

Minutes of the Regular Meeting Of the Academic Council

Thursday, May 6, 2004
3:30-5:00 PM
139 Social Sciences

Academic Council Chair Nancy **Allen** (CliSci) called the meeting to order, noting it to be the last until September 23, a long way off right now. Early in the fall the Council will try to have visits with the new Chancellor for Health Affairs, Victor Dzau, and with the new Dean of Arts & Sciences, George McLendon, and with the yet-to-be named new Dean of the School of Nursing. And of course we will again welcome President Brodhead.

The first item of business would normally be the minutes of April 22, but in view of the short time between that and the present meeting they were not available for advance distribution. Those minutes will be included in the September agenda mailing along with those from today, and will be considered for adoption at the September meeting.

Since Don Fluke (Faculty Secretary) is absent today, Prof. Ann Marie Pendergast (PHRM&CB, ECAC) has agreed to serve as Acting Faculty Secretary [in view of that officer's role in approval of degrees earned in course] and on Don's solemn promise that he of course will write the minutes working from the transcript [hoping that all who speak will identify themselves and speak up, for the microphones in the ceiling]. As mentioned at the last meeting, Don and his wife Pepper have gone abroad for an "Old Friends Tour" where we trust they are enjoying their time.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES EARNED IN COURSE

The next item on the agenda was nomination of candidates for earned degrees [under the watchful eye of the Acting Faculty Secretary], for diplomas to be dated May 9, 2004. In accord with long custom each School is called on in turn for the Dean or other representative to declare that three certified copies of a stated number of names have been delivered for consideration of approval in behalf of the Faculty and forwarding on to the Board of Trustees for final approval of their degrees:

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	850
Bachelor of Science	308

Pratt School of Engineering		
Dean Kristina M. Johnson		
Bachelor of Science in Engineering		216
Master of Engineering Management		24
School of Nursing		
Dean Mary T. Champagne		
Master of Science in Nursing		70
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences Dean		
William H. Schlesinger		
Master of Environmental Management		64
Master of Forestry		
	3	
Fuqua School of Business		
Dean Douglas T. Breeden		
Master of Business Administration		486
Divinity School		
Dean L. Gregory Jones		
Master in Church Ministries		2
Master of Theological Studies		26
Master of Divinity		92
Master of Theology		10
School of Law		
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett		
Juris Doctor		228
Master of Laws		90
Doctor of Juridical Science 1		
School of Medicine		
Dean R. Sanders Williams		
Master of Health Sciences		50
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership		3
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research		6
Doctor of Physical Therapy		33
Doctor of Medicine		102

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Returning from Executive Session the Council next took up a formal Question for the Provost.

QUESTION FOR THE PROVOST

Prof. **Allen** explained for those new to the Council the custom of receiving questions for the President or the Provost in the Academic Council office. These questions may be anonymous and generally are. They are forwarded to the President or the Provost or other senior officer for advance consideration and answering in an Academic Council meeting. Today we have a question for the Provost, circulated with the agenda, and relating to faculty governance, vis-a-vis faculty hiring. The question is:

To what extent does the Provost see a tension between top-down driven (central admin; deans; chairs) 'targets of opportunity' hiring decisions versus bottom-up (dept faculty) driven hiring decisions prioritized based on faculty-led strategic planning? In the context of top-down driven hires, what specific steps does the Provost take to ensure that the free will of the faculty is fully expressed and that any faculty concerns are fully addressed, given that there is often an impression that there is pressure coming from the top?

Coming to the lectern Prov. **Peter** Lange expressed appreciation for this question and the issues that it raises. He saw this as a good issue for him to address, because targets of opportunity are a matter that sometimes mystifies at least some of our faculty colleagues. He would begin by saying that yes, there are sometimes such tensions. He wanted in particular to address one of the premises of the question and then how this whole issue is treated, which he thought would [explain] why tensions do occasionally arise. His hope, in general, was that this is a good process. The premise is that many or most targets of opportunity for appointment are top down, an exercise of administrative will over the free will of the faculty. The truth is that many targets of opportunity appointments are not top down, but in fact originate in departments. An originating departments may discover, for one reason or another, that there is someone they would really like to hire even though the idea does not fit into their strategic plan, or more often is not in the search plan for the year, and yet this person looks like an incredible opportunity. He should be careful to say that not all such instances are targets of opportunity, but the premise within the question is that all or almost all of them are top down, and that is certainly not the case. Now, that said, targets of opportunity reflect University and School priorities generally, and he stressed that these priorities generally are those approved by the faculty and /or faculty representative bodies. Sometimes these priorities also are backed by budget commitments of the Central Administration, to ease the realization of those priorities within schools if appointments are made under those rubrics.

