MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, April 15, 1998

The Speaker, Professor John Pollak, Animal Science, called the meeting to order. He then called on Dean Stein to set the context of this meeting.

Peter C. Stein, Dean of Faculty: "According to our rules, we are only allowed to discuss the item that was on the agenda last week, the Resolution to Establish Natural Sciences Research Advisory Councils. We will turn to that discussion now, and we will continue this meeting until we dispose of that."

DISCUSSION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATURAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCILS

Speaker Pollak: "We'll start that discussion right away. You have before you the resolution that we began discussing last week. There have been several amendments to that resolution that were duly submitted; we will discuss the amendments first and then turn our discussion to the main resolution."

Assistant Professor Linda Nicholson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology: "There were a number of concerns that were voiced last week during the discussion of this resolution. We, the drafting committee, have constructed a set of amendments (Appendix A, attached) that we hope will address these concerns and we ask now for unanimous consent so that we might proceed on with a better resolution."

Speaker Pollak: "There is a motion from the drafting committee to unanimously accept their set of amendments. Is there anyone who wants to debate those amendments? Seeing no one, we will accept those amendments unanimously."

Professor Nicholson: "One of the concerns that was expressed last week was the concern that the proposed structure would create a top-down bureaucracy that would jeopardize the entrepreneurial approach that has worked so well and jeopardize creative genius. I would like to read through some recent history that, I think, illustrates that the structure would do the opposite; that it is more of a bottom-up approach than a top-down approach. After last week's meeting, I received the annual report from the Vice-President for Research, Norm Scott. After reading through that report again last night, it refreshed my memory on the motivations for this resolution. I'd like to go over some of those motivations now.

"The growth of research is judged by two general indicators. One is the total research expenditures in a fiscal year; another is the total federal research funding for a given year. If you compare FY 1996 to FY 1997 numbers for Cornell, the total research expenditures increased only 3%; the total federal research funding increased only 2%. These are very small increases that caused a great deal of concern in the central administration. Therefore, in the summer of 1997, the Research Futures Task Force was created to advise the central administration on how to approach strategies for developing new research. This task force came up with three basic areas of strategic investment. These are: 1) continue investing in basic science; 2) interdisciplinary science research; and 3) research in key strategic enabling areas. This task force went even further in identifying three key strategic enabling areas. These three areas are: 1) genomic and integrative molecular biology; 2) information studies; and 3) advanced materials. This is an excellent example of a top-down approach to research initiatives. This task force was actually asked to provide areas of strategic investment in research. I feel that this is a process that is happening now, that is a top-down structure.

"The proposed structure, I feel, is a better, more bottom-up type of structure, in which the proposed advisory councils would not generate ideas for areas of research initiatives, they would simply provide advice. They would not have check-writing or veto power. They would advise the Provost and the central administration on research proposals that would have a significant impact on the financial resources or the direction of research at Cornell. These people would not be generating research initiatives. Research initiatives would be generated by scientists, and they would submit their proposals to the Provost. The Provost's office would filter the proposals to be sent to the appropriate council. So, my argument is that this is really a bottom-up procedure. Also, any member of the council who has a direct interest in any proposal would not be able to vote on that proposal. This would actually eliminate bias, but it would take a step in the right direction toward eliminating bias. I think this statement really hits the heart of why we do this kind of advisory council. This is a quote from Norm Scott in the 1996-97 annual report: 'Because we cannot do everything, the research community must set these priorities.' The bottom line is that these priorities are going to be set. The question that we have to address is, will the people setting these priorities have the best possible information, have dispassionate advice from these research councils, or will we continue
with the top-down direction of research strategies that we have seen happening lately?

"Another concern was, what is the relationship between the proposed Local Advisory Council, and the current Cornell Research Council? In order to address this, we have what is called the second amendment to this resolution. We are going to insert the statement, in the Local Advisory Council paragraph, 'nominations will be solicited from faculty in the natural sciences and from the Research Council.' So, in fact, there could be an overlap between the Local Advisory Council and the Research Council. There was also a letter from the Research Council, which I believe was circulated via e-mail to everybody, about this issue. In fact, with their power of nomination, they could, in fact, nominate themselves, and then the Faculty Senate would then decide who belongs on the Local Advisory Council. The drafting committee felt that limiting membership on the Local Advisory Council to members of the Research Council would be a bit restrictive, and we wanted to optimize the breadth on the Local Advisory Council.

