

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

October 20, 1999

Speaker Pro Tem Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "We are two people short of a quorum as of the last count. Is there somebody here, who is not a Senator, who is willing to go make a couple of phone calls to senators who are not here? Yes, we do have a volunteer. (Applause.) Pick someone you know and call. Now before we convene for a formal debate, Terry Fine had something for Good and Welfare. I think we might have a quorum now. (Laughter and Applause.) No, we're still two short. I miscounted. Well, anyway, let's start with the Good and Welfare and then we'll see where we are with the quorum."

1. GOOD AND WELFARE

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "This item really grows out of Motion 5, which was defeated. We're not bringing back the motion, but you will recall that the motion was defeated soundly. I noticed that the opposition was divided; some wanted stronger requirements and others wanted weaker ones. CAPP didn't have the sense of the body that we could communicate to the Task Force, the Provost, etc. So what I'm proposing to do is not to bring the motion back (because that is done with) but to give you a chance to express yourselves in more detail. That is, to take the essence of this, point B, to have a stronger point A and a weaker point B, which before the vote was between a point B and point C. I was wondering if I could get from you a straw poll, not a motion, nothing binding, something in which you could express yourselves in regard to the acceptability of A, B, or C, so that we have some information we could give the rest of the world about what was said about this role. That is the plot. You may not want to proceed with it. You may want to change the wording of the alternatives to make them more compatible, and I see a hand raised back there. Basically, they are University-and college-wide and, if not that, then departmental or nothing at all. I was hoping to get some clarity about what the Senate thinks on this issue by giving three alternatives. If you agree to do this, you may even vote for more than one; they're not in opposition necessarily."

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research Center: "I just wondered if a D might be 'none of the above.' It would be a free range of choice for those who want nothing to be done from those who want to voice opinions."

Professor Fine: "Sure, D, 'none of the above.' Peter?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Peter?"

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I'm not very happy with this procedure. It's not very clear to me what the difference is between a straw vote and a Senate resolution, since

the Senate resolution is only a straw poll. We recommend that people do things, whether we do it officially or if we do it by straw poll. I'm much happier with our usual procedures where we circulate it in advance, people get a chance to look at it and think about it. There's a perfectly normal way, according to Robert's Rules, of doing what you're talking about. Namely, you have A as the main motion and you have someone propose B as a substitute motion, and you have someone propose C as a substitute motion for that. Then they're voted on sequentially and the body expresses its opinion formally. I don't have any objection to deciding on one of these three, but I think it should be done formally, using Robert's Rules, with a quorum and the group officially making a statement with proper notification."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Well, nothing officially is being done so we don't need to have a quorum present. This is under the rubric of 'Good and Welfare' even though we're doing it at this point. Dean Cooke?"

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "This was discussed by the University Faculty Committee and we decided that CAPP is not trying to persuade you to come to a different vote. If they wanted to do that, they would have another motion to reconsider and try to change peoples' minds. They're not trying to change peoples' minds; they just want to find out the message that was sent. So it's an entirely informal thing. It could be done by campus mail, e-mail, etc. Since the 'Good and Welfare' was a time to discuss things we thought we could bring it in this way. We can certainly be hard-nosed and do it the hard way, but it didn't seem necessary to the committee."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Professor Cook?"

Associate Professor Kerry Cook, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "I think that this would be an interesting and useful thing to do and information that the Computing and Information Task Force might like to have. I would like to see it done, like Professor Stein, with a little more time so that people can think about it or talk with their departments to get feedback via e-mail, in time to go into the final Task Force Report, which will come out around November 1."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Professor Fine?"

Professor Fine: "Well, we did have a discussion. This was on the agenda last week, so I think that there was ample time for discussion. There was debate on this issue. This is not a new issue. This is just an attempt to clarify the meaning of the vote."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, sir?"

Seymour Smidt, Nicholas H. Noyes Professor of Economics and Finance: "Since it would take about three minutes to do, instead of talking about it for twenty minutes, why don't we just go ahead and do it? People who don't want to vote don't have to."

