At the September 1999 meeting, Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical Engineering and Chair, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, reported on the four issues surrounding the discussion on Computing and Information Sciences:

- Procedures and processes to date
- Vision, goals and principles
- Organizational structures needed
- Role of the Faculty

He indicated that a response from the Senate should be targeted at the Committee’s meeting of October 1. The final Task Force Report is expected on November 1.

In October 1999, Professor Fine presented six separate motions concerning the CIS Task Force proposal. Each resolution was discussed and then voted on:
1. The Faculty Senate shares with the Task Force, Provost Randel, and President Rawlings the sense that an information revolution has ushered in an information age with unignorable consequences for our conduct of undergraduate education, scholarship, research, and outreach and with opportunities for new directions in scholarship and research whose pursuit deserves the support of Cornell.

Adopted unanimously.

2.a. The recently created office of the Dean for Computing and Information Science (CIS) be charged with assisting in the implementation of the vision, goals, and principles that will grow out of the Task Force efforts and those of others.

b. The Dean for CIS be provided with an independent CIS Executive Board having broad membership of stakeholders selected by a process to be determined that ensures that Board membership appropriately balances the interests of University, discipline, and departments.

c. The function of this CIS Executive Board shall be to advise and support the Dean for CIS and provide policy for actions taken in fulfillment of the roles assigned to his office.

Adopted 51-3.

3. The Dean for CIS together with the CIS Executive Board have the following roles:

a. Support of instruction and instructional innovation in this area.

b. Support of the development of faculty in this area both by providing bridging funds to enable departments to hire such faculty and by providing support to current faculty to develop and enrich programs in this area in their home departments.

c. Proactively and specifically identify important and promising directions in computing, information science, and information technology, as they are observed across a broad frontier, and encourage movements by faculty units in these directions.

d. Raise funds in support of the preceding.

Adopted 57-1-4.
The Senate finds that the creation of a large Faculty of Computing and Information (FCI) is unlikely to accomplish the aims announced for it and may obstruct the evolution of more useful mechanisms for smaller, more coherent faculty groups to engage with the information age.

Adopted 37-8-17.

The Faculty Senate recommends that all Colleges at Cornell with undergraduate programs adopt requirements for such programs to ensure that their students become familiar with appropriate elements of computing and information science and technology. In achieving this, their curriculum committees should consult with the office of the Dean for CIS.

Failed 23-29-9.

Before voting on resolution six, “orders of the day” were called. Resolution six will be pushed to a meeting for next week.

At the second meeting in October, an amendment to Resolution six was put forward to add the words “College of Arts and Sciences”. The amendment carried unanimously.

Discussion ensued on Resolution six as amended, with comments both in favor and against it. On a vote call, the resolution, as amended, carried 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.

At the November 1999 meeting, a motion was presented from the University Faculty Committee to affirm the October 20 vote on motion six. In determining the quorum, ex officio members were counted. Ex officio members can vote, but are not counted in determining a quorum.

The resolution, below, passed:

WHEREAS, following the October 20th adjourned Faculty Senate meeting, it was discovered that the ex officio members were counted in determining a quorum, and

WHEREAS, the ex officio members have voting rights but are not counted in ascertaining a quorum, and
WHEREAS, the vote was sufficiently strong (i.e. 3-to-1 ratio) in favor of adopting Motion 6,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate affirms the vote taken at the October 20th meeting as one being representative of the Senate’s sentiments and consistent with the will of the Senate.

In December 1999, Professor Fine introduced a resolution regarding the final report from the Provost’s Task Force.

Four amendments to the resolution were introduced and debated; one of which was adopted.

On a vote on the main motion as amended, it carried with a vote of 49-3-4.

WHEREAS, the Provost’s Task Force produced a Final Report on Computing and Information Science that was made available on 16 November, and

WHEREAS, the Final Report contains positive elements but does not adequately reflect the motions of the Faculty Senate that expressed deep reservations about essential elements of the Initial Report and that were passed by strong majorities on 13 and 20 October, and

WHEREAS, the proposed FCI would have powers and resources characteristic of a college,

BE IT RESOLVED that,

1. The Faculty Senate reaffirms that its Motions 2 and 3 are a sound basis for initiating an adaptation to the needs for computing and information science and technology in instruction and research that arise out of the Information Age. The Provost is urged to adopt the suggestions made by the Faculty Senate, to consider other organizational alternatives such as the “virtual college” suggested by Dean Cooke, and to report to the faculty as his deliberations progress.

2. The Faculty Senate reaffirms the importance of its recommendation to create an independently selected, broadly based Executive Board that will assist the Dean for CIS and will be empowered to set policy for that office.

3. The Task Force report does not go far enough to allay the Faculty Senate’s strong opposition to a large and less coherent FCI (Faculty of Computing and Information). It is imperative that an entity such as the proposed FCI, not be
created unless a much more detailed proposal is available and has been given
deliberate faculty scrutiny and explicit approval by the Faculty Senate.

4. The Faculty Senate maintains that there is little faculty support for the
proposed creation of a university-wide undergraduate computing instruction
program modeled on the Knight Writing Program. Thus the Senate
recommends that this proposal by the Task Force not be pursued on a
significant scale.

