

STONY BROOK IN THE NEW WORLD
PRESIDENT'S CONVOCATION ADDRESS

John H. Marburger, III

October 18, 1990

THE UNIVERSITY: IMAGE AND REALITY

As with other long-lived human institutions, universities acquire public images that owe more to our interpretations of their past than to their actual functions in society. Nearly all who speak of universities have had some experience with them, usually as students, often as faculty, infrequently as administrators. Most of us romanticize our student experience, over-generalize our faculty experience, and take all too seriously our administrative experience. When we speak knowingly among ourselves about "the university" as a concept we are building here at Stony Brook, we seem to have in mind something we wished we had experienced in our own careers. We think of a peaceful moment of study, a stimulating conversation with roommates or colleagues, a sabbatical on a campus seemingly far removed from the turmoil and irritation of our own institution. We think of moments of creativity, of discovery, of intellectual fellowship, of shared values, of a feeling of resonance in a class with alert and well-prepared students. We think of all the wonderful things that society could be doing with the knowledge we bring before it, of the reverence that society should have for the sacred labors here conducted. What wonderful lives we could lead in the pursuit of our studies, in the company of our students, in service to society if every moment could be like those.

Universities are not like that, of course, and never were. There never was an institution that had any major effect on society that was free from turmoil and internal dissent and uncertainty and self-doubt and pettiness and politics and problems with money and selfishness and intrusion from its sponsors. If we think we were ever a part of such an institution, then we were lucky enough to have been ignorant of its problems.

I want to talk today about what Stony Brook actually is, and what it must actually become as society transforms itself around us into a new world. I want to draw attention to the fact that Stony Brook is probably not what any one of us perceives it to be, and that it is changing faster than any of us is aware. As the world changes, Stony Brook will change with it, faster than our perceptions, faster than our interpretations. We influence its course, but we do not control it. We can impair its usefulness, or we can make it

more effective, but there is little that anyone can do to bring it to an end as an institution, for the University at Stony Brook has a life of its own, and a vigorous one at that.

THE CHANGING SCENERY OF WORLD AFFAIRS

Despite the social upheavals of the Vietnam era and the worldwide economic shock of the Arab oil embargo in the early 1970's, global events since the end of World War II have been played upon a well-defined stage with little change in scenery. Its dominant features were the superpowers and a world economy based on military spending and a large civilian market in North America. The decade upon which we are now embarking will be one of transition in which this scenery will be removed from the stage. What will replace it is surprisingly uncertain. We do know that the European market will be larger than North America's. We know that the Asian nations, especially Japan, will play an important economic role. We know that the Soviet Union will not be a superpower, that military concerns will focus on regional disputes, that the uneven distribution of wealth will continue to breed injustice and discontent throughout the world. We can be reasonably sure that the concepts of human equality and the value of individual liberty will continue to exert a powerful influence on worldwide social evolution as it has for several centuries. The growth and articulation of technology with our daily lives will continue apace. History and circumstance and the vigor of as yet unknown individuals will continue to determine the fine structure of events.

Against these vague premonitions, we do not know how our country will resolve the numerous crises of the present: an unbalanced budget whose deficit the rest of the world is increasingly unable to finance, an average standard of living that while declining relative to its immediate past is still too high to permit economic competitiveness in key manufacturing industries, an economy geared to a national military strategy that may be obsolete, a continued attractiveness to the poor and disadvantaged of other countries coupled with worsening conditions among the poor and disadvantaged of our own, a growing sense that government at all levels is inadequate to the complexity and diversity of modern society, and a profound and growing distrust of conventional sources of authority and leadership including the political, educational and scientific communities.

New York State and its Long Island region in which we live is a microcosm of world affairs. To reverse Plato's analogy, we see the behavior of the larger components of our society reflected in its smaller parts. On the negative side we see the dependence on military spending, the disparate

quality of life among people with different personal histories, the fragmentation and ineffectuality of government, the distrust of establishment wisdom. On the positive side we see many natural resources, the insistence on the worth of the individual, the determination to improve, the continued fascination with the American Experiment in freedom and individual opportunity.