Professor Elizabeth Earle, Plant Breeding: "I'd like to ask Terry what use is going to be made of the outcome of the vote? Is it going to be presented somewhere as the opinion of the faculty or will it just be for the Task Force internally?"

Professor Fine: "I guess it will be in the Public domain. The Task Force will know the outcome too. We're not bringing any motion out again. This is just to get the Senate's current thinking on the issue."

Dean Cooke: "Are we still waiting for a quorum?"

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "A quorum has arrived because the Chair has decided that the Provost counts as a part of the quorum."

Don Randel, Provost: "I'm really on this list." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "His name is there."

Provost Randel: "I promise not to vote on anything." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair confirms the quorum and that we will start as soon as we finish this. Yes?"

Associate Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I think that this is an interesting idea. If there weren't a Knight Writing program, probably we would have a higher percentage of faculty teaching in it so I think we might need some time to think about this amongst ourselves before taking the vote."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Let's see how many people here who are Senators are willing to vote on this issue now? How many do not want to vote on this issue now but are willing to express their votes later? Okay, the nays have it, but the Chair will rule that because all CAPP wants to do is get a rough idea of what the faculty thinks about this, that Senators should consult with whomever they wish to consult with and send an e-mail to Professor Fine with the information."

Dean Cooke: "Soon, before the deadline."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, as soon as possible. One more comment?"

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "Yes, Terry, if you e-mail that to me I will consult with my colleagues, collect an opinion and send it to you."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Let's use the list serve. Thank you all. Now let's move on to the formal consideration of the one item that is on the agenda, which is the remaining motion from last week. This was the last of the motions that we considered last week. Normally Professor Fine would introduce the motion, but he just suggested to me that he would defer to the one offered amendment by Professor Michael Todd. Once that is disposed of he will speak to the main motion. So I call on Professor Todd to introduce his amendment."

3. AMENDMENT TO MOTION 6

Michael Todd, Leon C. Welsh Professor of Engineering: "I just thought that in view of the rationale given here and the names of the individuals being urged to rethink it that it would make sense to change the phrase, 'its role in the College of Engineering' to 'its roles in the Colleges of Engineering and Arts and Sciences.' It's a minor change, but if you look through the rationale, that's what is being asked."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Is there a second? (Someone called out a second) Yes?"

Professor Anton: "Move to call the question." (Laughter.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair will not take that question because there has been no debate. Let me make sure that there is no interest in debating this. Is there anyone who wishes to speak to this amendment? Seeing none, we will move to the vote. Yes?"

Charles Van Loan, J.C. Ford Professor of Engineering and Chair of Computer Science Department: "I didn't want to go first."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "This is on the amendment?"

Professor Van Loan: "I don't know any of the rules."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "This is strictly on the amendment to add the words 'College of Arts and Sciences' to the resolution."

Professor Van Loan: "No, I wanted to talk about the main motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Okay. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, we will move to a vote on the amendment. All in favor of the amendment, say 'Aye.' All opposed, say 'Nay.' (The amendment was unanimously passed.) Now we will move to the main motion and I recognize Professor Fine."

3. MOTION 6 CONCERNING COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

Professor Fine: "I assumed the amendment would pass. (Laughter.) This motion really addresses an important issue namely what has happened to the management of Computer Science over the spring and summer, particularly over the summer, that was described in a memo from the Provost dated August 19. In many ways, the Computer Science Department was detached administratively from the College of Engineering, where it had been housed for many years. Whether that will also be an intellectual detachment is yet to be seen. We felt that this was far too important an issue for the process by which it was carried out. Many of us learned about this after the fact. There was not an open discussion of it and it impacted very many people. This motion itself is about as peaceful as one could bring on this issue. It asks to rethink carefully. The rationale has stronger opinion, but the motion just asks that this be reconsidered and reconsidered collaboratively&endash;not that these four people go and think about it individually because that would not accomplish a lot, but that it be done collaboratively. If they all went into their individual closets, the one who makes the decision then makes the decision again. The point is that this thing be done in a cooperative way. This is the motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Thank you very much. Let me just remind the body that no photos or tape-recordings of the meeting are allowed and that visitors are allowed to speak but only members of the Senate may vote on the resolution. This is the single item on the agenda today so the floor is open for debate and discussion."

