

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@Duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday December 3, 2009

Craig Henriquez (BME, Chair of the Council): Welcome everyone, I think we'll go ahead and get started. It does seem like we were just here – yesterday! (laughter) I hope everyone had a good Thanksgiving and is getting ready for the push to the end of the semester.

As you know, today we are going to continue our discussion on Duke in China, which will be in executive session. I'd like to thank the Council members who provided questions after Sandy Williams' presentation on November 19th. Those questions, along with those generated by ECAC, were submitted to Sandy, Blair Sheppard and the Provost and we look forward to hearing the answers in today's meeting. I want to let everyone know that Dr. Williams has to leave by 4:30 for a conference call. So, if the discussion goes longer than 4:30, which I certainly hope it does not, Bill Boulding, will jump in – he'll be jumping in anyway as the Deputy Dean of the Fuqua School of Business – Blair Sheppard would have been here, but he also had another appointment.

There's a slight change to our agenda. We are knocking off # 7 – Michael Gillespie, who's the Chair of the Athletics Council, will give his report in January. There was a survey that was taken of Duke faculty and students regarding Duke athletics and facilities, and we have not had time to think that through. Some of you may know there's been some additional commentary in the Chronicle in the last week about Duke Athletics, and we'd like to consider that more fully. So, Michael will present in the January meeting.

Before we move into executive session, we first need to approve the minutes from the November 19th meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

I now call our meeting into Executive Session and ask all those who are not faculty or have other association with this body, to please leave the room. We do have a few items to follow this one and you are welcome to come back for those discussions- probably around 4:20-4:30.

Hopefully everyone had a chance to read the questions that were circulated a few days ago which came from our first conversation about Duke in China. Sandy

and Bill Boulding are here to talk further about this plan and address the questions.

Before they speak, I would like to say a few words. As I noted last time, the current plans for Duke in China have crystallized very recently. There are a lot of complex issues here and some are very difficult to fully understand unless you have been studying them a long time, as Blair Sheppard and Sandy and others have done. ECAC has been working very hard over the last few weeks to catch up. I actually spent some time this morning looking at some YouTube videos showing the Kunshan region and I learned that Kunshan is home to the third largest beer festival in China. I figure that should help to attract a few students. (laughter)

The current plan as I understand it, and the one that will be seeking Board approval this weekend, is that a new facility will be built in Kunshan China specifically for Fuqua to use to offer a Duke degree, the Masters of Management Studies abroad. The facility will also be used to enhance Fuqua's Global Executive MBA Program and Cross-Continent Program. In addition the new facility will provide incubation space for faculty from Fuqua and other schools to do research and consider new educational programs.

In many ways the creation of a new facility parallels what Duke did in Singapore, except for one difference – the facility will not be directly associated with a major University in the area. The most typical model for a global initiative or study abroad is to partner with another university. That is not the approach that is planned here. Of all the aspects of the project – the creation of a new, separate facility has been the one piece that has generated the most questions and concern within ECAC. How will this all be perceived by those outside Duke? Is this a better model than a partnership? Will the autonomous campus of Kunshan be attractive to future students outside of China who may want to be more fully integrated with a larger student body?

We do not claim to know the answers here – our concern comes mainly from not having a good model for how this will all work.

With regard to the specifics of the project, the more focused Phase I plan for Fuqua is to set up shop in Kunshan and offer a one year MMS degree. We all believe that this is well thought out and motivated. Yesterday in APC, Dean Sheppard made a very compelling argument for why Fuqua professors and Fuqua students need to be in China to understand the Chinese economy and business approaches. There are great opportunities for the business school in China. We all know that China will likely be driving much of the World's economy in the next decade and possibly beyond. It is clear that it is important to be inside China. Also what is learned on the ground in China about China can be brought back to Duke and enhance the MBA and MMS experiences for students here. Phase I of the project was unanimously endorsed by APC yesterday.

Phase II of the project is somewhat less settled. But under the new plan, as I understand it, there will be time to flesh this out. The only thing that we are committing to at this time that is needed for Phase II is the creation of incubation space to experiment with new ideas.

So it's really in Phase II that more faculty and student input is needed than has been solicited to date. While there have been some high-level discussions with the deans of the various schools, our sense is this has not really been filtered down to the faculty who might be going there and initiating programs. We encourage the administration to foster greater dialogue with the faculty and think hard about the impact of these programs on Duke and its future.

