

## 30TH ANNIVERSARY CONVOCATION ADDRESS

John H. Marburger

September 17, 1987

On this date thirty years ago registration for the first classes was held on the temporary Planting Fields campus in Oyster Bay at the new Long Island campus of the State University of New York. The State University system itself was not yet ten years old, and no one had any certain idea of what it might become. Today from those early seeds has grown an awe-inspiring structure. SUNY itself is the largest and most diverse system of higher education in the United States under a single administration. And Stony Brook has become SUNY's most famous campus.

Today, I want to dwell for a moment on that fame, on whether it is real or simply a fiction of our wishful thinking, on whether it is deserved, and on whether it can be sustained. These are questions at the foundation of our reason for existence, and we must answer them continually to preserve our pride and our initiative and to justify the enormous investment society is making in us. A thirtieth birthday, on the watershed between generations, seems a good time for such reflection.

Let me begin with what we are. I have heard it said that Stony Brook's image is not clear; that our mission is obscure to many; that we must work harder to sharpen the concept of our mission. I will confess to some impatience with those concerns. Stony Brook's character is now fixed. There is, in fact, an extraordinary degree of consensus among ourselves about what we are and where we are going and what will be the evidences of success once we get there. Where I do find disagreement is over the means, not the ends. Most of us have trouble understanding why we are not even farther along toward goals that we all share. Many of us have different ideas about how to accelerate the pace, about what to do next. The unevenness of our development must suggest to some that there is disagreement about what we are. Otherwise, we would have facilities, programs, services and personnel that are more suited to our missions. Do not be misled. Those unevennesses are a symptom of our unique location in time and space. They can be understood and addressed. \*It is important to distinguish the transient exigencies of practical life from the overriding vision that drives us ahead.\*

## STONY BROOK IS A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

✕Stony Brook is what is known today as a Research University. We are one of a small number of such institutions in New York State.✕ During this past summer, the Carnegie Foundation published an update of its system of classification of types of higher educational institutions throughout the country. Of more than 3,000 such institutions, 70 were classified as "Research I," among them Stony Brook and six other institutions in New York: Columbia, Cornell, Rochester, New York University, Rockefeller, and Yeshiva. We are the only one in the public sector. A few others are classified as "Research II."

What is a Research University? The Carnegie classification scheme emphasizes volume of federally-sponsored research, percentage of Ph.D. students, and a tradition of emphasis on scholarship. It does not recognize any particular program or even judge the overall excellence of what we do. But the broad measures it uses are built up from a commitment over years to scholarship as a primary activity of the institution. A research university is a center of scholarship where men and women work individually and together in pursuit of new knowledge and of the development of the highest intellectual and aesthetic faculties. It embraces the entire universe of natural phenomena and human endeavor as its domain. It invites everyone who shares the love of knowledge and intellectual accomplishment to join in the grand journey of growth and discovery.

## IMPORTANCE OF FACULTY IN A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

✕As a research university, we seek to employ faculty who treasure both the pursuit of knowledge and the transmitting of it to others.✕ The character of our educational process, for undergraduates as well as graduates, is strongly affected by the fact that our faculty are engaged in advancing the frontiers of knowledge and of human potential. We seek to create an atmosphere of accomplishment and of possibility by gathering together people who are themselves successful in their fields. The education we offer gives insights into success through a method akin to apprenticeship with a master. Only by coming into contact with people who are succeeding will students appreciate their own chances for success.

## CRITICISMS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

We all are aware of an increasing volume of criticism directed toward some aspects of research universities. Some of our nation's most articulate spokesmen for higher education have contributed to the critical literature, including a

former SUNY Chancellor and the Secretary of the federal Department of Education. A recent blue-ribbon panel studying the University of California system has added an important dimension to the growing body of commentary. <The criticism centers in part on a widely-perceived tension between scholarly activity and teaching.> In a research university, scholars accept the responsibility to teach others. If they do not carry out that responsibility, then they are simply irresponsible and must be brought to task for their failures. I strongly agree that teaching is an essential part of the work of faculty in a research university, and I believe the criticism is bringing attention to a situation that needs it.