Professor Jerry Stedinger, Civil and Environmental Engineering: "I'll go before Charlie. It seems to me that there are fundamentally two issues. One is the concern over how this particular concern was reached and this motion doesn't really address that. It's a shame that there wasn't more debate before that decision was reached, but hopefully that will change in the future on such decisions. This motion addresses the quality of that decision and whether the decision was appropriate, and as the language at the end points out, expresses a high level of discomfort with the decision that was made. That is why it is being asked to be rethought. The Provost came to this meeting and said to us and to CAPP in writing that there were problems with his transferring of resources to Computer Science because of the demands that they had and that is why he separated the department from the Engineering College's administration. This University has many colleges and dozens of departments and they have different resource needs. If when these sorts of problems come up, the solution is to remove departments from colleges and treat them in special ways, then the whole management of the University will become impossible. It seems to me that any problems he has in getting resources transferred need to be resolved without reorganizing the University. Thank you."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Further comments?"

Professor Van Loan: "Forgive me for getting up too early. I want to argue that we should defeat this motion. It sounds great that everyone should rethink everything, and

we should lead examined lives, and I hope that the President and Provost constantly rethink things, but the rethinking process has gone on too long, for several months now. In the last few months, I've heard the phrase *fait accompli* probably a hundred times. I don't think that the debate has been stifled. I think that there has been anger but also constructive criticism about the proposed structure. There's a line in the rationale that the debate was distorted, and I strongly disagree with that. To me, the Task Force Report is just a bunch of blueprints, a bunch of possible blue prints that were tossed on the table. We can quibble about who was on the committee and the timing of things but basically, these are blueprints. The devil is in the details and I think that the process has been satisfactory. We have clarified our thinking about the FCI and made some adjustments as to how we approach things. I think that this is exactly what campus-wide debate is all about. The idea, the feeling, and I don't want to speak for the Provost because he's here, but the feeling is that no matter how this pans out, a lot of new resources are going to be required and they are going to have to be administered from the Provost's Office directly.

"The second thing I want to talk about in the rationale is the fact that CS might be too dominating a partner in this. If you think of the FCI and our department a unit inside of it, I can certainly see that it looks like we're trying to control the whole show. The view I have of the FCI is where the Dean of CIS engenders new projects around campus, on one side and CS on the other side. Some of our faculty members may choose to participate in it just like some of your faculty members might choose to participate in it, and we do so coming to the table from different viewpoints. You do want the close proximity to CS research to these undergraduate developments and we bring that to the table; the people in other departments bring other things. You can say we're equal partners -- but different. I want to argue for that, for a single dean who speaks to all of this stuff. If you subtract us from that then you're looking at a center and I think we get hurt because of that. I like the idea, and I'm prejudiced, of having a dean at the campus-wide level articulating campus-wide thought on CIS at the Dean's level. I like that idea and I think it's beneficial. You want to coordinate resources as a department, there's the FCI. If you're a cynic, you can think about competition or whatever. The other standpoint is coordination and through this single person perhaps we can get outside resources at a higher level. I'm giving my interpretation here.

"Another very important thing is the keeping the structure of the department's integrity. We have a mission like you do, basic research, innovative teaching, and so on. As you probably are aware, we have undergone some difficulty in retaining faculty and recruiting faculty simply because the industrial level out in the world is so plush. We can't compete with the same salary as them, just forget that, but we can compete in terms of having a great environment. It's not just the department, it's not just the collegiality among us thirty, it's the overall landscape. I would hope that the FCI can cover that landscape beautifully so that when faculty come, they not only see a strong department, but unprecedented opportunities for collaboration in digital arts, digital

libraries, computational biology, graphics, etc. All of these many enterprises will help us to recruit and keep the department strong. I see the integrity of CS being preserved by the FCI, not threatened, by this new arrangement.

