

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, October 14, 1998

The Speaker, Professor John Pollak, Animal Science: "We'll start off with some comments from Dean Cooke."

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the Faculty: "Let me make a few very brief comments about the session today and about the one a week from today. We have a panel presentation scheduled for you. My sense is that this is one of the most substantive conversations that the Faculty Senate is likely to have this year, so I am delighted that we are sponsoring this, and that we have a chance to come to a better understanding of the situation and to decide how we want to address it. A week from today, the meeting is not in this room but in Kennedy Hall, so make a note on your calendar. That will be called as an open forum, rather than a meeting of the Senate, so that we will broaden the participation to include other people such as lecturers and senior lecturers who are not full-fledged members of this body, but would be welcomed under those conditions.

"We've also created a web site <<http://UniversityFaculty.cornell.edu>> that is now up and running. We are hoping to use this as a significant piece in promoting communication with the faculty. The page will change as we enlarge it to serve the broader interests of University Faculty, not just the Faculty Senate. But at the moment there will be an item at the top. If you click on it, you get the current meeting's agenda and all the background documents. There are resource documents. We have the Martin-Coffman report from earlier on the Division of Biological Sciences now available on the web site. So is the document that we shared with you last May when we adopted a resolution saying that the faculty wanted to be a part of this conversation. There are also comments by the faculty, currently just a handful, but I fully expect this to expand in the days ahead. This will be, in fact, a useful way to facilitate conversation of the faculty. We have already three statements and there are others that will be made available immediately after the meeting today, or very shortly afterwards. But we'd like comments from the University Faculty, one to two pages, so that they are not excessive in length. Send them to Judy Bower and she will place them on the web site. We currently have statements from Walcott and Howland, from Bob Foote, who was part of the Morrison committee studying way back thirty years ago, and comments from one of the panelists, and perhaps we'll have comments from other panelists shortly. And I think that that's all I need to say. I promised to do it in three minutes; maybe I made it."

2. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST

Speaker Pollak: "O.K. We'll now move on to questions with the Provost."

Don M. Randel, University Provost: "Let me just say a word or two first. I'm going to defer anything I might say about biological sciences until we come to that and, if you want to ask me then, that might be appropriate. I'll otherwise say only a couple of words about a perennial topic which is before us again, namely, the sexual harassment procedures. You will recall that at the last meeting a resolution was passed. I had a discussion of this matter with the University Faculty Committee on last Tuesday and we were just getting rolling with that topic when the time to adjourn came around, and it was agreed by the Dean and those present that we needed to continue this discussion rather than try to rush it to a conclusion. I expect that we will discuss it again at the next meeting of the UFC and, following that, I will respond to the resolution which I otherwise expected to do today.

"Let me say parenthetically between now and then only that that resolution asks for essentially three things, that there be the right to confront the accuser in the investigative stage, that the accused party be presented with all of the evidence against him/her, and that the accused party have the right to rebut any such charges. The last two of those had already been incorporated in the procedures in the wake of discussions that were held with the UFC and the other committee engaged in drafting the procedures. So really what is novel about the resolution that you passed last month is the question of the right to confront your accuser in the hearing, and that was the subject of the discussion that we're having in the UFC and will continue to have. I'm extremely reluctant to adopt that provision at the investigative phase, given that any charged party who is a faculty member has a right to the faculty committee and the faculty committee judges that this has to do with the academic relationship, then the committee will

ultimately rule on everything. There will be ample opportunity for confrontation of witnesses, accusers, you name it. But in the investigative phase for both staff and faculty, as I say, I am very reluctant to adopt the notion that there should be confrontation of the charged party by the charging party and vice versa. I could elaborate on that and perhaps the occasion will present itself next time."

Associate Professor Randy Wayne, Plant Biology: "I was in Olin Library today and I happened to pick out a book that used to be owned by President White on biology, and I was just curious which biology books you've read recently. If you can't give me a specific title, just where is the library, what's the Library of Congress System? What are the numbers where you would find biology books?"

Provost Randel: "Next question?"

Provost Randel: "I've read the Science magazine issue with the cover title, 'The Evolution of Sex.' Maybe that counts."

Speaker Pollak: "Other questions? O.K. Thank you, Provost. Now we'll hear a report from the Nominations and Elections Committee."

3. APPROVAL OF FACULTY SENATE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 1998

Speaker Pollak: "O.K. While she's coming up here to get her slides ready, you've all had an opportunity to read the minutes from the September 9th meeting. Are there any corrections, additions, or comments to those? O.K. Seeing none, I'll cast the unanimous ballot in favor of them."

4. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Professor Kathleen Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I'd like to share with you the report of the Nominations and Elections Committee. We've made a number of individual appointments to specific committees that are listed in this overhead and the next one. They also were provided to you in the call to the meeting. These are all replacements for resignations or open seats of one sort or another. We still have one open seat on the Faculty Advisory Board of Information Technology, and a few more other incidental positions to fill. Are there any questions or comments?"

- Residence Life - Jennie Farley, ILR
- Health Services - Thomas Kern, Vet.
- Transportation Hearing and Appeals Board - Roberto Sierra, A&S
- P2K Advisory Committee - Mark Turnquist, Engr.
- P2K Council - John Muckstadt, Engr.
- University Hearing Board - James Turner, Afr. Ctr.
- Minority & Third World Affairs - Dong Lai, A&S
- Library Board - Eberhard Bodenschatz, A&S
- FABIT - Geraldine Gay, CALS
- Campus Life Faculty Committee - Don Ohadike, Afr. Ctr.
- Educational Policy Committee - Doug Gurak, CALS
- Campus Store Board - Florence Berger, Hotel

Speaker Pollak: "No comments on those nominations? O.K. Likewise I'll cast the vote for these accepting the report of the Nominations Committee."

"We have a resolution to be presented by Melissa Hines on the Academic Misconduct Policy and there is an amendment to that."

5. RESOLUTION ON THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

Assistant Professor Melissa Hines, Chemistry and Chemical Biology: "I've been asked to tell you today about a proposed revision to the Cornell Policy on Academic Misconduct. The stimulus for this revision was not anything that happened at Cornell; but, rather it was an external stimulus. Over the summer, the Office of Research Integrity at the DHHS reviewed our current policy and determined that we are not in compliance with their policies, and they supplied us with a four page list of problems in our current policy that had to be corrected. We were given a ninety-day deadline to comply with this policy and adopt a new policy because the deadline for the adoption of the new policy was about two months ago. So, our proposed revision of the policy primarily addresses these problems that were put forward by the Office of Research Integrity.

"They identified three major problems in our current policy, two of which are really substantial. (1) There are no provisions in the current policy for possible conflicts of interest with the investigators, and so that really does need to be corrected in the policy. (2) Also during the investigation there is no provision that allows for protection of people, funds or equipment during the investigation stage. So both of these do need to be addressed. (3) And additionally, the bulk of the problems that they listed had to do with reporting to sponsors. They have very strict reporting requirements that need to be put into our current policy. So about the first of August, the AFPS was asked to revise our current policy, and in doing this, we've really tried to do two things to our current policy. We want to revise it to meet these DHHS requirements and, at the same time, we want to look at the NSF requirements and make sure we meet those requirements because that is the only other sponsor that has formal requirements for academic misconduct. And, we have to conform to the very complicated new Cornell policy format. So those are the three things that we have tried to address in the new policy that is put forth to you today.