5. The Faculty Senate instructs the Dean of the Faculty to advise the Board of
Trustees, in addition to the President and Provost, of this resolution adopted
by the Faculty Senate.

Vice Provost Bert Garza, at the February 2000 meeting, presented an update on the
discussions with committees, college deans, the Dean of Faculty, and the Dean of
Students related to the Task Force Report and Recommendations. He summarized the
responsibilities of the Dean of CIS:

- Lead the campus discussion in development of the area of computing and
  information science.
- Administer and manage the Office of Computing and Information Science.
- Develop this area of scholarship within University units.
- Direct CIS and the FCIS to the policy guidance of the Executive Board.
- Carry out the goal activities and increase resources.
- Expand external relations with industry.

The Faculty of Computing and Information Science (FCIS) has the responsibilities to:

- Identify key areas for faculty recruitment in a timely fashion.
- Advise the colleges and central administration on issues that relate to faculty
  promotion and retention.
- Anticipate facilities and other resources needed to maintain the University in the
  forefront of this field.
- Promote collaboration and attain objectives related to the University’s teaching,
  research, and outreach missions.

Also at the February meeting, Professor Fine withdrew a motion from the Committee on
Academic Programs and Policies because it basically reiterated something the Senate
already supported by a vote of 49-3. The body unanimously approved withdrawing the
motion.
In May 2000, Vice Provost Bert Garza gave an update on implementing the proposal he reported on at the February meeting.

He reiterated that the FCIS will never belong to any specific college and will not make any professorial appointments or tenure track appointments. In addition, the FCIS will not decide budgetary matters, but rather only make budgetary recommendation. The Provost’s Office will decide where the Department of Computer Science will reside.

In March 2002, Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Chair, Committee on Academic Programs and Policies, introduced the report on progress made in fulfilling the terms of the Agreement presented to the Faculty Senate by Vice Provost Garza on May 10, 2000:

Abstract

This document is the report of the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies pertaining to the progress that has been made to implement the terms of the Agreement negotiated by Vice Provost Cutberto Garza and announced to the Senate on May 10, 2000. We begin with a review of the background that led to the need for this Agreement, continue with a summary of key elements of the Agreement, and review the progress made towards implementation. A key element that is still unfulfilled is the development of a plan to guide the re-installation of the Department of Computer Science into one or more of the existing colleges. We are concerned by evidence of a lack of commitment by the Provost to carry out the terms of this Agreement, and we close with several questions for the Provost.

I. Brief Background to the Agreement

In June 1999, a preliminary Task Force Report, Cornell in the Information Age, was issued that addressed the need for computational thinking and the availability of computational resources across Cornell. This document identified a central role for the Computer Science Department (CSD) in promoting this thinking. On August 19, 1999, in response to rumors and after requests that Provost Randel clarify matters, the Provost issued a memorandum, “Computing and Information Sciences.” This memorandum informed the Cornell community that the provost has appointed

“…[Robert Constable] to the position of Dean for Computing and Information Sciences...The charge to him and the task force is to identify how computing and information sciences can best be advanced throughout the University; it is not to invent, on whatever pretext, the way to do nothing.
“Secondly, I have asked Dean Constable to work with Vice President Carolyn Ainslie and Vice Provost Cutberto Garza to develop pilot management procedures for the new Office of the Dean for CIS. I have asked that these pilot procedures encompass administrative responsibilities for the present Department of Computer Science….In the meantime, the Department of CS remains a department of the College of Engineering and the College of Arts and Sciences….In order to ensure that, as new resources are committed, these resources constitute neither a drag on the College of Engineering nor an indirect subsidy for others of its programs, the Office of the Provost has assumed responsibility for the oversight of the Department’s finances.”

The removal of the Computer Science Department (CSD), by Provost Randel, from the administrative control of the Engineering College and therefore from the administrative control of any college, occurred in the summer of 1999. This action was taken against the expressed wishes of the Dean of Engineering and of the other department heads in the College. On May 24, 1999, the heads expressed themselves presciently as follows:

“The creation of an autonomous unit, as suggested in the presentation, in our view would have significant adverse impact on the College of Engineering’s reputation and ultimately, upon the reputation of the University….Without consideration of these issues, the report could be seriously divisive.”

Many of the issues raised by this unprecedented administrative action and by the Task Force Report of June provoked strong debate for much of the 1999-2000 academic year.

The Senate met to discuss the implications at its September, October, December, and February meetings. The December meeting contained a discussion of the now completed final report of the Task Force.

Vice Provost Garza worked diligently to complete his assigned task of developing management procedures, and in this he consulted frequently with Dean Constable, Dean Hopcroft of Engineering, Dean Lewis of Arts and Sciences, Dean Cooke and with CAPP and its chair, Professor Fine. After about a dozen revisions, Garza presented a draft to the Senate at its February 7, 2000 meeting that was entitled, “Faculty and Office for Computing and Information Science: Administrative and Management Structure”, and he solicited reactions.