"Another important idea that was brought up was the question of whether these advisory councils should have a broader scope. The example that Richard Schuler brought up was the upcoming task force on social sciences. While we feel this is a very important question, there is so much up in the air right now that we really can't make a firm structure at this point. What we have done is to offer two amendments. One states, 'After a period of two years, the Faculty Senate will evaluate the effectiveness of this advisory structure and decide whether to continue, modify, or discontinue the Natural Sciences Research Advisory Councils.' This is saying that after a period of two years, we must evaluate. This is not saying that after two months, we cannot make a modification. If, another advisory council were to come up, the relationship between these advisory councils and this new council could be defined.

"The other amendment, the fourth amendment, is simply a rationale statement, it says that the formation of these advisory councils really should be thought of as an evolutionary step that hopefully will advance our progress in this area and we will reevaluate our progress as things develop.

"Finally, we also added a statement, in the paragraph describing the External Advisory Council. We added the phrase, 'broadly representative of the areas of natural sciences that exist at Cornell.' This is describing the representation on the External Advisory Council. We thought this would optimize the breadth of the External Advisory Council. The additional amendments are changing, 'inefficient' to 'unpredictable' in the second 'Whereas' paragraph and adding 'mathematics' to the definitions of natural sciences in the 'Therefore, be it resolved... ' paragraph.

"Just to summarize things, we feel that the proposed advisory structure will aid Cornell's clearly stated research goals. This is another quote from Norm Scott's annual report: 'This research goal is to establish Cornell as a preeminent institution in research and education in new areas that emerge from the diversity of intellectual disciplines, and to maintain our acknowledged strength in core disciplines.'"

Speaker Pollak: "We now have a resolution, as amended by the drafting committee. Now, I will call on Professor Fine to present his amendment to this resolution."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I move to strike II. D. (provide a frank evaluation of the quality of Cornell's program in natural sciences), which extends the scope of this thing very quickly within the space of one sentence casually added at the end of the document."

Speaker Pollak: "Is there a second to this amendment?"

The amendment was seconded.

Professor Fine: "I don't agree with the resolution, but there was a rationale. The Provost asked for advice on how to allocate the University's scarce resources. The discussion about small grants, medium grants, large grants, bridging funds, makes a certain amount of sense in terms of the function of assisting him making decisions when there is a competition for resources. It is a completely different matter to arrogate unto itself a judgment of all of Cornell's research. That is a very serious activity, it is equivalent to Program Review. That is not the sort of task that you undertake with one small sentence tacked on to a document, which has a purpose, which I disagree with, but otherwise has a purpose. I do not think that it fits with it and I think it should be struck from it."

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "Independent of whether or not the sentence remains in the document, I think it is fair to say that the External Advisory Committee would, in making advisory statements about the areas that Cornell should..."
undertake or expand research initiatives, evaluate whether or not those areas are capable or competent to go into or expand into new areas.

Professor Donald Farley, Electrical Engineering: "Does this mean that we will have to make presentations every year, in every program, to this External Advisory Council? That's what it seems to imply. Otherwise, how could they know what is going on in these departments? I, for one, think that we have better things to do than to prepare for these reviews every year."

Professor Nicholson: "The motivation behind that comment was, as Rich said, that it would be inherent in the nature of the process of coming to Cornell and looking at what research projects were being put forth. I think it does extend the actual scope of the intent of the resolution and I don't oppose the amendment."

Speaker Pollak: "Are there any other comments on the amendment? Those in favor of the amendment, signify by raising your hand. Those opposed. The amendment carries. We will now move on to discussing the main motion as amended."

Professor David Wilson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology: "I would like to speak in favor of the motion. It takes a process that is going on right now, obviously the Provost or whomever else makes the decision, gets advice from people who are experts in the field. It makes that process more explicit. I think that one of the most severe problems that Cornell has is that there is far too much secrecy and under-the-table dealings and suspicion of under-the-table dealings. We can't totally eliminate the problems. But, it makes it very clear who the people are who talk to the Provost. It makes conflicts of interest obvious. For that reason, I don't think about this as adding a new layer. I think about this as formalizing a process that is already happening now."