"So let me just very briefly go through this policy and let me apologize in advance, this is a very busy transparency ([Appendix A](#), attached), but I couldn't make it any simpler. O.K.? If there is an allegation of misconduct this allegation goes to the Dean of Faculty. The first stage is an inquiry. The purpose of the inquiry is to see whether a full investigation is warranted or not. In the usual course of events, the inquiry is carried out by the inquirer who is the Dean of Faculty. If there is a conflict of interest with the Dean of Faculty, the Provost will appoint an alternate inquirer. The inquiry goes on, and looks to see if there is any reason to have this investigation and the results are issued from the inquiry. If there is cause to believe that there was academic misconduct, then a full investigation begins. Usually the investigator will be the dean of the college, but again, if there is a problem with conflicts of interest, the Provost will be asked to appoint an alternate investigator. Additionally, the dean can ask any standing or ad hoc committee to assist in this investigation or he can appoint other people to help him as well. In either the investigation or the inquiry, if the Dean of Faculty or the dean of college does not have sufficient expertise to look into these allegations, they can appoint other people to help them.

"After the investigation is completed, the investigator issues a report which must include his determination whether there is in fact, or was in fact, any academic misconduct, and if there was academic misconduct a recommendation for sanctions. After the investigator, who's normally the dean of the college issues this report, the report is forwarded to the inquirer, who is usually the Dean of Faculty. The inquirer then reviews these findings and has the option to accept or modify either the determination or the sanctions. This is the same as what is currently in effect in our policy right now. So after the inquirer reviews the findings and decides on a final determination and sanctions, he or she issues the results. If there is cause, if there was academic misconduct, all of the sponsors are notified at this point that there was indeed academic misconduct. If the sanctions are contested, then the applicable grievance procedures can be invoked. So that's pretty much like what we have in place right now, but there are some reporting requirements that are also in here.

"We decided that all of the reporting is best done by the Vice Provost for Research. During the inquiry, at any stage, or at the beginning, if this involves sponsored research, then the funds will be protected if necessary. If any other

protection is needed, then the Vice Provost will also see to this action of individuals and equipment. If there is any indication that there is a criminal violation or that this problem will be publicly reported, then the Vice Provost has to notify the sponsors if it is required by their policies. So that's what happens during the inquiry. After the end of the inquiry, but before the investigation begins, the Vice Provost must notify the sponsors of the affected research. This is before the investigation begins. And if it would be a good idea in his opinion, the other sponsors of the investigated individuals may be notified.

"During the investigation, the Vice Provost has more reporting responsibilities. Again, if there is protection he will take care of that. If there is evidence that there was a criminal violation there will be a public report of these problems or if facts are found that could affect the sponsors, the sponsors will be notified if it is required by their internal policies. So, in a nutshell, this is the new policy. There are not major changes from the current policy. Most of the changes are in the section on reporting, and a few changes in the rest of the policy."

Speaker Pollak: "We'll hold questions on the resolution itself until we have addressed the amendment. The amendment has been submitted by Peter Stein and Bob Lucey, and Peter Stein will make a comment on the amendment."

Professor Stein: "The proposed amendment to the paragraph entitled Inquiry on Page 5 changes what happens if the Dean of Faculty has a conflict of interest. It says:

(additions in bold)

*Upon receiving such a report, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a preliminary Inquiry into the allegation or other evidence of possible academic misconduct. Should the Dean of the Faculty have a real or apparent conflict of interest with the case, **the Secretary/Associate Dean of the Faculty will serve as the Inquirer. Should the Secretary/Associate Dean of the Faculty have a real or apparent conflict of interest with the case,** the Provost will appoint a member of the professorial faculty to serve as the Inquirer. The purpose conduct of the Inquiry.*

"It's a simple change. When the whole reorganization of faculty governance took place several years ago, there was a conscious attempt on the part of the Executive Committee of the FCR to make the office of Secretary of the Faculty a more weightier office, because the feeling was that it would help to have two people in that office who could talk together and consult together on different matters of importance. And so the title was changed from Secretary to Secretary/Associate Dean, and the responsibilities were to serve for the Dean when appropriate. That's the normal function of an Associate Dean, and so it just seemed to me like this was a reasonable place where an Associate Dean should serve automatically.

"I did call up Professor Hines, the chair of the committee, and asked her why it was that the committee chose not to do that, and she told me as best I can remember that there was some concern on the committee that the Associate Dean of the Faculty might not be a person to whom one would entrust this weighty responsibility. And I must say it surprised me. I started to think of the Secretaries of the Faculty that I've known and worked with. I've worked with Kathy Rasmussen, with Bob Lucey, with Mary Morrison when I was Dean, and then before that in different contexts I worked with Fran Herman and with Paul Hartman, and all these people were substantial people, and I have no problem giving any of these people this kind of responsibility. I also would point out that it's unlikely that this is going to happen, but we give to the Associate Dean of the Faculty far weightier responsibilities. The Associate Dean of the Faculty chairs the committee that appoints people to all of the faculty committees and forms the slate of nominees for the offices that we elect, and that's an issue which affects faculty governance on a daily basis, and I think if we can give that office that responsibility, we ought to be able to give the office this responsibility."

Speaker Pollak: "Bob has joined in this amendment, so it's seconded. Are there any comments or discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all of those in favor of the amendment, signify by raising your hand. All those opposed? The amendment carries. Now back to the resolution, are there comments or questions on the resolution? Yes?"

Professor Keith Dennis, Mathematics: "I was taken by the word 'protection.' I didn't quite understand precisely what it meant, and in particular, I was curious about whether this or other Cornell policies cover the accused in the following way. That is, what are the technicalities for carrying out the investigation? It seems you might want to look at someone's computer files, their correspondence, their lab notebooks, whatever. Assuming a presumption of innocence, it might be that if you took such things away from them it would interrupt their research. I know they have the right to have, maybe not the originals, but a copy so they can continue their work during the investigation. And another question it seems to me that comes up there is a question of the actual location of such things and who actually owns them. Is it Cornell, the sponsor, the individual or their house or in their office? It seems to me that you get into all sorts of, shall we say, technical problems when you want to have access to such things. Is that really addressed here or elsewhere, or am I just missing something?"

Professor Hines: "The reason we put 'protection of individuals, funds, and equipment' in there was it was taken verbatim from what we were asked to put in by the DHHS."

Professor Dennis: "But that means presumably protecting of sponsors' interests. Is that, or is that individual ... any equipment ...?"

Professor Hines: "I think what it was meant to do was to protect people from harm, so in case someone is doing strange research that possibly involves clinical trials, and there is some evidence of misconduct, then people involved in these clinical trials should be protected. And that may mean that the clinical trials would have to stop. That is what I took to be the intent."