On May 10, 2000, Vice Provost C. Garza announced to the Senate that, “I’m pleased to say that the President and Provost have agreed to pursue the proposal
that I presented to the Senate in February.” The document that was approved was unchanged from the draft of February 7 that had been presented for information and discussion by Vice Provost Garza to the Senate at its February 7 meeting.

II. Elements of the Agreement

“The Faculty of Computing and information Science (FCIS) is used to designate a defined university-wide faculty body responsible for advising the university regarding the enhancement of teaching, research, and outreach related to the computing and information sciences and assuring the cohesive development of this area across the university...The position of Dean of Computing and Information Science (CIS) was created to move the University’s Computing and Information Science initiative forward in a timely and organized way.”

There was created an Office of Computing and Information Science (OCIS), administered by the Dean of CIS. The Dean of CIS was to, “Direct the OCIS and FCIS subject to the policy guidance of an Executive Board.”

“The initial charge to the FCIS will be the development of a five-year academic plan....The Computer Science Department will be located in one or more of the existing colleges based on the recommendations of the five-year academic plan”.

“The authority to make primary professorial appointments is reserved to the deans of the university’s colleges. The Dean of CIS, however, will appoint search, promotion, and tenure committees jointly with the dean of the candidate’s home college for all proposed or current members of the FCIS. Appointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations will be made according to University policies that apply to the candidate’s home department and college.”

It was made abundantly clear that the FCIS and OCIS did not constitute a college.

III. Implementation History

By May 2000, an initial group of 18 faculty was selected to form the nucleus of the FCIS under the leadership of Dean Constable. This group has met regularly since June 28, 2000 to promote the hiring of individuals, the development of majors/minors/concentrations, and encourage the spread of computational thinking and methods in research, scholarship, and undergraduate education across Cornell. The FCIS has had success in attracting excellent faculty to Cornell and in supporting the creation of such undergraduate programs as the one in
Computational Biology and in developing plans for one in Information Science. It initiated development of the required five-year plan but was careful not to address the issue of the eventual location of the CSD. As of March 5, 2002, there has been no growth in the membership of the FCIS.

The process of formation of an FCI Executive Board was not followed, although in some respects the small FCI acts as the Executive Board.

The most troubling issue has been the failure to address the location of the CSD in “one or more of the existing colleges.” During this time, the CSD has made several grants of tenure and numerous faculty tenure-track appointments. Former Dean of Engineering John Hopcroft asserts that there was no Engineering involvement in hiring and promotion in CS, nor in any other administrative matter in the period fall 1999 through June 30, 2001. Interim Dean of Engineering Harold Craighead reports that this absence of involvement with CS hiring and promotion has persisted to date. There does not appear to have been significant involvement on the part of Arts and Sciences. The anomalous administration and location of CS has been raised several times with Provost Martin, particularly as it impacted the search for a new Dean of Engineering that commenced in mid-2000. However, Provost Martin declared a moratorium on discussions of the location of the CSD and stated that it would not be a matter for discussion with the dean candidates invited in 2000-2001. Provost Martin was reminded of this matter as recently as the UFC meeting of February 19, 2002. At that meeting, the Provost said that she was not bound by this Agreement, a position that she had advanced on an earlier occasion. Upon being challenged on that position and being shown the sentence quoted above on the eventual disposition of the CSD, the Provost suggested that the sentence was consistent with the way matters stood at the present. She then offered that further discussion on this topic await the outcome of the current search for a new Dean of Engineering.

That this issue is of ongoing concern to the Engineering College is evidenced by the following email of February 18, 2002 from Interim Dean Harold Craighead to the chair of CAPP:

“I believe a strong Computer Science Department is vital to a modern and highly ranked engineering college and university. Leaving the CS Department in its current unusual and ambiguous position does not seem ideal for the long-term health of the department. The Engineering College is ready to work toward locating the Computer Science Department in one or more colleges. The mechanism for implementing this is, however, not clear to me.”
Dean Craighead and department chairs in Engineering have had several meetings with CIS Dean R. Constable and Chair C. Van Loan that failed to reach agreement on such a mechanism. Dean Craighead’s sentiments are supported by an email of March 4, 2002 from Dean Philip Lewis, Arts and Sciences, which says:

“I do think it would be desirable for the Senate to use the Garza Agreement as a basis for seeking clarification about the future of CS. While I have my own reasons for wanting to know where we are heading on this front, I think the concerns that really matter and take precedence are those that originate in the faculty of the Engineering College. My interest has of course been rekindled and greatly reinforced by my contacts with Engineering faculty while serving on the dean’s search committee. What I’ve observed is a strong sense on the part of faculty in many departments that the eccentric status of CS causes problems for the college as a whole. Just how true this really is, is clearly subject to debate, but since persisting ambiguity makes it hard to develop consensus and move ahead, it’s not a debate that should be deferred. In addition, since I was a party to the Agreement worked out by Bert Garza and spent long hours in meetings in his office, I’d like to see the Agreement respected.”

IV. Questions for the Provost

1. What is the status of the FCI-generated five-year academic plan agreed to in the Garza Agreement?
2. What are its recommendations or implications for the location of the CS department in one or more colleges?
3. How have tenure-track appointments and promotions been made in the CS department and the FCI?
4. What is the rationale for delaying implementation pending the selection of a new dean of Engineering?