Now if new programs are created, there should be an emphasis for innovation and not just doing the same old same old. Singapore is a model for this as well. For those of you who know about it, there was an opportunity to innovate the medical school education and some of the ideas about medical school education are now being translated back to Duke here.

With that as a preamble, I will hand this over to Sandy and Bill.

Executive Session on the Duke-in-China project in Kunshan. After considerable discussion, the following action was taken:

Henriquez: I'd like to present a statement on behalf of the Academic Council to the Board of Trustees regarding the plan. The statement is the following. It may need to be wordsmithed or modified based on some of the things that I heard because there are a lot of programs and I am not sure if I have all of the acronyms right, but this is the statement.

The Academic Council supports Phase I of the China Opportunity for Duke, which will allow the Fuqua School of Business to offer the existing degree of Masters of Management Studies (MMS) in China. The Council also supports Fuqua's goal of using the facilities in Kunshan to enhance its Global Executive MBA and Cross-Continent Programs and to provide incubator space to other Duke schools for faculty to explore complementary research and educational programs.

The Academic Council is not prepared to endorse future plans of the program until the faculty have had more time to understand fully what it means in terms of cost and other commitments to establish high-quality educational programs in China beyond those already proposed by Fuqua.

Thoughts, comments? Motion to approve?

Julie Britton (Fuqua): It's not clear to me. This doesn't mention anything about PhD education; I know that that may not be our PhD that we're granting, but rather support for their PhD, so I don't know if that needs to be included or not.

Bill Boulding (Fuqua): You are correct that we are not granting our PhD but we are supporting the development of their PhD students.

Henriquez: Any other thoughts? Comments? Can I have a motion to approve?

Karla Holloway (English): You didn't call for abstentions.

Henriquez: I'm sorry. Abstentions? (laughter) [The motion passed by voice vote with one abstention.]

Timing of Fall & Winter Degree Approval

As you may recall from our September meeting, there has been an ongoing problem with the timing of the approval of earned degrees for September and December graduates – particularly for graduates of the School of Nursing, who need a certified transcript before they can apply for a job. In our first meeting we discussed various options to deal with this and we didn't come to any consensus.

At this point, we are planning to use the simplest option and that is to call a special meeting of the Academic Council which we can do, which will be on **January 6** with a single agenda item – the approval of earned degrees – which hopefully will be done much more smoothly than it was the first time (laughter).

We have alerted all the necessary people who are involved in generating the list of candidates about this new date and it appears that it's going to work. We hope some of you can join us on January 6, but we understand if you cannot (laughter).

The plan is be able to submit the list of candidates to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for their meeting – on January 15, I think it is – so we just wanted to let you know that that will be coming and we'll just have this and hopefully this will facilitate the process for the certification of these transcripts and the nurses can go out and get jobs, because we need more nurses. Are there any questions?

Unidentified speaker: Will it be at 3:30?

Henriquez: We will let you know the time. Don't be late. It will go very fast. (laughter).

I also want to alert the Council that our 2010 nomination and election process, we know you all enjoy that, is just around the corner and that is going to begin later in January. Sandra and I have worked very hard with the OIT folks these last few months to refine this electronic voting process that was rolled out last year. We have several enhancements. One of those enhancements (it's

an interesting little enhancement) is that we will be requiring each voter, before they vote or before they nominate, to answer a question before they do so, and the question will be: *Are you willing to stand for election and serve if nominated?* (laughter).

The reason for doing this is that last year Sandra spent an extraordinary amount of time getting email notifications to the nominees and then checking whether or not they were willing to serve, and then going down the list in order until we found people who *were* willing to serve.

We're hoping that this simple question and answer will cut down on the time she has to spend on this step in the process. So you will see that, before going into the voting you will have to answer this question. We thought about the possibility of taking people off of the list to do this, but we didn't want to go through a two stage process, so right now this is just to see whether or not this will cut down on the time that Sandra has to do this email validation.

There are also going to be some other enhancements in terms of how you view the nominating ballots and how you can sort the names and look at the list. Hopefully this will make things a little easier, and please encourage your colleagues in your respective divisions – all 2800 plus of us – to take part in both the nomination and election steps of the Academic Council election.