Professor Dennis: "Right. That was my interpretation as well. My question was, is there any protection for the individual who's being investigated so that, assuming they are innocent, they haven't lost a hundred and twenty days, or whatever, because all of their equipment, notebooks, correspondence has been taken away from them?"

Professor Hines: "We have not addressed that in the current policy. There is no explicit protection, but there is also no loss."

Professor Dennis: "Is that covered elsewhere under Cornell policies?"

Professor Hines: "I have no idea."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments and questions?"

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: "Just a minor point. When you said the reporting duties of the Vice Provost, perhaps just the duties, because it has both protection and reporting together in the part that you showed us on the sheet. I was just wondering why you just called it 'reporting duties'."

Professor Hines: "This was just something that I made for you to show today. There is a full flowchart in the back of the policy that's much more complex. This was just to try and make it easy for everyone to understand."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments?"

Professor Judith Reppy, Science and Technology Studies: "It seems to me that whatever the intention of this language that you've used, in practice the language is quite broad. It could cover protection of the rights of the investigator as well as the poor patients who are alleged to be harmed. So the question is, is it a problem? I mean, it's certainly an issue in some cases, but is it a problem of the language that's being proposed here? I would guess not. The Vice Provost could protect the individual investigator as well I suppose."

Speaker Pollak: "Are you ready for the question?"

Assistant Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "I'm just noticing that the reporting to the sponsors goes on very shortly after the allegation has first surfaced and before it's been verified. And I'm aware that that entails some risks in terms of what if the allegation is false and we've proceeded to point out the potential to the sponsor, and perhaps started to hurt the accused's reputation. I'm curious about the rationale for it. I assume it was required

by the outside board."

Professor Hines: "Yes. We had absolutely no choice in this. If we want to receive NIH funding, we have to do this."

Professor Simons: "As soon as the accusation has been raised and it's been determined there is some grounds for it?"

Professor Hines: "Yes. Yes, then you definitely have to notify the sponsors. And if there are problems beforehand that could be publicly reported or things like that, then you have to notify even earlier. But these things are all verbatim requirements from the sponsor."

Professor Simons: "O.K. Thanks."

Speaker Pollak: "Peter?"

Professor Stein: "We've been following those rules for some time now, even though they weren't part of the policy. We did routinely follow them and notify the sponsors when there were investigations."

Speaker Pollak: "Yes?"

Professor Richard Galik, Physics: "I should note that language has been added in the policy to specify that the Dean or unit heads will 'undertake diligent efforts to restore the reputations of persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct'."

Speaker Pollak: "Other comments? I'll remind you to stand so that people can see you and hear you. O.K. We'll call for the question now if there are no other comments. All of those in favor of the resolution, signify by raising your hand. All of those opposed. The resolution carries ([Appendix B](#), attached).

"We'll now move on to a panel discussion of the Biological Sciences at Cornell. I'm to introduce Bert Garza, who will introduce the panel. They didn't tell me what to do if Bert's not here."

Dean Cooke: "He's coming in from Washington. I would just call the panel and go ahead and start."

6. PRESENTATION ON RECENT REPORT ON THE DIVISION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Speaker Pollak: "Bert Garza has sent his introduction with Kathleen and she will read that introduction and then I'll ask the panel to come forward and make their presentations."

Professor Rasmussen: "You'll just have to think of me as Bert for this for the future, and so I will use the 'I' substituting for Bert."

"First I want to thank Dean Cooke for arranging this meeting, the members of the panel for agreeing to participate in this discussion and to each of you for coming to share your views."

"It is important to begin by recognizing that we have common goals at this meeting, the strengthening of basic biology on this campus and, in so doing, strengthening the broader life sciences and better serving our students, faculty, and the public that supports us."

"It also is important to address two principal concerns that faculty have raised. One is that decisions already have been made by the central administration and, thus, that this consultation is an empty exercise. The other relates to the timing of the decision-making process."

"In response to the first concern, I assure you that no decision has been made on the matter before you. Furthermore, it is the expectation of all members of the academic cabinet that past positions relative to the structure of the Division of Biological Sciences taken by any of us have been set aside. I am assured that all members of that advisory body are approaching the closing stages of this review with an objective mind set and that all are striving

to serve the University's best interests rather than that of any single unit.

"In response to the second concern, the Task Force headed by Associate Deans Coffman and Martin was commissioned in the summer of 1997. Its report was issued in March of 1998. Failure to come to closure on recommendations made by this group and others is taking an increasingly heavier toll on faculty morale, their ability to plan, the University's capacity to support individual faculty, departments, colleges, centers and institutes in implementing key decisions intended to strengthen their programs, as well as how we are perceived by our peers as we compete for students, prospective faculty, research opportunities etc. Therefore, the university community has a strong interest to come to closure on this matter in a timely way.

"I hope each of you read the report of the Task Force appointed to review the Division of Biological Sciences' organizational structure, the organized response of several faculty to that report, and the report of the external team that recently visited the campus. It is my view that the latter report entangled three distinct issues: (1) the future organizational structure of the Division of Biological Sciences, (2) the stature and organization of the broad area of life sciences throughout the University, and (3) issues of university governance that affect over 400 faculty positions.

"I suggest that this afternoon's discussion focus on the first of these matters, i.e., on the organizational structure of basic biology/Division of Biological Sciences keeping our common goals in mind.

"Some of you also have had the opportunity to read self-studies prepared by various sections within the Division of Biological Sciences and other life science departments. Please bring perspectives developed through those self-studies to the discussion.

"Your recommendations are sought regarding alternative structures and/or characteristics that a new or existing structure(s) should be designed or modified to meet. Input from this and other meetings that are planned, various reports that have been submitted and written comments from various groups and individual faculty will be distilled and broad outlines of alternatives will be presented at a meeting called by the Faculty Senate on October 21.

"The strongest and most common recommendations made are that whatever organizational structure is implemented, it should:

- (1) Do more than just reorganize the proverbial chessboard.
- (2) Anticipate advancements in knowledge that drive excellence in research, teaching, and extension rather than the alternative of letting organizational structures principally determine future directions.
- (3) Be flexible. Biology is and will be moving too fast over the foreseeable future to permit institutional torpor.
- (4) Be faculty-driven. The organizational framework must include reward structures and institutional roles that motivate faculty teaching, extension, and research within and across academic units.
- (5) Assure excellence. It must enhance collaboration and coordination across departments and colleges in key steps of the hiring, tenuring, and promotion processes. And,
- (6) Assure congruence among goals, responsibility, accountability, and resource availability in the implementation of university-wide interests and in the updating of facilities within colleges and, equally importantly, across colleges in support of interests that transcend single colleges.

"It will be very helpful to have your reactions to these characteristics and/or your assessment of their relevance to a specific solution any of us may recommend."

Professor Rasmussen: "I also thank you for your indulgence on Dr. Garza's behalf, because he had a long-planned meeting at the USDA in Washington today."

