performance expectations for each faculty member who comes up for evaluation. This document, expected to be brief, must be completed and approved by the SD and must be included in the tenure file at the outset in order to educate all participants in the tenure process (including external letter writers and Area faculty) of the expectations and responsibilities associated with an individual candidate’s appointment. Although it may initially require significant effort to document expectations, the process should become much less burdensome over time.
- All Schools and Areas, together with guidance from the DCB and Faculty Advisory Committee, will need to develop guidelines to ensure consistent and appropriate practices for the many procedural details, such as the content of letters soliciting external letters and the conduct and documentation of meetings to discuss cases.
- All administrators and faculty will need time to learn, internalize and live up to the principles of governance articulated in Section 3. Doing so consistently will require all of us to learn more about the missions of our sister Schools and the interests, hopes and concerns of our new CCB faculty colleagues.

These implementation and acclimation issues led the committee to recommend some process adjustments for faculty below terminal rank who are relatively near the point of formal evaluation. The committee, however, rejected as counterproductive expansive grandfathering proposals that would, for example, maintain existing School-based processes for all current faculty regardless of the time remaining before tenure evaluation. Such a restrictive process
would essentially delay the implementation of the new procedures for many years (the time it would take for all current Assistant Professors to receive tenure review, which could be a decade in the case of a Johnson candidate with an eight-year clock and multiple parental or medical extensions). This would unnecessarily forestall the critical process by which faculty in the CCB come to understand and respect the specific missions of the faculty in each of the CCB’s Schools. Moreover, any effort to maintain the functionality of the original (now legacy) review systems of the individual Schools over such an extended time period would almost certainly create new risks to existing faculty as the natural integration of CCB faculty progresses.

Consequently, the Committee recommends the following tailored provisions to address the special considerations relating to current faculty:

- For faculty coming up for promotion, reappointment and/or tenure review in AY2016-17, each School will follow its current process, with the expectation that the School will invite one faculty member from the Area but outside the School (if feasible) to serve on its IAHC and that a copy of the dossier will be provided to the DCB when the dossier is submitted to the SD (or CALS Dean, in the case of Dyson faculty). The SD (CALS Dean, in the case of Dyson faculty) will still submit the recommendation to the Provost.
- For faculty coming up for promotion, reappointment and/or tenure review in AYs 2017-18 or 2018-19, the candidate has the option to be reviewed under the new procedures or under the procedures described in the previous bullet, with the additional provision that the DCB will also submit to the provost an assessment of the tenure file. A faculty member must make this election no later than six months before submission of his or her tenure dossier for review.
- For all tenure reviews conducted under the new process, if the DCB (and/or the CALS Dean in the case of the Dyson School) reaches a negative determination following a positive recommendation by the SD, or if the CALS Dean and DCB reach opposing determinations, the standard Provost review of the file at that point (prior to the initiation of the university appeals process) will include special consideration of whether the evaluation of the candidate adhered to the standards and mission of the hiring school or the documented expectations and responsibilities of the particular candidate.

6. Hiring Processes

The Committee’s proposed hiring processes are designed to be inclusive and transparent mechanisms that encourage and facilitate the continuity of School missions and the cohesion of the CCB, while ensuring that future promotion and tenure reviews respect and maintain the position responsibilities that new faculty members are hired to fulfill. The choice of which positions to search for should also be informed by CCB strategic priorities so as to ensure full valuation of the benefits expected from positions that may benefit other Areas and Schools beyond just the primary Area and School of appointment.

The process runs as follows:
The CCB Dean will authorize faculty searches based on teaching, research, and external engagement needs, thematic strategic priorities, and funds available (and for Dyson hires, with involvement of the CALS Dean).

The CCB Dean will authorize faculty searches only after receiving input from Areas and Schools.

- The final stage of Area and School input comes from an Academic Planning Council (APC). The APC will be chaired by the DCB or designate (e.g., the DAA), with membership including all Area Coordinators and a representative from each of the three Schools, who may be the SDs or their designees.
- APC members are expected to actively solicit input from the Areas and Schools they represent. Due to the tremendous variety of hiring needs, many of which will cross both Areas and Schools, decisions on how to solicit such input are left to the judgment of the APC members.

For each search, the DCB appoints the SD of the hiring School to lead the search process.
- The SD appoints – subject to DCB approval – a search committee, typically 3 or 4 faculty. Ideally, Area and School representation on the committee mirrors that of the IAHC committee for future promotion, reappointment and tenure reviews.
  - For TT hires, this implies 2 members from the Area (at least 1 in School, 1 outside School, when feasible) and 2 from the School (1 in Area, where feasible, 1 outside Area), chaired by a School faculty member.
  - For NTT hires, this implies including one NTT faculty member of equal or higher rank.

