

Duke University

Durham
North Carolina
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

PHONE (919) 684-6447
FAX (919) 681-8606
EMAIL: ACOUNCIL@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU

February 15, 2001

Addendum to the Minutes of January 18, 2001: on p. 13, par. 2, lines 1 and 4 replace "Another questioner" with "Prof. Louise Roth (Nat. Sciences)" and to ". . . could not be measured" add: "on a single or even three-dimensional linear scale."

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on Thursday, February 15, 2001 from 3:45 - 5:10 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies) presiding.

MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** called the meeting to order and asked for approval of the Minutes of January 18, 2001 including the addendum noted above. The Minutes were **approved** unanimously by voice vote as corrected.

In his first announcement, he stated that members would receive another invitation to attend another open house with wine and excellent hors d'oeuvres at the renovated Faculty Commons. The date for it would be March 8 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. The new conference rooms were now furnished and ready for use and they would also be on display at the open house. His second announcement concerned the election of the editor of the Faculty Forum at the next Council meeting. ECAC would put forth the name of Larry Evans, who had agreed to continue as editor if re-elected, but the Chair emphasized that this was an elective office, and that nominations were open. Anyone interested in serving should contact the Academic Council office for details. Nominations could also be made from the floor next month, providing prior agreement had been obtained from the candidate. In April, the annual election for the Faculty Secretary would be held. Again, anyone interested in serving in this capacity or wishing to nominate someone with their prior consent were urged to contact the Academic Council office for more information.

THE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN AND RESOLUTION

The **Chair** now turned to the first of the two main items of business. He pointed out that the University Strategic Plan, now entitled "Building on Excellence," was returning to the Council for a third time, which was appropriate for a document this dense and a project of such obvious importance for the institution's future. The revised form in which members received the Plan at the end of last week was the form in which it also went out to the Board of

Trustees. ECAC was asking the Council to endorse this definitive version of the Plan in anticipation of its coming to a vote at next week's Board meeting. Members had the resolution before them. He would now read the resolution proper, short of its various whereases.

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Council recognizes and commends the vigorous efforts of Provost Peter Lange, Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs John Harer, and many others who contributed substantively to the development of the Plan; and that the Academic Council endorses the general goals of the Plan and accepts the Plan as a thoughtful and coherent basis for guiding the University over the next five years; and that, given the importance of the goals and recommendations contained in the Plan, the Academic Council requests that the Provost report to the Council annually during the life of the Plan on its implementation and consequences."

He would call for a vote after Provost Lange had spoken to Council and faculty had had a chance to ask any remaining questions or make any further comments.

Provost Peter **Lange** pointed out that another person not mentioned in the Resolution should be given proper credit, namely Vice Provost James Roberts. Since he could not offer an amendment to the Resolution, he asked that perhaps someone from the floor could make a friendly amendment.

Prof. Sunny **Ladd** (ECAC) rose to offer a friendly amendment to add Vice Provost Roberts to the list of people named in the Resolution.

Prof. **Burian** on behalf of ECAC was very happy to accept that friendly amendment and he thanked the Provost for the reminder of Jim Robert's role. These people and many others had worked very hard on the document.

Provost **Lange** began his remarks by stating that the final stage in the planning process had been reached. The Plan would be presented to the Board of Trustees on February 23, 2001. The Plan before the membership incorporated the changes he discussed with them in January. They included a major new introduction and the addition of Goal 9 of collaborations and major rewritings of Goal 6 on technology and Goal 7 on students. Some smaller changes had also been made throughout the text placing greater emphasis on the purposes for which excellence was being sought. Finally, he wanted to note that in response to discussions with the Council, small but he hoped meaningful changes regarding expectations in the APT process and research productivity had been made, and that they tried to assure that there were no misunderstandings with regard to the university's expectations. The Plan was built around nine goals for the university. Some of these goals represented continued commitment to priorities that had been clearly stated for