I do not believe, however, that the concept of a research university is itself flawed. It is, on the contrary, of the utmost importance for society to support centers for the gathering of new knowledge. It is important for such centers to provide instruction for both graduate and undergraduate students and for them to be available to everyone in our society who can take advantage of the kind of education that they offer. Last fall, Newsday published an "op ed" piece entitled "Let's Bury 'Publish or Perish'" by James Fisher, former President of Towson State University in Maryland and of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The article harshly criticized SUNY's then recently-announced Graduate and Research Initiative. He pointed to the national criticism of the quality of undergraduate education and linked it to overemphasis on research. In my response, I pointed out that the initiative was not intended to convert every SUNY campus into a major research institution and that it is essential for at least some SUNY campuses to offer the kind of education that comes with a research university. <Stony Brook is the research university in SUNY.> If we attempted to become some other kind of university, the State should be alarmed and indignant.

#### SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING

There is certainly a conflict between scholarship and teaching in the sense that one cannot do two things at the same instant. But all scholars are automatically teachers in some sense; otherwise, their scholarly efforts will have been in vain. Scholars who do not preserve the record of their labor for others to follow and who do not make a serious effort to spread knowledge of their work do not belong in a research university. Those who do make such an effort have demonstrated the most important characteristic of a good teacher: the desire to make their knowledge available to others. <Our challenge is to take advantage of the assets of a research university to create a high-quality educational experience for our students.> That requires a conscious effort to orient new faculty, to provide dignified and effective opportunities for faculty to develop good teaching

skills, to produce curricula compatible with our resources, to watch what we are actually doing in the classroom and take corrective action when it falls below our standards. I am happy to report that all those things are happening at Stony Brook to an unprecedented extent. The new URECA program, the conferences on teaching in large class settings, the relatively-recent undergraduate program reviews, and the Provost's "orientation" conferences for new faculty, all are badly needed innovations. Much more needs to be done, however, to increase the depth and coherence of the Stony Brook undergraduate experience. The new general education requirements, to name an obvious example, are still more of a skeleton than a comprehensive curriculum.

#### STONY BROOK'S MISSION DERIVES FROM HER STATUS AS A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

Our mission is to be a research university and all that that implies. The State of New York, through its diverse manifestations, wants us to compete nationally with other research universities in faculty quality and impact, in student excellence and success, and in the encouragement of industry and culture. The State does not want us to resemble any other type of university in our system. It is our responsibility to deliver the "high end" of research and instruction. We are expected among our enrollments to include undergraduates and students whose intrinsic abilities would permit them to take advantage of our kind of education. We are expected to participate in the global responsibility of affirmatively redressing the effects of social injustice as they affect the ability of young people to realize their full intellectual and creative potential. We are expected to assist the State of New York in improving the physical, economic, and cultural condition of its people through instruction and the application of knowledge. X

These expectations resonate well with the aspirations of our own faculty. They certainly shape my own thinking about resource allocations, appointments and promotions, and long-range strategy for the campus. During the coming semester, I expect that the process begun last year under the Provost's direction will lead to a new campus mission statement that will articulate the consequences of these general themes for campus development during the next decade. During Stony Brook's fourth decade, her mission as a research university will be unambiguous to all.

Let me turn now to the question of our reputation.

## STONY BROOK HAS ACHIEVED RECOGNITION AS A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

Although we have advertised our Carnegie classification as a research university, that is an indirect result of hundreds of praiseworthy accomplishments by our faculty, students and staff. There is no question that Stony Brook has achieved international recognition for her academic accomplishments. We are not simply resting on our laurels or benefiting from a halo effect that is holding over from the days when Governor Rockefeller created SUNY campuses almost overnight. Already five years ago, on a similar occasion, I remarked that Stony Brook's survival as a fine university was no longer in question. The question even then was only how long it would take for the recognition to catch up with the reality. Today I can report that Stony Brook is taken seriously as a player in the most important issues in higher education. And our reputation is based not on media hype but upon so many individual solid contributions to so many different fields that our name has become impossible to ignore.