Professor Fine indicated he received the following document as he entered the meeting today, written by Ken Birman:

To the members of the Faculty Senate:

I have been shown a copy of the CAPP report and am sad to say that in the areas familiar to me, it is simply not reflective of the facts.

In particular, the report suggests that the creation of the CIS unit has hurt the CS department (this would seem to be the implication of the “concerns” raised in the section quoting acting Dean Craighead), has been harmful to Engineering (the apparent overall point of the report) and that the “eccentric status of CS causes problems” for many departments in the college. Presumably, the department
most implicated in this sense is ECE, and of course as Chairman of CAPP, Terry Fine (an ECE department member) is primarily familiar with the views of that department.

Nonetheless, I feel that no department has experienced substantive problems in conjunction with the FCI, and in particular, I feel that the ECE/CS relationship has improved tremendously since the CIS unit was created. In support of this view, I want to offer a brief summary of the situation in my own area: Computer Systems. More specifically, I’m a researcher in computer networks and systems. In CS there are perhaps 6 or 8 of us in the overall area. Another 6 researchers from ECE are members of the CS graduate field and 4 of these are in my area.

Prior to creation of the CIS unit, relations between ECE and CS were at a low ebb, and this extended to the systems group. Monthly joint luncheons had been ended after several years of lunchtime dialog. The departments were at odds over recruiting, TA allocations within the College, advising loads, vision for the College of Engineering, Duffield Hall, and many other issues. CS and ECE had conflicting goals and overlapping hiring objectives in the systems area.

Today, the ECE and CS systems groups enjoy a closer relationship than at any time since I first joined the CS department 20 years ago. We have a broad dialog, many joint projects and funding proposals, co-teach courses, attend one-another’s seminars and have lunch together almost weekly. CS has been active in helping ECE recruit, and the two departments have clarified visions that no longer overlap; on the contrary, they are mutually complementary in a constructive and positive manner.

Infusion of CIS resources has helped calm the advising and TA load issues that were at a head two years ago. Indeed, I’m convinced that the creation of the CIS unit has been the dominant force in calming the tensions that had previously inhibited dialog and cooperation. Meanwhile, CS continues to play the same teaching and advising role it played within Engineering before the Department was moved into CIS. Cornell has just hired a truly outstanding individual, Kent Fuchs, to head Engineering as its new Dean. This is simply not a pattern of “damage”.

Let me amplify on some of these points:

• CS and ECE co-teach CS314/ECE314, which alternates between a “CS-taught” semester and an “ECE-taught” semester (the curriculum doesn’t change). Sometimes a CS and ECE person work together to teach the course jointly in the same semester. We hire ECE TAs for this and other CS courses and ECE hires CS TAs in a like manner. Indeed, ECE TAs have worked for CS in many courses
over many years. Prior to creation of the CIS unit, CS and ECE had competing but similar courses in this area, taught independently.

• ECE students commonly take CS courses at all levels and make up as much as 50% of some of our upper-level courses. CS students often take ECE as a minor and while I don’t know the statistics, I am confident that we are equally well represented in many of the upper-level ECE course offerings. Prior to the unification of the 314 course this was less common because the students in each program lacked basic prerequisites for courses in the other.

• We run a joint weekly research seminar series, on Friday, meeting in the CS systems lab, which houses some experiments that are joint with the ECE folks in the area. Lunch is provided and we cover a paper each week. Some topics are picked to stress ECE areas of interest, some stress CS topics. A great number of faculty and students are thus exposed to both ECE and CS interests in a single weekly setting.

• We are active on the ECE faculty recruiting committee and have attended talks by their candidates, met with candidates one-on-one, etc. They reciprocate: Ravi Ramamcorthi, a recent visitor who is a candidate for a faculty position in graphics, visited with Rajit Manohar during his interview here and was introduced to several other ECE systems faculty. Ravi later commented that his lunch with Rajit, who he knew as an undergraduate at CalTech, was a very positive and interesting one.

• ECE faculty members help make up and grade the systems graduate qualifying (“Q”) exam in CS, providing 20% to 25% of the exam material in this exam, which is required for CS PhD students. Indeed, some six ECE members have become CS graduate field members. Prior to the formation of CIS, I believe that only two or three had this status.

• We jointly supervise students who work in the areas of wireless and mobile computing. For example, Zygmunt Haas and I meet at least once or twice each semester for a graduate A or B exam lately! Toby Berger and I are also on many student committees together. Indeed, our joint advising extends beyond the graduate program: this past summer, we were approached to help the Swiss EPFL in Lausanne plan a form for merging their communications and CS departments and hire a new dean. Toby and I attended a one-week meeting on this topic in Lausanne last July and another meeting is planned for this coming summer. EPFL specifically requested that I give a talk on the CIS concept during this meeting; one might surmise that the Swiss admire and hope to imitate our innovation in this area.
I have held several joint grants with the PSERC consortium in ECE (headed by Jim Thorpe and Bob Thomas) and, most recently, we are looking at teaming up to form a bi-coastal institute for critical infrastructure protection research. At Cornell, Wicker and Schneider (ECE and CS respectively) would lead the effort. At Berkeley, Shankar Sastry would lead the West Coast counterpart. The level of potential funding is immense. But this simply builds on existing successful funding collaborations – plural, and not just involving me. Several of my colleagues have similar collaborations.