Candidates are voted on by the faculty of both the primary appointing School and the primary Area to which the faculty member will belong. SDs can set a 24-hour window on voting, if needed for competitive purposes. The votes will be counted separately by Area and School. It is the responsibility of the SD to provide a recommendation if there is a notable discrepancy between the two votes.

The SD negotiates the offer upon approval by the DCB (and for Dyson hires, with involvement of the CALS Dean).

7. Areas

While the Schools serve as the tenure home for faculty and function as the primary mechanism for preserving and advancing the unique mission of each School, the complementary use of Areas is intended to provide a powerful mechanism to encourage and facilitate faculty integration across the CCB. The Areas are intended to supplement, rather than replace, Schools as an effective means to organize and enrich faculty interactions. To achieve this goal, Areas must be large (more than 12 faculty) and include representation from all 3 schools (with an allowable minimum of 2 schools). The Committee envisions a number of critical roles for Areas. In particular:
Areas integrate faculty around common areas of scholarship, through informal collegial interaction and formal activities (such as seminars, workshops, and research programs).

Areas coordinate undergraduate, graduate and non-degree curricula within a discipline across Schools, coordinate across public engagement activities based in disciplines, and provide scale useful for supporting specialized programs (such as Ph.D. programs).

Areas provide useful points of comparison with other peer institutions, which help the CCB emulate best practices and help prospective students and faculty to assess the strengths and fit we offer them.

That said, Areas cannot fully capture nor describe the full breadth of CCB faculty, some of which will be better captured by Themes (see Section 9 below). Furthermore, Areas can be expected to evolve over time, in composition, label and number. Allowances for such changes are made below, in section 7.4.

7.1. PROPOSED INITIAL AREAS

Following these principles, the Committee proposes that the CCB define the following disciplinary areas.

1) Accounting
2) Applied Economics and Policy
   This may include, but need not be limited to, agricultural economics, environmental and resource economics, international and development economics, real estate
3) Finance
   This may include, but need not be limited to, agricultural finance, real estate
4) Management and Organizations
   This may include, but need not be limited to, business law, entrepreneurship, human resources, organizational behavior, strategy
5) Marketing and Communication
6) Operations, Technology and Information Management
   This may include, but need not be limited to, analytics, food and beverage, information technology, management information systems, properties development and management
7) Strategy and Business Economics
   This may include, but need not be limited to, entrepreneurship, industrial organization, strategy

Areas may choose to develop sub-Areas informally for the purposes of internal organization of scholarship and teaching. Under appropriate circumstances, where the Area includes faculty from diverse disciplinary backgrounds, with the approval of the AC and the DCB, the AC will identify votes by sub-Area when the Area provides input into tenure and promotion decisions.
7.2. **Area Coordinators**

Each Area is led by an Area Coordinator (AC), who is appointed by the DCB, after seeking input from the School Deans and Area faculty. ACs report to the DAA. The DCB will seek balanced representation of ACs from each School. ACs will have three-year appointments, staggered to ensure some continuity in leadership. When a new AC is needed, the individual should come from a different School than the previous AC, when feasible.

7.3 **Process of Affiliation with Areas**

Each TT faculty member will have a primary membership in exactly one Area, and may have a secondary membership in one or more areas. See Section 4 for additional information about primary and secondary membership with regard to tenure, promotion, review, and hiring. New TT faculty searches will typically specify the primary Area of the intended candidate, though the Area may be left open for searches focused on filling interdisciplinary or thematic needs. NTT faculty have a primary membership in an Area if their teaching assignments would allow benefits from coordination with other members of the Area. However, in rare cases of NTT faculty whose teaching assignments would not allow coordination benefits and who teach exclusively in a single school, they need not be a member of any Area, with approval by SD and DCB.

Existing faculty will declare a preferred Area of primary membership and any preferred areas of secondary membership. Those who wish to affiliate with no Area or with one or more secondary Areas must provide written justification to their SD. The SDs will review declared preferences, discuss modifications with the relevant candidates and already-appointed members of the Area, and propose Area memberships to the DCB, who makes the final determination on Area membership.

Once a faculty member has been appointed to an Area, s/he may petition to switch Areas with the endorsement of the AC of the Area into which s/he proposes to newly affiliate (or to switch from secondary to primary affiliation) and of the SD. The DCB makes the final determination on changes to Area membership.