some time while others were departures that led to new directions. The key new themes were first deepening resources for existing faculty with selected growth where needed and second, a major focus on science and engineering. Third: in the Humanities the Franklin Center would serve as a core for interdisciplinary initiatives and in addition common fund monies would be made available for initiatives outside the Franklin Center. The new Art Museum, new integrated art space which is now under discussion and a renovated Perkins Library would also enhance their efforts in these areas. In the social sciences there were several departments in which the support of Arts and Sciences would be sought to bring them into the top tier. A major strengthening in Fuqua could be expected with less growth in Law. Three major interdepartmental initiatives would also receive attention: the Center for Environmental Solutions, the Microincentives Research Center and the Child and Health Policy Initiative. Several programs would be markedly strengthened, namely in information technology both on the academic side and introducing information technology into the curriculum as a subject of study and in the infrastructural sense to increase Duke's ability to use technology in teaching and research and in administration. Finally, a more up-to-date infrastructure would be built up that included new and renovated spaces, more investment in expert personnel and instrumentation and increased library and other supporting resources. What was going to be different? Over a 5 to 10 year period the areas of science and engineering needed improved space, the science and engineering faculty needed to be improved as well as the quality of education in these areas to enable them to make their full contribution to the dynamic developments that were promised in these areas in the next decades. There would be new faculty in selected priority areas outlined in the planning document and they would be hired to build on existing strengths and to expand programs. Duke would have a growing national reputation as one of the universities that knew how to do multi-disciplinary research right by supporting collaboration in innovative ways. An infrastructure that supported the enhanced use of computing in scientific research would be developed. The ability to collect, store, analyze and then use data which were coming out at a pace in the sciences now that were unimaginable even ten years ago dictated the building up of a computational infrastructure. What would be different in the humanities? First of all the Franklin Center would support the creation of a variety of new programs including the Franklin Institute Center which provided faculty and graduate students with a think tank that allowed release time from teaching in order to participate in an intellectual seminar program and course development and interdisciplinary conversation. Everyone knew that the humanities fields were those which were least able to generate outside funding to support leads. They were pushing forward with finding other ways of supporting time off, time outside the classroom in support of what went on in the classroom for humanities faculty that could not get it through external grant opportunities. They also hoped to have developed a coordinated strategy for the arts and for arts

performance and be well on their way to creating the kind of space necessary to support that strategy. The Nasher Art Museum and a hope for integrated art space would be central to these efforts. In exploiting these changes already strong departments would maintain and in some cases increase their strengths as detailed separately in the Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan.

What was going to be different in the social sciences? It was the integration of diverse disciplines in their efforts to respond to the effects of globalization on economic, social, cultural and environmental systems. There was an intellectual agenda that had been developing in the social sciences and an interaction with the natural sciences in recent years and Duke was not yet in a position to exploit that agenda and to address it. Duke's resources needed to be put behind such an effort. Social science interdisciplinary initiatives would include child policy, health sciences, genomics on the ethical and policy side, political economy and the environment. Finally, pressing space needs in the social sciences would be addressed among other things with a key investment in the expanded Sanford Institute. Because of other space adjustments that would be made, space would become available on West Campus to allow highly impacted West Campus departments to have more space for their activities.

What was going to be different with regard to students? The quality of the student body would be showing improvement in five years as initiatives in recruitment and financial aid were introduced. Improvements had already been made in financial aid packages for Duke's students and next year, and the year after the coming one, financial aid would be offered for foreign students for the first time through a combination of external funding that had been raised and university funds. Substantial enhancements of stipends and awards in the graduate school would also be made. Dean Siegel had put forward an ambitious plan which would increase the total amount of resources available for stipends and awards in the Graduate School by over \$ 2M in the near future. These were major investments to improve our graduate students. Decreasing the dichotomy between curricular and co-curricular activities and better integration between campus activities and community service also needed attention. Educational programs would be better integrated with research programs and barriers to creative teaching would be lowered. For the faculty there would be increased resources available to individual faculty as well as structures in place to provide greater opportunities for collaboration, an APT process appropriately geared to faculty quality measurements consistent with Duke's strategic plans, intensified research efforts, more resources to support innovation in teaching students of the highest quality, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, improved support and integration of technology into both research and education, and new intellectual areas emerging in teaching and research in and about information technology.