"Next, there's the issue of whether the Engineering College is hurt about this move. Let me just give you a historical perspective. Now, I'm not a historian, all I did was get a hold of Morris Bishop's, *A History of Cornell*, and look up in the index two departments — Electrical Engineering and Chemical Engineering. The fact is to me that fields grow up. Go back to the 1880s, electrical engineering was born of physics. They started with a course, then there was a proposal for a four-year program. The person who clinched all of this was Robert Henry Thurston, who was the director of the Sibley School of Mechanical Engineering in the College of Arts and Sciences. Incidentally, when the trustees balked at his idea of a four-year program in electrical engineering — the Provost might react to this differently -- A.D. White offered to pay out of his own pocket the additional funds needed. (Laughter.) I just looked this up in that really great book.

"In the early part of this century, within chemistry, we start to see technical courses and some professors got upset because they felt that chemistry was becoming too technical and not scientific enough. The president at the time, Jacob Gould Schurman, actually proposed a College of Chemistry as a way of reconciling this tension between the technical and scientific. Curiously enough that never got anywhere because there was no endowment. And this is what is really interesting to me, the College of Engineering, which was about 12 years old, formed a one-year Master's program for graduates of chemistry to get into engineering. Then in 1938, Chemical Engineering became a department. What is the point of all of this? Where would EE and ChemE be today if not for the adventurous spirits of a couple of bold administrators? Where would they be? EE could not grow up in Physics, it became too big. ChemE could not grow up in Chemistry, it was too different. So, the point I'm suggesting is that this change goes back a hundred years. Yes, it's novel but I bet that in fifty years from now it will just be a big change that comes along in the University's life. When the Engineering College was formed in 1921, who would have believed that there would be a Department of Operations Research? Who would have believed that there would be an AEP or a Materials Sciences or a Computer Science Department? The fact is that it was great for getting together and in the structure these fields could develop in a natural and unfettered way. That is absolutely critical. Who would have believed that the Sibley School would drop the 'Mechanical Arts' from their name? Who would have believed that EE would add 'Computer Engineering' to theirs, which apparently is in the cards and is great? So, I guess my point that we don't know where things are going. That's the history of this place. The fact is, CS had a happy home in Engineering for twenty years, but we grew up too. We still have a lot of Engineering ties, but a lot of other things are happening like e-commerce, graphics, computation biology, and the libraries. We're not spoiled children who are ungrateful of our home. We like Engineering; it's just that we

see a larger mission for us and the University and we want to play that and we want to do it unfettered without the constraints that Engineering has. It doesn't mean that we don't like Engineering or that we have any intention of dropping those research or teaching connections.

"Let me conclude that the ties that bind us are the research ties and the classroom ties, not the administrative or reporting lines. That's why the new structure in the 1880s worked for EE, why at the beginning of the century they worked for ChemE, and why I think they will work for us. Thank you." (Applause.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Other comments? Yes, sir."

Professor Louis Billera, Mathematics and Operations Research and Industrial Engineering: "I'm not in the Senate, but I've been a part of the faculty of Cornell for over thirty years. I spent most of that time in Engineering, but I've also spent the past 10 or 15 years in Arts and Sciences, so I've seen both sides of the story and in particular, I've been a neighbor of Computer Science from both sides. One thing that I find so surprising is how, given what Charlie said, he can't believe that Engineering could adapt to the realities of Computer Science. When I was an undergrad in an Engineering school forty years ago, I remember looking at yearbooks, the ones that were about thirty years old, and I was surprised to see what they were doing in the 1930s. They were doing railroading and nobody would believe an Engineering College wouldn't do railroading. The point is that the technology evolves and the idea of taking out of the Engineering College the core of modern technology seems really unreasonable. It leaves Engineering somewhere in the backwater. I am speaking in favor of this motion because this business needs to be rethought a bit. In recent years, we've seen several cross-cutting departments being formed. Statistics was the first which has the mission of giving degrees in lots of colleges, and then a few weeks ago in this room, the Arts College talked about a degree in Atmospheric Science, which would then be a three-college major, and now we have Computer Science. One of the difficulties with cross-cutting disciplines is that they tend to cut off at the knees people who are standing in the traditional way. There is a lot of business that goes on in a college that I don't see picked up by these ventures. In particular, Charlie talked about the research and teaching aspects of their mission. Another aspect of the mission that I realized when I first got here was that advising was a big part of what we do and I don't see any discussion in any of this as to who is going to advise the various majors in these cross-cutting departments when they are not in the various colleges. I know for a fact, after being in a neighboring department of Computer Science, that they don't, or at least at the various times that I asked, advise freshmen and sophomores, and I don't believe there has been a change as they move out of these colleges. I first learned this twenty years ago in Engineering when I found myself with a lot of CS wannabes. I asked most recently this spring in Arts & Sciences when I had a similar situation. It seems to me a little unreasonable at Cornell to set up a department that has as its role only the last two