Professor Peter Schwartz, Textiles and Apparel: "I voted against this issue in its last incarnation and I don't see any reason to change my vote. This is a new layer of bureaucracy that is being added. I am also concerned about what this will do to people who are doing good natural sciences at the boundaries between the tectonic plates of these great initiatives. I think that they are one of the great strengths of this University and I fear that this will be detrimental to those areas."

Professor John Smillie, Mathematics: "When you talk about this previous incarnation, what are you talking about?"

Professor Schwartz: "I'm talking about the Research Futures resolution."

Professor Smillie: "I was a member of the drafting committee, and many members of the drafting committee, although not all, agree with you that the Research Futures proposal was a problem and this is our attempt to create a solution. In particular, we are not imposing a certain agenda on the University. Rather, we are saying that anyone who has a particular research agenda to impose will have to go through a series of steps, including convincing some people who are not already believers, and it will also involve making a case to a standing committee, to faculty members, and to some extent bring it out into the open. So, I would like to make a strong distinction between this proposal and the Research Futures Task Force report."

Professor Fine: "I have objections to this proposal, which I won't go into at the moment; I went into them last week. I am particularly concerned now about the e-mail that I think we all received from Professor Olbricht, about the Cornell Research Council and the 'Venn' diagram as it was correctly referred to, and the fourth amendment which tries to address it and talks about a trial period which will allow clarification with respect to the relationship.

"If I were for this general idea -- I'll admit I'm not -- but if I were for the general idea, I would like to see this clarified before hand. There is not an emergency matter here. I don't think the responsibilities of the Cornell Research Council were known to me before this meeting, I suspect they were not widely known in the Senate. It is something that I think was an oversight of the committee, although I cannot speak for them. The responsibilities of the CRC, which Professor Olbricht points out in his letter, read very closely to the charge of the advisory committees being proposed here."

"In talking about breadth, the CRC is 21 members, the committee you propose is 10 members. It is not at all clear that this is a step in the right direction, even if you want to move in the direction that you want to move in. I really hope that the committee withdraws this proposal and then thinks about integrating their proposal with the CRC, perhaps creating a totally new entity. There is no reason why it has to exist in the form it exists. If it has not been effective in some measure, then let's create a new body that will be able to perform the functions that need performing. I'm not sure I would agree with that, but I think you should. I would think that you would want to do this properly, and if you want to do it properly, you have to take account of the CRC, not by a Venn diagram and not by this sentence, 'let's go now and figure it out later'."
Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I find myself in agreement with Professor Wilson. I see this as a very different proposal from the Research Futures report. I understand what Professor Fine is saying. But, I think I see the problem that this proposal is trying to solve. The problem is that the CRC is really the Vice-President's Research Council. We have permission to put faculty members on that committee. As we heard the other day, we only get a portion of the faculty. There are many other administrators on that council. The problem with that composition is that it is really not in a position to give independent advice to the Provost. The beauty of this committee is that it is able to give independent, above-board advice to the Provost in a way that the CRC is not able to do."

Professor William Olbricht, Chemical Engineering and Co-Chair of the Cornell Research Council: "I take exception to some of the comments that Professor Howland made. Since 1996, the Faculty Senate has appointed six members of the CRC. It has appointed a Co-Chair of the CRC and I have served in the capacity since 1996. During that time, the membership appointed by the Vice-President has shrunk in size to give the Faculty Senate nominees a larger role in the Council. I think that Faculty Senate members, some of whom are here, would say that they feel very able to present independent ideas, and that was one of the reasons for having Faculty Senate members—and so that any faculty member could bring to the agenda any item that he or she feels is important.

"We first learned about this resolution in reading the 'Call to Meeting' last week. At our regularly scheduled meeting, the members of the Research Council asked me to write to you about our activities. Most of the sentiments expressed at that meeting were that we would like to work with the Senate. If there is to be an integration of these councils, one should be dissolved in favor of the other. We are eager to work with the Senate, but we are upset with the lack of contemplation that led to the proposed resolution."