The last announcement is that we are planning on having the Annual University Faculty Meeting – this is the President's meeting and it's separate from AC – on February 9. We will have more about this in January.

Masters of Management degree in Clinical Informatics

We will now vote for the proposed Masters of Management degree in Clinical Informatics that was brought to us by Fuqua at the last meeting. Those of you who were here, there were a few of you who stayed to the very end, heard Bill [Boulding's] presentation. The background documents were circulated. Bill and Kevin Schulman are here to answer any questions you might have regarding this degree. If this plan is approved today, it will go to the Board of Trustees tomorrow for their approval. Are there any questions from the floor? We did not get any questions by e-mail, but of course there were only four or five of you in the room (laughter). I didn't expect to hear more than that, but are there any questions regarding this degree offering from Fuqua? May I have a motion to approve this request for this new degree for this Masters of Management in Clinical Informatics? [The motion passed by voice vote.]

DIBS Authority to Hire Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The next item is a request from the Duke Institute for Brain Sciences for authority to hire non-tenure-track, regular-rank faculty. As I noted last time, in the fall of 2007, Academic Council voted on a formal process for granting authority which involves a signoff of the proposal from APC, ECAC and Academic Council before

going to the Board of Trustees. To date APC and ECAC have unanimously voted to approve this request for granting the authority to hire non-tenure track faculty within this institute. A document that outlines this process was provided to you -- David Fitzpatrick, Director of the Duke Institute for Brain Sciences, is here to answer any questions about this before moving to a vote. Are there any questions? Ok, seeing no questions, I will again ask...will someone make a motion to approve this? [The motion passed by voice vote.]

University Priorities Committee Update

Thank you very much, so that is our last formal task to do and the last item, last but not least if we have enough time, is an update from the Chair of the University Priorities Committee, Dr. Warren Grill.

For those of you who are new to the Council, UPC, as it is commonly known, is a committee that reports to the President and whose members are charged with assessing university and academic priorities, ensuring that the University's annual and long-term budgets reflect these priorities, and making recommendations to the President.

When UPC was restructured a few years ago, the Council asked that the chair of this committee report twice a year to Academic Council – early in the year and then at the end of the year. We actually asked Warren if he would wait to have a few meetings under his belt before he presented this academic year. As many of you know, the University is entering into the budget season and some decisions regarding compensation and priority-setting at the School and University levels will need to be made in the next few months.

If you have not seen it, there is an excellent article in this month's *Duke Magazine* on Duke's adjustment to the financial challenges of the past year entitled "Sizing Up a Smaller Duke." If you have not read it, I encourage you to do so. It's a very good article. Warren is here to tell us more about the role of UPC and how UPC is helping to generate a more efficient Duke.

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): Thank you Craig. So, I just have a few slides and I will give you an update on our activity as well as a little bit of foreshadowing about what we are going to be doing in the coming semester. At the end I would like to identify what I consider to be some important issues which have been raised at the intersection between University Priorities and budget matters. Our charge is up here [slide], but I think it is a little bit better to think about this...we really work with senior administration in an elaborate role. We discuss issues rather than vote on them. In my four years on the committee, we have never had a vote. And Peter Lange captured the sentiment of what we are trying to do with the phrase "funding our aspirations." And as you are all aware, our aspirations in the last year or two have certainly not declined.

We are continuing to be on the ascent, but the capabilities to fund all of these aspirations has decreased and so this really makes refining our priorities quite important.

Members of the committee are listed here...I would particularly like to thank [Mary Champagne](#) from the Nursing School who served on the Committee for six years and I'd like to welcome to the committee, [Sunny Ladd](#) from the Sanford School.

I'd also like to point out two folks from the senior administration who I've worked with quite closely. That's [Hof Milam](#), Vice-President for Finance in Tallman Trask's office, and [Jim Roberts](#), Executive Vice Provost for Finance & Administration in Peter Lange's office – they have been immensely helpful both in helping to identify agenda items that we have addressed on the Committee as well as providing information to distribute to the members of the Committee in advance of our discussions so that we can try to use our time more effectively.