THE UNIVERSITY AT STONY BROOK AS A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

In its context, Stony Brook has been shaped by many complex forces and a few simple ones. My predecessor, John Toll, and I together have administered Stony Brook for nearly three-fourths of its history. Despite stylistic differences, our visions have been nearly identical and very close to recommendations made by two gubernatorial commissions during the 1960's. The Heald Commission (in 1960) called for a research university "that could stand with the finest in the country", and the Muir Commission (1963) urged a research-oriented health care and education center with strong ties to the rest of the University. John Toll and I have tried to build a research university in a mold closely resembling what we each knew from other examples and from our own experiences. Most current faculty and senior administrators have come from such universities and with their help it has not been difficult to carry out our intention. Let me correct that. It has been difficult, but, at least during my tenure, not in the sense that we had to labor to build a consensus about what kind of university to build. Let me talk for a moment about what kind of university that is.

The September 1990 Chronicle of Higher Education "Almanac" lists Stony Brook as one of 70 "Leading Research Universities" in the United States. Among New York universities, the only others listed are Columbia, Cornell, New York University, the University of Rochester, and the medically oriented research and teaching centers, Rockefeller University and Yeshiva University. In the region including New England and the Middle Atlantic States, the only other public institutions listed are Penn State, the University of Connecticut, and the University of Maryland. It is this list that defines our peers, from whom may be inferred the characteristics that define our historical aspirations.

I mention this listing to demonstrate that Stony Brook is widely regarded as having "made it" into the ranks of leading research universities. In some sense we have accomplished the mandate of the Heald Commission. We have similarly established ourselves as the kind of research-oriented health center that the Muir Commission envisaged. At a meeting this spring of SUNY Trustees, central administrators and campus presidents, State Health Commissioner David Axelrod

made the surprising statement that alone among New York State institutions, Stony Brook was increasing its market share of federal and private support for medically related research. No one can dispute that our Health Sciences Center is also the center of health care and research in Eastern Long Island. The medical, dental, and health related faculties assembled in this center are nationally renowned for their work. The federally supported research attributable to the School of Medicine and related bioscience departments has tripled in the past decade. University Hospital, now ten years old, is regarded as a leader in advanced health care and has completely won the confidence of a decidedly skeptical Long Island community. In stressing the accomplishments of the health sciences, I do not mean to diminish those of the other sciences and the arts and humanities, which have also been impressive. But in the 1980's, Stony Brook's growth was dominated by health care and bioscience.

Not only are the facilities, faculties and programs in place to satisfy the conditions of the research university image, but we are actually beginning to perform the functions for society to which the Heald and Muir reports pointed in declaring the need for our type of university on Long Island. We are beginning to give back the kind of service to our community that publicly supported institutions are supposed to produce. We obviously provide outstanding medical care in University Hospital and our dental and psychology clinics. But we also provide advice and support to small businesses, lease space to start-up companies, perform studies and frame alternatives for solving regional problems, and provide entertainment and cultural enrichment for the general public through the Staller Center and other public facilities. I will be saying more about these later.

The point is that in our thirty-third year we can honestly say that we have achieved much of what had been expected of us. There are also things we have not achieved, and my purpose here is to mention some of them and place them in my view of what we need to do next.

THE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY IN TROUBLE

If we keep firmly in mind that we are a research university more or less like the other 69 leading research universities in the Chronicle's list, that will help us assess what changes we are going to have to make as we prepare ourselves for the new world that is taking shape around us.

The salient feature about research universities today is that they are in trouble with their constituencies. Let me remind you that following former Education Secretary William Bennett's virulent criticisms of higher education during the

Reagan administration, it became increasingly clear that the characteristics that disturbed him most were precisely those of the research universities. Other types of institutions quickly noticed this and launched a campaign to distance themselves. For a decade the virtues of small non-research institutions have been touted first by themselves, then by the detractors of the research universities (usually their own alumni), and finally by high school counselors and the students they advise. I am not blaming all this on Bill Bennett, but he found a weak spot in higher education and a public responsive to his complaints.