Dean Stein: "I would like to talk a little bit about why I think this is a good proposal. I would like to respond to something that Professor Fine said at the last meeting, after having a week to think about it. It was a nicely turned phrase that 'I had never seen a faculty committee that I didn't love'. In fact, last week, I talked about a committee that I didn't love, because I didn't think it was effective. Closer to the mark is the statement that I have never seen a way that the faculty can increase its ability to run things at this University that I didn't love. That is why I think this proposal is such a good idea. You always have to think about the alternatives. You can't think about this Research Council in terms of an idyllic period of thirty years ago when there was great expansion and the only thing that you could think about this Research Council doing is limiting someone's ability to do something. That is not the age that we live in. The age that we live in is an age of scarcity, an age of choice, everybody is saying that again and again, an age when we make decisions which are very important and the affects of which will determine the future greatness of this University. The question is not whether or not Cornell will make those decisions; there is no way to avoid making those decisions. The question is, who will make those decisions. We all know the example, the Provost will make those decisions. This proposal does not question that. When the Provost makes those decisions, will he have the best advice he can have, both nationally and locally? Who will decide who the Provost asks for information? Will the Provost decide or will the Faculty decide? Somebody is going to advise the Provost. Is that going to be determined by us or is that going to be determined by the Provost? We have a long history of cronyism, I don't know what you want to call it, of favoritism.

"Professor Fine talked about the fact that this is in opposition to the departments. The question is, there is only a certain amount of influence to go around, and if this committee has more influence, then the departments have less influence. I think that is the wrong way to look at the problem. Of course, some departments will be favored, and some departments will not be favored, because there is scarcity. The question is, do you want to have the Provost seek advice from a publicly known group of people? You know who they are; you can approach them. Or do you want that advice to come from backchannels of advice, from people who are favored? Is that the way the decision should be made?

"I don't want to talk about the interaction with the CRC. Perhaps the drafting committee made a mistake in not consulting the CRC earlier. Obviously they did. I don't think that is fundamental to this particular proposal. The time to do this is now because this process is going on now. The Provost is now seeking advice, he will seek advice soon, and will continue to seek advice. The Provost will be seeking advice about decisions that have to be made. If we want to run this University in the way that I think we want to run it, we have to make decisions like that to have ourselves represented in the place where these decisions are made."

Professor Richard Schuler, Economics, and Civil and Environmental Engineering: "Let me try to do my own summing up, to see whether it resonates in some sense with the body. What I see in the proposal before us is an attempt to broaden and have a truly faculty generated perspective of setting research priorities, and it adds the dimension of having the External..."
Research Council, which I think incorporates into it, a more formalistic way of doing faculty oversight. On the other hand, I see the CRC already in place and it certainly accomplishes one of my other ultimate objectives of a broad interdisciplinary representation on whatever activity is setting these priorities. There are monumental and far more expensive proposals before the administration dealing with natural sciences, but there are also many in the social sciences as well. I applaud the natural sciences for getting on the horse first and I think they deserve some kind of reward for being there firstest with the mostest. On the other hand, it seems to me that there are tremendous opportunities that are already before us, that I think might not get the proper airing, if the committee we are voting for is not more broadly based. The question I am rhetorically asking is, why can’t we, as the Senate, get out ahead of the game and put in place a more broadly constituted committee? I do feel a bit badly about the apparent lack of coordination with the CRC, but I also recognize that choices have to be made. So, I just express that view, although I recognize that I cannot propose an amendment. I think that this committee may be beneficial to the Senate and the University as a whole and establish the faculty in a true leadership position."

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "What's that? I don't know where you've come out."

Professor Schuler: "Unfortunately, I'm saying send it back to the committee, but with a charge to come forth with a similar proposal that is more broadly based and call it, 'The Faculty Research Committee,' not just the Natural Sciences Research Committee."

Professor McAdams: "So, you are saying add the Social Sciences. . . ?"

Professor Schuler: "And the other activities. What is motivating me is that there are natural constituencies that deal with many of the sciences individually. I think the real opportunities are those that cut across or are bending the disciplines in new and different directions. Those are the ones that require investment on the part of the University because it is less likely to come from the funding source. This is the real value that this committee could add to the University."

Professor McAdams: "You are saying vote 'no' now?"

Professor Schuler: "I'm saying vote 'no' now. Rather, vote to recommit, and consider this interdisciplinary group as an option now."

Professor Nicholson: "Well, I agree. We have to look at this as if it can all be linked to the Research Futures Task Force report. Hence the natural sciences focus. We saw that as our task and we were completely remiss in communicating with the CRC, and I take full responsibility for that as chair of the committee. I think our concern about the CRC was that its representation was not just placed there by the Senate, but it was also placed there by the administration. I'm not sure what we can or cannot do. We can either vote on it or send it back to the committee, I guess."

