

**Note: Provost Bidy Martin's responses are in brackets and bolded.**

September 3, 2002

Provost Bidy Martin  
300 Day Hall

Dear Provost Martin:

As you recall, the University Faculty Senate meeting on 10 April 2002 passed a motion, by vote of 64-1-3, that was clear cut and precise in its focus on the administration of the Computer Science Department. The motion contained the following three points (in their original numbering).

“(7) Be it resolved, therefore, that the Faculty Senate requests that concrete steps be taken to begin immediately the process of locating the Computer Science Department in accordance with the Garza Agreement, with this process to be completed by October 2002.

(8) Be it resolved further, that this implementation will assure that the dean(s) in whose college(s) the Computer Science Department would be located will play the traditional roles in determining Computer Science Department faculty hires, promotions, salaries, etc., i.e., activities that deans normally engage in at Cornell.

(9) Be it resolved further, that the Provost is requested to report to the Senate at its next meeting in May, and again in October, regarding progress made in this regard.”

CAPP wishes to inform the Senate as to the extent of compliance with these requests. It appears from your letter of 4 August 2002 that you have complied with request (7) in that,

*“President Rawlings and I are pleased to announce the administrative arrangements for the Department of Computer Science and the Faculty of Computing and Information Science.”*

In looking ahead to your reporting to the Senate in October 2002, as requested in (9), CAPP identified a number of issues that make it difficult to discern compliance with (8). Given the confusion that attended even a rather clear statement in the Garza Agreement concerning CS being in one or more of the existing colleges, the significant ambiguity in the letter of 4 August needs to be reduced. Your letter of 4 August had four paragraphs of which we focus only on the second and third paragraphs. The second paragraph concerned individual CS faculty members, while the third paragraph concerned the Department of Computer Science and the Faculty of Computing and Information Science.

Regarding the second paragraph, we ask for clarification of the following:

(1) The first sentence asserts that every faculty member in CIS “will be appointed in and have his or her tenure home in one of the existing colleges.” **[Provost Martin response: not CS, CIS.]** This largely repeats a clear Garza Agreement sentence. Unfortunately, the Garza Agreement sentence needed clarification, as shown by point 8 of the Senate resolution. Your second sentence confuses matters when it asserts that “faculty members will be appointed jointly in the College of Engineering and the Faculty of Computing and Information Science”. There is an implication of parallelism between the Faculty of Computing and Information Science and an existing college. Furthermore, FCIS was envisioned as a campus-wide collection

of faculty and this can only succeed if all members are equal. Embedding a department in FCIS impairs the standing of the necessary members from other areas across the university.

**[Provost Martin response: Will take time to increase size.]**

(2) The third sentence notes that "processes will follow college guidelines."

Can you clarify this by saying explicitly that the processes will be conducted under the authority of the Engineering College, as would then be consonant with the Senate resolution?

**[Provost Martin response: Yes.]**

(3) What does it mean for the Dean for CIS to be "integrally involved in those processes" if they are to be conducted by the Engineering College? Consonance with the Senate resolution would need you to clarify this as the Dean for CIS being consulted in an advisory capacity.

**[Provost Martin response: Yes. Now being refined by Deans Fuchs and Constable.]**

Regarding the third paragraph, we ask for clarification of the following:

(4) How does a department belong and report to both the College of Engineering and the Faculty of Computing and Information Science? As the FCIS is not a college, how can a department belong to it? This part of your letter recreates the situation of ambiguous authority that the Senate resolution attempted to correct.

**[Provost Martin response: Details currently being worked out by Deans Fuchs and Constable.]**

(5) Does the Dean of Engineering appoint the Chair of CS and determine the details of the SIP?

**[Provost Martin response: Appointment made jointly.]**

(6) No mention is made of which dean controls the budget for the Department of Computer Science, although conformity to the Senate resolution would have the control vested in the dean of an existing college.

**[Provost Martin response: Dean of CIS with transparency for Dean of Engineering.]**

(7) Having an academic department as a member of CIS or FCIS is a marked departure from the terms in which they were previously discussed and established. Our understanding of the FCIS was that its members were to be selected as individuals and not as members of a particular unit.

What is intended by this? **[Provost Martin response: Governing of FCIS under review.]**

It would be helpful if you could find time to discuss these issues with CAPP prior to the October Senate meeting at which these matters will be reported.

#### Committee on Academic Programs and Policies

Jennifer Gerner, Chair

Terrence Fine

Mildred Warner

Christine Ranney

George Hudler

Trevor Pinch

Bud Tennant

Martijna Briggs

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of Faculty, ex officio

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary of the Faculty, ex officio