These collaborations are quite meaningful. Jim Thorpe and I discuss research fairly regularly, and have traveled together to Washington at least 4 times in the past two years. Bob Thomas organized some of these trips. In other settings, Bob has covered for me when I was unable to attend and given a talk on my behalf – he knows my work well enough to do this in a high level manner. In others, I’ve covered for him and Jim. Jim and I also jointly supervise one CS PhD student, Ken Hopkinson, who splits his interests between CS and ECE – one of my five current PhD students.

The above is, of course, focused on just my own research and my own relationship with ECE. Within the CS department as a whole, I’m certain that at least five or six of us could tell similar stories. More broadly, looking at CS dialog with Engineering as a whole, I suspect that as many as half of us have some form of direct dialog or joint research interest with someone else in Engineering, sometimes in ECE, sometimes in ORIE, sometimes in MAE, etc.

Obviously, not all of the above are direct consequences of the formation of CIS. Yet broadly, I credit CIS for creating the atmosphere within which much of this dialog has become possible. Far more of these things have happened since CIS was formed than previously.

Is it reasonable for CAPP to characterize this as an atmosphere in which CIS and CS are causing “problems” elsewhere in Engineering?

Now, I’ve focused on the ECE/CS dialog, but elsewhere in the College, CIS resources are permitting us to hire people like Hod Lipson in MAE, who plans to establish close ties to CS faculty members in the AI area. CIS is in discussion with ORIE to assist in filling an opening in data mining within that Department. CIS has seeded new programs in Computational Biology (clearly an emerging Engineering discipline), and in Information Science (likely to be very popular with Engineering undergraduates). And as a member of the CIS Founding Committee, I can say that CIS would welcome proposals from interdisciplinary groups within Engineering, just as we welcome such proposals from other parts of Cornell.
As I look again at the CS/ECE interface, it seems to me that while prior to the formation of CIS the two entities were at odds, today, very few sibling departments in the University as a whole could point to a stronger or more vibrant ties. Yes, there are sometimes areas of friction, but I think that on the whole, these are rather minor.

The CAPP report quotes Dean Craighead in a manner as to suggest that the CS department has suffered a loss of quality and stature since the CIS unit was founded. Yet I believe that the opposite is true. CS itself has gone from a serious retention problem (six faculty departures immediately prior to formation of the CIS unit, with many citing friction within Engineering as their reason for departure) to a very positive growth, with the highest quality of incoming faculty members in my memory. Two years ago, CS graduate admissions had the remarkable experience of seeing 50% of our admitted PhD students select Cornell over peer institutions such as Stanford, MIT, Berkeley and CMU. This year we may be poised for a repeat success.

We all know that rankings are suspect (especially rankings conducted by popular magazines). Nonetheless, it is worthy of note that CS at Cornell is nationally ranked among the top five departments, both by *US News and World Report* and by a more scientific ranking, conducted by the National Academy of Sciences. Moreover, since the CIS unit was founded, it seems to me that the ranking of Engineering and of the ECE systems group has actually risen. None of this is consistent with the CAPP report.

I could go on, but hopefully, the point is clear. This is simply not the pattern of a department (or a CIS unit) taking actions damaging to the ECE department or to the College of Engineering as a whole. With the help of CIS, much past friction has been eliminated and the two departments are working constructively for the good of Cornell, for their own good, and certainly for the good of the College as well.

Before closing this note, I do want to comment that I am particularly troubled by the last paragraphs of the CAPP report. Here, among other points, one finds the comment that the FCI membership “has not grown” subsequent to the founding of the unit, and also an admonition that the Senate investigate CIS tenure and hiring practices.

These and other remarks in that section surprise me, because Terry Fine, Chairman of CAPP, has participated in precisely those FCI actions related to faculty appointments. Terry already knows a great deal about these matters, yet
the CAPP report omits relevant information and seems to hint at nefarious doings.

For example, on the question of “membership”, the CAPP report is poorly informed. The FCI unit has no formal notion of membership—there are no FCI “members”. We do have the founding committee, on which Fine serves—whose membership was carefully determined by the University leadership in negotiation with many units including the Senate, and is not open to casual expansion.

CIS has assisted in hiring quite a number of very impressive faculty members over the past year, so membership in the sense of CIS-funding faculty is clearly growing. Indeed, I can think of no meaningful notion of membership that has not shown growth. If CAPP wishes to recommend that the CIS unit institute some other form of membership or affiliation, we would welcome their ideas. Quite possibly, a graduate field will soon be needed for CIS affiliated faculty; it is not clear that CS field membership is a suitable long-term option (although this is the near-term solution we’ve used in several cases during the past year). At any rate membership, at least up to the present, has not been a primary concern of the committee.