We've had a fairly busy fall. I'm not going to go through each one of these issues, but I thought that it would be prudent to address a couple in particular. The first is what many of you may be familiar with because there has been a lot of public press about the Bain report. This was commissioned by the University of North Carolina upon the commandment and support of one of their trustees and they hired an external consultant company, Bain, to come in and look at their operations to try and help them trim their administrative operations as a way to save money. I think they paid about \$3 million for this study. It generated about 150 pages of report and we have looked at that report quite closely and we benefit from them having spent \$3 million (laughter) because we can take advantage of some of the same recommendations from that report.

I think, however, more importantly, we have working at Duke University, a gentleman named [Tim Walsh](#) who has been heading up the DART Initiative, the Duke Administrative Restructuring or Reform (I know we keep changing it back and forth) Team. And Tim used to work for, as a consultant, for one of the competitors of Bain and he has been working at Duke for three or four years, so we have our own internal consultant who we are already paying, who, in my opinion, has done a really successful job with the DART Initiative.

He has studied quite carefully the Bain report, and my conclusion, both from talking to Tim, as well as looking at this report on my own, is that it would not be prudent of Duke University to hire a comparable company to do a comparable study because I think what we have to learn we can learn from our internal consultant Tim Walsh as well as from studying the existing Bain report. This was discussed, I know, by the Board of Trustees, and has been a topic that has appeared at least twice in the Chronicle as well.

The other highlight I would like to touch on is Facilities Management and that is because this impacts, perhaps, your quality of work when you come to spend your day at Duke University. We have an enormous physical plant, there are lots of people involved in taking care of the physical plant. It is a tremendously complicated place. We have old buildings, we have new buildings and the early retirement-incentive program which was implemented, had a disproportionate impact on indi-

viduals who worked in Facilities Management, so a large number of individuals in that department retired voluntarily from Duke. Given the reductions that he has in personnel, John Noonan, who runs Facilities Management, has been charged with figuring out how to continue to deliver the services that he must deliver to our faculty and the students, to the constituents' satisfaction, without hiring all of those people back. He has gone through, in great detail, his plans to reduce costs and in this year has identified almost \$3.5 million in cost reductions – I'm sorry that I don't have my notes to tell you what fraction of the total budget of his department that represents, but I believe it's an excess of ten percent.

So what does this mean for us? Well it means that your offices will not be cleaned as frequently, your garbage cans will not be emptied every day, the grounds will not be kept in the splendor which we are used to, meaning that lawns will be mowed less frequently, litter will be picked up less frequently, floors will be mopped less frequently. This will not impact, I assure you, the cleanliness of restrooms, (laughter) and there are also certain areas of campus which have been identified, the gardens, the athletics area, the medical center, where the grounds-keeping has to be maintained at its current level because this is an important part of the functions that these facilities are used for. For example, the NCAA specifies how often you cut the grass on the field, so we can't say well we used to do it once a week, and now we're going to do it once every two weeks because we have one person mowing the lawn where we used to have two. So I believe that one part of our success in moving through these difficult times is from shared sacrifice and I think this is one clear area where there is going to be some shared sacrifice. Yes?

Jennifer Brody (African and African American Studies): I know on that point, there was a movement in the Arts and Sciences Council to have tenured faculty give up 1% of their salary so that we wouldn't have to be cutting from the bottom up as it were. Was that considered or anything like that under the University Priorities Committee?

Grill: This is the first I've heard of that notion, and at the end I will certainly give people the opportunity to make suggestions, it's certainly something that we would consider discussing. In this instance, no one has been cut involuntarily. These individuals have chosen to retire from Duke University, and in many cases, have been provided additional financial resources to enable them to retire when otherwise they may not have been able to retire. No one has been cut.

Any other questions? The last part of this, and I see a fair number of people with sweaters on today because it's a little unseasonably cold out, there is an effort to regulate more tightly the temperatures in many of the buildings on campus, particularly the buildings that have been built in the last twenty years. The University has the ability to centrally set the high and low temperatures in these buildings and the thermostat on your wall is simply a decoration and a convenient place to hang an extra shirt (laughter). So what this means is that the average temperature in offices will be going down, I be-

lieve to 68 degrees during the winter months, and you are not supposed to bring in a space heater to compensate if your office is too cold for you, and in the summer months things will be two degrees warmer than they would have been in the past. This has not only saved us money, but it also reduces our carbon footprint as well so I think we get a double bang for our buck there.