### AWARDS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During recent months one of our faculty, Professor Robert Sokal in Ecology and Evolution, was elected to the National Academy of Sciences. The Howard Hughes Medical Institute established a major research program at Stony Brook centering on the work of Professor Paul Adams, a member of the faculty in Neurobiology who last year won a coveted MacArthur Foundation Award. Our Einstein Professor of Physics, C.N. Yang, received a Presidential Medal of Honor. Physicists Gene Sprouse and Gerald Brown received Humboldt Fellowships, Germany's highest award to foreign scholars. Howardena Pindell in Art and Gary Matthews in Neurobiology won Guggenheims. Anthropologists Paula Brown Glick and Elizabeth Stone won Fulbrights. Jack Lissauer in Earth and Space Sciences received a Sloan Research Fellowship, available only to young investigators.

National publicity spread the word about the discovery of a remarkable branch of the hominid family tree when Stony Brook Anthropology and Anatomy faculty, who did much of the work, hosted an international conference on "the black skull" that provided the key. Clinton T. Rubin, a Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, was named a Presidential Young Investigator. Professor Clifford Swartz, a national leader in the teaching of physics, received the prestigious Oersted Medal of the American Physical Society. Arthur Green, a Ph.D. candidate in Music, gave the first piano recital in the newly-renovated Carnegie Hall in New York City, a recognition bestowed as the top award in an international competition. An undergraduate music major, Daryl Stark, was named by Time magazine as one of 100 outstanding undergraduates in the

United States in Time's Second Annual College Achievement Awards. The Pollock-Krasner Foundation, established by the estate of artists Lee Krasner and Jackson Pollock, transferred title of the house in Eastern Long Island, where essentially all Pollock's famous work was done, to the Stony Brook Foundation to be operated as an appointment-only museum supported by private funds. A study reported in Change Magazine of the undergraduate origins of Ph.D. recipients ranked Stony Brook alone among SUNY campuses as producing a Ph.D. success rate comparable to other major public and private research universities throughout the nation. Accomplishments in the understanding of supernovae, Lyme disease, interaction of laser light with molecules, tropical forests, all by Stony Brook faculty, were highlighted by publications in visible national magazines such as Scientific American and National Geographic. Science magazine devoted a long article to the wide impact of Anthropology Professor William Arens' iconoclastic views on cannibalism.

When I go out among my colleagues throughout the country, I find only praise for Stony Brook's success in maintaining its standards and its power as a force in higher education. When we seek candidates for new positions, we are taken seriously by everyone we approach, whether they ultimately decide to accept our offers or not. I could mention a score of other indications that we are seen to be doing well. In her fourth decade, Stony Brook will be viewed as successful in carrying out her mission.

#### STONY BROOK'S RECOGNITION IS DESERVED, BUT WHY DO WE QUESTION IT?

It thus appears that our reputation is not just wishful thinking. People in higher education, lots of them, think we are doing fine. I feel compelled to state this perhaps obvious point today because there is a great deal of uncertainty on our own campus about how we are doing. There are important reasons for this uncertainty that I want to talk about today.

#### IGNORANCE ABOUT STONY BROOK

The first one is ignorance about ourselves. Frankly, too few of us are aware of what is actually happening at Stony Brook outside our own departmental worlds. Provost Schubel has recognized this problem and has moved vigorously to address it. The development under his aegis of the new faculty/staff club in the area formerly called Senior-Commons is but one example of initiatives he has undertaken to improve the flow of information and social interaction within the University community.