On the contrary, the committee has focused on defining the kinds of multidisciplinary programs into which CIS resources should be directed. By and large, these are undergraduate educational programs that cross domain boundaries in innovative ways to create opportunities for Cornell students, which would not otherwise be available. Examples include our new program in Computational Biology and Genomics, and our program in Information Science. Others are being developed in areas such as Digital Arts and Graphics, e-Business and Commerce, and Computational Science and Engineering. CIS is helping to structure such programs, to recruit faculty members into them, and to fund the necessary course development. They are characterized by an emphasis on undergraduate education, by their cross-disciplinary nature, and by the importance of the opportunities they represent. These programs are offering Cornell a way to achieve immediate visibility in some of the most exciting emerging disciplines without disrupting its traditional unit and departmental structures. I view them as great successes.

This raises the second matter on which CAPP is implicitly critical. In part at Terry Fine’s urging, and with his participation, and ultimately with his supporting vote, FCI has developed a written policy on appointments governing the precise rules under which FCI resources can be expended and spelling out the policies for FCI involvement in tenure and other review activities. FCI has adopted the College of Engineering tenure and teaching policies. All of this
occurred with Professor Fine’s active participation. Again, it seems that CAPP has failed to inform itself of policies and information readily available.

In the case of the CS department itself, tenure is being evaluated under the same policy as was used previously, when CS was a part of the College of Engineering. Ad hoc committees are formed by the Dean for CIS through dialog with the Deans of Arts and Engineering, and have membership drawn from outside CS and from both colleges. The process is one that demands the highest standards for scholarly and instructional accomplishments. It is as difficult to gain tenure at Cornell in CS today as it would be at MIT or Stanford.

I should perhaps comment that the CIS policy on appointments responds to one of the charges put to the Founding Committee in the original Garza report. Pursuant to that report, we are now waiting for review and comments by the various units with which CIS has been in dialog. All of this is entirely above board, subject to normal academic control and review, and all of this is well known to Professor Fine, who has attended CIS Founder’s Committee meetings. He has taken on responsibilities for the FCI and offered constructive input.

The Senate should be critical of subcommittees such as CAPP which place biased and narrowly researched material before the body as a whole. While a broadly written consensus report would have some value, the Senate should reject the current report and may wish to reconsider the nature of the charge to the CAPP subcommittee. This is a poorly researched report, replete with hints of intrigue and innuendo, but short on facts and inaccurate in significant ways. CAPP’s report serves all of us poorly.

With respect to the CIS unit as a whole, I believe that if the Senate were to look closely at what has been accomplished, the body could only applaud the effort. Details of the placement of CS within one part of Cornell or another may seem to be a matter of great importance to a few individuals, but I think it is actually a minor issue in the larger picture. The significant point, and the one I hope the Senate would note with approval is that CIS is helping Cornell step onto the world stage as a leading institution where Information Sciences and Computation can play a significant role in every part of the University, rather than been concentrated in the CS department. Through the CIS unit, Cornell’s CS Department has emerged as a leader in building interdisciplinary programs and bridges. Some of our highest profile hiring successes of the past two years has been concentrated in CIS.

In a very short period of time, CIS has had a dramatic and positive impact on Cornell, on CS and indeed, on the College of Engineering and ECE. Given more time, CIS can help lead Cornell to historic heights and help transform the
University into the kind of institution able to demonstrate international leadership as we jointly confront the challenges of a decade within which the role of computation in science and the arts will surely continue to surge.

I urge the Senate to set the CAPP report to the side and to join the CIS unit in tackling these important and exciting challenges.

Ken Birman

The floor was open for discussion.

Professor William Arms, Computer Science, said his department is really concerned about the report:

The Garza Report
• Defused a bitter confrontation between the Faculty and Administration, but left behind ambiguity and conflicting promises for today’s Provost.

Weaknesses in the CAPP Report
• Failure to consult with interested parties. None of the following were consulted in preparing this report: Members of Computer Science Department, Chair of the Computer Science Department, Dean, Computing and Information Science, Faculty of Computing and Information
• Little analysis of what has happened since 1999

1. What has happened to the Computer Science Department under CIS?
   • During 1998/99 Computer Science was in bad shape [6 faculty left in one year.]
   • Since summer 1999, Computer Science has thrived [excellent recruiting; no faculty left; splendid students; major research grants.]

2. Has the location of Computer Science in CIS stimulated interdisciplinary activities across the university?
   • Computer Science faculty, working with the Dean of CIS, have been part of numerous initiatives. [Genomics, Graphics, Communication, Physics, Science and Technology Studies, etc.]

3. Have interactions between Computer Science and Engineering been harmed?
   • Strong educational cooperation, especially between Computer Science and Electrical and Computer Engineering. [Undergraduate and graduate level]
• Numerous joint research activities, notably in computer systems, networking, etc. [At least 20% of Computer Science faculty]
• Collaboration in recruitment.

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate
Ask CAPP to withdraw the report because of lack of consultation with the academic units concerned.

Request to the Provost
Please resolve the current ambiguous situation of the Computer Science Department in an open and consultative manner.
[You will hear strong arguments that the current situation is working well for the university and should be made permanent, but the final decision must be yours.]

Following further discussion, the time allotted for this topic was exhausted.