years of undergraduate study. It seems completely against anything that I've been led to believe about what Cornell stands for. That's why I think that this needs to be rethought."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Is there any further discussion? Professor Stein?"

Professor Stein: "Believe it or not, this is an issue on which I do not have an opinion. (Laughter.) It may be the only issue at Cornell on which I do not have an opinion. But, I am sort of unhappy about this resolution. I didn't like it last week; I don't like it this week and, in a certain sense, I'm unhappy with the whole debate. I was talking to my colleague Rich Galik this morning and trying to say what was making me so unhappy and one thing is that this whole debate is going on at two very different levels. One is a very high, intellectual level, like 'what is the future of knowledge? How should knowledge be organized?' We passed the first motion, so we all agree that we have the Information Revolution and the question now is 'who belongs in the Information Revolution college?' Computer Science? Physics has a department lunch every Monday and we had a discussion about whether there was any real difference or fundamental divide between the purest of theoretical physics and computation and the answer was no. I thought maybe we, the Physics Department, belong in this and maybe the Government Department or Art. We're talking about a massive reorganization whose dimensions we don't understand. It's not clear to me what those boundaries are and why some disciplines should be involved and others not or not as much.

"We never talked, in this room, about the other level until Jerry Stedinger brought it up. We talked about it with people outside, and the issue wasn't the high level; it was the kinds of things that go unsaid in polite company. It was about how various administrators and faculty members have reacted. Are they trustworthy? Are deans, provosts, and faculty members trustworthy? When people have talked to me in private they say that this is the real reason and this is what they are talking about. I don't know. I have no opinion whatsoever but it upsets me a bit to vote on a resolution that is about type 2 issues masked under type 1 issues, which is what I sense we are doing. In the end, we get the most toothless, meaningless resolution I ever saw in my life. Before Terry put in the word 'together,' it had zero meaning whatsoever and now maybe it has more.

"In fact, I don't think we have a very good history with resolutions that ask the central administration to do things. I read through our minutes of the Senate last year. We passed five resolutions that were very clear to the central administration, asking them to do things. I can tell you that on four of those resolutions we never heard what happened and the fifth one was to not dissolve the Division of Biological Sciences before a certain meeting was held and that happened, so that resolution affected matters. On the other four, we didn't hear anything. Those four were clear and here I don't know what we're asking the administration to do. Even if they wanted to

cooperate with our request, what are they going to do? Are they going to have a meeting of these four people? Is that it? They'll have a meeting for an hour and they'll say, 'Well, I think we should do it' and someone else will say, 'Well I don't think we should do it' and they'll say, 'Well, that was a good meeting' and they will have conformed with the Senate's request. I have no idea exactly what we're directing people to do and we're talking about a very important issue that has to do with the whole structure of the colleges and the University, but that's not why we're doing it. We're doing it because of personality conflicts, which aren't talked about openly, and we sum it up with a resolution that doesn't mean anything and that sort of makes me unhappy."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would prefer to recognize, at this point, someone who wishes to speak in favor of the motion. Professor Fine, I'm not going to call on you until other people, who have not been recognized yet, get an opportunity to speak. Yes, sir."