All the research universities receive substantial funding from the federal government, and most are also state supported. The criticisms of Bennett and others did not go unnoticed by executive and legislative agencies that provide higher education oversight. Throughout the 80's they brought forth reports and proposals that increasingly took the position that the criticisms were valid and that the institutions themselves were unlikely to do anything to improve the situation. Increasing restrictions on student financial assistance, reluctance to pay full overhead on grants and contracts, proposals to regulate intercollegiate athletics, accusations of dishonesty and conflict of interest among faculty principal investigators, legislated academic assessments, requirements on the disclosure of campus crime statistics, of graduation rates, of gifts from foreign countries, of faculty affiliations with industry, regulations on laboratory animal care, regulations requiring drug-free workplace programs, increased reporting of every kind of transaction involving public funds, full-scale congressional investigations of faculty researchers accused of fudging research data--this is a short list of the burdens our government partners have placed upon us in recent years.

We are receiving criticism from other quarters, too. The press loves to see an outraged individual take on an establishment giant. To the general newspaper-reading public, our institutions are no different from city hall. We appear to them as a big money-hungry bureaucracy spending millions of their tax dollars so our underworked faculty can travel to European libraries to study obscure and probably obscene medieval French poetry. They should be in their classrooms teaching instead, say our detractors. Our requirement that faculty set forth the results of their labors to the scrutiny and feedback of their peers through publications is seen as irrelevant to their function as teachers of young people. That is a view not only of the lay public but even of a few respected academic administrators.

If you read the Chronicle of Higher Education, the weekly newspaper/magazine devoted to higher education issues, you are already familiar with the mood I am talking about. I wish more faculty would read this publication. It is the

best source of information about what is happening on other campuses and in higher education generally. Stony Brook will need a well-informed faculty as we try to change ourselves to meet our challenges. Other criticisms that you will find widely discussed include our failure to produce a coherent undergraduate curriculum, the greater-than-inflationary escalations in cost, our use of graduate students to teach, the perception that our teachers--graduate assistants included--are not trained to teach, and the undesirable side effects of faculty involvement in private enterprise.

Some of these criticisms must be shared by two-year and four-year colleges, but it is the research universities toward whom they are all directed. And, proud as we may be of our relatively new status as such a university ourselves, we must share in the criticism. Shall we ignore these complaints? We cannot. While I believe that all research universities are eventually going to have to change to some extent to regain the confidence of their constituencies, I believe Stony Brook is going to have to change sooner than others. As we swiftly acquired the behavior of a research university, so we are going to have to adapt swiftly to the conditions that are rendering at least some of that behavior untenable.

LESSONS FROM THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

It would be easy to use up all the time I have today talking about the external conditions that make it necessary for us to change. I am going to assume that you understand that the world around us is changing dramatically and irreversibly and that these changes cannot but affect higher education, especially Stony Brook. Not that we are going to grow very different from our peers; they are all going to have to do something similar to what we will do. Some of them are already well on their way. Many of them are private universities.

Despite our complaints that the State of New York has not funded our operating budget in a stable or even a rational way, the pressures of the present bear more strongly upon private universities. They are feeling the pinch of the changing attitude of the federal agencies toward general university support on top of the growing resistance of students and their parents to accept crushing indebtedness to pay their high tuitions. We play down the boast of the independent sector that it responds more quickly to the changing needs of society than the public sector, but it is true. They are driven to it by economic reality, and they are not obstructed by the inertia of layers of bureaucracy and government. Consequently, it is illuminating to look to our private peers for ideas about our own future.

Let me start with topics related to money.

Tuition and Financial Aid: Everyone should be aware that the past two decades have seen a shift in federal student aid from grants to loans. Access to both grants and loans is based on an assessment of family ability to pay. Most selective private universities admit students on a "need-blind" basis assuming that they can come up with a financial aid package that will permit all accepted students to attend. Nearly all financial aid has been awarded on the basis of need. In the face of hyper-inflationary cost growths, private universities are just beginning to move away from this ideal. Merit-based scholarships are becoming more frequent, and estimates of who will be able to afford to attend are becoming more important in the admissions process. Fortunately, our tuition is low and will remain low compared with private universities. But it will get higher, and we will be competing with universities that give modest merit-based scholarships to students who have the ability to pay without the award.

The most rational tuition policy for a private university is to charge the highest publicly acceptable amount and give generous financial aid. The net result is a fee for education based on ability to pay. With luck, admission can be need-blind. Although this policy has negative side effects, such as an image of unaffordability that may deter low and middle income families from even finding out about the financial aid opportunities, it appears to be the currently accepted way of operating.