Professor Richard Root, Ecology and Systematics: "I'd like to know how you arrived at five members for that External Advisory Council? It seems a little small to me, for such important decisions."

Professor Nicholson: "Five members was what we thought would be a realistic number in the type of person, the type of luminary, we were hoping to bring here. We figured that would be a realistic number. We would contact many and perhaps we could get five. That was the rationale."

Professor Smillie: "I don't completely agree with my fellow committee member, Linda, that we made a mistake in setting up this committee. I think it is an excellent objective to have something that is broadly based and deals with a variety of research questions. Research is going on all over the University in all areas, not just involving large amounts of dollars. But, we wanted something that was actually going to be effective. One of the models which influenced our deliberation was the group that comes in to advise, I believe it is LNS, the Laboratory for Nuclear Studies. A group of outsiders comes in and basically chooses from among a variety of different proposals for the laboratory. Apparently, this is a group that works very well. No one, if their proposal is turned down, seems to complain that the deck was stacked. They simply go back and write a better proposal for next year. That was a nice model. What seemed to us to make that work, was that it was not such a big committee. It was a small group. It was a group that talks to each other. There can be, I imagine, lively discussions, and there is a certain narrowness to their focus. In a sense, these people are speaking the same language. If our motion passes, and it is effective, then we could see how to scale it up and incorporate other groups, in terms of our modifications in two years.

"This was also reflected in our view of the CRC. We were told that it had 35 members and not 21. I guess, if you look at ex
Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "I'm impressed by the fact that there is also some urgency. We have a major rethink of the way that the Division of Biological Sciences and biology, more generally, is organized. I think it would be very nice, if we are going to have faculty input through this mechanism, that it come sooner, rather than later. I would oppose sending it back to committee, I would be in favor of trusting them, when they say that it is evolutionary, and we could come out with a better or broader reiteration in a year or two. But do something today in response to all the hard work this committee has done in preparing this motion."

Associate Professor Robert Corradino, Physiology: "Since you brought up the issue of the Division of Biological Sciences, I wonder if I could inquire of anyone if the Provost has solicited from anyone outside of Cornell what to do about the division?"

Dean Stein: "I was the one who brought that up. I do not know of anyone he has contacted. But, I have heard it stated in many different quarters that he intends to do that."

Professor Corradino: "Does the faculty want to advise him on who should be advising him?"

Dean Stein: "I would imagine that if this proposal passes, then that would be the case. That is what we are talking about here. The abolition of the Division of Biological Sciences is clearly a major step in a new direction for this University."

Professor Corradino: "The Provost has said, and I am almost quoting him, that regardless of your interest, he will seek advice from anyone he so chooses. With that attitude, I'm not so sure he is amenable to the advice of any council. I would just as soon stay with the Council we have. Perhaps have it rethink its charter, perhaps have it expand its membership to include more Senators."

Professor Farley: "I have a couple of things. I was astounded to read this e-mail, that this council we had for a long time, we never even consulted. Then, reading farther down, the charges are almost identical to the main charges of the committee we are considering. Who is going to decide who should really be doing this? We have two identical charges.

"Regarding the biology question, we are going to get this nice unbiased, external advice, but there are only five people on this committee. Presumably, one of those people is going to be a biologist, maybe two. You are granting this entire decision, which affects the entire University to one person who visits the University for a day or two and says, 'well you ought to ax this and build up that, I have a Nobel Prize, so my advice counts'. I think the Provost is quite right that he will seek advice from whoever he wants. He will probably go out and ask quite a few people and not pay any attention to this guy. If you are only going to get five people, you are probably only going to have one person who is going to know anything about a given subject, maybe there is an outside chance of having two people. I just don't think it is going to work for a huge broad issue. If the Provost wants advice from an external source on some subject, he is perfectly free to go get it.

"The Local Council that we discussed, the Arecibo project, has a council like this. All of these people know quite a lot about Arecibo, and the LNS people I presume know a lot about LNS, so they know the issue, they know what is going on. If you get a small group of people to give advice on such a broad subject, it seems to me not to be a good idea. It seems that it is better to get together an ad hoc committee."