7.4 **Process of Redefining Areas or Creating New Areas**

Although the FGC has defined seven initial Areas in Section 7.1, we recognize the evolutionary and experiential aspects of these divisions. Therefore, the faculty in an Area can elect, by whatever internal voting mechanism the Area faculty choose, to propose to redefine or rename the Area. That proposal should be brought to the Faculty Policy Committee for deliberation prior to a proposal being made to the DCB. The SDs, the DCB or the FPC may also propose possible changes in Area definitions. The DCB makes the final determination on Area titles.
Proposals to create new Areas will follow a similar process. A group of faculty wishing to constitute a new Area need to document how the proposed grouping would enhance the CCB by fulfilling the roles for Areas identified above better than can be done under the prevailing configuration of Areas. That proposal should be brought to the Faculty Policy Committee for deliberation prior to a proposal being made to the DCB. The DCB will make the final determination on Area titles.

8. Faculty Policy Committee

The charge of this Committee includes the responsibility to “Define processes for faculty consultation on and governance over major policy issues.” To this end, we propose a process for the formation of a CCB Faculty Policy Committee (FPC), which will fulfill key faculty duties associated with the CCB, as authorized and imposed by Cornell’s model of shared governance. The existence of a CCB-level FPC does not alter the right of individual Schools to form their own FPCs or other mechanisms required to fulfill the faculty duties of shared governance of issues specific to their School.

To provide the FPC with the autonomy necessary to share in CCB governance, we propose election rules and a committee charge for only its initial formation. The FPC may modify, with faculty and DCB approval, its rules once initially constituted. Schools may decide whether or not to retain a School-level FPC.

Election Rules
Each School’s TT and (≥0.5 FTE) NTT faculty will vote for three FPC members from its School, two from among the TT faculty and one from among the NTT faculty, using whatever election rules the faculty of the School choose.

Charge
The initial charge of the CCB FPC is to develop bylaws governing all issues appropriate for faculty governance, including:

- Codifying (without materially changing) the policies and processes presented by the CCB Steering Committee.
- Developing rules for FPC membership, elections and operations (e.g., terms, rotations, timing, voting, meeting schedules).
- Specifying when matters are delegated to other CCB faculty committees (e.g., by granting additional powers to the FAC) and School-level faculty committees (e.g., for committees that oversee curricula and academic standards specific to one School).

9. Matters Delegated to Future Bodies

The Committee has identified a number of matters that remain to be addressed. Here is a list of particularly important ones that we propose be delegated to future bodies.
1. **Articulation of CCB Mission, Vision and Core Values**
   The Committee discussed the three Schools’ mission, vision and core values statements and drafted some material towards an initial set of statements. But needing to prioritize the topics covered in the recommendations above, we halted on the mission, vision and core values statements. CCB leadership has already convened a separate faculty/staff task force from the three Schools that is working on these now, as input into a formal CCB branding exercise in summer 2016. A representative of the CALS Dean’s office (outside of Dyson) has been invited to participate to encourage communication and synergy.

2. **Identification of Themes**
   The Committee spent significant time discussing the frequency with which faculty research coalesces along themes that cut across disciplinary (Area) and/or School boundaries. The Committee expects CCB and the Schools to continue to support - indeed, to strengthen - strategically important thematic pursuits that differentiate CCB from other leading business schools. Examples include, but are not limited to, emerging markets, innovation and entrepreneurship, food industries and systems, hospitality, real estate, sustainability, etc. In many cases this will continue to be achieved through Centers, Institutes and other interdisciplinary initiatives. Because faculty and student interest in thematic pursuits can change in unpredictable ways, the Committee recommends that formal governance responsibilities and authorities be limited to Schools and Areas.

   Themes should nonetheless help shape faculty hiring priorities. Toward that end, members of the Academic Planning Council should actively solicit input about thematic pursuits when making recommendations for new faculty searches. Themes should also help coordinate curricular and extracurricular programming that cuts across Areas and Schools and provide points of comparison with peer institutions in multidisciplinary domains beyond Areas or Schools.

   The DCB should appoint a faculty group to identify strategically important themes, following the findings of the CCB Faculty Mission and Vision Task Force.

3. **NTT Titles and Voting Rights**
   Future bodies should consider whether and how NTT titles might be harmonized across the schools. For example, should there be a cap on the percentage of faculty holding the title of Professor of Practice within each School or within CCB as a whole? We recommend that future faculty committees also advise the Dean on the scope of NTT faculty voting privileges in the CCB excluding those specifically precluded by University policy.