I believe SUNY's tuition will go up substantially in fiscal year 1991/92 and thereafter. I do not believe tuition increases will be adequate to provide significant relief for SUNY operating budgets. I strongly favor differential tuitions for CUNY and SUNY and for different kinds of institutions within SUNY. The cost of education is greater at the University Centers, and I favor charging more tuition at the University Centers than at the other types of SUNY institutions, the difference being made available to the campuses. (If the differential revenue is not returned to the originating campus, I would not favor differential tuition.) Whether this will ever happen depends on many political factors, and I cannot guess at its chances. I do believe, however, that the ideal of no or low tuition at New York public universities will not be realized in the new SUNY.

The implications for Stony Brook are clear enough. We have already made merit scholarship funds a high priority for fund raising through the Stony Brook Foundation. We are also going to have to continue to find ways to defray the cost of education for talented students for whom even modest tuition increases pose a problem. This is going to require additional investment in fund-raising staff.

Relationship with Federal Government: Since the early 1970's, the federal government has been redefining its relationship with the research universities through the management of its research sponsorship. The initiative has been led by the budget control part of the federal bureaucracy but has been reinforced by criticisms from Congress of waste, fraud and irrelevance in university-hosted research. The result is a reluctance to pay the full cost of sponsored research, an increase in bureaucratic surveillance of host institutions, and a growing "procurement" mentality that ignores quality issues in funding decisions. For example, indirect costs are beginning to influence which institutions should receive support for research. An administrator at a private university recently told me that this policy shift so strongly favors public universities whose states are willing to put up tax dollars to win federal funds that private institutions are unlikely ever to succeed in attracting major new federally funded research centers.

Limitations on Sponsored Research: The ultimate consequence of this trend is to make it impossible for research universities to continue to expand the volume of sponsored research they can accommodate. This is an extremely important change in the sponsored research environment. It means that at some point some university administrator is going to have to tell a faculty investigator that he or she cannot accept a research grant for financial reasons. This will not be simply a Stony Brook problem, but a problem for all research universities. The private institutions will feel the pressure first, but because of the way sponsored research is managed in SUNY and in New York State, Stony Brook will feel it sooner than others. Tension is already growing nationwide between public and private universities because most major public systems have been willing to pick up the unfunded expenses to capture the federal funds.

Maximizing Productivity of Existing Research Resources: Before Stony Brook places limits on sponsored research, we should make absolutely certain that we are investing our available resources as wisely as possible. That does not simply mean operating the Research Foundation offices efficiently. It means managing the much larger sums expended from our State budget to support sponsored research. Our investment through matching grants, computer services, technical services, utility costs, shops, organized research units, faculty released time, and student faculty ratios is enormous and not managed consciously in relation to other University goals and priorities. Committees chaired by Professors Arthur Grollman and Linwood Lee last spring recommended an overhaul of local sponsored program management practices, and steps are being taken to reduce overhead costs.

Our ability to maximize federal sponsorship also depends dramatically on SUNY and State policies. I am sure everyone is aware that of the funds the federal agencies are willing to pay for indirect costs, our campus receives only a fraction, less than half, for actual reimbursement of those costs. The policies that remove the other half simply have to be changed. Earlier this year, I wrote a long technical analysis of this problem that concluded with fifteen specific recommendations for SUNY and the Research Foundation to improve the management of sponsored research. These recommendations, if implemented, could make millions of dollars more operating funds available to our campus and defer for many years the difficult decision to limit sponsored programs. I wrote this analysis on the occasion of my election to the Board of Directors of the Research Foundation and can report that the Board is beginning to respond positively. Within the current year, Stony Brook should receive more than three-quarters of a million dollars in overhead support that it would not have received under previous operating principles. This amount has already been included in the campus RF financial plan. Much of it will go back to principal investigators in response to strong recommendations made by faculty committees last year.

In the long run, the changing relation between the federal government and the research universities is going to disperse funds more broadly among institutions, reduce the impact of peer review on award decisions and increase the general contentiousness of the relationship. Stony Brook will be better off than most private institutions because we will reap short-term benefits from better management at the campus and state levels, and New York will come through with matching support from time to time to capture large federal grants. But in the long run, all research universities must face up to the intrinsic limit imposed by the sheer cost of hosting federally sponsored research.