Some issues that have arisen both through my discussions with the Executive Committees of the Academic Council as well as my participation as a faculty representative of the Business and Finance sub-committee of the Board of Trustees: The first of these is that I presume, many of you have heard that there is in place a faculty early-retirement incentive program and at this stage, this is really something, to my understanding and Provost Lange, please correct me if I'm wrong, that has always gone on, but in this instance, there are central resources being made available to deans to provide additional resources to faculty who may be interested in retiring.

I think we need to be very cautious going forward about the net impact of this program on faculty size. In my view this is particularly acute now because, as we have heard, there are many efforts to enhance our revenue and this is largely, as we have seen, through having more students on campus, in new master's degree programs, in larger undergraduate classes, and new degree programs. As we are bringing more and more students to campus, if this is happening at the same time, it could cause a net shrinkage of the faculty. This could really create a challenge for us going forward so I think it is something that we need to pay close attention to as faculty.

Provost Peter Lange: Can I say something about that? Just to be clear, the early-retirement-incentive program was not put in place as a budgetary measure, and in fact it was much more designed to enable faculty who wanted to retire to do so, so that we could have more positions to turn over than we otherwise would in a period in which faculty turnovers were reduced. Both because there were fewer people retiring and because there were fewer cases of retention with people leaving because other schools are also not hiring. The basic intention of the deans has always been that most of these positions that go out in retirement will be replaced, although perhaps at a different rank than the person departing. Now, that doesn't mean faculty in some schools might not get smaller for other budgetary reasons, not as a direct result of the faculty deciding to leave.

Grill: Any other comments on that before we press on? So the second issue was raised, again, once in the Business and Finance sub-committee as well as with my meeting with ECAC, is to ensure that we look at our central administration, Associate and Assistant Vice-Presidents, Associate and Assistant Provosts and the staff that support them and ensure that that the administrative structure is in alignment with the strategic plan of the University. We have an effort afoot to remove a total of \$125 million from the operating budget to create a "smaller Duke." A big part of this is for the individual schools as well as the University as a whole, to generate

a revised strategic plan and it's prudent, I believe, to look at our administrative structures and ensure that those are in alignment with that new strategic plan.

So we're working again with [Tim Walsh](#), who has collected some data in this area, and this will be a big part of what we try to do in the coming semester.

Finally, I think broadly, all of us, and folks on the UPC in particular, are monitoring the University finances and the success of the cost-reduction measures which have been put in place during the current year. However, I think that we have largely done the easy things. Turning down the thermostat, cutting the lawn a little less frequently, these are what I would characterize as "low-hanging fruit." As we heard from Tallman Trask in a prior meeting, we disconnected 800 phone lines that had no phone plugged into the outlet. I don't think this has had any bad effects on any of us. But I think that the challenges going forward are going to be a little more demanding, and we are going to need to be very prudent to stay on this glide path to reach our goal of cutting this \$125 million. And so even though you may hear that the Dow-Jones industrial average briefly crossed 10,500 yesterday, we still have hard work in front of us as a University. Finally, I am happy to answer any questions on the behalf of the committee and I welcome your identification of issues that you would like us to take up. You can either raise those now or you can email me at warren.grill@duke.edu

Karla Holloway: I think this might be an appropriate consideration for the UPC: in meeting with the Black Faculty Caucus yesterday, President Brodhead suggested that our question, our concern about potential layoffs at the University having a disparate impact on minorities, something that the University is interested in following to make sure that is no disproportionate impact. I don't know if there is or if that's of value to the UPC, or another committee. But since you are thinking about how the budgetary changes will affect the University community, one of the values that we would like to see articulated is an interest in making sure that minority employees at Duke, especially who are in staff positions and in less secure positions, are looked after carefully in terms of the kinds of impact that the financial picture might have.

Grill: I will certainly add that to our discussion. I think it reflects perhaps the broader principle that as we go about making cost reductions, we need to think about doing this across all levels, from people all the way from the bottom to the top if you wanted to characterize it that way.