4. **APC, FAC and FPC will each have a standing, public schedule of monthly meetings**
   Establish details of appointments, terms, meeting schedule, etc. for each body.
5. **CCB faculty policies and procedures**
   Examine differences across Schools in effort allocations, service expectations, teaching and research support, etc.; harmonize to the degree appropriate and feasible.

6. **Should Areas have a student advising component?**
   Schools have advising specific to each degree program. Should Areas contribute to academic advising (for example, in Area-specific concentrations)? Might Areas contribute to career advising?

7. **Faculty mentoring**
   Who appoints mentors to new faculty below terminal rank? Who serves as mentors: only School faculty, only Area faculty, or a mix? What role(s) do mentors play in reviews, if any?

8. **Review of faculty governance processes and structures**
   By the end of AY2019-20, the processes and structures developed in this document should undergo thorough review by a faculty task force. Particular topics for review shall include, but need not be limited to, hiring, review, promotion and tenure processes; Area and School governance; and the role and functioning of the Faculty Policy Committee. That task force should include a CALS liaison. The task force’s review shall be advisory to the DCB but also to the Provost and Academic Deans.
APPENDIX A: Responsibilities and Authorities of School Deans and Area Coordinators

Responsibilities and authorities for School Deans
- Overall leadership of the School’s academic degree programs (curriculum, advising quality control, student satisfaction and placements, etc.).
- School faculty hiring and periodic, promotion, reappointment and tenure reviews.
- School alumni relations and fundraising.
- In conjunction with Area Coordinators: teaching assignments and quality control.
- In conjunction with DCB (and in the case of the Dyson School, with involvement as needed of the CALS Dean under the terms of the January 2016 MOU between the Provost and the Deans of CCB and CALS): manage School office/lab space, financial and staff human resources in support of School mission.
- Member of the CCB senior leadership team along with the DCB, DAA and DER.
- Member of the CCB Academic Planning Council that prioritizes faculty hiring.

Each SD has authority to create an appropriate academic leadership structure within the unit to handle these authorities and responsibilities.

Responsibilities and authorities for Area Coordinators
- Coordinate disciplinary curriculum standards and, in conjunction with School Deans, coordinate teaching assignments and provide teaching quality control within the Area across the three Schools.
- Coordinate disciplinary scholarly community activities (workshops, seminars, etc.).
- Coordinate Area faculty input in hiring and review processes.
- If the Area elects to establish sub-Areas, manage the alignment of Area faculty into sub-Areas and oversee and coordinate with sub-Area leaders.
- Member of the CCB Academic Planning Council that prioritizes faculty hiring.
APPENDIX B: Proposed Promotion and Tenure Review Process

Proposed Promotion and Tenure Process
Cornell College of Business

IAHC receives all materials, shares with Area
Area meets to discuss
IAHC solicits other input
SD solicits list and materials to IAHC
Candidate provides material and proposes list of external letter writers to SD
IAHC proposes list of external letter writers
SD names IAHC

ACvj forwards letters, summary, voting breakdown by School
IAHC assembles complete dossier, incl. summary assessment
School tenured FHR meet to discuss
School tenured FHR send letter and vote to SD
SD reviews and recommends
DCB reviews and recommends
Provost reviews and decides
Board of Trustees

IAHC action
SD/School action
Area action
College/Provost action

ACRONYMS
AC: Area Coordinator
CALS: College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
CCB: Cornell College of Business
DCB: Dean of College of Business
FAC: CCB Faculty Advisory Committee
FHR: Faculty of Higher Rank
IAHC: Internal Ad Hoc Committee
SD: School Dean

[If Dyson]

Copy of list to DCB ( & CALS Dean if Dyson)
### Acronyms and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Area Coordinator, appointed by the DCB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Academic Planning Council, reports to DCB, provides input for faculty searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>A grouping of disciplinary faculty across the three Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>College of Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>Cornell College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Affairs, CCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB</td>
<td>Dean of the CCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DER</td>
<td>Dean of External Relations, CCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson</td>
<td>The Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Faculty Advisory Committee, reports to DCB regarding promotion and tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGC</td>
<td>Faculty Governance Committee, one of seven committees formed in January 2016 to address key aspects of the CCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHR</td>
<td>Faculty of higher rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Faculty Policy Committee, an elected representative body for CCB-level policy input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAHC</td>
<td>Internal Ad Hoc Committee, reports to School Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (JGSM)</td>
<td>Samuel Curtis Johnson Graduate School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>School Dean (Dyson, SHA, Johnson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>School of Hotel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>