Responding to the Marketplace: With the rapidly growing gap between the "sticker price" of public and private tuitions comes the question, "What is it in the private university experience that makes it worth the price?" In the northeast United States, and especially in New York, families still scrape to send their children to private institutions not demonstrably better than the much less expensive public colleges, and by some measures demonstrably worse. Why? We would do well to examine closely the arguments advanced by these institutions because the driving factor of enrollments is as important for the stability of our funding as in the private sector.

The Supportive Atmosphere: The private institutions are responding to the marketplace demand for a supportive atmosphere for beginning undergraduates. Few prospective students or their parents are interested in faculty accomplishment. Few even care about the sophistication or coherence of the curriculum. It is an extraordinary fact that save for a handful of universities--specifically Yale, Princeton, Stanford and Harvard--all the rest are viewed as offering pretty much the same level of academic quality by the general public. Choices are made on the basis of secondary characteristics.

This is bad news for Stony Brook. We have (demonstrably) the best faculty in the public sector in the northeast. Although we are not satisfied with the coherence of the undergraduate curriculum (rightly so), our academic standards are very high and we are delivering a high quality academic product. We are doing well in the fundamentals, but we are not doing as well in the secondary characteristics that draw students. What are they?

Appreciation of Students: In talking with students, parents, and my own family, I conclude that the desirable supportive environment includes a sense of community in which visible adult authority figures such as faculty are seen to appreciate the presence and interests of students. That does not seem like much, but it is not the image that research universities project.

Consider some of our own excellent undergraduate programs, of which we are rightfully proud. Each projects a subtly different image of respect for the student. Through the Master Learner concept, the Federated Learning Communities transform a faculty member into a student to help bridge the gap between the two cultures. The Honors College brings motivated students together where they can learn from each other and from a parade of academic visitors in an extracurricular setting. URECA (Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities) brings students into contact with research faculty. These are excellent programs and I would not want to change any of them. But there is, nevertheless, something that they fail to provide. Where are students and faculty acting like real people enjoying together things worth doing? Where are they going out for a late evening cup of coffee and talking about the impact of the changing world on each other's lives? In what program or initiative do we seek the motivations, aspirations, insights of our students out of simple compassion and the interest that intelligent human beings have for one another? A few such efforts are just beginning, such as the Faculty/Student Lunch Program, and some aspects of other programs encourage the behavior I have in mind. But most of our programs glorify our glorious faculty and do not sufficiently acknowledge the value, and values, of our students.

I am implying here that our undergraduate students are interesting people faced with monumental decisions. For all the turmoil of the late 1960's and early 70's, for all the meaningless denigration of the "establishment" during the Vietnam era, the world is changing more profoundly now than it was then. Our students (some of them) then faced death and terrible personal choices. But our students now are awakening intellectually in that dizzying instant when the world gestalt switches, (after we know the image of the old woman in the shawl is not quite right, but before the image of the elegant young woman has revealed itself to our confused eye). During that previous turmoil, the issue was one of choice--society as it was or escape through personal action. During this one the society itself is rippling like a mirage, and the issue is not so much one of escape from unpleasant reality as it is identification of reality at all.

Do we need to improve physical conditions in our dormitories? Yes. Do we need to make the campus more attractive? Yes. Do we need to improve our curriculum? Yes. Do we need improved parking, athletics, activity space, student-faculty contact? Yes, yes, yes. But if we do not become actually interested in our students, we will not create a campus environment that attracts them to us. To compete with institutions that know this secret, we are going to have to project an image of caring for students.

There is much to say about the phenomenon of caring for students. Stony Brook is blessed with many faculty who do value their students. I daresay most of us do. That is a fact that will be of great utility as we discuss ways of changing our image to one of greater caring and respect. I look forward to participating in that discussion. But, frankly, we could make immediate progress--without additional funding, without committees, and without clever new ideas--if each of us were actually to do something that demonstrates our care for our students.