What would be examples? Well, the clearest is diversity. We have a strong commitment, in the University's Mission Statement and in the strategic plan, to pursue diversity in appointments. In some fields the hiring of a faculty member who would meet the diversity goal is an opportunity

because there are very few such faculty members available in that field. And when we find one that we think will also be an excellent faculty member, worthy of joining the Duke faculty, we go after that person. That is a target of opportunity. He wanted to emphasize that it is such a target within the context of a broad, but not specific, University strategy priority which has been approved in the strategic plan and voted on by this Council as well as others. Similarly, there may be other examples within the school plans.

Often, targets of opportunity appointments also reflect pursuit of truly outstanding potential faculty whose availability represents the opportunity. These often come from the School or Department or other units in fact. They sometimes come from Deans and very, very occasionally from the Provost. To give some real life examples: Suppose there's an outstanding faculty member at school X whose marriage suddenly breaks up and he or she really wants to get out of school X. And there's a faculty member at Duke who knows this colleague well enough to be alert to the element of opportunity. "Everybody is giggling," Prov. Lange observed, but it's true, it happens. Or, there is a faculty member whose research program for one reason or another at their university suddenly seems no longer likely to prosper, and that faculty member is looking around for another place where her research program could prosper. And Duke is such a place and this is a truly outstanding leader in the field, and either the Dean or the Department wishes to go after that person. Often we don't run searches in those cases, because the person is so truly outstanding. They may be a chaired professor at the other school, a person who is really a leader, and so recognized in the field. We still need all the letters and everything, but we don't run a full search. We go after the person.

A third area among targets of opportunity - differing somewhat in character ~ is partner accommodations. These come more often come from Deans or Provosts. We're hiring someone in one department. They have a partner. The hire is impossible unless the partner can come too. We try to work through the process, and it's not easy to make a partner accommodation within another unit. The other unit can feel somewhat prevailed upon. But we try to make it work. Sometimes it does and sometimes it doesn't. Sometimes it works for awhile and then it doesn't work so well. Sometimes it doesn't work so well for awhile, and then it comes to work really well. Generally, targets of opportunity are easiest to accommodate and create the least tensions when they arise in the context of faculty initiative and of strong and concrete strategic plans to which the opportunity in one way or another responds. Say you have a good strategic plan, highlighting two or three areas, and in one of those scenarios somebody really outstanding pops up, and the department says: "Oh, we've got a plan. It isn't in our search plan for this year, but will you give it to us?" That's the bottom-up example. Or, the Dean says, we've got a plan: "Here's a person ~ how about taking him?"

Now, once the target of opportunity is identified, there needs to be an explicit permission granted by the Provost to conduct the hire without a regular search. There are no targets of opportunity without having the Provost sign on. There are also no targets of opportunity without going through the rest of the normal hiring process. We collect letters, departments vote, units vote, and deans write letters. If it's a tenure appointment, which it almost always is except in some

cases of partner accommodations and in some other cases as well, the APT Committee when appropriate makes a judgment and the Provost makes a final judgment and recommends the appointment to the Board of Trustees. There are ample opportunities along the way for units to say this person is not of the quality we want. He took it from the question that that is probably the point at which the tension arises. That is, the unit or faculty members within the unit feel the Dean or the Provost really wants this, and we don't think it's such a good idea for any of a number of reasons. Maybe it's going to be a trade-off with something else that we would like more, or arguing that we'll take it, but somebody else is going to get it in the neck. Or some other unit is going to get it, and we're going to take it in the neck in terms of future hires, and so forth. That's where the tensions arise. And there's no question that sometimes they do. But he believed that in general the process is pretty good. And the alternative of always having to run full searches in all of these circumstances that he had described would be a severe handicap to our ability to build the kind of faculty that we are trying to build.