Speaker Pollak: "O.K. We'll move through the panelists, and they'll each have three or four minutes to make their presentation. We'll start with Bill Fry. If the rest of the panelists could make their way down front, maybe we could expedite the switching of speakers."

Professor William Fry, Plant Pathology: "I'm a plant pathologist in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and I've always regarded myself as a biologist of sorts, sometimes very applied and sometimes less applied. I've had a fairly long association with the Division of Biological Sciences, with Harry Stinson, in Biochemistry with Joe Calvo, and Plant Physiology with Andre Jagendorf. So it's good experience. I have a disclaimer. The reason I'm here is because I was sitting next to Bob Cooke at a reception and he asked me to appear before you. I have no particular history in this, even though I've been with the college for the better part of twenty-five years and have a vested interest in biology at Cornell.

"I'd like to make a series of observations. The first view I heard was that biology at Cornell is a very large enterprise. When the Faculty Committee on Program Review (FCPR) looked at the number of persons who contributed to biology, they came up with a list of nearly five hundred faculty in both Ithaca and Geneva, not including the Medical School. From those of us who are in applied departments, I want to assure you that excellence in basic biology is of utmost concern to us. We cannot exist in applied departments if the basic biology units are not absolutely excellent. There are all kinds of benefits to us to have basic biology be absolutely strong. So I want to assure you that from four hundred or so faculty who are not in the Division, it is crucial that basic biology be very strong at Cornell. There are too many benefits to enumerate and I will not list them at this time.

"I would also mention the importance of biology. Some persons have suggested that we are currently in the age of biology, there are revolutions in understanding technology, and also economic implications, and I think these revolutions are reflected in some very large companies which used to be pharmaceutical companies, which used to be chemical companies, are now billing themselves as life sciences companies. The undergraduate majors in biology are crucially important for those of us in more applied units, and we strongly support whatever intent to nurture and support those things that facilitate our largely successful curriculum in biology.

"There are some reported trends in biology. In my area, which is plant science, some of the most exciting work is coming from very large centers in which multi-disciplinary teams can be focused on specific problems. And so I think team building with interdisciplinary components is a really important issue for the future of biology. I think the distinctions between applied and basic research are becoming blurred. Many of the discoveries now are need-driven, problem-driven, and some of those result in very significant discoveries regardless of whether it's basic or applied research. An example at this university is John Sanford, located in the Department of Horticultural Sciences at the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, who developed a gene gun. Another example is the current Genomics Initiative, which is very strongly supported by the faculty both within and without the Division of Biological Sciences. We all see this as an important issue and it's being supported very strongly.

"The two reports that you heard Bert talk about just a minute ago (laughter) came to some very similar recommendations. They also came to some very dissimilar recommendations. I'd like to emphasize those dissimilar recommendations. The internal task force recommended the dissolution of the Division of Biological Sciences with the sections of the Division to be remolded into departments which would then benefit from the advocacy of the appropriate dean. Another dissimilarity is that university-wide decisions concerning biology are to be developed with the aid of an external body of consultants and a vice provost to work with the appropriate deans to achieve the recommendations of the consultants.

"Let me just give you the review of the consultants from this last summer. A major difference is that they suggested the appointment of a vice provost for biological sciences, dealing with basic biology. Again, they suggest that this vice provost be advised by an external candidate. My personal concern is -- I don't presume to say I represent a group of people -- that a vice provost position located in Day Hall might not facilitate the type of team building, the type of communications that are required in this new age of biology. My fear is that this might create walls rather than bridges. I am also concerned that a vice provost position, with faculty lines, support, and budget, sounds very

much like a college to me. And I was wondering if that's the kind of direction we want to move."

Speaker Pollak: "Howie Howland."

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I'm here because I played some role in organizing a group of faculty who responded to the original Task Force Report, and it's certainly sort of jumbled, kind of a kaleidoscope presentation here. But, I believe the Task Force Report is on the web, and so is our report, so I think you can get the logic of that. I found myself, in talking with my colleague Professor Walcott, who is Director of the Division now, that we had large agreement. And so we sat down together, and given the fact that there were such diverse proposals on the floor, we formulated some principles, and that's passed out on the sheets that you have. And if for some reason you missed that sheet I have some more here that I'll leave on the front table if you want to get them.

"Well, the facts and principles we outlined are the following. They're on the sheet, so I'll just go over them briefly with you. The undergraduate curriculum is a nationally recognized success and we believe that it's health and maintenance depends upon a strong single academic unit which embraces the full range of basic biological sciences and includes a professoriate which both teaches and conducts research. So, a strong unit to protect the undergraduate curriculum. Secondly, we think that with the advent of modern molecular biology, there are more reasons for biologists to collaborate with one another than there were ever before, and we think that with artful coordination, Cornell biology can be greater than the sum of its parts, rather than less as it is at the present. Those are the two arguments, I think, for keeping a strong central unit. We know that, and we're in agreement with the external reviewers who looked with astonishment on our situation. We believe that no academic unit can be strong unless its principal officer has control of an adequate budget and the power of appointment of a significant number of faculty positions. That was the situation of the first Director of the Division of Biological Sciences, and for one reason or another, that power has eroded over the years. We also think, and I agreed with the previous speaker, Professor Fry, the distinction between pure and applied biological research has become increasingly blurred. Nonetheless, we think there will always be some areas of biological research that have no immediate obvious practical applications, read 'not interesting' for money making, but which are believed to be basic to other applied areas of research. The central biology unit referred to above must provide a home for such pure research areas. We think that biology, biochemistry and molecular biology, and genetics and development, which should be in there, must be strengthened and invigorated at Cornell, but not at the cost of weakening the great strength in classical biology. And by classical biology, we mean organismic, ecological and evolutionary biology. Those strengths make Cornell unique among the nation's research universities. We believe that, and we know that there are many biologists in many different departments and ways must be found to facilitate communication, cooperation and coordination among these biologists. And when it's appropriate we should change the boundaries and bring into the unit of Biological Sciences those efforts in biology that originate in the sister sciences.

"We believe the direction of the Biological Sciences would be materially improved if the chief officer were advised by advisory groups which were both internal and external to Cornell. We agree with Professor Fry. We drew some premises from this, and that's what I hope we'll do today and in future discussions, that we'll look at this logically and see whether what we're doing makes sense in terms of what we think is important. So, we said, it would be foolish to abandon the Division without replacing it with a stronger central unit. Now, we might not go all the way to what our outside advisors suggested, but if you don't, then you certainly want to hang on to what you've got, and strengthen it. And it has to be strengthened because we don't think the current Division as presently constituted can survive. It doesn't have the strength, the budget, or the power of appointments that are being eroded. That's sort of the basis of our stand and I hope that these principles may play some use in your thinking about the problem. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Dean Lewis."

Philip Lewis, Harold Tanner Dean, College of Arts and Sciences: "The statement that I have prepared isn't 100% compatible with one sentence in Bert Garza's introductory remarks. Rather than say that my past positions have been set aside, I would prefer to say that they are not rigid or final, and that persuasive arguments might prompt me to modify them. I believe the options under consideration at this juncture can be reduced to three major models, all of which would retain the existing undergraduate biology program and give an important role to its director, and

each of which could have a number of possible variations.