THE VALUE OF OUR SERVICE

These are some of the lessons I think we can learn from institutions that are already responding to the pressures that changing times are thrusting onto Stony Brook. But there are other lessons that we can learn directly from our own environment. We are a public university in a State that may not yet understand the value of such an institution. As the State of New York, our patron, struggles with the problems of massive economic and social change, we are obliged to demonstrate our usefulness. When these changes affect our patron's ability to support us, then our very survival depends on being of evident value.

The concept of usefulness in American public higher education is not new, but the economic expansion of the postwar decades has weakened its urgency. The current economic recession has deep roots and no short or simple solution. And it is now that the value of our service to society will be tested. Fortunately, Stony Brook is well poised to make the case for its value as a provider of needed social services, and like the effort to project an attitude of caring for our students, we must be genuine and enthusiastic in demonstrating our concern for the society that nurtures us. There are several distinct areas that I call linkages in which the case can be made.

Health Care: We obviously satisfy a profound need for advanced medical care in eastern Long Island. There is still much to do, and doing it is going to require financial investment. I believe much can be done with resources derived from patient revenues. With enlightened responses from SUNY and appropriate State agencies, Stony Brook can continue to expand the range and depth of its impact on the quality of life on Long Island. The responses are excruciatingly slow in coming and have already cost us and the State of New York dearly, both in additional expense for inefficient solutions and in lost opportunities. Health care will nevertheless continue to be a major thrust of our campus in a changed world.

Economic Development: I wish it were possible to develop a formula that shows how each State dollar invested in a Stony Brook program is later returned manyfold in expanded economic activity. The point is not lost on Californians who have been competing recently for the privilege of having a new branch of the University of California in their neighborhood. Here on Long Island public consciousness is finally awakening to the fact that Stony Brook is one of a small number of keys to rebuilding a viable economy not based upon federal military expenditures. Our involvement in these efforts is not simply an opportunistic ploy to get more support for faculty projects; it is part of our mission. If we can help the regional economy through training and retraining of the workforce, through analysis and research, through assistance to new businesses, through the creation of new technology, we will gain the support of our most significant patron for our own continued economic health.

Research: I have already disclosed my views on the changing picture of federally sponsored research, but the kind of research I want to emphasize here is that tied to regional needs. Studies of Lyme disease, of Alzheimer's disease, of alternatives for solid waste disposal, of the feasibility of new industries in wine or recyclable materials, of the pre-conditions for competitive manufacturing on Long Island-- these are activities of obvious relevance to our region. Our faculty need to be encouraged to seek inspiration for their

creative talent from the challenging material of the problems around us. While I agree that preoccupation with patents and licenses and liaisons with business are not invariably healthy for academic departments, Stony Brook now has a variety of programs in which applied and industrially cosponsored research is very natural. Programs such as the Center for Advanced Technology in Biotechnology, the Waste Management Institute, the Center for Regional Studies, and the Long Island High Technology Incubator facility are going to be very important in the New World.

Primary and Secondary Education: Long Island's schools need our help to replace retiring teachers, to keep teaching skills and content up to date and to prepare school leadership for the monumental changes in the New World. We are beginning to carry our weight in this enterprise, and I am pleased that our efforts have attracted attention throughout the State. We are noteworthy because we are training significant numbers of effective teachers without a traditional School of Education. In addition to the mainstream teacher certification programs, we are offering an array of programs for teachers in the School of Continuing Education and through the Center for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education. The high reputation of Long Island's schools cannot be maintained without a renewed dedication to the preparation of teachers on a large scale at Stony Brook.

Athletics: At the recent dedication of our new Indoor Sports Complex, I cited four reasons why intercollegiate athletics is important for Stony Brook: Participation, Public Service, Campus Atmosphere, and Visibility. Since I am emphasizing linkages, let me repeat here the argument on Public Service. Stony Brook's athletic programs are the only NCAA programs in Suffolk County, a region of more than 1.3 million people. Only at Stony Brook may eastern Long Islanders witness live athletic competitions beyond the high school and club levels. I believe that state, county, town and village governments should all work to fill this vacuum. Educators at all levels know that athletics builds family ties, instills good values, helps people learn to work together, provides healthy emotional outlets and offers ways for young people of every stage of intellectual and emotional development to feel a sense of participation in society. Too much attention has been given to the troubles of student athletes; all too little attention has been given to the overwhelmingly positive aspects of athletics, especially for young people. I believe investments in athletic opportunities for our youth will repay society many times over in improved attitudes and life skills. Stony Brook can be a highly significant factor in an overall pattern of regional athletics that reaches substantially more young people than at present.

Social Leadership: By virtue of our educational mission and the commitment of many of our faculty to the improvement of society, Stony Brook is seen as a source of leadership in social issues. The most important area in which we need to provide such leadership is in the recognition and development of human value without regard to the accidents of race, culture, or personal history that lend diversity to our society. Whether we are conscious of it or not, Stony Brook is an example to all other Long Island institutions, organizations and businesses in our effort to bring every able person into the mainstream of social and economic productivity. Our New World will be one in which racial and ethnic groups not traditionally associated with wealth and status in our society will comprise a significant fraction of our population--no longer minority groups. My new colleague, Patrick Swygert, now President of SUNY at Albany, refers to these groups as "the emerging majority." Our State has made the development of this emerging majority a high priority for public support. We are expected not only to participate in this mission but to provide leadership for it.

There are other linkages that tie us in positive ways to the community: Continuing Education, the highly successful programming of the Staller Center for the Arts, summer programs for high school students, volunteer activities by our students. These and others like them are evidence of a growing awareness throughout the University that our neighbors are important constituents of the campus. This is an attitude essential for our continued survival in the New World.

MAKING IT ALL WORK

At this point, I want to restate my message that appears in the Annual Presidential Report for 1989-90, the first in recent history to be published during the same year as the progress it reports, for which I thank the people in our Publications Office. It is an extraordinary document because it chronicles vitality, growth and excellence in every mission despite a background of Statewide fiscal doubt and gloom. If we are going to transform our University to match the needs of a new era, we are going to have to do it during the uncertainties and economic dislocations that mark the onset of that era. Certainly the most astonishing thing about Stony Brook's record is that our progress continues through bad budget years as well as good ones. How is this possible? How long can we keep it up? Will the worsening State economy finally bring Stony Brook's growth to an end next year?

These are important questions whose answers need to be understood by all our friends as well as by ourselves. Our successes are made possible through extraordinary human effort and ingenuity. Our employees, faculty, students and staff care deeply about Stony Brook and are exerting themselves to find new ways of doing things, new forms of support, new habits of work and study and personal behavior that ensure not simply our survival but our predominance within higher education. Our success is possible in these difficult times because we refuse to give up our hard-won excellence. From energy conservation and recycling to imaginative use of computers and the largest revenues from non-State sources in New York public education, Stony Brook people are finding ways to keep moving ahead. We will pull the entire State along with us if that is what it takes.

We can maintain our forward motion for as long as the stewards of public education in our State permit us to apply the fruits of our ingenuity and effort. Stony Brook is hammering at bureaucratic barriers that were established long before New York understood the potential of public research universities to solve their own problems. We have reached that level of institutional maturity that permits us to tap technology, philanthropy, federal sponsorship and the free marketplace to fund State objectives beyond the means of tax support. But to do it we need new statutory authorizations. We need a new Statewide flexibility initiative. We need to be able to "privatize" some of our activities, including educational activities, so people who require expanded service can get it. We need new ways to build essential facilities, new ways to finance the replacement of expensive equipment, new attitudes toward the operation of health care facilities. To some of these needs the State is, in fact, responding, but ever so slowly. These difficult times demand more rapid change.

Next year looks grim for tax-supported programs. But Stony Brook is favored by substantial works in progress, described in the Annual Report. Stony Brook is favored by the importance of our region to the State's economy. Stony Brook is favored by the strength of Long Island's elected officials, who worked magic for our "incubator" project in a gaunt year. Stony Brook is favored by the fame and excellence of its faculty who receive more support from non-State sources for their work than all but a handful of other faculties throughout the nation.

But most of all, Stony Brook is favored by its people, who are not hypnotized by adversity. We are going to tighten our belts, operate more efficiently and fight for the freedom to solve our own problems if the State cannot solve them for us.

If you are as impressed as I am by what we have accomplished even during "bad" years, then lend your support to the tasks that still lie before us. We need your personal commitment to accomplish the metamorphosis to the New Stony Brook demanded by the New World. With your help we will be successful.