"So there's my answer to the question. I'd be happy to take any questions about the answer to the question."

Prof **Earl Dowell:** (Pratt) asked for comment on a slightly different dimension, but still one he thought relevant to the general question being asked. Another scenario is that you go for the best athlete, or for the best person in a given department, the best person in a given School who's out there and available in the job market that year. Or, you decide to look for someone in thermodynamics, say, even though there are probably other people who are better in that given year who do not fit within that realm of thermodynamics. As a matter of philosophy or strategy or practice, given the fact that our faculty members tend to stay around for awhile, is it better to always go for the best person? Or should we target areas and get the best person within that area, thinking that there is some school or university that needs a person in that area?

Prov. **Lange** didn't think there is a unique answer to that question. It depends on the unit. It depends on the strength of the unit at a particular time. It depends on the interrelationship between that unit and other units. As an example, imagine we have a university initiative in thermodynamics ~ although that would be rather generic. Let's say in non-linear dynamics (to pick a more specific area he thought not relevant to anyone on the room). And suppose Mathematics had an appointment [to make] and there might be a tension [within] the department about whether to go for the best player or maybe another field. And the Dean, in consultation with other deans and with other faculty, and with the Provost, would say, "this non linear-dynamics initiative really could use a mathematician." Well now we have a discussion. And the arbiter of such discussions ultimately is the Provost, because the Provost approves all the search plans. Right. Now, in his discussions with the deans we always have this particular discussion, department by department, appointment by appointment. How broad a net do you want to cast? How sharply focused? Some schools regularly do it more broadly, and others not, or some departments more broadly and others not. It's a matter of timing in some degree. As said, it's the quality of the department at the time, and what's available out there in this field. Sometimes that targeted search will get converted into a non-targeted target of opportunity when, lo and behold,

that person comes on the scene that we didn't expect and the department comes back and says, listen, instead of going for this junior search in X (this is the way it usually works), can we go for the full professor search in Y, or the junior search in [something else]. That's the classical example. We work it around every year. The balance changes, the strategic priorities we're trying to fix or fill change, the targets become available, or don't. There is no formulated approach. The question itself- if he could go back to the question ~ is really about faculty governance within the appointment structure. Ultimately that rests in the procedure by which the appointments are made and not by which the names are inserted into the process. But he was not so naive, coming from Political Science after all, as to believe that agenda setting makes no difference. And so, it's clear that the definition of searches and whether or not a search is targeted makes a difference, and it's out of that context that some of the tensions that are alluded to in the question arise.

Prof **Marjorie McElroy** (ECON) had thought in first reading the original question that it was going to be about University Professorships rather than about [other such] targets of opportunity, as the same issues arise there. There are perhaps ten or so of these [kinds of appointments], and how do you see the issues there?

Prov. **Lange** answered that we have, he believed with the approval of the Academic Council or at least of EC AC, a very clear set of procedures for the conduct of searches for University Professorships. These are usually endowed positions which often it is possible that faculty from multiple fields could fill. They were in the middle of one of these now. What we try to do in these instances is to put together a search committee which is very broadly representative. The search committee then works down to a name or possibly two names of people that they deem best qualified to fill that named-chair position. And then we name a review committee which is much more targeted, and which will assure that the candidate is ultimately approved either by a single department or multiple departments, or by some composite group, depending on the particular character of the professorship and the particular person. "Does that answer your question?" **McElroy** asked at what point the department learns that it is involved. **Lange** cautioned that there have been only two of these so far, within his experience. The department usually knows that somebody is being brought in during the search phase for this University Professorship, when they are invited to come to the lecture. And there is usually a lecture, although not keyed to a particular department. Usually it's a more general public lecture during the search phase. In the review phase, if a person comes back for another lecture, the lecture is likely hosted in multiple departments, or a couple of departments at least. We've done it different ways. The person might lecture twice, once in each department, or they might lecture to an [inter]-departmental group, or some other such thing. Unfortunately we don't have a lot of endowments of this sort yet [to give us more experience].

Prof. **Prasad Kasibhatla** (NSEES) asked the Provost about some of the tensions he thought arose during the process at the stage of [departmental] faculty meetings. He didn't know what the Provost sees at this stage; perhaps it's just the vote. Would it be useful to have detailed minutes of those meetings for the Provost to look at to get a sense of what the real tensions are?