"The first of these three would retain the Division model with a smaller number of sections and with enhanced authority for the director. The second would adopt the course recommended by the three external reviewers who visited us this summer, which is to concentrate the responsibility for hiring biologists, and structuring biology programs in the central administration. The third would adopt the course recommended by last spring's Task Force on the Biology Division. It would transform the Division into two or three large departments with reporting relations to the relevant college deans. Since that Task Force Report of last spring, I have been expressing my general support for this third model proposed by the Task Force. My sympathy for it is undeniably related to a concern with the academic integrity of the undergraduate colleges. However, my principle reason has to do with mobilizing faculty for leadership roles in the key areas of basic biology. In the physical science departments of my college, strong chairs working with a core group of respected senior faculty have successfully exercised the responsibility for maintaining distinguished programs. Thanks to their leadership, these departments function very well with minimal interference from the administration. I believe comparable arrangements at the departmental level would optimize our chances for building greater strength in the enabling sphere of Cell and Molecular Biology, and for maintaining our distinguished programs in organism biology.

"I also believe it is time for us to make a decision on the basic organizational structure. The program reviews and further discussions within the community can and will contribute usefully to the many decisions of the type we shall face. But gathering more opinions about the administrative structures appropriate at Cornell seems unlikely to make a significant difference while waiting for another year or more to get on with the planning required under any of the three models under consideration. It seems to me likely to be counter-productive."

Speaker Pollak: "Daryl Lund."

Daryl Lund, Ronald P. Lynch Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences: "I defer to the eloquence of our distinguished Dean from the College of Arts and Sciences regarding the comments which we shall be making here regarding our own personal opinions on the structure of biology at Cornell University. In addition to the three structural models that Phil has so eloquently laid out for you, there is, of course, the concern about the breadth of those models. And since as Bert has suggested, we are here considering specifically the positions that are in the Division of Biological Sciences, this rather narrows the scope of how we're going to be addressing the lines and the budgetary resources in support of the Biological Sciences at large across this University.

"It seems to me that there are some principles by which we ought to make these considerations. The first one is that whatever structure we arrive at should obviously foster collaboration and strategic planning or support in these areas of basic biological sciences. Secondly, strong departmental leadership is absolutely essential, as demonstrated and pointed out again by Phil. Third, we must preserve the undergraduate program, frankly, largely intact as I understand it, because it does seem to be working well across several colleges who employ it for undergraduate students. Fourth, external reviews, including external advisory councils, should be employed in the future to help us focus on improving our teaching, research, and where appropriate our extension/outreach programs in the biological sciences both at large as well as within the basic biological sciences. Fifth, we should not create a structure in which we have differentially provided rewards or additional hurdles for faculty in tenuring and other activities, and so we should not create those hurdles or rewards for subsets of faculty. Sixth, we should engage and ultimately charge the deans with responsibility for improving the status of the basic biological sciences at Cornell University. And lastly, seven, we should move forthwith with regard to the structure of the Division of Biological Sciences and not wait until all of these reviews are in.

"It seems to me that there are three specific action steps that need to be taken fairly soon. One is to clearly define our objectives. We want excellence in the basic biological sciences in what arenas, as measured by whom, and to what purpose? Secondly, that we should specify which further investments in the biological sciences are actually being requested, relative to molecular biology, biochemistry, structural biology, genetics, etc. And thirdly, to clearly lay out the alternatives for organizational structure with potential impacts and characteristics."

Speaker Pollak: "Don Smith."

Don Smith, Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine: "I received the memorandum from President Rawlings exactly one month ago today with the External Review Committee's Report on the Biological Sciences. After reading it and noticing that we had several days to respond, I responded to President Rawlings saying that he clearly got the attention of the College of Veterinary Medicine. I do concur with the external review group that Cornell University does have a mismatch in resource allocation and in productivity in the biological sciences. Certainly productivity in molecular and cell biology and genomics, in structural biology, chemical biology, must be enriched if Cornell is going to resume its leadership position in the biological sciences. And I'm particularly heartened, both personally and on behalf of the College of Veterinary Medicine, that we as a college are included in this expanded definition of biology on this campus, although I would have been felt better if the reviewers, at least the external reviewers, had known the difference between veterinary sciences and veterinary medicine. There are fundamental differences, not just nomenclature.

"Veterinary medicine does have a distinctive mission with respect to enhancing animal health and welfare. It also has a unique opportunity to contribute in important ways to comparative medicine and in transitional biology, perhaps in ways that have not heretofore been recognized in this University. In the Veterinary College, within the last couple of years, we've given much thought to these matters and are pursuing initiatives in some respects very similar to some of those recommended by the external review committee. Recognizing that many advances in biology and in medicine are occurring at the interface of traditional disciplines, we did reorganize our administrative and our departmental structure within the last year to give greater prominence to interdisciplinary research, both in cell and molecular biology as well as in genetics, cancer biology, and also to integrating these disciplines into our professional curriculum and into our delivery of animal patient care.

"Which brings me to an earlier point which I made in my letter to President Rawlings, and that is that any report, internal or external, in which we look at the biological sciences, should have an enriched understanding, a deeper understanding of how to integrate biology and medicine. The external committee calls for the centralization of administration and planning for the biological sciences under an associate provost. My principal concern with the committee's model, with this model, which has been referred to earlier, is that measures taken to strengthen areas of perceived weakness at the University level, unintentionally dislocate parallel efforts either within the College of Veterinary Medicine or perhaps in other colleges. Teaching initiatives and research are inextricably linked, at least in our college, to our unique professional teaching and our professional service missions. These considerations argue for retaining faculty lines at the college level while promoting effective consultation and coordination to a central authority. Rather than succumb to an overly prescriptive resolution of the vexing organizational issues of which we're all familiar, I would like to limit my comments to the following, and they reflect what I would call a higher set of standards for both rigor and relevance in the biological sciences at Cornell. And so I have three very specific recommendations which transcend any organizational structure.

"First, that we establish measurable parameters by which the magnitude and the quality of biological research can be evaluated, and hold all administrative units responsible for achieving the highest standards for their faculty. Secondly, that we identify targets of opportunity for integrating biological disciplines across colleges and departments, and foster a climate that supports interdisciplinary scientific and teaching endeavors. And third, and finally, that we develop a deeper understanding of the unique opportunities that exist on this campus to forge meaningful integration between basic biological sciences, such as chemical biology, and the biological systems with veterinary medical and medical applications."

Speaker Pollak: "And we'll conclude with Charles Walcott. While he's coming up here, formulate your questions now, because when we begin I'd like to give each person one opportunity. No follow-up questions until everybody has had an opportunity and then we may go ahead. Be prepared."