Associate Professor Brad Anton, Chemical Engineering: "I just want to make sure that I understand what you are both saying. It sounds to me that you are saying that the Provost is empowered to make these decisions, so why bother questioning his decisions. We should just shut up and let it happen."

Speaker Pollak: "Do you want to respond to that very quickly?"

Professor Fine: "The quickest response is that he didn't understand what was said."

Speaker Pollak: "Maybe, but it wasn't your comment." (laughter)

Professor Farley: "I am perfectly content to let Terry speak for me."
Professor Smillie: "The question of which committee will decide, we did ask the Provost. The drafting committee met with the Provost and we talked to him about the CRC and one of the points is that the CRC is a creature of the Vice-President for Research, who will soon be replaced by a Vice-Provost for Research. It is not clear exactly who will listen to what and what exactly the Vice-Provost for Research will do or listen to. I don't think it is a bad idea have this committee set up as a choice. We were not empowered to decide anything about the future. The only thing we can do is set this up and hope that it plays a role after the shift in administration is complete."

Professor Wilson: "I think that two things have come up that seem to be somewhat confusing. First, I think that the decision regarding the future of the Division of Biological Sciences is already governed by the process already in place for doing faculty reviews of programs. This committee I don't think will play a role in that.

"The second has to do with the problem of finding people with very broad expertise to make a decision. To me, it is a choice between two things. If you go on an ad hoc basis, you get the best expertise for the specific thing, but you don't get advice based on the breadth of activities or the context here at Cornell. How can they really give advice since they are in this area and they do it and they love it? So, of course, we should too. The whole idea of having a broader group that sits for a couple of years will bring a little more balance to the decision making process. If people know more about the issue and local affairs, we may be able to get better decisions."

Professor Fine: "I agree in part with Professor Wilson, but I also agree far more with Professor Farley. I think having a fixed small group of external advisors can't work on this basis very well. For example, right now in our department, we just received approval to build a $40 million building. We could have used advice on this, but not from a committee like this. We needed to create an ad hoc committee. Obviously, Professor Wilson is right. If you have a committee with five microelectronics people on it, they'd all say build it, of course they would. You certainly need to have somebody like that to represent microelectronics on that committee. I think in the end, if this were to work, it needs to have ad hoc committees for large proposals. That doesn't mean a committee only of people who work in the field of that proposal. We need some means of judging that proposal against a competing proposal.

"I would like to address Professor Reppy's concern. My hearing is getting worse as I get older: I do not hear the barbarians at the gate; I do not hear the great rush that we must decide today or else all sorts of wonderful things will escape us. I think we have the time to make a reasonable decision. This is not yet at that point, this is not yet mature. It should have been; they had an extra week to figure things out. We had some amendments that make some sense, but it is not ready yet for prime time. We have been called to a special session on it. It does need to be voted. I think if it is voted down, it will come back again in some other manifestation. But, maybe that will be a better manifestation. We have time to make a reasoned response, this is not yet a reasoned response."

Professor Nicholson: "In response to the concern about the External Advisory Council, if you look carefully at the description of the members of the External Research Advisory Council, they are people who would be well versed in making science policy, not just in one particular area, but in a broad sense in science administration. They are people who would have heard of microelectronic fabrication and issues, and having this external council in place would not preclude the Provost from seeking additional advice, from forming his own ad hoc advisory committee. I stand here in firm belief that I think this broad perspective is very important.

"The second part that you spoke about are the barbarians at the gate. In the flow chart, you see the detail of the Research Futures Task Force. The Provost has before him now a proposal for a genomic initiative. There are additional proposals on his desk right now that I happen to know about, for a new department, for new research initiatives. These are probably things that in general, most people don't know about. I do think that this is an imperative time and I do think that there is a very strong need for this now."

Professor McAdams: "As decoded, I think Dick Schuler has made a very powerful point. (laughter) No offense Dick."

(laughter)

Professor Schuler: "It's the language." (laughter)

Professor McAdams: "The point is that there is a certain narrowness. What I hear in this proposal is that there is a certain narrowness in this broad group. It does leave out all the social sciences and as I read this whole thing, I see a number of issues that these people are asked to respond to that are really social sciences issues. Economics, management, resource
allocation, all these areas would benefit from having additional input. I agree with Dick; we really ought to vote it down now, bring it back when we can broaden its scope. I think the idea in general is a good one. I believe in faculty governance, but I don't think this is the right thing at the right time."