What would be distinctive about Duke? Setting as an overarching ambition to be among the few institutions that define what was best in American higher education - that was really their goal. Duke had to understand its existing strengths and build upon them. That was why this plan was called "Building on Excellence." In the new introduction to the plan the notion of entelechy was discussed. It was a word for which he had been searching for months. It captured an image for higher education where there was so much that needed to be done well, so many synergies that needed to be created and sustained. It expressed the notion of the pursuit of balanced excellence in a number of activities simultaneously and taken as a whole. Many other schools were emphasizing and doing similar things. It was not the individual area of initiative or priority that distinguished one school from another, rather it was the distinctions that emerged between institutions in the mix and the synergies that they created. Ultimately, Duke's distinctiveness depended not only on what they did, but on how they did it and its relationship to a larger whole. Any particular program could be replicated elsewhere, but Duke's entelechy was unique, a distinctive signature of excellence. Duke's commitment to community and, inextricably bound up with it, its quest for academic excellence was what would create the conditions for its academic success as an institution in the various components that combined into its signature and constituted its entelechy. It was one of the ends of academic life. Perhaps the most recent symbolic thing was the Faculty Commons. They had a lot of work ahead of them and unexpected challenges as well as unanticipated opportunities would be encountered. If only as many successes as the Franklin Center this past week could be celebrated that would be great, but disappointments and setbacks would also have to be faced.

To achieve the goal to be among the small number of institutions that define what is best in higher education and to achieve the specific planning objectives some things were needed, i.e. first of all money. He was proposing an investment plan that perceived spending up to \$727 M over the next five years. This was a daunting, but they thought realistic sum. And he and his group expected the Board to support their efforts to marshal these resources. Second, leadership was needed, i.e. from the Board of Trustees, from the senior officers, from the deans, from faculty leaders, from student leaders, and leadership in all those pockets within the university in which people could be drawn together to produce a better education and a higher quality of research than they would if left apart. Also the leadership and the engagement of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and the Academic Council itself was required to assist in working through the problems and in helping them to keep on track with the plan. He hoped Council had enjoyed its reading and he'd be more than happy to take questions.

Prof. John **Baillie** (Medical Ctr.) expressed concern with the paucity of information in the Provost's document about the Medical

Center. It started with genomics. Particularly as they were between deans at the Medical School he was hoping the committee that had been appointed to help with the appointment made sure that the person who came on signed on to this, because he thought the Medical Center was spinning off in one corner and was in some danger of losing its academic mission compared to what the Provost was trying to achieve for the rest of the campus. His comment was not to let the Medical Center be forgotten about in this whole document.

In his response, the **Provost** assured the questioner that in his discussions with the search committee for a new Medical School dean everyone concerned acknowledged the importance of the School's full integration with the rest of the university, although it was difficult in the absence of the dean to get the level of engagement that was there when Ed Holmes was here. Still, he could assure him that they would build on the forms of cooperation that had already begun, not only for instance in genomics, but in areas such as biomedical engineering, neurobiology, cognitive sciences and chemical biology. In each of these areas there were very serious academic programs going forward and he fully anticipated that the new dean would not only be supportive of these programs, but would in fact encourage them. He didn't wish to downplay potential problems just as there were problems within the campus area between schools. Nevertheless, he felt fairly confident that they would get a dean who would be totally on board with this.

Prof. James **Cox** (Law) complimented the Provost on the boldness of his vision and the good work that had been done to develop the Plan, but he wondered what the major sources were for the financing of his Plan.

Provost **Lange** replied that there was a broad discussion in the Plan. Basically, they had built up and had sources of internal central funds that could be put behind the Plan. He didn't have the numbers, but that was one set. There was a second major source of funds through the campaign and through the additional funds that would be raised in the campaign as the goal was raised from \$1.5 to \$2 B. The third source would be some combination of direct expenditure of funds and debt financing. If and to the extent that financing with debt would be used, they would make sure that there was an existing identified stream of revenue to cover the debt service behind that debt. Someone once asked him if this was another LSRC. It was precisely because of that component that this was not another LSRC.