I have the good fortune to be in the information loop that brings news of important accomplishments by our colleagues. That is what sustains me in the irksome, bureaucratic business that occupies most of my own workday. Others who deal with similar frustrations without the certain knowledge that I have of the vast productivity of our University can be forgiven a certain despondency about our future. But not for long. Means of communication are multiplying rapidly. The employee newspaper Campus Currents now appears weekly. The longer campus magazine that replaces Stony Brook People will appear (approximately) quarterly this year. If you are not aware of it, you should know that the Provost and I each present reports summarizing major campus issues, decisions and activities each month at the regular meetings of the University Senate. I also meet monthly with representatives of UUP, the professional employee's union.

Many faculty have the impression that Stony Brook this year is the same institution that it was last year. That is not the case. Stony Brook is changing rapidly and continually, and each of us is obliged to try to keep up with what is happening. I know of no better antidote to the despair that comes from preoccupation with the frustrating delay and incompleteness that burdens our campus. During the fourth decade, we must come to know ourselves better.

#### VISIBLE CAMPUS DEFICIENCIES

This leads me to the second reason that so many of us are uncertain about the future. The trees of the many visible deficiencies on our campus obscure the forest of our overall success. Some deficiencies are addressed each year only, it seems, to be replaced by others as debilitating. I am talking about things like parking, climate control in buildings, inability to reclassify employees, failure to get needed supplies on time, campus cleanliness, lack of clarity in campus procedures, lack of cooperation among departments on essential business, etc. These are problems by no means unique to Stony Brook, but their ubiquity and persistence are cause for concern. Furthermore, the deficiencies I am talking about seem to be inconsistent with how we speak of ourselves as a great research university. Many of us doubt that we can be truly great if we must put up with these frustrating problems.

I am telling you today that many of these deficiencies can be removed and very probably will be removed during Stony Brook's fourth decade. It will not happen without effort, but the effort is being made. No major changes need to take place in SUNY and no major legislative action is needed to make Stony Brook a much better place to live and work. Let me mention three general areas of concern and what I expect will happen with them:

Condition and appearance of Stony Brook's physical plant. More people express concern about this area than any other, and it has received much more attention than most of us realize. There are two kinds of problems: the very visible minor maintenance, grounds and cleanliness problems, and the hidden deficiencies in major machinery or structures such as roofs and heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment. During the past five years enormous strides have been made in replacing and repairing the hidden machinery of the campus. There are still some dramatic and serious problems, especially the numerous leaking roofs. I have encouraged a devotion to the repair of this deep infrastructure that has consumed substantial resources of time and money in recent years. These efforts have laid the foundation for easier maintenance in the future. The serious problems are the targets of budget requests that have, by and large, been successful. SUNY, the Budget Division, and our legislators share our concern about the physical plant and want to help us. The help has been forthcoming, and its visible impact will increase geometrically during the next few years. Stony Brook will look better and work better during its fourth decade.

Long transaction times. Why does it take so long to get anything done at Stony Brook? Because there are too many external demands on management time that should be used to troubleshoot problems closer to home. ~~Because service areas are understaffed and inadequately automated~~ Because some of the most important transactions still require "Albany" approvals. And what is the prospect for improvement? In some areas, very good. Personnel reclassifications, for example, will be under more campus control next year after final implementation of a personnel flexibility program that began two years ago. Financial transactions are no longer encumbered by Budget Division approval except at the beginning of each year, and this has led to campus efficiencies that will become more apparent each year. We are still learning to exploit the opportunities of the new SUNY "flexibility." Some areas will continue to be awkward. Labor contracts are still negotiated with little campus input. Purchasing will always be more difficult than if we were a private university. But we can do more, and later I will say more about current efforts. In any case, during the fourth decade, we must decrease the time it takes to get things done to carry out our mission.

Quality of work and materials. During the summer I launched a campaign within our service areas to raise the quality of design, purchasing, and execution of all the rehabilitation and repair projects undertaken on campus. So often we see a well-intended project falling apart only a few years after it was installed (or dying, in the case of landscaping). In some cases the installation may be well done

but lacking in taste or appropriateness for its location. The culprit may be poor design, purchase of low-quality materials, or poor execution of construction. The new initiative is designed to raise consciousness of standards and to raise worker morale by making it clear that we care about the quality of work. It is still too soon to see results, but the level of enthusiasm is high. A "quality circle" program is beginning to appear in the affected departments. Stony Brook in her fourth decade must value excellence not only in academic affairs but in every aspect of her operation.

#### STONY BROOK CAN SUSTAIN AND IMPROVE ITS PERFORMANCE

And what of the future? Can we actually fulfill the promise of the past or even sustain the successes of the present? Aren't we losing senior faculty, going backward in funding, slipping behind in the myriad changes that are urgently needed now just to remain competitive? No. We are, in fact, doing well in replacing departed or retired faculty with exceptional new senior people. We are moving ahead in the most important funding categories. We are making more innovative changes than ever before in Stony Brook's history.

#### SENIOR FACULTY REPLACEMENT

In the two previous years, for example, we did lose some very important faculty -- 26 full professors during 1985-87. Half retired, the other half went, for the most part, to excellent positions at distinguished other universities. They included people like David Cohen, the father of our fine Neurobiology Department, now Provost at Northwestern; Charles Prewitt, now Director of Geophysical Laboratory at the Carnegie Institute; Peter Elbow, the guiding genius of our nascent writing curriculum; Leo Treitler, who led music history to national prominence. And Marcia Johnson, Rose and Lew Coser, Rueben Welch, Patrick Hill, Bob Neville. These are names so prominent and familiar to us that it seems scarcely credible that they could have been replaced with equal talent.

But in the years 1986-88 we hired 18 new full professors from outside the University and promoted somewhat more than that number from within. Of the ten that arrived this year, five were serving as department heads at distinguished institutions (one of the institutions is the General Electric Corporation). All are exceptional people. A recital of their fields is intriguing: Jasper Brener, University of Hull, Psychology; Anne Kaplan, Rutgers, Humanities Institute; Philip Lewis, General Electric, Computer Science; Charles Nittrouer, North Carolina, Marine Sciences; John Reeves, Rochester, Physical Education; Farley Richmond, Michigan State, Theatre Arts; Michael Taksar, Florida, Applied Math;

Clifford Patlack, NIMH, Neurological Surgery; James Quigley, Brooklyn HSC, Pathology; Charles Rich, UC San Diego, Medicine. I guarantee that you will read more about these distinguished scholars in coming months. ✓Stony Brook will gain substantial faculty strength during her fourth decade✕

#### FUNDING FROM THE STATE

Stony Brook receives funds from State appropriations, sponsored research, fund raising, and fees for services (such as medical practice plan, hospital, and dormitory fees). All funds are increasing. We tend to forget that the State, more or less automatically, funds substantial salary increases for all employees. ✓SUNY is moving rapidly toward a system resembling zero-based budgeting for all campuses.✕ Because of Stony Brook's history of underfunding in the support areas, such an approach tends to favor our campus. The fact of our underfunding, hotly disputed only a year ago, is now acknowledged by SUNY following major cost analysis studies by Stony Brook, SUNY Central, and the independent accounting firm of Coopers and Lybrand. The entire budget process has grown rapidly more credible as a side effect of "flexibility" legislation for SUNY. The result will be a less contentious budget process for SUNY, more rational distribution of funds within the system, and better management. ✓Stony Brook's funding for support services will become more nearly adequate in her fourth decade.✕

✓The State of New York is beginning to realize that investment in its public universities can help economic development.✕ Stony Brook has been a major beneficiary of that policy. We have received funds for new organized research activities such as the Living Marine Resources Institute, The Humanities Institute, completion of the Yeats archive project, as well as for special initiatives such as the Center for Advanced Technology in Biotechnology, and the "incubator" project for spawning new high tech businesses. Stony Brook received \$2.5 million in new funds this year as part of SUNY's Graduate and Research Initiative, much of which will go toward solving longstanding problems in graduate student support and research infrastructure. A companion initiative in Undergraduate Studies is likely to bring lesser but still significant amounts. ✓In the fourth decade, Stony Brook will receive incremental funding to expand and improve academic programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.✕

## SPONSORED RESEARCH FUNDING

Sponsored research growth was slower this year than in the past, primarily because of the departure of a small number of very well-funded faculty among those I mentioned above. The fact that our total support did not actually dip attests to the strong growth in support throughout the University. We know that we have unfulfilled potential for additional external support in the Health Sciences and Engineering. Smaller but still significant potential exists in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Programs now underway to encourage continued growth in these areas will almost certainly lead to expansion. The various centers proposed under the Graduate and Research Initiative will add to the totals. In Stony Brook's fourth decade, external support for scholarship will grow substantially.

## PHILANTHROPIC FUNDS

Philanthropic support to Stony Brook is also increasing strongly. During the past three years, the assets of the Stony Brook Foundation, all of which come ultimately from fund raising, grew from \$3.5 million to \$8.5 million. The number of donors increases substantially each year. The average size of gifts is growing. The number of faculty engaged in fund raising is growing. Support from alumni, faculty, parents, student organizations -- from all sources is growing at an unprecedented pace. We are still in the earliest phase of this phenomenon. It will be sustained by recent appointments and improvement of automated systems in the Stony Brook Foundation and the Office of University Affairs. Vice President Teed and Foundation Director Denise Coleman have completely transformed the University's approach to fund raising in an exceptionally short time. The Stony Brook Foundation has a renewed Board of Directors. It has created or planned subsidiaries to develop a campus conference center, the incubator facility, and an ambulatory care facility. I have already mentioned the Pollock-Krasner House, now owned by the Foundation. These departures from traditional fund raising activity presage a new character for the Foundation. Philanthropic support will grow geometrically during the fourth decade. The Stony Brook Foundation will undertake significant capital development projects.

## HOSPITALS

As of this year, University Hospital can be declared successful. Sixty or more beds remain to be opened, but no longer can we say that the hospital is in its opening phase. In some areas, health care operations have already outgrown the available space. The hospital is providing high-quality health care in the most sophisticated modes of treatment to

intensely ill patients. Hospital finances will never be completely predictable, given the strong and erratic regulation of health care by State and federal agencies. But our hospital is in good financial condition, and we are no longer engaged in bitter exchanges with the Budget Division over the origin and suitability of expenses. The Veterans Nursing Home is approaching the construction phase miraculously on schedule. Management changes taking place now to give the hospital the independence it needs to survive in the complex and rapidly changing health care environment will provide the model for managing the veterans home so as to eliminate any negative financial or operational impact on the rest of the campus. In the fourth decade, Stony Brook will have TWO health care facilities, both of which will be assets to the University.

#### THE PACE OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

The present rushes inexorably along the line of history, creating from the visions and uncertainty of the future the monuments and the chaos of the past. Is Stony Brook keeping up? Are we changing as an institution in all the ways we must to survive? I have spoken of innovations, plans and likelihoods in the academic sector. Let me reveal to you some of the enormous energy in the less visible management machinery at Stony Brook.

During the previous fiscal year the financial status of two of our largest operational units changed dramatically as the result of an Executive Branch initiative. The hospital and the residence halls were placed on a so-called IFR basis (standing for Income Fund Reimbursable). That required major changes in procedures and in accounting and management practices. At the same time, the campus completely overhauled its financial planning and budgeting process, identifying much earlier in the fiscal year what resources each unit will have to spend and giving local managers unprecedented control and responsibility over budgets. We also began a massive conversion of software preparatory to changing from a Univac to an IBM computing environment, installed and began to manage a new digital telephone system for the entire campus, completed an exhaustive study of the allocation of resources throughout the campus, and implemented many new procedures required by SUNY's flexibility initiative. Many campus "users" of services see the offices they deal with as slow and unresponsive. I can say with absolute confidence that no SUNY campus, and few campuses anywhere, have made as many profound changes in the management and service infrastructure as Stony Brook has in the past two years. We have sorely taxed the energies of our staff to make these changes

while sustaining the everyday work of the campus. The changes are not just furniture shuffling. We are configuring ourselves for action in Stony Brook's fourth decade. In the fourth decade Stony Brook will have a management structure and technology commensurate with her stature as a great research university. ✓

#### LEADERSHIP AND NEXT STEPS

None of these predictions for the next decade will come to pass without personal effort. Much depends upon the quality of the people that we rely upon to make things work. You are all aware of changes in the academic administration that led to an entirely new team starting in the previous year. Provost Schubel, Vice Provosts Lichter and Jonaitis, and acting Vice Provost Schneider are emerging from a year that would have tried even the most experienced and battle-hardened veteran of academic administration. They have come through very well and are taking initiatives now that demonstrate that they learned quickly from their experience. I am very pleased to announce that Jerry Schubel has agreed to remain as Provost for an additional year, for a total term of three years, before resuming his role of national leadership in the Marine Sciences as Dean and Director of the Marine Sciences Research Center in 1989.

Provost Schubel is an unusually vigorous and imaginative administrator, and I am anxious to exploit his talents to the utmost during this period. I am seeking to broaden the role of the Provost in University-wide administration beyond the limits that I defined for this position in 1981 when I implemented the new provostial structure. Consequently, I have decided to change the title of the Provost's position to "Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs." This signifies a distinction between the larger role of Provost and the function of chief academic officer that has become traditional at Stony Brook. (I suggest that, despite this formal expansion of title, you continue to refer to Jerry in conversation as "the Provost".)

At the same time, I am asking the Provost to accept the responsibility for convening a new administrative planning and budgeting committee that assembles the campus budget proposals and financial plans. I will continue to exercise final authority for broad strategy and allocations among major areas of the University, but Jerry will be responsible for working with the vice presidents and other university constituencies to generate the detailed plans. This is a division of labor that works well on other major campuses. The Provost and I have similar views on strategy and direction, and I am very optimistic about the new arrangement.

I am also asking the Provost to chair a task force that fulfills a commitment I made nearly seven years ago to extend the concept of reorganization to the Health Sciences Center. When I charged the reorganization task forces I created on my arrival at Stony Brook seven years ago, I excluded the Health Sciences from consideration because the opening of the hospital and building of the medical school was in full swing, and I did not want to disturb what I viewed as a functioning system. But the dramatic growth and success of the life sciences and the clinical health sciences at Stony Brook have made it necessary to consider new ways of organizing and administering them. Provost Schubel, Vice President Oaks and I will work out the final charge to the group during the month of September.

A similar exercise is needed for the administrative functions of the University, and I have been working with the University Senate Executive Committee to identify a Task Force on Administrative Organization, "Part II" to advise me in that area. Major rearrangements of functions have occurred since the original 1980/81 recommendations. This summer, for example, responsibility for residence hall maintenance, custodial and other functions was transferred from Campus Operations to Student Affairs as part of a management strategy of localizing responsibility for a single operation under one administrator. I anticipate major organizational changes starting in the near future and extending for approximately two years. In the fourth decade, Stony Brook will continue to make bold administrative changes needed to adjust to changing needs and environments.

#### FORGING REALITY FROM VISION

Vision creates paradox. Essential for revealing the possibility of a better future, visions also produce tensions whose side effects can inhibit that future from coming into existence. First impelled by the boldest visions three decades ago today, Stony Brook's distinguished reality is the result of continual struggle against the side effects of our demand for excellence. For as long as we try to achieve our vision as a leading research university, we expect this struggle to persist. But our unambiguous success at year thirty demonstrates that the struggle is not a hopeless one. The Stony Brook that we and our predecessors have created is both worthy and viable. I welcome the opportunity to work together with you to create the Stony Brook of the fourth decade.