Professor Charles Walcott, Director of the Division of Biological Sciences: "I'm going to be very brief, because a lot of what I would have said has already been said, and I see no point in saying it twice. I came here as a graduate student in 1956, in the Department of Zoology, which I believe was in the Arts College back in those arcane days. And biology at Cornell at that point was spread largely throughout the University. It seems to me that the Division has served in a couple of very important ways to change the face of biology at this University. It's brought people together. It has brought a unified curriculum at the undergraduate level for all biology majors, a curriculum that by any of the objective measures we've applied to it seems to be successful and doing a very good job in terms of

students that get into medical schools and so on. And the curriculum is an outcome of a joint effort by a great many of the sections. But biology has grown since the Division was founded some thirty years ago. It's spread into many disciplines. Chemical biology is but one example, there's biology in physics, engineering, and we've heard about the necessity for the applied areas.

"At the same time I think the Division has not been responsive to these changes. It has not been welcoming people from some of the applied departments to come and participate in our teaching programs, and I think that the growth of biology in other areas has been inhibited from having a unity which is really necessary. So I look for a solution to our organizational problems which provides some measure of a strengthening of the core of biology, a Division of some structure of that sort. And that core would have the responsibility to reach out and promote interaction with all the other biologists on the campus, would emphasize some form of faculty governance, would emphasize the outside consultation with experts, and then it would need some administrative mechanism. There are various possibilities to ensure that the needs of this group of biologists is consonant with the needs of the various colleges, which are, rightfully, very different, would also suit the needs of our undergraduates. And it seems to me that such a structure would have to be in some way above the level of the colleges in terms of coordination, but in no means should co-opt the individual colleges' needs to fulfill their own particular missions. And it seems to be the task before us all to think through the details of how such an arrangement can be made. Thank you."

7. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Speaker Pollak: "It would help if you could direct your questions to one or two of the speakers so that we don't get a panel response to one question. And we'll open it up now for questions and comments. Peter."

Professor Stein: "From somebody who has no interest whatsoever in the outcome of this, I just would like to make a couple of observations. One is this notion of a vice provost. As one of the panelists said, it's sort of like a dean, but it's not exactly like a dean. It strikes me as a funny kind of dean. It's a dean that has faculty, but doesn't have students, and doesn't have a curriculum. It only has the power of appointment somehow. And it strikes me that that is not a stable structure, not if one was going to make a College of Biology that would be a third of this University. Maybe that's O.K. But I think that the dean of that college ought to have the responsibility for educating undergraduate students then, and the responsibility for doing admissions and financial aid, and infrastructure and everything that deans have responsibility for. It does seem to me as I sat and listened to Phil Lewis' three alternatives that I don't like any of them.

"It seems to me that there's a fourth alternative that answers more of the complaints that were made. And the fourth alternative is to make a Division where the director of the Division has more power than he had, because everyone seems to say that the lack of power for the Division director didn't help biology very much. But everyone also says that the boundaries of biology keep expanding today, and you can't really separate pure and applied. So I wonder why one couldn't take a Division director that has the breadth of the vice provost, namely, has concerns for all of the programs in biology that go on on the campus, but shares with the deans the ultimate responsibility, so has somewhat less authority than the vice provost is given in the outside committee's report."

Speaker Pollak: "Yes?"

Professor Richard Harrison, Ecology and Systematics: "I'm Rick Harrison and I'm Chair of the Section of Ecology and Systematics within the Division and I don't think it's appropriate that no one from the task force on which I served was asked to participate. I actually have prepared a few comments, which in some sense are a rebuttal to what Howie Howland said and a reflection of what the task force, I think, was about. I don't speak for the other members. I don't know. Is that appropriate in this?"

Speaker Pollak: "Yes, go ahead."

Professor Harrison: "I don't speak for my section either. The piece I have to say is really my own personal view. I spent a lot of energy and put a lot of time into the Task Force Report and I really still believe quite strongly that many components of that report are still the right decision. And I want to simply examine the first three premises that Howie Howland discussed, and examine them from the perspective of the Task Force Report. Because in fact

they represent a rebuttal in some sense. And if you read those premises and the conclusions drawn from them, what you see is that there are arguments being made as to why the Division should be strengthened rather than abolished. So let me just examine the first three. The four through seven, I think we're all in agreement on.

"One says that the undergraduate curriculum is a nationally recognized success, the undergraduate curriculum in biology. I'll take that as a given. I don't know that we have hard data. The next sentence says, 'Its health and maintenance depends upon a strong single academic unit which embraces the full range of the basic biological sciences.' And that basically implies that we need a strong Division to continue our successful undergraduate curriculum. I don't think that is a given. I don't think that is a fact. I don't think we have any data. The task force strongly recommended retaining a single coordinated biology curriculum and major and, moreover, described a structure for coordinating and directing that major that included a director of undergraduate biology who in fact was given more clout vis-à-vis curriculum than the current Division director or associate director currently has.

"The second premise is that with the advent of modern molecular biology, biologists of all subjects at once have more reason to collaborate, etc. I'd like to rewrite that sentence and say that with the advent of modern molecular biology, biologists now have more reason to collaborate with chemists, physicists, engineers, and computer scientists, and my feeling is that if we create a 'single strong central unit of biological sciences which has control of its own budget and faculty' that it will only serve to isolate biologists more and to further fragment what I consider an already uncomfortably fragmented University.

"And number three, 'No academic unit can be strong unless its principal officer has control of an adequate budget and the power of appointment of a significant number of faculty positions.' This premise is essentially saying if the Division is to exist, it must have a Division director who controls the budget, etc. That may be the case, but in fact, departments have flourished within the college system in this University, and I would look to my colleagues in physics and chemistry, as I understand it, those two departments have clearly flourished as departments within the college system. Why, therefore, should biology, which is simply another discipline within the sciences, be given special treatment or be made into a strong Division or a narrow college? One reason might be that it cuts across several colleges, and that therefore it requires special treatment. Physics and chemistry are within the College of Arts and Sciences. Again, I would argue that rather than carving it out of those colleges, that is creating a vice provost or a strengthened Division director, we should look to provide coordination and facilitation from the higher administration. And the Task Force Report, again, addressed this issue by recommending in fact that there be a new vice provost, but not one who has control over budget and facilities, etc., but one who would have the responsibility for integration and facilitation and coordination, and I think that recommendation still has merit now as it did six months ago. So, at least as one member of the task force, I strongly support the recommendations that we made six months ago."

Speaker Pollak: "Other questions?"

Professor Howland: "May I respond? With regard to the first point on maintaining the curriculum. If we split biology up into individual departments, I think that's extremely unlikely. I think that if we had individual departments who are responsible for different portions of biology, these departments are going to act like departments, and they're going to say, 'We need to educate our majors in this way.' And they will come down with the full force of their specialization and their expertise and say, 'that's why it has to be.' I think the biology curriculum would not maintain its unity in the face of that sort of approach. To show you, just let me tell you about the power of departments. We have a department that last summer renamed itself, by itself, without consulting anybody else. Chemistry became Chemistry and Chemical Biology. With that sort of departmental power, what do you think is going to happen to the curriculum?"

"I think that there is no evidence that the Division has not cooperated very well with people outside the Division. I myself collaborated with somebody in Theoretical and Applied Mechanics. I think we could make numerous collaborations. I think there simply isn't evidence that the Division has blocked interdepartmental or collaboration between the Division and outside biology. I think those were the two biggest points."