Lange said that what happens is that chairs are required to submit a letter about candidates approved by departments for appointment. The chair is asked to give not only his or her own opinion, and not only the department's opinion more generally, but to describe the discussion that went on in the department about the candidate. So that is the place where that [kind of greater detail] happens. He himself was not a big fan of detailed minutes of departmental discussions, which are too often an embarrassment. Certainly, in his own department they were at times, so he suspected that would be true in other departments as well. In any case, there is a lot of extraneous material. But the accounts that are received at the level of the Provost and the APT Committee level of the discussions in the departments are actually pretty detailed and pretty thorough. In addition, the APT Committee (perhaps there were recent members of APT present) will often ask questions about process. Was there a target of opportunity? Was authorization given? Why didn't they search more broadly? Why is this person so exemplary? So, if there was significant opposition in the department it will get reflected. What he thought the question better reflects is that there may be faculty members who don't want to speak up, or don't speak up, or don't vote against something because they think that the Dean and/or the Provost is leaning on them so heavily that to express opposition is somehow inappropriate. Now, he didn't think that's a very good way to proceed, but even so we won't get that in any notes or minutes anyway.

Prof. **Nancy Allen** thanked the Provost for these explanations, while inviting him to stay at the lectern for the next item on the agenda, an update of the status of the proposal for the Fuqua joint executive MBA degree with Goethe University in Frankfurt, discussed at the Council meeting two weeks ago. She had asked Provost Lange to provide that update for us, since things have changed a bit in the meantime.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR A FUQUA JOINT EXECUTIVE MBA DEGREE WITH GOETHE UNIVERSITY IN FRANKFURT

Provost **Peter Lange** wanted first to apologize for not being present at the last meeting, when this proposal was discussed. It was the first Council meeting he'd missed since becoming Provost he thought, and he was away on Duke business. The proposal for the joint degree in its current form will not be brought forward this year. That decision is reflective of the conversation that was held here in the Council last time, as well as in some other discussions that have gone forward. If a program of the Fuqua School with the University of Frankfurt does go forward this year it will not be the one that was presented here. It will instead be one which is within the context of an degree program already existing in the Fuqua School and which has already been approved by Academic Council and the Board of Trustees as a degree program. Such a venture will have characteristics similar with those of that preceding program, approved under that degree, including [specifics of] the number of Duke faculty who would participate in the program and the degree of oversight exercised by the Fuqua School. So that's the answer to the first part of the issue. You will not see this program this year again, although you may see it in the future in the same form as you saw it earlier, or in some other form.

That said, he did believe that the Fuqua proposal [presented last time] raises some broader issues for Duke to think about in terms of academic partnerships with other universities, issues which we will eventually have to engage. There are questions such as whether we should have joint degrees. And if we do decide to have joint degrees, what is an appropriate partner? If we have joint degrees with an appropriate partner, what can we expect the partner to accept as terms of a partnership, in terms of how much a program has to have Duke participation, say? We have to understand that if you say to a partner, you're our partner, but we're only going to let you teach 20% of the courses, we're saying something about the partner that they may not symbolically find particularly attractive. He could imagine partners that we would want to partner with who are of equal standing and quality as we are, and he was making no judgment about the Fuqua-Frankfurt partnership in saying that. [In finding a partner OK in general terms] we would not want to necessarily specify that Duke teaches 75% of the courses or have unique oversight. There is a complicated set of arrangements to be worked out in any such partnership. While these partnerships could likely be international, over the next decade it's quite possible there will also be partnerships that are domestic. University curricular programs are expanding. There are many things going on that no single university can any longer do by themselves. There may be choices that we face down the road about whether we have enough strengths for something we want to do within some area, and we may find we need to do it with a worthy partner. To do that we may want a joint degree with some partner in which both schools contribute perhaps equally to the degree program.

We've never had a joint degree program. That was one of the issues that arose within the discussion at the last meeting. There's a set of issues to address which he thought would better be addressed in principle, rather than around a specific program proposal as had happened with this Fuqua-Frankfurt example. He intended in the fall to take this whole issue to the Deans' Cabinet and then to the Academic Programs Committee, and then eventually it will go through all the various committees. His intent was to bring this issue into discussion and see how far we get with it. We'll see whether specific proposals emerge, or just sort of lines of thinking for the future. Not having this Fuqua-Frankfurt program go forward at this time does not mean that we have somehow put this larger issue aside for the long run. He didn't think we can really put it aside as a university. With that he asked if there were any comments questions or comments. There being none forthcoming, he thanked the Council and Prof. **Allen** in turn thanked him for this explanation. She also thanked the Council members and President Keohane for excellent questions raised last month that had led to these further discussions, and she thought as well to better outcomes in the future.

UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES COMMITTEE ANNUM, REPORT

Next on the agenda was an annual report from Prof. James Cox (LAW) as chair of the University Priorities Committee. Prof. **Allen** remarked that the Council has heard from him a number of times already this academic year, so we have kept him busy. But as stipulated in the original arrangements for the UPC as a newly revamped committee this year, we did ask for an annual

report. She called attention to a handout available up front that describes the make-up of the committee, its charge, and so on.

Prof. **James Cox** (LAW) began by saying that the most salient part of the charge to the committee was set when it was created a year ago. It included a paragraph about the division of responsibilities between the UPC (University Priorities Committee) and the APC (Academic Priorities Committee), and he'd be coming back to that in a moment, and also to the line about budget and financial information. The committee is fairly large, an overhead projection showing 10 faculty [reps] and 11 *ex off* These people have been working quite hard. The UPC has met 11 times this year, every other Monday in the Allen Building Board Room. In spite of the lengthy list of people on the Committee, attendance has been great. The subjects looked at this year were shown in a next overhead:

- Orientation and Future Agenda Discussions
- Supporting Interdisciplinary Efforts at Duke
- Examining Debt Coverage at Duke
- Discussion of Challenge Areas for Long Term Plan at Midpoint
- Central Campus Planning
- Internationalization at Duke
- Duke Web Policy
- Ethical Investing Guidelines
- Review of Duke Strategic Indicators

The committee had multiple meetings on a few of these, which are listed in no particular order, but cover quite a range of issues. In his view the committee became sort of generalized, providing input and comments about matters that spread across divisions within the University, not in any particular School. Some of these items, for example Central Campus Planning, are a little frustrating to deal with. That's because once you get into it, trying to talk specifically about where the railroad is going to go, say, and depending on who you're talking with it's, well, this is going to happen 40 years from now, but then you find you're not being told that there's to be a building, sometime soon, etc. That has been a concern.

UPC talked some about how we would advance interdisciplinary work, and where the money would come from. That may have been their most profound achievement this year, [working] in support of interdisciplinary efforts at Duke and providing support for positions that the Dean and Provost had some discussions about. He thought that had been useful. This is a time of transition at Duke, so some of these more burning questions would probably be more appropriate when we have President Brodhead on board and can be formulating things under his leadership. And, some agenda items are more in the future, as bases for useful discussions.

But, to go back to the matter of budget and financial information, they actually had not seen many issues that dealt with that kind of information. So, when he had met with EC AC for a sort of debriefing about all this, and thought about what grade we would give the committee, he certainly

would give his colleagues on the committee an A+, considering all the effort they had put into it. He saw it as a committee that's striving hard to create a culture that will carry academic involvement into the life of the University in strategic moments, further than they were able to advance the ball this year. He was looking forward to all the good will that they can have during the summer months, working with his colleagues on the committee and with ECAC and with the senior officers to figure out exactly what should be the agenda for next year. It would be a mistake to think that whatever happened with PACOR (President's Advisory Committee on Resources), the predecessor to UPC, is to be a template for what all happens here. We created PACOR in a very different era at Duke in terms of the administration and where Duke was and what the struggles were between the faculty and that inanimate object called the Allen Building. Those years are behind us, he thought, and Prov. Lange and he were part of those efforts, and we need a different template. The UPC does provide a useful template, but one of the key issues for us in going forward is to identify exactly what the priority issues are that need to have broad discussion before they go to the Trustees, and perhaps even before they go to the Academic Council. That's where they were trying to move things, having established some good will this year he hoped with the senior officers, and within the faculty as well, to show that we are trustworthy and can bring something to the party. "So that's where we are."

DISCUSSION

Prof. **Allen** called for questions, and Prof. **Earl Dowell** said he had at least a dozen for Jim. There was to be a subcommittee that dealt specifically with finances. Was that subcommittee ever formed? **Cox** said that it was indeed formed, had had a couple of meetings and some general discussions, but he thought that at that point they were never told of any problems out there, and never really saw any. There probably aren't any problems out there, he remarked. If there are, he didn't want to know about them right now, because they hadn't been told about them. That's one of the things they were grappling with, so to speak, thinking how individuals from very different walks of life could insert themselves into a discussion about the budget. They had not, for example, seen the budget for the next year, as when he and Prof. Dowell were on PACOR together and did not see the budget for 2004-2005. What we would have made of it had we looked at it he had no idea. He had learned today that at least one school is running a fairly big deficit. So what does that mean? It's between the Provost quite frankly and the School. So, they had not seen any budgets within the UPC.

Prof. **Dowell** then asked that if this is the University Priorities Committee, "what do you want to see other than budgets?" Cox thought that was a very good question and one of the issues that they needed to be working on over the summer. It was one area where they had had meetings that he did not think were very fruitful.

Prof. **John Board** (E&CE) asked, based on this year just past, whether in retrospect there were things that should have been on the UPC agenda? **Cox's** answer was partially lost [as the tape had to be turned], evidently involving discussions at the level of the Trustees after discussion among "natural academics and senior officers." He didn't think it was a question of someone's

hiding the ball [at times of such discussion]. He thought it was a question about individuals relying on what they think are the best political instincts for going to the Board, and letting them see it first. There are a few issues like that, where we said, well, this came up at Business & Finance and I think we ought to have a presentation and discussion about this before UPC. And that would be two months after it had already happened at Business & Finance. But it would have been useful for faculty to have been brought in [by B&F] for questions, for example to note that for a variety of issues we're getting close to one of the metrics we use in determining whether there is an excessive amount of debt at the University. Now, it could be that that metric is not a very reliable guide and there are two other metrics we can use, since we have three. We did have a discussion about that in UPC, providing useful input. When you trip one of the metrics and see a bright flash of light, but it's not a red light, maybe when you get closer to another metric it is indeed a red light and you have to think about slowing down construction. That was a useful discussion, and it took about an hour to get there. But it was also a little late.

Prof. **Peter Burian** (CS) asked about what Cox had said was successful while discussing interdisciplinary activity. One of the issues that arose in thinking about changing the old APC and PACOR was that in [the new] APC you might well have a discussion about interdisciplinary activity, what is happening with it, and so on, without any reference to the financial base and the like. A useful part of such a discussion would be for the faculty group to try to understand the degree to which [there are] tensions on the fiscal side between the support of traditional departments and these new programs. It would be useful to know how these matters relate and how decisions are made, for getting the kind of information needed. Cox thought this was the one issue where there really was the best marriage that could be expected under the circumstances, for looking at a priority and advancing interdisciplinary efforts to the next level, and then looking at the financial strategies to get there. It was also best for looking at the timing of those various inflows and where the money was to come from. They did have that discussion. The UPC had had several meetings about that, looking at the role of interdisciplinary efforts mainly through centers and stages [within] centers, thinking about where the funding was going to come from and the politics of getting the deans to buy in for this, because this would be something for which they might pony up some money. That's even though they may not have total discretion over the money that they could provide, since that may be going into larger pot for the greater good. But he thought that on that issue the UPC did get the information.

Burian asked if experience like that leads to some generalized principles about what kind of information is needed, and when and how. Cox thought that the issue is not what kind of information is needed. From his perspective it's trying to set the agenda in talking with people. It's in trying to figure out where the issues are, out there, that we need to be getting into. And there is this natural tendency to be told sometimes, well, that's not quite right you know. And you sort of stomp your foot, if that's your style, and say well it is. But he wasn't sure just where you go after that kind of exchange, frankly. Again, there is an issue about information, at least from his perspective as a faculty member, about figuring out exactly what's being talked about on 2nd floor Allen Building, and that you need to be involved in and need to know when best to become involved.

Apropos that point Prof. **Barry Myers** (BME, ECAC) thought that there had been many worthwhile discussions, among which the interdisciplinary discussion was one of the best. However, it was still a matter of learning about the relevant aspects of the budget on the fly when having such discussion. So building into the UPC the intrinsic knowledge base of budget and budget structures he thought was requisite, for this committee to really meet its charge in the future.

Prof. **Fritz Mayer** (PPS, ECAC) was curious about the agenda of the UPC, and how those particular items got on the agenda. How does that typically happen and was Prof. Cox satisfied with that process? Or did he have some thoughts perhaps about how to get ahead of the curve a little more in the future? **Cox** said that the agenda list was shaped through multiple stages. Last summer he had gone around and met with all of the members of the committee and with the senior officers and had asked what they thought was kind of important. And then he had prepared a list of those agenda items. The UPC had talked about these items at their first meeting, where that was a main focus of the meeting, to try to figure out what were the appropriate topics for discussion and focus upon them. One of the issues that was really burning at this stage was the question about interdisciplinary efforts. Another was the role of internationalization at Duke, which he thought would be the subject of multiple conversations in the future. But along the way they had found other issues that appeared to be important, and not just those driven necessarily by budget or finance. To look at some of these, and say what he could about them, even though not quite sure how they had become involved with them, there were such questions as a discussion about the debt coverage. But he thought it would have been better to have the faculty involved with that earlier, quite frankly. UPC talked about supporting the plans for enhancing interdisciplinary efforts, and one of the issues there is trying to figure out something very difficult, how you try to get deans of the various schools to support faculty members whose teaching and research may be in another school. So they had talked about that, about the politics involved, but there didn't seem to be any ready reservoir of money that was going to facilitate that [kind of need]. But they had talked about some of the problems. It was more a process he thought of acquainting many of us with this sort of global issue.

Now, coming up next year, one of the questions to be looking at is planning for building physical facilities. We've gone decades without building a lot of science buildings. That topic would involve multiple meetings. In a conversation about that someone has to think about planning out how you can tie in with the Capital Campaign. One of the other issues that comes up next year is going to be questions about where are we in relation to the next campaign in terms of the size of the development office. That's a budget issue. And planning that campaign. He had been involved with that topic previously at PACOR, and for a number of years they had been discussing that before even reaching the silent stage of the campaign. A third matter is the whole question about financial aid, an issue that needed to wait until we had a new President. So, there are some issues out there that have definite and profound budgetary impact, but because we are in a period of transition we're not able to go there. There are other areas where he thought probably more discussions were needed, because of effects on the University. He would prefer to have had more discussions about exactly what issues are being [brought] up. There needed to be more

discussion about what's happening with Central Campus, which he thought was going to define this University in the latter part of this century that we're in right now. And he also thought we probably need to have more discussions about the Central Student Mall [between the Union Building and the Bryan Center]. What's going to happen there will be a core feature. And, somebody is coming from the Provost's meeting who [will prompt our] talking about admissions strategy. To the extent that admissions strategies do cross over between the Engineering School and Arts & Sciences he thought that that would be something useful to have the UPC look at, and that's something that's already being presented to the Trustees.

Prof. **Dowell** noted that Cox had mentioned President Brodhead. What do we know of his experience at Yale, in terms of dealing with things of this sort, [that have come before the current UPC]? He had no idea what the Yale governance structure might be. **Cox** said he had no idea either. Maybe somebody else does. [But nobody elected to take that on].

Prov. **Peter Lange** had a couple of observations. Prof. Barry Myers had remarked that there's a fairly long learning curve for how University budgets operate, when you meet every two weeks. If he remembered correctly UPC had an orientation at the beginning of the year about University budget processes. But he expected that the committee is going to work better next year than it has this year. Some of the things that Prof. Cox had said and that he had heard in the discussion he wanted to address, too. He thought the committee will work better next year if we don't change the membership too much. He didn't remember just what the rotation is, but it shouldn't be too big, because there is a fairly long learning curve for getting through to the complexity of these issues. The other thing he would say, as Prof. Cox has said, is that things are different than they were 10 years ago. There are a lot more forms in which there is a lot more transparency about financial data than was true 10 years ago. That's one of the changes, although it doesn't obviate the fact that we didn't structure the agenda probably as well as we should have to make sure that the [new] UPC had fixed agenda items, in anticipation for instance of Board of Trustees meetings. We could go through the fixed items on every Board agenda and identify what we know is going to be discussed at each of those meetings, and then schedule that for the UPC, either a month before or two weeks before. But that would be a fixed item on the agenda. They [the senior officers] hadn't thought of that and he didn't think that they [the faculty reps] had thought of it either. It's not like they came and said we should do this and we said no.

EVP **Tallman Trask** said that he shared Prof. Cox's frustration this year. He thought we all [recognized] that part of the complication is that we're in the 3rd or 4th year of a 5 or 6-year plan, so there aren't a whole lot of new things going on. It's a time for making sure the plan gets funded, more or less the way we said it was going to be. And in this time of relatively low inflation, and relatively low tuition increases, [there's still] a lot of forward commitment. For those reasons there isn't a lot of active play in the budget, but he thought it goes to the committee that created [the new UPC?], after 2 or 3 years of earlier misinformation. Provost Lange and he were seriously committed to complete transparency with the faculty [in this process] and will really work toward that end. Going back to the mention of admissions policy, they still hadn't gone to the Board of Trustees with that, although they might be going this summer, or in

October. He just thought [this could be added]. Prov. **Lange** also added that if there was disagreement with Prof Cox it was that he wasn't sure that admissions policy was appropriate for the UPC to discuss. We could discuss that, of course, but it's not a budget-related discussion, and really, admissions is a Trinity College/Pratt issue. A number of other faculty members and [administrators] are interested in admissions policy strategy. They could of course argue [about where that discussion should take place].

Prof. **Dowell** had served a couple of tours on PACOR, he noted, and this conversation sounds awfully familiar. There's a tendency for everyone to put their favorite topic on an agenda, which most frankly was a waste of time for a committee of this stature and with these fiscal responsibilities. There might better be recourse to the web or something. It occurred to Prof. **Cox** that web policy could just be such a topic. **Dowell** continued that there was only one issue [for the UPC], and only one topic for the [fiscal?] subcommittee. That's the annual budget, which every year drives the entire system. As you want people to learn about the finances in the University they've got to go through at least one full budget cycle, from soup to nuts, and at a high level to be sure. But they have to understand the budget formula. They have to understand the trade-offs among faculty salaries, financial aid, money for buildings, and all the rest of it. And unless you go through that [experience] everything else is [problematic].

Nancy Allen invited any other questions or comments. There being none, she thanked Prof. Cox and the UPC for their work this year, seeing it is a learning process and also believing it will work better next year. "We've learned quite a bit" [on UPC this year, where she serves *ex off.*]. In setting up the committee they had said that the agenda is to be set by the chair of UPC in conjunction with the senior officers and ECAC. They would be sure to get those agenda set early in the year. Also, it is stipulated that Prof. Cox will come back early in the next academic year to lay out what the committee has on their plate and to get reactions and suggestions. And she did think that the budget issue is important and that all will work hard to be sure that that happens next year.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

The last item on the agenda was the annual report of the Academic Programs Committee. Prof. Timothy Strauman (PSY:SHS) chairs that committee. He couldn't attend today but had sent a detailed report which is available up front, along with the charge to the committee and the membership of the APC. She commended the report to the Council for review, and for any who have questions about the committee itself or the report, the Provost and several members of the committee were present and might be able help assist with answers. She thought that the APC had worked hard this year, with quite a bit to do in terms of departmental reviews. The report had some suggestions, again, for improvements next year, as that committee also was slightly restructured from the previous Academic Priorities Committee. She was sure that Prof. Strauman will be reviewing those with members of the committee and with the Provost, so that next year, again, will go even better. She invited any questions. There being none she call for any new

business.

NEW BUSINESS

Prof. **Barry Myers** said that actually he wanted to go back to the old business, just because of something he'd heard twice. He didn't think there was any question, at least on his part, or others, about the transparency of the administration process in UPC. The problem is rather that our lens isn't focused quite right at this early stage in the committee's life. "Is that why we are sending you to Fuqua to get your MBA?" **Allen** asked, to the Council's amusement. With that, she wished all on the Council a wonderful summer, hoping of course first to see them this weekend around the Commencement activities. "Thank you very much for your work this year.

For consideration by the Academic Council

Donald Fluke, Faculty Secretary