Professor Galik: "There are a couple of things I want to point out. One is the strength I want to put behind Professor Nicholson and Professor Wilson. Global experts are people, we hope by their choice, able to see the truly big picture. When you mentioned the new Engineering building, I do not think that that is within the purview of a group of electrical engineers. The key competition for the $40 million was not purely engineering. There may be very large amount of competition from biology or from other areas for the $40 million. We need some group of people who have the broader perspective of science administration to make those large decisions. I think that the CRC, while this committee is getting its feet wet, seems to address some of the issues that Professor Schuler brought up. It is broadly based, it has a larger number of people to be involved in advising the Provost, and the Vice-President or Vice-Provost for Research.

"The areas right now that command the largest demand and the most competition for the most amount of research dollars, whether that be in buildings or equipment or in faculty lines, are indeed natural sciences. It is therefore, I think, incumbent that we have a group of people who can act in that area. I think that it would be just fine if all the natural resources departments and all the members of the CRC became members of this council. That would be great. It would help with hosting the External Advisory Council and preparing reports and all of the other duties that this council is responsible for. This local group, however, has to make fast turnaround decisions. We have to know by next week if we can spend half a million dollars to bring in some new assistant professor and put her in a large lab setup; and she is being courted by Harvard, Princeton, and Stanford. We need to know if this person's expertise really fits in with what we are doing. We need the local advisory people to help the Provost make that decision and the CRC is just too big and too broad to handle that type of decision."

Professor Milton Zaitlin, Plant Pathology: "I agree with Professor Schuler that the issue of the meld between social sciences and natural sciences is the real issue here. We are really dealing with resources that come from one pie. I disagree with him in the sense that I think that we should vote for this procedure and then when this deliberative body later talks about the social sciences, there is no reason that we couldn't then meld these two together to divide up this single pie."

Professor Olbricht: "One of the things you learn by serving on the Research Council is that the way research is carried out across the campus is very different from college to college and across departments. One of the things that the Research Council has done routinely is recommend proposals for submission to the various funding programs, such as NSF. It has been very effective at providing feedback to improve their proposals, much of which has been adopted. That is part of the reason that Cornell has enjoyed phenomenal success in that area. I argue on behalf of the University. I would just ask a question of Professor Nicholson. We have six members of the CRC that serve at the pleasure of this body. They are not members of the Senate. You said in your earlier remarks that the ten members of the Local Advisory Council would be appointed by the faculty, but I was curious, because the proposal that I have says that half would be appointed by the faculty and half by the administration."

Professor Nicholson: "They would be appointed jointly by the Faculty Senate and the administration."

Professor Seymour Smidt, Nicholas H. Noyes Professor of Economics and Finance, JGSM: "We seem to have two groups of people who are proposing that we vote against the resolution. Professor Fine, who doesn't like the idea of the resolution and Professor Schuler, who wants to enlarge it. If we send it back to committee, then they won't know what we want. I suggest that if you agree with Professor Fine, vote against this; and if you agree with Professor Schuler, vote in favor of it, and at the next meeting bring up the possibility of amending it."

Professor Schuler: "I just want a clarification about the timing issue. I don't know whether this is a conflict of interest. I am a member of the Social Science Advisory Task Force. Our time line is to come forth with a report by this fall. I'd like to see an ability to integrate, if there is something coherent that comes out of our review, more rapidly than a year and half later."

Professor Nicholson: "The time line that is currently in place says that we must evaluate in two years, but that is not saying that we can't evaluate earlier. If you find that you have a very concrete thing that you would like to apply here, you would be free to do so."

Dean Stein: "It seems to me that if you start off with the charge to design a system on how to give advice on how Cornell
should place its bets on research in the natural sciences, what one would first think of is a committee of natural scientists to make that decision. That is the simple straightforward way to do it. There may be some advantage to having some broader representation, I don't see what it is. But I would see, in an evolutionary way, you would start with the simplest, most natural way of doing that and then, in time, we could think about how to add, link, or maybe make cross-representations. It doesn't seem to me to be the most proper way to start."

Speaker Pollak: "The question has been called. We will do this by a roll call vote, because I think it will be a contentious issue and I don't want to count this one.

The resolution, as amended, carried 39-22. (Appendix B)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:43.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty