

May 8, 1992

Provost James Coffman
Anderson 106
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Coffman:

We wish to inform you that we are opposed to removing Computer and Information Sciences from the College of Arts and Sciences and placing this department within the College of Engineering. We believe that the proposed mode of transfer which has been described as "revenue neutral" and which is to be accomplished "as is" is inequitable to the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Furthermore, we believe that the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences has not had sufficient input into the decision process.

First and foremost, we do not believe that a professional school's mission and provenance extends to providing general education service courses. Placing CIS within the College of Engineering will inevitably lead to a proliferation of general education courses in computer science throughout various colleges and departments in our University, and undermines the credibility of Central Administration's assertion that "the College of Arts and Sciences is the cornerstone of the University."

Over the last several decades, the College of Arts and Sciences has expended substantial capital and human resources, first by forming, and then by nurturing and enhancing CIS. These expenditures were in large measure accomplished by internal reallocations within the College of Arts and Sciences, and has left the College with significantly less money, space and equipment for distribution to other units and departments. These reallocations were supported by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in view of the fundamental importance of CIS in the general education curriculum of our University as well as its importance to our graduate mission. Furthermore, the general education commitment of the College of Arts and Sciences which is vested in CIS, has played a significant role in the deficits of the College. Therefore,

any mode of transfer of CIS that does not distribute significant OOE, space, faculty, classified and GTA salaries back to the College of Arts and Sciences, and which does not assign "deficit-debt" to the College of Engineering, will not be viewed with equanimity by the faculty of our College. An "as is" transfer of the CIS GTA budget, is to our minds, particularly egregious, and the assignment of space in Nichols Hall to Engineering sends the wrong message to a very cramped faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. We support close ties between CIS and various departments of Engineering that wish to form collaborative research ventures. However, it is our view that keeping CIS within the College of Arts and Sciences is not an impediment to collaborative research programs.

Finally, we are greatly concerned that to date, the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences has had insufficient opportunity for input into the entire decision making process of the proposed transfer. In particular, there has been only one perfunctory open hearing on this matter, and this occurred as late as May 5, 1992, at a time when most faculty were involved with preparations and arrangements for final exams, and when most Department Heads were writing role and aspiration documents. In the past, decisions concerning re-allocation have been announced without full faculty input and with negative consequences. To avoid damaging faculty morale, we urge that you schedule a series of public forums on the issue of the transfer of CIS during the Fall semester of 1992.

Respectfully,

<i>Steve Pappas</i>	<i>James J. Higgins</i>	<i>Brydley A. Shaw</i>
<i>Walter Williams</i>	<i>Gary Woodward</i>	<i>John G. Hall</i>
<i>Jan Allen</i>	<i>J. H. Wright</i>	<i>Frank E. Seal</i>
<i>M. Owen Miller</i>	<i>J. R. Hill</i>	<i>James T. Rayson</i>
<i>Larry Noble</i>	<i>Joseph Z. Dreyf</i>	<i>Thomas L. Rocha</i>
<i>Paul Smith</i>	<i>Carol DeKrop</i>	<i>James C. Legg</i>
<i>M. Dale Hawley</i>	<i>Harold Nichols</i>	