Associate Professor David Grubb, Materials Science and Engineering: "I will speak in favor of the motion. I would like to reply to Charlie Van Loan's remarks, but they're really too extensive to reply to. Let me just say that a lot of them don't seem to be directed at the motion. A lot of that is about the FCI and whether it stood as a *fait accompli* or some magnificent new structure. That's not part of the motion. The motion is quite restricted, maybe even too restrictive, but it still has merit. The restriction is to the management of the Computer Science Department not whether they should be a large faculty of computer, computational, and information scientists. A lot of that stuff was good, but not relevant. Then we heard that Computer Science needs to burst its bounds, just like Chemical Engineering needed to burst its bounds. Computer Science has gone a good deal further, it's a department that is now too big to be in a college, whereas the others were subgroups too large to be in another department. That's a little different. I don't think that those analogies were useful although they were great fun."

Professor Van Loan: "Well, can I say one thing? I think . . ."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair did not recognize you. Professor Grubb, are you finished?"

Professor Grubb: "No, I was just interrupted. (Laughter.) That is not really valuable. I was actually in favor of a stronger motion and I represent the Engineering Policy Committee, which met and discussed this many times over the past couple of months, and they had a similar motion. They also had a solution. They said that perhaps after settling down all of the issues, perhaps Computer Science could go back to its original form to be part of Arts and Sciences and Engineering, that way it widens its reach and is not cut off from anyone. This has been done already with Geology and ABEN, they are bi-college departments. It's not a strange thing, unlike what has now been created."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would recognize someone opposed to the motion. Yes, sir."

Dean Robert Constable, Computing and Information Sciences: "I was the chairman of Computer Science for the past six years and I would like to correct a point of fact about Lou Billera's remarks. It is the case that Computer Science advises freshmen and sophomores in both colleges. Right now, there is a formula that determines the number of freshman advisors you supply that depends on the number of majors you have. Since the CS Department has the largest number of majors in the College, that formula does not require CS to provide freshman advisors because they have so many majors. They have provided them in the past in both colleges. Lou, that point is not to be taken for or against; it's incorrect."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would recognize someone who has not spoken yet on either side. If not, the Chair will recognize people who have spoken. Yes, sir."

Professor Vavasis: "I'm speaking against the motion because I originally had thought about a possible amendment and talked to Terry about it last week because the Senate voted just last week that the Dean of CIS would be a position coordinating resources and it seemed strange that the Dean of CIS wasn't included in the resolution. Then I thought that the Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences should be there too because Computer Science is trying to reach out to our colleagues in biology and we already have a program in place for that. That was my original plan but then I realized that if that group of people got together and met, they might meet for a while, but in the end they would decide on the status quo. Meanwhile things are happening in Computer Science. Microsoft is trying to steal our faculty, and I'm not kidding, and we're competing with MIT and Stanford for graduate students but we may not get them if there is uncertainty about the department. If this motion passed, it would delay decisions and in the end nothing would change. That's why I'm speaking against it instead of offering an amendment. Another reason to vote against it is if you look around you you'll see unfamiliar faces, most of them are my colleagues from Computer Science. At our meeting, we talked about this and were essentially unanimously against the motion. Since the motion is about our department, I would ask fellow Senators in other departments to take into account feelings of the faculty who are most affected by the motion, us."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes, sir."

Associate Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "I'm not one of those people who is affected by the motion, but I am struck by a few things. One is that I noticed, as Peter Stein has mentioned, how many motions we have made that haven't been followed up by the central administration or, at least, not in a way that we heard. I'm also struck by the sense that I'm hearing from the College of Engineering that this move

is going to hurt them as a college substantially. I'm not convinced that the central administration has sufficiently considered the views of the College of Engineering and I'm not sure where Arts and Sciences stands on this. The sense I'm getting is that this is a very important part of what makes the College of Engineering who they are and has helped them achieve the standing they have achieved in terms of international reputation. I think that those colleges that are affected should be at the table in discussion and I'm speaking in favor of the motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Is there any further debate? Professor Ahl?"