At the April 2002 meeting, Professor Fine introduced a motion concerning implementation of the Garza Agreement, suggesting there are two principles that come into play, as well as problems, history, difficulties, and key issues:

What, after careful consideration, the Senate and the Administration mutually undertake must be accorded a high level of respect and attention by both sides to ensuring that these obligations are met.

We accord great respect to academic due process by providing ample opportunities for dialogue and debate. This respect is open to abuse for the sake of delay.

The problem:

• We do NOT raise issues with respect to either the FCI or the position of Dean for CIS as leader of the FCI with a mission of outreach as described in the Garza Agreement.

• We address solely the issue of the element in the Garza Agreement, “The Computer Science Department will be located in one or more of the existing colleges based on the recommendations of the five-year academic plan.”

• The Computer Science Department is currently under the academic management of Dean for CIS Robert Constable.
CSD should be located in one or more of the existing colleges (particularly Engineering and Arts and Sciences) in conformity with the Garza Agreement and with uniform academic practice.

The current situation has had unfortunate consequences for the Engineering College, has damaged collegiality, is unwarranted by the nature of the CSD, and contradicts well-established patterns of academic governance.

Brief History:

Spring 1999: Provost Randel creates the position of Dean of CIS and appoints Robert Constable, former chair of the CSD, to this position.

Summer 1999: The anomalous location of the CSD occurs in the summer of 1999, against the desires of the then Dean of Engineering, John Hopcroft, and against the expressed desires of the chairs and directors of the departments in that college.

There is a University Faculty Forum on these matters in September 1999.

The Provost’s actions, and task force reports urging the incorporation of computational thinking and methods across the academic fields at Cornell, led to Senate involvement with these issues in September, October (twice), December of 1999, and February, April and May of 2000.

Vice Provost Cutberto Garza was charged by the Administration with developing a plan to implement task force recommendations.

This plan was presented to the Senate in February 2000 and reported to the Senate in May as having been accepted by the Administration.

The FCI was formed and began operation in June 2000.

Provost Martin declares that she will not decide the location of the CSD in 2000-2001.

In Fall 2001, Dean Craighead of Engineering begins a dialogue with the CSD leadership that is then terminated.

Difficulties:

- It has been suggested, as recently as the February meeting of the UFC that either this Agreement, developed in good faith with wide participation can be set aside
unilaterally or that its statement of “location” is sufficiently ambiguous as to accommodate to the current situation of the CSD.

• Provost Martin declared that she would not resolve the “location” issue in 2000-2001, nor would she allow it to be a point of negotiation with candidates for Dean of Engineering.

• Negotiations by Dean of Faculty Cooke with Dean Constable have failed to achieve agreement that would have avoided the need for this motion.

Solution:

• Point (7) of the motion before you from CAPP urges activation of the process of location of the CSD and suggests a deadline of six months from now for its completion. If this plan is followed, then it will correct a situation that has existed for the substantial period of three years.

• Point (8) of the motion explicates what the Senate means by “location”, consonant with the intentions of the Agreement. This is critical in view of the resistance to this interpretation.

• Point (9) ensures that the Senate remains informed of progress towards achieving the objectives of the preceding.

Key Issues:

Respect for a Carefully Developed Agreement:

The appearance that the Administration can just choose to disregard an agreement once it has served a purpose of quieting the faculty.

The desirability for the Senate to maintain continuity with itself.

Administration of Academic Units:

Departmental and College structures are the norm at Cornell and at our peer institutions.

Computer Science Department:

Issues involving the disposition of the CSD have been discussed at length.
• The numerous debates held on the floor of the Faculty Senate (and documented in its online transcripts) in September, October and December of 1999.

• The heated debate on September 15, 1999 at a university-wide Forum (also documented in an online transcript).

• The extended discussions conducted by a Vice Provost that led to a compromise that was presented to the Senate on February 7, 2000. Subsequently, that Vice Provost reported to the Senate (May 2000, transcript also online), reported publicly that that compromise had been accepted as university policy by the President and Provost.

Professor Arms presented a substitute motion:

“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.”

Rationale: This is Section 7 of the CAPP motion, with the first five words deleted. The aim is to have a courteous resolution that the Faculty Senate can accept unanimously.

The Garza Agreement was written at a time when the Faculty Senate was rightly annoyed by a sequence of academic decisions that were made without consultation of the faculty or the people concerned. The reorganization of Computer Science was one of these decisions. Vice Provost Garza negotiated a temporary agreement that calmed down the situation, but postponed the final decision. To achieve consensus, the agreement included some deliberately vague language. At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Provost announced that she will move ahead to resolve the situation once the new Dean of Engineering joins in July. Everybody, and especially the Computer Science Department, wants to see the uncertainty resolved. We believe that there can be a resolution that satisfies the reasonable concerns of all parties and lies firmly within the boundaries defined by the Garza agreement.

At a time when consensus building is called for, the CAPP motion seems inappropriate and unhelpful. The six introductory sections are unnecessarily assertive and selective in the facts that they present. The two final sections verge on rudeness to the Provost.

The Speaker called upon Professor John Abel, Director, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, to read a statement from the chairs of departments in the College of Engineering:
On the floor of the Senate meeting at its last meeting, it was alleged that all is well between the Computer Science Department and the College of Engineering, despite the separation of Computer Science from the College. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The College, through its Deans and the chairs of its departments, has vigorously and repeatedly protested the separation to the President and the Provost. We have explained that the temporary organizational structure imposed by then-Provost Randel harms Engineering and is simply unacceptable to its faculty. We have made our concerns clear to the Dean of Computing and Information Science and to the Chair of Computer Science in a series of meetings. They can have no doubt of our position.

The harm done to Engineering by removing CS while requiring Engineering to continue to admit and provide services for CS majors has a number of forms. The most elementary is this: the college has no say in the hiring and promotion of the CS faculty who will be teaching Engineering majors and responsible for shaping the curriculum delivered to them. It therefore has no control over the qualifications of CS faculty to teach engineering students.

We value our colleagues in CS, and we have supported the creation of the Faculty on Computing and Information. It is important for everyone to clearly understand that the Department of Computer Science and the FCI are two distinct entities. All departments in the University report to the Dean of a College. This is the fundamental organizational structure of this University. The Garza Report recognizes this, and specifies that the FCI will recommend the placement of CS in an existing College. It states:

“The initial charge to the FCIS will be the development of a five-year academic plan for the university-wide enhancement of teaching, research, and outreach related to computing and information sciences and of the quality and breadth of faculty appointments in support of its recommendations.

“The Computer Science Department will be located in one or more of the existing colleges based on the recommendations of the five-year academic plan.”

The Computer Science Department is not mentioned in the Garza Report except for the one sentence above and of the following subsequent statement:
“Existing undergraduate computer science majors will be maintained in the College of Arts and Sciences and Engineering. Admissions for undergraduates will proceed exactly as they do now through those colleges. Student services will continue to be provided as they presently are.”

In particular, the Garza Report lists the duties of the Dean of CIS, and those duties do not include authority over CS.

We firmly believe the Garza Report represents a contract and should be implemented without further delay. We believe CS should be located in an existing College, and prefer that to be Engineering.

Signed by Chairs of the College of Engineering, April 9, 2002: John Abel, CEE; Joel Brock, A&EP; Tim Healey, T&AM; Bryan Isacks, GS; Sidney Leibovich, M&AE; Chris Ober, MSE; Clif Pollock, ECE; Sidney Resnick, OR&IE; Michael Shuler, ChE; and Mike Walter, BEE

Discussion ensued. It was voted to go on and debate the original motion from Professor Fine.

On a vote call, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 63 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

(1) Whereas, the document “Draft (February 7, 2000), Faculty and Office for Computing and Information Science: Administrative and Management Structure”, hereinafter referred to as the Garza Agreement, was drafted by the Administration, in a deliberate process that included many written versions developed through extensive consultation with members of the Senate and other interested parties over a period of several months;

(2) Whereas, the Faculty Senate discussed the issues related to this Agreement at its meetings in September, October, and December of 1999;

(3) Whereas, the Agreement was presented to the Faculty Senate in February 2000 and announced to the Senate in May 2000 as being pursued by the President and Provost;

(4) Whereas, the Agreement represented a compromise between the interests of the University Faculty represented by the Senate, the Computer Science Department, and other academic units, including those represented by the Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Science and of Engineering;
(5) Whereas, while some aspects of this Agreement have been implemented, the re-location of the Computer Science Department into one or more of the existing colleges was held in abeyance by the Provost for academic year 2000-2001;

(6) Whereas, Dean Lewis of Arts and Sciences and Interim Dean Craighead of Engineering, have expressed dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs;

(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.

At the May 2002 meeting, Provost Biddy Martin said she has been meeting with the Department of Computer Sciences, some of the founders groups of the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences, and chairs and directors of the College of Engineering on the question of the location of the Department of Computer Science. She plans to report the outcome before October.

At the October 2002 meeting, Provost Biddy Martin said that the Senate has taken an interest in the location of the Computer Science Department and the governance of the faculty of Computing and Information Sciences. The Senate had adopted a motion on this subject on April 10, 2002, and the Committee on Academic Programs and Policies sent the Provost a letter in September, in anticipation of her reporting at this meeting. The letter and the Provost’s responses follow:

Note: Provost Biddy Martin’s responses are in brackets and bolded.

September 3, 2002

Provost Biddy 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.]
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 & Secretary of Faculty, ex officio

Questions to the Provost included the administrative arrangement. The Provost replied that the College of Engineering is the college where faculty members of Computing and Information Sciences belong for tenure. The budget for the Department of Computer Science is held by the Dean for the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences, but is transparent to the Dean of Engineering, that is, he has an advisory role. The Department of Computer Science actually becomes part of Computing and Information Sciences.

Provost Martin said that some of the structural mechanisms are still ambiguous because the details haven’t been worked out. But the Engineering College is the tenure home for Computer Science, with appointments and tenure promotion processes handled as in other colleges. The College of Engineering serves as the administrative umbrella for the entire operation of the Faculty of Computing and Information Sciences. There won’t be any changes in the relationship between Arts and Sciences and Computer Science. The system is a combination of traditional structures and some innovative structures and mechanisms. It is not a college, but an anomalous structure.