Prof. Richard **Riddell** (Drama) also paid his compliments to the people involved in the Plan and to its substance. Specifically, he wished to speak to and applaud the makers of this Plan that \$5 M was designated to improve the arts facilities, and he thought this was a great beginning. There were two projects that were already underway and he hoped as this moved forward that those would also

receive attention. The Art Museum had had a history of moving along and he thought there had been great progress with that. There was some question about how much integrated space could be created there for teaching as well as exhibition. It was important to keep an eye that, because one of the strategic initiatives was to integrate the arts into the academic mission, so that these spaces that were created truly did that. The other project that did not receive mention although it was mentioned in the Plan was the Bryan Center addition to integrate performance with the teaching and study of theater. He thought both of these projects, which were vetted by the Provost's Task Force that the President and Provost convened about 3 years ago, were thoughtful projects and he hoped they would move forward as well.

The **Provost**, without commenting in detail, thought that Prof. Riddel 1 had both captured the spirit of what they were trying to accomplish with the plan as well as the specific projects that he outlined. Clearly, he had just recently appointed a faculty advisory committee for the museum to work with the museum director of the Nasher Museum as that project moved forward and he did that in cooperation with ECAC. And they were also working regularly on the museum plan and while Tallman [Trask] could comment in more detail he thought it would be safe to say that there was more of what he would call real academic space in the Nasher Museum now than there was several months ago. While there were compromises to be made at the margins in that Museum that were fairly harsh because of the overall cost, they were trying to assure that it was a real academic resource.

Prof. Richard **White** (Natural Sciences) thought that to continually stress that the undergraduate student population needed improvement was to shortchange the current student body, i.e. they were doing an improvement as if they didn't have a quality core to improve. They were more sensitive in talking about the faculty and enhancing the faculty than they were about enhancing the undergraduate student body. Despite the criteria that were being put forward for change, he was struck by the fact that they were dependent on loyal alumni, major donors, sons and daughters of alumni. They had just not been sensitive enough to the public relations issues related to enhancing the undergraduate student body, namely the danger of putting down the current student body by emphasizing the improvements of the current student population that were deemed necessary. Duke had found in the last 20 years that it had wonderful applicants and they couldn't get the top couple of hundred, they went elsewhere. Well, it may not be the applicant pool, but something else like what they offered them and how they offered it and what they said.

In his reply, the **Provost** stressed that the community building aspect was crucial here and that the students who were coming here were 'superb.' That didn't mean, however, that they should not continue to improve the quality of the student body. That was not

demeaning to the current student population. By way of an example, he cited a (student amateur) performance he had attended the night before and he thought he had witnessed a superb, intellectually engaging performance by students who were not drama majors [he called on Prof. **Riddell** to confirm that, who replied that a lot of them were drama students, but the Program had nothing to do with it]. Without putting down current students, they shouldn't be complacent, and it was necessary to keep pushing and it was necessary to keep pushing to get as many of the top students here as possible, because that was the way they would build better faculty, a better education, and to form those multiple roles that everyone had as a university and as a society.

Prof. John **Staddon** (Natural Science), although he appreciated sincerely what had been done, felt he had to point to a flaw in the document, although it was no more than a freckle and not a wart. Referring to the issue of diversity in the document, he thought that it was not about that but about advancing or privileging the interest of particular groups and in particular African Americans and women. There may be very good reasons to do this and he suspected there were, but they were not presented in that section. The section just took it for granted that this was something we all should do. For example on page 57 was a repeated statement that the institution must redouble its efforts to recruit women faculty in physics and areas of this sort. He found himself no more worried about the lack of women in physics than about the lack of men in developmental psychology. Why was this something that this university should be concerned about. After all, an academic discipline was not a representative body, not a legislature. There was really no reason why any academic discipline should have this or that distribution of particular kinds of people so long as everyone who had ability had access to it. In general, however, he thought it a wonderful report.

Peter **Lange** said he would stay out of the sun in order not to develop more freckles. Some of those principles he had referred to had not been re-elaborated, because they were principles that had motivated their planning document from the beginning, drawing from preexisting policies of the university and drawing from "Shaping our Future." There were many principles that were articulated in "Shaping our Future" which had become an integral part of the university's culture and those were carried forward. He knew that Prof. Staddon didn't agree with those the first time, or the second time and that he continued to disagree and, as he had said before, their disagreements were part of what made Duke a better place.