Speaker Pollak: "Other questions and comments."

David Shalloway, Greater Philadelphia Professor of Biological Science: "Many of you are not from biology and I want you to understand how serious this problem is for us, that the option of maintaining the status quo is not tenable. I think Dean Lewis said it well when he pointed to the problem of effective leadership. We are the unit with molecular biology in our name. We feel, frankly, bad that there has not been better effective leadership in this area of molecular and cell biology on campus. We don't feel that this is particularly our own fault, but that the current situation basically works against effective leadership. By the very fact that molecular and cell biology is so important it has been spread out so far that there is no one unit anywhere that can effectively work in its favor. The Division as it stands has no authority and what in effect happens is that sections, such as my own, end up pleading with separate colleges, which have very little coordination and very little communication. We don't blame this on the deans. We think this is a structural problem. It is not a problem that came or went with any individual dean. It is built into the structure. And actually coordination and cooperation between the faculty, from our point of view, is much superior than coordination and cooperation between colleges. Provost Randel actually pointed that out at a meeting on Monday and pointed out how his view of things has dramatically changed that there had to be more change. And again, I think that is a factor of the situation. So, in some way, I don't think that you will get coordination between the colleges.

"My experience, and that of the chairs before me, has been that there will not be coordination between the colleges in a sort of good will sense, because the colleges really do have different missions that overlap to some extent but the situation we experience is almost that of a child between two divorced parents. So, either we require a strengthened Division where we can negotiate with one authority to actually deal with the issues that we raise, or else somehow we have to be placed within one of the colleges. Or, someone has to have a brainstorm and really figure out how to have these colleges really work in a coordinating, cooperative fashion when it comes down to dollars."

Speaker Pollak: "Comments? Questions of the panelists?"

Professor Galik: "I think we've all before seen that this university does very well with departments and the departments are very strong. I do, therefore, sort of identify with Phil Lewis' suggestion that several departments would perhaps be the appropriate model. However, as we've heard and the task force pointed out, that there is this concern that there are limited resources, and eventually there is some center that there is going to be money for, and there's only money for one. And which college is going to get to win this prize? I was wondering if Phil could comment on how he sees the interaction between and among the colleges and departments in a time when there might be limited resources for new programs, new centers, new faculty, new whatever."

Dean Lewis: "I can't say very much, Rich. We have had numerous discussions between Arts and Sciences and the College of Agriculture, and Daryl may wish to comment on this too, about resource allocation questions and how we could cooperate more effectively if we had a different structure. What is not easy to anticipate is future flow of resources, which has a great deal to do with the dynamics of sponsored research and the likely growth of the field of biology in the future and the necessity to adapt to the pressures that sponsored research resource sources on the outside exert upon us. What I do believe is that two of the models that I mentioned in my remarks do make for administrative simplification. That is, the departmentalist model, or what you might actually refer to, Peter, as the college model. I do believe that they make for a kind of administrative simplification that might make it easier to work out the resource issues to which you are referring. But in the end, until we get down to working out the details, which I believe is a process that we can't do overnight, we have to make a decision and begin working within some framework and work out those details gradually. I really don't think it's going to be terribly useful for any of the deans to speculate on exactly how we would set up the appropriate mechanisms to achieve fairness and productivity down the line. I'm sorry to respond vaguely as I have. I simply don't see how it's possible right now to respond with precision."

Speaker Pollak: "Daryl ..? "

Dean Lund: "Maybe just a comment. When I came here three years ago I was informed in no uncertain terms where the director of the Division of Biological Sciences reported. That person does not report to two deans. That person is appointed by and reports to the Provost. The only thing the deans have to do is identify if in fact the resources, faculty lines and staffing support, etc., was going to be in the budget to give to the Division to operate the Division.

And so, in fact, in the last three years, with the exception of this last year, we really have not had much significant interaction and discussion between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, about how the Division and its various activities were going to be supported in total. And in fact this year for the very first time, when we were meeting with those sections which have split lines between the two colleges, we included in our discussions with those section chairs, to specifically invite either Phil or Don Smith, or both of them in some cases to attend those discussions. So, clearly it has not functioned the way it ought to function relative to coordination and strategic planning and meeting strategic objectives in supporting the basic biological sciences. That needs to be improved, and I would absolutely agree, there are a number of mechanisms by which that could be improved, and they don't all include having a vice provost for biological sciences."

Associate Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "I'm completely out of this discussion, but I just wanted to suggest that there is an administrative structure that hasn't come up and it's the way that Computer Science and Electrical Engineering are organized at Stanford and MIT, where you have a sort of system of laboratories that's orthogonal to the departments and the laboratories are pulled together by common research interests, common funding mainly, and laboratory space. And it seems to work very well for MIT computer science and Stanford computer science. I don't know if that's come up or it's relevant. Would the panelists like to comment on that? We have a Biotechnology Center, right?"

Speaker Pollak: "Is there a panelist who wants to address that one? No? No takers. Dick?"

Professor Emeritus Richard Warner, Animal Science: "I was on the committee in the late 1950s that first discussed the opportunities to change from the current circumstances that they had then to the Division of Biological Sciences. One of the strongest arguments that the people in biology, such as botany in Agriculture, zoology in the Arts College, genetics in Plant Breeding, made was that you did not have a sufficient advertising component that would attract students to the broad base of biology. And I think, my observations over the last thirty years has been that by developing the Division of Biological Sciences, it did make the whole substance of biological science attractive and appealing to the outside world. I think the success of the biology Division has been proof of that recommendation."

Speaker Pollak: "Question?"

Professor David Wilson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology: "I think the big problem we face in biology is that there aren't vast resources that are willing to be committed to one program. And Biotechnology is a good example. It started out with wonderful resources, but it has quickly dwindled."

Associate Dean Bidy Martin, College of Arts and Sciences: "I just wanted to suggest that, to go back to what David Shalloway said and to emphasize again what we discovered in our work on the task force and what the external reviewers also discovered and what everyone else seems to have discovered, and that is that there is an urgent need to build some molecular biology at Cornell, and that we have fallen way behind at this most basic level. And given the urgent need to build in that area, it seems to me while everyone's attention is focused on structure, what to do with the structure of biological sciences, that our attention might also need to be focused on the concrete question about how best to build cell and molecular biology and how to begin that project immediately. Because while all the Deans, the Vice President, the Provost, the President and the entire faculty is focused on this, one way to think about these alternative structures would be to begin with the concrete urgency of building in this most basic area, and to ask ourselves how and where the resources are to do that. That is, what kinds of already existing resources within different colleges can be brought to bear on this project. How many should be brought to bear? What do we need the deans of the various colleges and the faculty of the various colleges to do in order to make this possible? What additional resources might need to be pumped into this project of building cell and molecular biology? And what would be the best group of faculty to really make this occur, to build in this way?"