Joel Marcus (Divinity): This may be opening Pandora's box and I don't have a dog in this fight to use two clichés in one sentence (laughter), but I read an article yesterday in Durham's *Herald-Sun* by Orin Starn about athletic spending and I just wondered if his figures are correct, or anything like correct. The basic thesis of the article is that athletic spending is a great drain on the University's budget, that the athletic budget has increased over 40% in the last three years and that football, for example lost \$6.7 million last year and that even basketball lost a couple of million and this at a time when all

the liberal arts departments are facing cuts of 15%. This just seems to me to be a serious issue of the disparity between ... athletics budget according to him and the cuts in all of our departments as well as in services and the upkeep of the buildings and grounds and so on. I don't know about this subject myself but it seems to me to be an important issue and I would like to hear some response on it.

Grill: Yes, I agree that the funding of athletics is an important and challenging issue and one that we have discussed extensively on the committee, not in the current year, but in the previous year. I haven't read this article, I don't know about the veracity of his numbers, but we did hear in our previous council meeting about the athletics budget and the numbers that we were given are that the overall budget of the Athletics Department is \$60.3 million a year and of that, they receive, if you want to call it that, a subsidy of \$14.4 million, approximately half of which is in financial aid for scholarship support for athletes. The remainder of that subsidy, again in my understanding, comes historically from the SIP funds, the strategic investment pool that the central administration had available. The provision of those dollars, those \$7 million was a commitment made, and if I recall voted on, last year by this body to endorse the strategic plan for athletics. So this was a conscious decision to make a further investment in athletics. That is just to clarify my understanding of the facts. However, I think there is a much larger issue than just those dollars, and that is what place does athletics have at Duke University?

President Brodhead: Maybe you would allow me just to say something? This subject was discussed in some detail at the last meeting of the Academic Council where the budgetary figures were shared. I would say that I have nothing but respect for Orin Starn, I have nothing but respect for anyone who raises the question of the adjudication among competing values in the University at this time, but I do not believe that the figures in his article are indisputable either. If and when this group is going to return to a discussion of such things, we might come back to a consensus regarding this matter. Much of the so-called budget increase for athletics comes from the fact that over a period of many years things were approved as expenditures for athletics that were then just sort of written off as overruns and part of the strategic plan for athletics was to be frank about what money the University is in fact putting into that space, among other things so that we could acknowledge it, and among other things, so that we could control it.

The notion of the \$15 million subsidy, one of the things I found quite interesting is there are American universities that do not have major athletics programs. There are not many. They include very distinguished universities, and actually there are many distinguished universities whose subsidy is higher than Duke University's is. I understand why at this time the question would come up, but I guess what I would hope is that if and when this body wants to return to it, and again we discussed this on several occasions last year, you could actually look at the strategic plan, we actually discussed it with Kevin White who came to this body once last year,

once early in the fall, and at the last meeting where there is actually very substantial materials presented. I'd be reluctant for us to take it up late in the meeting on the fly rather than treat it with the disciplined informed analysis that we reserve for other sections.

Grill: Peter, did you have a comment to make also?

Lange: If we are going to come back to it, I won't make a comment.

Grill: Can I just close with saying that the component of the roughly \$7 million of investment funds was cut on the order of 10-15% this year along with everything else, so they (Athletics) have not been exempt from the financial challenges that we are all facing.

Lange: So may I just say one thing? The difficulty in the figures that Professor Starn presented which is that the revenue from the TV and other media contracts are in one part of the budget and the athletics budgets are in another part of the budget and he was reporting the results absent the revenues that come from the media contracts. In fact, it is my understanding, from some correspondence we had yesterday about that article, that basketball in fact was positive for last year regarding those circumstances and football was not as negative as reported.

It was not his error; he was using data that was reported in another source, and the other source does not bring data together in a way that you could actually get an accurate picture. What Professor Grill just said about the reduction in the non-scholarship portion of the athletic subsidies is that they were cut at the same level.

Henriquez: Thank you Warren. I do want to remind the Council that Michael Gillespie who was going to speak with us today, is the chair of the Athletics Council and will be here in January and we can address this issue more deeply then and any other questions you might have – you have an entire month and a half to form questions and I encourage you to do so. You can certainly send them to us at acouncil@duke.edu.

I want to thank everyone for attending – this actually may be a record for a December meeting. Thanks everyone – our meeting is adjourned. Have a successful final exam and grading process and a restful holiday break. See you next on January 21st.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, December 18, 2009