Professor Frederick Ahl, Classics: "Just a very simple observation to make, it may be germane to the discussion but I'm not sure that I share Peter's fuzziness about what the precise effect of the motion would be. It seems worrying to me, however, that one would separate off, at this crucial juncture, Computer Science as a separate entity at a time when what is happening in computers affects every facet of the University. Even in an area as obtuse and obsolete, and I'm sure the Provost is noting this, as Classics (Laughter) that there is computer use in ways that would surprise people who think we only work with rare books and manuscripts in the library. There is a desperate need in all areas for much greater computer literacy. In other words, this is fundamental to the entire educational process. Therefore, I find it strange to see Computer Science become a separate entity, admittedly with connections, of the University. I sense that it is completely distinct. Somehow, I suppose, even though I'm not sure I understand the motion, I would vote for it on those grounds."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Is there any other debate? Professor Cook?"

Professor Cook: "I'm not a Senator, but I am a UFC member and a member of the CIS Task Force. I'd like to speak, however, also from my discipline. I'm in the Ag College and I am a computation fluid dynamicist and I wanted to remind you all that computing is used at all levels throughout this University and I would use the same arguments that Professor Ahl used to argue against the motion because I feel that bringing computing up to a University level will help facilitate teaching, interdisciplinary research, and outreach to all of the colleges. I see this reorganization facilitating that and I would like to speak against the motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Would anyone else like to speak for the motion who has not yet spoken? Yes?"

Donald Greenberg, Jacob Gould Schurman Professor: "I am in computer graphics in the business school and Architecture, Art, and Planning, and I hope that this will be my new home. I want to speak with respect to the breadth and the need for computer education because I've gone through thirty years of advising students in various disciplines such as literature, psychology, architecture, art, theatre design, and so on,

and none of these have much to do with the Engineering College. I'm not including the electrical engineers, the computer scientists, and the operational researchers. This is the first time that if this happens, there will be a dean speaking on behalf of what the entire University needs at the freshman and sophomore level. I can guarantee that if we opened up options to what would be minors in this field in every single department in this University so that students could set up a minor in whatever we call this entity, we will open up options for these graduates for the next two decades. I think that this is the best move that the University has made and I want to give the administration a lot of credit for making it." (Applause.)

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair would remind the body not to have any indications of demonstrations. Is there anyone who wishes to speak further who has not spoken? Yes?"

Associate Professor Keshav Pingali, Computer Science: "I've heard a lot of comments from my Engineering colleagues about how this move is going to really hurt the Engineering College, but they have not specified how this move will hurt them. I've heard statements that we're not going to advise freshmen anymore, but we've been advising them all along and I don't see any reason why that should change. And just because we've been moved out of the Engineering College, it doesn't mean that our offices will not be on the Engineering Quad or that we will not be doing research in Engineering. This is more of a question for my colleagues in that could they be more specific regarding how this move will affect them negatively? I realize that we're probably the highest rated department in the college, but we will still count for all the national rankings, so I'd like to know in what other ways Engineering will be hurt."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Is there anyone who wishes recognition who has not yet spoken? Seeing none, the Chair would say that anyone who said something before may speak again. Does anyone wish to do so? Or could we move to a vote? Professor Fine."

Professor Fine: "In this matter, my cup is totally overflowing. Most of what was said was not to the point. The rationale raised a lot of issues, but the rationale is not what is up for vote. For that reason, the rationale is covered. The motion is up for vote. Professor Van Loan brought up in his discussion the FCI. The Senate expressed itself on the FCI in motion 4, where it did not indicate support for the FCI. That is not the issue before us, not the role of CS or the FCI. Insofar as addressing the FCI, we did that already. He raised historical issues but we're not talking about creating a new department. This isn't 1965; it's almost the year 2000. We created a Department of Computer Science many years ago. It's not an analogue to what happened to Electrical Engineering or Chemical Engineering. Not everything having to do with computing is the property of Computer Science, and that is why you find it throughout the University. People are doing it everywhere and they're doing it without a 'by your leave' from the Computer Science department. And, by the way, I was wrong when I

said that the Web came out of physics. It did come out of CERN, but Tim Burnersley was a computer person in CERN. The point is what does the Computer Science Department do, what are its core competencies and how can they best be preserved and enriched?