"So, maybe this is not a helpful suggestion; I made it in the college faculty meeting the other day too. But it occurs to me that it's very hard in the abstract to choose among the different models. I do continue to prefer the recommendations made by the task force over some of the others, although, in a wonderful moment just now I found myself sort of agreeing with Peter Stein about more possibilities. But I simply want to urge the Provost, the Vice Provost, the Deans, and members of the Academic Cabinet as a whole, to think concretely about what

everyone has identified as our most urgent project, and that is to make sure that cell and molecular biology emerge and get strengthened and have presence on this campus that they haven't had, that the Division hasn't succeeded in making sure we kept up on, and which we now really must face. And to see, based on concrete needs, what structure emerges as the most likely to get what we need to get."

Speaker Pollak: "O.K. One more and then we'll ..."

Professor Wayne: "I hope I can phrase this succinctly. I'm in biology. In the past three years, it seems like the different administrators have been fighting over us as some pawns in a particular subdivision or group. Our morale has just really plummeted. So, I feel like I don't want to trust my future with the administrators that are fighting over us. And, for that reason, I really like a faculty-governed Division of Biology as it is."

Speaker Pollak: "With that, I'd like to make three comments. Kathleen will try and expedite the development of these notes and have them on the web site by Monday, O.K.? And if you wish to post things there, send them to Judy Bower, and please invite other interested faculty to attend the open forum next week, which is October 21st. We'll move on to the next item. Kathleen will introduce a University Faculty Committee-sponsored resolution."

8. RESOLUTION ON OPPORTUNITY FOR INFORMAL DEBATE BY THE FACULTY AS A WHOLE

Professor Rasmussen: "You all should have received this resolution as part of a call to meeting and there was a handout on the table that includes this. The University Faculty Committee was very concerned when it continued to be told that a decision on the Division of Biological Sciences was imminent by the end of the month, and we didn't feel that there had been adequate opportunity for the larger group of life sciences faculty who are concerned about this issue to fully express themselves. As a result, it proposed the resolution that is before you, which I won't read in its entirety, but we respectfully request the administration make no decision on the future existence and/or structure of the Division until such time as the faculty as a whole has had an adequate opportunity to provide informed input on this important issue. We make this resolution recognizing that, as Dr. Garza said in his remarks, that this has been ongoing for some time and has produced a morale crisis in some parts of the Division of Biological Sciences. We're not proposing a year's delay, but we do feel that an adequate opportunity for the Senate to discuss this issue, perhaps at its next meeting, might be the most appropriate way to proceed."

Speaker Pollak: "O.K. Is there discussion on that resolution?"

Associate Professor Alan McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "I've listened to the discussion. Obviously, I'm not directly involved. I'm an economist in the Business School. But I hear absolutely no consensus on anything in this body. I hear absolutely opposing ideas, and whether you can pull together something that will lead to excellence in a great university by doing something structural, that no one seems to agree on, strikes me as being very difficult to accept or respect. I think that the current motion is an appropriate one and there ought to be some way to begin to build at least some common ground. Perhaps the last speaker, or next to last speaker's point of working for something concrete would be a way to start, but just coming with a structural change strikes me as not a good managerial approach."

Professor Douglas Haith, Agricultural and Biological Engineering: "I speak in opposition to the resolution. I think it is much too vague. It is not saying, let's spend another month'. It's not saying, let's just have another meeting'. It's very, very open-ended, and I think it's an invitation to continue this debate on and on and on. And I think there are problems here that have to get solved and decisions that have to get made. So I'm opposed to the resolution."

Speaker Pollak: "Are you ready for the question? All of those in favor of the resolution signify by raising your hand. All of those opposed?"

The motion carried as follows:

WHEREAS, the Task Force Report (Division of Biological Sciences: Structural Review, March 1998) has been discussed within the Division of Biological Sciences but neither it nor the Response to the Task Force Report on the Division of Biological Sciences

Structural Review (March 1998) has been available to or discussed by faculty with interests in the life sciences who hold appointments outside of the Division of Biological Sciences, and

WHEREAS, about one-third of Cornell's faculty is engaged in research in the life sciences and, therefore, any decision made based on these reports or on the Report of the External Review Committee for the Biological Sciences (September 1998) and will affect a high proportion of Cornell's faculty directly or indirectly, and

WHEREAS, reviews of the programs of affected units are currently underway, and

WHEREAS, there is no pressing deadline by which any structural reorganization of the Division of Biological Sciences must take place, and

WHEREAS, informed discussion of options by interested and affected faculty members may result in a better and more widely accepted solution than those already proposed; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty respectfully requests that the Administration make no decision on the future existence and/or structure of the Division of Biological Sciences until such time as the faculty as a whole has had an adequate opportunity to provide informed input on this important issue.

Speaker Pollak: "We have two items under Good and Welfare. John Ford."

9. GOOD AND WELFARE

John Ford, Robert W. and Elizabeth C. Staley Dean of Students: "I would like to invite you to consider joining a hundred or so faculty members who volunteer each year to serve in the Faculty-in-Residence and Faculty Fellows Program in the residence halls. As a former Faculty Fellow and Faculty-in-Residence I can really attest to the opportunity that this program provides for undergraduates to take more full advantage of the intellectual life at Cornell and to interact with faculty outside the classroom. We have a number of opportunities for faculty to hold seminars with students, to work with students bringing their research into the students' lives, and we think that this is really a wonderful opportunity to build community among the students and faculty in the University. If you'd like more information about how you can become involved in this program, you can speak with David Owen, Professor of Near Eastern Studies. Also there is more detailed information about the program on the University Faculty web site. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "Carry that message back to your appropriate departments. Don Campbell?"

Professor Donald Campbell, Astronomy: "I was asked just to say a few words about the effects of hurricane Georges on the Arecibo observatory in Puerto Rico three weeks ago. The hurricane passed directly east-west across Puerto Rico with wind speeds that were measured at times up to about 150 miles an hour. It did a tremendous amount of damage through the island, a fact that wasn't exactly reported very well in the U.S. news. About 30,000 houses were destroyed, primarily wooden houses. About 60,000 were damaged. The observatory itself came through quite well out of the storm. It suffered some structural damage to the catwalk that was swinging in the wind and a few other areas had minor damage on the telescope.

"When you total it all up, the damage to the observatory really and the repair of it comes to something approaching a quarter of a million dollars or so. So it's non-trivial, as far as the observatory was concerned. About twelve of our staff members lost either their entire houses or at least parts of them, of course, primarily the roofs. When you lose the roofs of these houses, of course, the entire contents get destroyed. And finally, there has been a move to provide some assistance to our staff. We did ship in about fifty-three power generators, the loss of electricity was almost total on the island for a number of days and is still missing over in many areas. We shipped in about fifty-three generators which are being distributed at cost to our staff members and there's also a move on campus here to set up an emergency fund with donations that are going to this particular address as well. I think the aim of that employee

fund is to raise somewhere about \$10,000 to assist the people who lost their houses and possessions. Thank you."

Speaker Pollak: "That concludes our business for today. We are adjourned."

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Rasmussen, Associate Dean and Secretary of the
University Faculty