The **Chair** at this point thought that the document had been given sufficient airing and said that it was to go forward to the Board of Trustees as members had it. He had already read out the resolution which they also had and which had been amended. Since it was an ECAC motion, it was before the floor and he would simply call for a vote at this time. He asked for a show of hands. The

Resolution **passed** unanimously.

He thanked everyone who was involved in this long process and would continue to be and, in a sense, that meant everybody. Since the Provost had emphasized the importance of community, it was an easy transition to make to give over the remainder of this meeting to community in a slightly different sense. No action was called for. Rather, the report they were about to receive was for information and to afford them an opportunity to raise questions and make comments. He then called on the Vice President for Public Affairs and Government Relations, John Burness, to talk to Council about one of the things that Duke had done over the last years and over a period of time now in the last couple of decades, namely to more actively engage itself with the surrounding community in a number of ways. John Burness was here to talk to Council about the Duke-Durham Neighborhood Partnership Initiative. ECAC felt that this was something that many faculty didn't know about but ought to.

DUKE-DURHAM NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Vice President **Burness** pointed out that from the time of Nan Keohane's arrival at Duke, she had emphasized the importance of Duke being a constructive partner with Durham. The principles which guided the neighborhood partnership initiative were before his audience. There were twelve neighborhoods in the partnership. They had consciously focused on the neighborhoods near campus and particularly the schools which served them. Part of what they were trying to do was to enhance the partnerships based on collaboration, based on having real conversations with Duke's neighbors about empowerment and what they identified as the issues most critical to their own communities, to their own schools and how Duke might be a constructive partner in helping them address the issues they had identified. This was really a grass roots oriented kind of program with Duke acting as a facilitator. It was their hope to improve the quality of life in these neighborhoods and also to think about service and its implications, particularly for Duke's students who, after all, when they graduated would be leaders in the communities in which they lived. There had been several departments and faculty members at Duke who already had been actively engaged in the program. At the risk of omitting others, he was going to mention some of them, the Divinity School and the library. In addition, Professor Gary Ybarra in Engineering and his students taught at E.K. Powe Elementary on a NSF grant and did very interesting work with the children and teachers there. Ken Dodge, at the new Center for Child and Family Policy in the Sanford Institute was involved as were members of the faculty over there in a variety of programs, such as 'Pre K' programs as well as youth violence prevention studies. David Malone in the Program in Education, Steve Wainwright in summer programs for science teachers, Tony Brown and others in service learning at the Hart Leadership Institute in the Sanford Institute, Elizabeth Kiss and her colleagues in Kenan Ethics, Kathy Silbiger in the arts, and

there were many many others. By way of some historical background, Mr. Burness explained that in the beginning of Duke's involvement in the Durham community there was a lack of focus and hence the impact of their investment was only felt at the margin and it was not very visible. It was decided that by focusing on a set number of neighborhoods which happened to be near campus and in which large numbers of Duke employees lived and the schools that served them, Duke could have a real impact. Duke would be able to make investments in different kinds of ways and create partnerships which had a much more powerful and long lasting impact, and what could be learned from that could be taken into other communities.

For example, there was now a partnership between the Nicholas School of the environment and the CC Spaulding School, an environmental magnet school in Durham. Other areas of partnership included a decision to merge large portions of Duke's buses with city buses which had an impact on some of the residents in the partner neighborhoods, because many could not afford their own cars and therefore needed bus transportation. It also meant that the city increased ridership for the buses, thus qualifying the city for an \$8 M federal grant by virtue of having that kind of an increase. There were several things that were going on in downtown Durham where Duke had been involved pretty much under Tallman Trask's leadership. In various neighborhoods Duke was instrumental in providing affordable housing through collaborative efforts. These were the Crest Street neighborhood, Walltown and West End. They represented poor, low-income communities in Durham. Since Duke was not a corporation with considerable discretionary resources and since a corporate presence was lacking in Durham, Duke could only seek to raise funds for its programs and thus have less of an impact than a corporation could. Crime was another problem, especially drug related crime. Duke was not too well tuned in to community problems and there was a lack of trust on the part of the community. Through the good offices of one County Commissioner, Bill Bell, and one City Council member, Sandy Ogburn, Duke was trying to jumpstart the trust question and get some answers on what was really driving the questions in Durham and what were the concerns. They were right up front at the beginning of this. It was induced enlightened self interest to pay attention to these issues. One result from these efforts was the establishment of the Office of Community Affairs located out in the community in the Erwin Mill Building under the directorship of Michael Palmer.

Homeownership, affordable housing, safe neighborhoods, good schools, and more access to health care were some of the things that Duke in partnership with the neighborhoods in question got involved in. Through a \$2 M loan from the university, and the initiative of Mark Meeks, a McArthur 'genius winner,' "Self Help" was born which was the largest non-profit affordable housing financing agency in the country. It provides financing for people who cannot get that through conventional mortgages. Self Help also leveraged \$1 M of the loan to obtain a \$50 M grant from the Ford

Foundation. The other \$1 M was used to purchase and rehabilitate some 28 single family homes in Wall town. Most of the new homeowners were African American single moms, a third of whom were Duke employees. Habitat for Humanity had also joined in and they committed to do eleven houses there.

Another project Duke was involved in was the Trinity Homesite Project. It ran about 10 blocks long immediately behind East Campus. Through a lot of work that Tallman and others had done a plan over there was developed and right now there was a big construction site of faculty/staff housing which reinforced getting faculty next to East Campus and getting them engaged in East Campus. All of those houses were hard wired to the university. He thought about 80% were already subscribed. In the schools were two big areas where Duke made a real difference. One was in technology enhancement, the other in the library. Duke was involved in securing a \$875,000 grant for the schools to bring technology into the classroom and helped train the teachers, but also how to connect so that parents could talk to teachers electronically. There were service learning and research service learning going on, and a whole slew of Duke students who were now engaged in course work where they not only got engaged in tutoring or whatever the project was with the schools, but they also went back and reflected on it to what it really meant as part of an educational program. And members could see that that was also in the Plan that they had endorsed this very day. There were now more than 300 Duke students, faculty and staff that volunteered in Duke's seven partner schools. Duke was not all over the map, but focusing where the institution thought it could make a difference.

There were now 70 Duke retirees, faculty/staff who regularly were working at the Lakewood School. Duke also got some anonymous grants which had supported the Durham Institute of the Arts. They now had an exhibit of work by students in the public schools at the museum. Overall they had raised \$4.4 M to support this so far including the latest which was \$1.2 M to the Duke Libraries. Overall Duke had committed to raise \$10 M for the NPI. The John Hope Franklin Center was turning out to be really committed to some of these community outreach programs. Finally, the materials that Council had endorsed earlier caused him to take some comfort that in them were some forward looking issues on where Duke wanted to have its priorities.

Prof. Mary **Boatwright** (Humanities) said she had two children in Durham Public Schools which were two of the seven schools with which Duke worked and it had been tremendous. It was a case of enlightened self interest which might also help new faculty to live in Durham rather than Chapel Hill and send their children to the Durham Public Schools system rather than the Chapel Hill ones. Duke had made a wonderful difference, so 'thank you. '

Prof. Richard **White** (Natural Sciences), following up on Mary

Boatwright's idea about enlightened self interest, said that he didn't know all of these issues and the good things that Duke was doing and attempting to do. He felt that the university needed to do a better job of informing faculty and staff about these kinds of initiatives, so that they had an answer when someone said 'I'm coming to Duke' or 'why should I come to Duke?' or 'I can't come to Duke because the school system is so poor.' If faculty knew these kinds of things, they could be very much more positive about why coming here would be better than not.

John **Burness** agreed that Duke needed to do a much better job at keeping its own people informed. In the document "Building on Excellence," he thought on p. 137 that very point was made. When they started the program one of the things they consistently heard was that the only reason Duke ever did anything in the community was because of PR. So, literally for the first 2-2 % years they just went about doing their business and didn't try to promote it and now they were sort of paying a price for that.

Prof. **Burian** added that helping to spread the word was one reason why ECAC asked John Burness to come here today. He thanked the presenter and said that he would entertain a motion to adjourn and declared the meeting adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt
Faculty Secretary