"That is not a trivial issue. The importance of intellectual reach is an important issue and one that I am doubtful was properly considered because the people who were involved in this construction beforehand did not involve any people from the Engineering College. It was done very much as an in-group thing, by the now Dean of Computing and Information Sciences and members of the Computer Science Department. They're quite happy with what happened. Well, why not? I'm afraid that my joke about this has been to cast Dean Constable as Moses, the Computer Science Department as the Chosen People, the Engineering College faculty are the Egyptians, Dean Hopcroft is the Pharaoh, slavery is teaching and advising, Manna from heaven is being dispensed by, well I won't anoint him anymore than he already is, but one would choose to remind the Chosen People what their eventual history was. (Laughter.) They've come here whether they are Senators or not, to speak on behalf of it. Of course they would, there is a great deal in it for them as it is currently constituted. They have a direct line to resources -- they are being showered with resources -- and perhaps appropriately; that is not to be resolved by this motion. That is not being addressed and it is not for us to argue here. That there is need to have this thing considered is very important.

"Now, this is not about the position of a Dean of CIS. In motions 2 and 3 we supported that. We did not support the FCI in motion 4. Those issues were already treated by the Senate and do not have to be revisited here. What seems to me to be beyond issue is that a move of this magnitude, removing a department from a college in this fashion, does need to have a careful, thorough, and open examination.

"When we talk about current events, this is not particularly the trend of the present. We just had a visitor from Berkeley, a peer institution, who told us how there used to be separate EE and CS departments and how they were forcibly put together against their will and how, today, he feels that was an excellent move. What happened here is not the wave of the future, but in any event, that is not what you're being asked to consider. You're not being asked to consider if this was right; you're being asked to consider if it needs consideration."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Further comments? Yes, sir."

Assistant Professor Gregory Morrisett, Computer Science: "We have a term called 'no-op,' which means instruction that does nothing and while I agree with the comments you just made, this resolution doesn't really say anything. It doesn't have any teeth one way or another. I think that's enough to perhaps consider a different resolution."

(Someone called out "Question.")

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The question has been called. Does anyone else wish to say anything further. Yes, sir."

Professor Billera: "Just something about my comments. The Dean of Freshman in Arts and Sciences told me last March that there were no freshman advisees from Arts and Sciences in Computer Science. Former chairs Hartmanis and Hopcroft also told me the first time I asked about whether there were freshman advisees that they don't do that because they were too busy and this was in the years when there were 27 majors. Currently, the number of majors that they handle, 180 a year, is per capita probably what the OR Department has always had. The issue of their extraordinary workload has to be thought about a little bit and that is why I support this motion."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "Yes sir?"

Professor Van Loan: "Terry, I think that if the rationale said that we've had productive discussions and progress has been made, if it was cast in a positive note, that it is not a *fait accompli* and it is an ongoing process and it's not as if we're going to turn everything over to the Provost and President and be done. This is going to take years to build and I would say that the last four months have been a wonderful experience for me and others. The rationale for this is very negative and tells the President and the Provost that they made a mistake for these reasons. It is on that basis that I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Pro Tem Norton: "The Chair sees no one else wishing to take the floor and will therefore assume that you are ready to come to a vote. The Chair would ask Professors Rasmussen and Obendorf to serve as tellers. Remember that only Senators can vote, I know that there are a lot of visitors here. All those in favor of this motion please raise your hands. All opposed please raise your hands. All abstentions. The motion carries by a vote of 30-10-3.

The President, Provost, and Deans of Engineering and Arts and Sciences are urged to rethink carefully the management of the Computer Science Department, taking into account the intellectual reach of this department and its roles in the Colleges of Engineering and Arts and Sciences and assessing whether radical change is justified by the reasons offered thus far.

"That being the only item of business on the agenda, the Chair declares this meeting adjourned."

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty

