

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday January 24, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): Welcome you to the first meeting of 2008. I hope everybody had a wonderful holiday season. I know I ate too much, so I'm on a diet. I don't know about the rest of you. The first order of business is approval of the minutes. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

McClain: Thank you, John. There are no announcements today. The next item of business is the nomination of candidates for earned degrees.

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated December 30, 2007

Summary By Schools And College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

[Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.](#)

Bachelor of Arts 45
Bachelor of Science 24

Pratt School of Engineering

[Dean Robert L. Clark, Jr.](#)

Bachelor of Science in Engineering 9
Master of Engineering Management 30

School of Nursing

[Dean Catherine L. Gilliss](#)

Bachelor of Science in Nursing 52
Master of Science in Nursing 28

Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences

[Dean William L. Chameides](#)

Master of Environmental Management 9
Master of Forestry 3

Fuqua School of Business

[Dean Blair Sheppard](#)

Master of Business Administration 173

Divinity School

[Dean L. Gregory Jones](#)

Master in Church Ministries 1
Master of Theological Studies 1
Master of Divinity 18
Master of Theology 3

School of Law

[Dean David Levi](#)

Juris Doctor	4
School of Medicine	
Dean Nancy C. Andrews	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	7
Doctor of Physical Therapy	2
The Graduate School	
Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Master of Public Policy	1
Master of Science	37
Master of Arts	47
Doctor of Philosophy	88
TOTAL	578

Proposal for Ph.D. Program in Marine Science and Conservation

McClain: Professor Dan Rittschof is here today to present the proposal for the Ph.D. program in Marine Science and Conservation. We will hear the proposal today, and vote on the proposal in February.

Dan Rittschof (Nicholas School): Thank you Madame Chair. This Ph.D. proposal is a logical outgrowth of the Nicholas School's formation, which was roughly in 1989. If you've had a chance to look at the document, there are currently 2 Ph.D. programs in the school. One is for the Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences and the other one is for ESP¹ and our Marine Science and Conservation Division. The reason we're requesting this program is to provide intellectual home for the students who are in our division.

One of the problems you get to, and I'm sure you're all aware of this, is if you're a student from the outside and you're looking for how to apply to a department, and the faculty are spread through a variety of different departments in the school, the students very frequently don't know whether to apply to biology or to ENV or to UPE or to the toxicology program, and

¹ Environmental Sciences and Policy – not Extra-sensory Perception, an earlier Duke program terminated in 1965.

that results in a lot of confusion and difficulty managing the student body.

In addition, the large program, as it is right now, isn't set up well for seeking external funding or for appropriate advertisement for the school.

So what we're proposing to do is to split off our program from the ENV program and have each of the divisions have its own Ph.D. degree, and the document that you probably have somewhere outlines that in detail.



Basically, the faculty that would be in this Ph.D. program are the multi-disciplinary faculty that are at the Duke University Marine Laboratory, by and large. They range from social scientists to natural scientists to molecular biologists. They have a common theme: working with conservation and marine science and interfacing with policy. To us, this makes logical sense, and I think the justification that Andy Reed has written here explains that fairly carefully.

What we're doing right now is actually duplicating efforts, because, since we're a remote campus, we keep all of our own books and then we also keep all of the books – the same set of books up in the ENV – up here at the LSRC. This program would cost nothing to the University. We already have all the funds that we need for this, so that's not an issue to me. And it provides us with a position nationally and internationally for recruiting the very, very best students in the country.

I'm willing to take questions if you have them.

Randy Kramer (Nicholas School): Dan, could you talk a little bit about other programs around the country you might be competing with for students...

Rittschof: One of the appendices contains the other programs that we consider our competitors. From the marine-biology component of that program, and these are really closely paired programs, and as the school, as our division, turns over and changes over time, I see the two programs becoming more and more meshed together – being biology and policy, both of them doing research education, training people for academia.

So our competitors from the conservation side: basically there's only one, and that's Scripps. From the marine biology side, our competitors are Stanford,

Santa Barbara, the Rosenstiel School at University of Miami, and UC Santa Barbara.

Proposal to allow the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to Recommend Appointment of Regular Rank Non-Tenure-Track Research Faculty Appointments

McClain: Remember, we will vote on the degree program in February. Next, we will hear a proposal to allow the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to Recommend Appointment of Regular Rank Non-Tenure-Track Research Faculty appointments. A similar request from the Institute for Genome Sciences and Policy (IGSP) was presented and approved at the February 2005 Academic Council meeting. John Aldrich is here to present the request, and Peter [Lange] – I don't know if you will have any comments.

John Aldrich (Political Science): Thank you. I'll be here representing the Social Science Research Institute. As you may know, it is one of the seven University Institution Centers, or UICs, that are one of the major implementations of the current strategic plan. One of the reasons we're coming to you in this fashion is because we're establishing a general policy, of which ours will be the first instantiation, for the UICs to be able to hire regular-rank but non-tenure-track faculty entirely within our institution centers. The IGSP one was before there was a UIC set, and so it was not precedent-setting.



I thought I'd take this time to give you a brief sense – I'm just going to float this [slides] through in the background while I talk about a couple of things that may be relevant for understanding the nature of this proposal. While we're all UICs, each of the seven of us has some distinct characteristics, and there are, I think, two things that are relevant to this proposal for the SSRI in particular. What's showing [slide] right now are various things that are provided as essentially public goods for the social-scientific community, broadly defined. So that's one of the things we do.

We have a number of programs. I'm pointing in this particular instance to the Faculty Fellows Program which some of you may already be familiar with. An-

nually, we have a group that meets throughout the course of the year. At least for faculty within the college of Arts and Sciences, we are able to provide support for halftime reduction of teaching to be able to focus on interdisciplinary programs and questions.

The one coming up next year will concern medical decision-making, and you'll be soon getting a request for proposals for Faculty Fellows.

This is one example of the kinds of things we do, that are available for all. One of the things that's not on the slide is the reason that we might be, as the SSRI central administration, interested in the possibility of occasionally hiring a regular rank non-tenure track faculty member, and that's because we're beginning to offer certificate programs and other kinds of teaching opportunities. So we currently have – partially through the benefit of the Dean of the Graduate School – a certificate program for graduate students in quantitative social science. We are in the midst of applying for an undergraduate certificate program and have, hot on the drawing boards at least, a Focus program that we hope to be pursuing over the coming year or so, which of course requires cooperation across a number of units.

And so one possibility would be for regular-rank non-tenure-track faculty to be one of the sources of instruction for these courses or for short courses and other opportunities we provide for our students.

The other thing which I'm leading up to slowly here is that we, like a number of the other institutes, have a variety of centers that are affiliated with us. I'll come back to that for just a second...So, this is a list of the current set of affiliates and programs, some of the ways by which we implement social-science research, so have potentially their own expectations for the possible use of regular rank non-tenure track faculty. And indeed, the Center for Child and Family Policy, which Ken Dodge directs and has been a substantially successful program for some time (we're pleased that's affiliated with us), has hopes of getting regular rank non-tenure track faculty status for some of its people.

In this context, I just want to add by way of closure on this, is that part of the plan – this should have been circulated for you – is the requirement that, since these would be done through our institute, that we have the guaranteed source of support for this person for the length of his or her contract.

In case you're interested, I have here, color-coordinated with the chairs (!), folders with our most recent version of *Gist from the Mill*, which is one of the ways you can keep up with what's happening in the SSRI, and also in social-science research across the campus. A new version will be out in the next six weeks or maybe even less.

And so with that, I will be pleased to take any questions about the actual proposal itself, hoping perhaps this provides a little context for it.

Warren Grill (Engineering): Do you see any downside to hiring non-tenure track regular rank faculty in these positions?

Aldrich: As with all these sorts of hires, it's not a question of the trade-off between tenure-track faculty or tenured faculty versus non-tenure track – that is not something that these new UICs will be in the process of hiring. We may have joint appointments, but they'd be tenured in some regular department.

Downsides: we need to insure in advance that they're fully supported both financially and in other ways. Secondly, we need – we're governed by an Advisory Board that is all regular-rank tenure-track faculty – we need to make sure that we have an appropriate balance so that the evaluation of these faculty will be done in the same way as would be done for a professor of the practice in the department or something like that.

Susan Lozier (Nicholas School): What's the major source of support for these faculty members?

Aldrich: There's a variety of sources. So, for example, taking the Center for Child and Family Policy, they raise a substantial amount of grant funds – soft money and so forth. In those circumstances, we require that, because the contract's five years to date, we guarantee five-year funding. So one stream is external. There is of course also the possibility of internal sources of funding – I'm not sure if I'm walking in the right direction here or not – for continuing sources of support. And, you know, we haven't actually reached that point. But the thing about doing it at the institute level is that we could in principle make sure we pooled sufficiently broad resources to cover vagaries in short-term funding.

Mary T. Boatwright (Classical Studies): Do you



see the possibility that whoever is hired might then be ending up teaching to pick up the slack, if you will, of the faculty fellow who gets two courses off? I just wonder how moveable these individuals might be, and what positions they may end up taking?

Aldrich: That particular trade-off would not be one we'd be making because the faculty fellows aren't ordinarily working within the Institute, for example, and teaching our courses.

Boatwright (Classical Studies): But, I mean, they're regular courses that they end up not teaching.

Aldrich: Yes. I mean, I'm sure there's no particular reason that, if an appropriate person is available,

that that could be worked out on a case-by-case basis, but that's not how we're thinking.

Provost Lange: If I may – teaching funds are certainly one possible source for a portion of this faculty member's remuneration during the time that he or she is under contract. So the SSRI could work out that this person would be teaching a course in a department or in a certificate program, and that Arts and Sciences or another unit would pay for that portion of teaching and that would count toward the person's total remuneration. So that's certainly possible and makes up grant money, other sources, some teaching money, etc. That would just depend on the particular responsibilities and that would have to be worked out ahead of time. Or it could be worked out after: if the person comes, and they're doing great research, people say "Why don't you teach a course?" Then I presume the director of SSRI or the particular program would go to the Dean and say, you know, "we've had a request that she teach. Are you willing to pay?" And that would free up some money from some other source, Tolly [Boatwright].

Kramer: John, I guess I haven't heard a compelling argument for why the Institute needs to have the right to hire its own faculty and why you're not able to reach your goals by hiring faculty through the various departments that cooperate with the SSRI.

Aldrich: There are several parts to the response. Taking the affiliates as one of the sources of demand for these people – for example, Ken Dodge. He has a number of non-regular-rank, non-tenure-track research scientists who are very talented and who are receiving external offers, sometimes for tenure-track positions, and this is a way of keeping such talented people by providing them with additional avenues of support and stages that can lead to different kinds of work. So that's one source of things – the competitive market. The second, which is more often going to come up – the reason, for example, IGSP is particularly motivated by this – is that a lot of their work requires such scientists, and again, it's the same sort of thing. You could do it in a non-regular-rank way, but then you have accept reduced quality of the people that you could attract. For us, with instruction, for that sort of dimension of it – that third dimension – we would only want in the classroom the sort of person who we think would be, you know, eligible for a regular-rank position. The sort of person you want, you know, working with our students.

Monty Reichert (Engineering): Do you see this as a group of faculty that are sort of going through a 'breeding' mode when a large bolus of money comes in based on some contract or something that you've established, you go out and hire some people to staff this activity, and when that activity dies down, these people disperse in some fashion? I mean, as opposed to somebody who's regular-rank tenure-track presumably their 'vapor pressure' is much lower so they're going to stick around. Is that sort of the model ...?

Aldrich: We're managing the longer term, and we're imagining for us – at least SSRI, I can't speak for the other institutes – a relatively small number of these as supplementing, providing such as things that we can't provide through other means. So, it won't be particularly – I mean, unless you would take a multi-year institutional grant, like an IGERT or something as one of those 'breeding' things – those are long-term prospects. We're imagining it for longer term and to attract and keep the kind of people at Duke that we want to have.

Kathryn Andolsek (Family Medicine): Do you anticipate any of these individuals transferring from this status to tenure? Is there a mechanism for that to happen?

Aldrich: Sure. You can apply for any open position. This is not really trying to sneak people into the tenure track if that's the sort of variant that you could imagine...it could very well be the case that somebody who comes as a research scientist uses, you know, successful teaching to strengthen their application to a regular tenured position in some other unit; but it'll be in some other unit and so they would have to convince that unit that they were the person that that unit would want.

Warren Grill (Engineering): I have a little bit of a concern to follow on what Peter said that if these individuals indeed are going to fill an instructional role, they're in a position where the institution does not have a long-term commitment to them and their career, and you could make the argument that this provides the way for the institution to replace tenure-track faculty to whom they must maintain a long-term commitment to career with non-tenure-track faculty, who are then serving the instructional role that the other tenure track faculty currently serve. And, I wonder how you prevent that?

Aldrich: I'll let you do it. (For Peter)

Lange: So, maybe I can tie this to Randy's question. So, there are general rules which govern how such appointments need to be made in any of these units that would come to the Council for their authority. So why have such positions? I think the more – and then I'll come to your specific question – the more specific thing is that the University Institutes and Centers are fundamentally interdisciplinary units, and they develop major specializations that sometimes don't map very well onto the needs or specializations the departments have. And so we've had a lot of experience already, where an institute or a center is saying "We need someone who has this specialized skill, this interdisciplinary area, and no single department wants – since they count against departmental allocations – no single department wants to in fact hire that person. Yet, from the point of view of advancing our interdisciplinary agenda whether it's in research or in instruction, that person could fill a very important role."

So that's the core reason: it creates a flexibility without impinging on the right of departments to determine who is tenurable or who has regular-rank ten-

ure track or tenure credentials in the institution. That's the first part.

Now, to go to your point, the instructional needs are in fact being generated through these institutes themselves. So, when John describes that instructional need, it's through a certificate program that the Institute has developed and for which they have identified the instructional need. So there's no displacement because if they can't do it, it just means the instructional need won't get met, unless a department were willing to hire a person to meet that instructional need, and as I've already suggested, one of the reasons for having this is the departments are often not willing to meet that research need, because their own agendas don't map on perfectly to the interdisciplinary institutes or centers.

So, this is again part of this matrix structure we have, and there are people who sometimes in the institute or the thematic structure that the institutes represent, fit very well onto that structure which we want to promote, and yet, the departments aren't prepared to make those appointments, especially not on a long-term basis. So that's the real reason for having that.

The reason for having the budgetary strictures that John has mentioned is in fact so that there isn't a budgetary trade-off beyond what the support are giving for these institutes for these particular positions. So the positions have to be self-supported, either within the institution or, if the dean can convince a department to include the course, it'll pay for the course. Randy, is that responsive to your question?

Aldrich: One of the things that we intend to do with the provision of the instruction for the certificate programs...if we could design it perfectly, we would have...currently we have commitments to three people to try and teach one of their currently tenured senior – they're actually all our senior faculty members – to teach one of their regular courses, to volunteer it for the certificate programs, but doing that more than one a year is asking a lot of sacrifice in their department. We would like, ideally, to have one to two of these joint positions because the Provost is helping finance, which would be a tenured person in different unit – maybe statistical science in our case, or it might be in one of the social sciences – that would be teaching like half time for us. And then one to maybe two of the outside of these faculty who in particular take charge of the short courses and so forth in addition to teaching one course, a regular course. So, it's meant to be a contained program, with relatively small numbers involved. That's our intention.

Earl Dowell (Engineering): John, I think that the concerns we're hearing expressed would have been lessened if you had told us that the people you plan to hire in these roles will serve here a relatively short period of time, small compared to the time it takes for a tenure-track person to be considered for tenure. And when you told us that these people are going to be here for a very long time, there's the possibility of someone in this category will be here much longer than seven

years. And so we have a large number of very fine people who come into Duke with great promise but fail



to get tenure. This mechanism, it's not unique to your proposal, of course, this mechanism provides a way for people to be here for a much longer period of time, and I think that you have to think about what that means in terms of the tenure system.

Aldrich: So, we have one part that I'll say immediately before the Provost gives the right answer, and that's that, it's a term limit with review from, in our case according to our bylaws, from the Advisory Board which consists of the chairs of the social science departments and people outside the SSRI. And so that's our primary mechanism of control. These could be renewable, but they are to be evaluated the same way we evaluate other regular-rank faculty.

Lange: These appointments are no different than POP appointments, and they are all reviewed and renewed. In fact, these are a little more difficult because the rules for initial hire on these appointments require a 2/3 majority of the faculty or governing body of the institute or center whereas the POPS only require majority in the departments. Then a majority is required for the review. So the review process is similar. So obviously if the institute either thinks the person is no longer consistent with the program or has not performed at the level expected on the renewal period, then they won't renew the contract, since they have resources invested in this person one way or another.

Dowell: I think you would agree that this is different from a tenure decision.

Lange: Oh, absolutely!

Dowell: The bar for reappointment is much lower...

Lange: It's much different. We have a very broad spectrum of faculty that already are governed by rules a little less tight than these rules, and I think that's been a very successful experiment.

Question: In general, how do you see the relationship between these people and the regular faculty in the departments? It wasn't clear whether the teaching is going to go into the regular courses or be confined to the courses through the Institute.

Aldrich: We will offer a small number of courses of our own. I should preface, most of these will be

research appointments. I just wanted to make sure that it was understood that there could involve some teaching. For us, it will be teaching, for example, the gateway or perhaps the capstone course for this program, that sort of thing. So it's a relatively small number of courses that will be uniquely SSRI. You know, if this person's talented and a different unit finds it's valuable to, as Peter said, pick up some of their additional funding through hiring them, then that would be something to be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

Reichert: If I interpret this correctly, I think the rub isn't so much that, if you hire people in, as you described, and they come in and they teach high-end courses in the SSRI that they generate and they teach workshops or something where they bring people in and they generate their own resources or whatever, that's great. Win, win, win. I think the rub is when it doesn't work out that way, and people end up possibly scavenging for teaching opportunities and then that possibly comes in conflict with the departments, saying "Well, you satisfied that teaching hole in our curriculum through asking someone from SSRI or IGSP or whatever to teach this class. Therefore, there's no pressure to try and maintain the size of the faculty or increase the size of the faculty or whatever." I think that's a discomfort, sort of. And so, what happens when things sort of drift in that direction versus the sort of higher level?

Aldrich: So, if this is a person who we don't want to have teaching with this, at least at the end of the contract period, he wouldn't be teaching with this. We have to have guarantee of a hundred percent of the budget, you know, and if someone else wants to say "...we'll substitute something and give you lesser funds," maybe, but that's a reduction then of the contribution of that person to SSRI, and that would be done only in the context of our evaluation. So I'd say that the directors and the Board of Advisors is the principal bulwark against that sort of concern. Why would we want to have people who we don't like when we don't have to?

Lange: Monty, if I understood you correctly, just to add to John's answer, if you're saying "ok, the department identified a need for a couple of years of teaching for one course." So, are they going to go out and try to find one of these people to teach that one course rather than hiring a tenure or tenure-track person who can fill that course for pay? Well, I don't think actually departments operate that way for the most part. If they have a one-course need, they're going to go out and look for somebody to teach that one course as an instructor or some other position or as a visiting professor. We have some visiting professors and they are hired just to do that for a couple of years. So it's not clear to me that this augments that opportunity. It might in fact tell you...you might know more information before you actually sought out this person, because they would've been teaching at Duke and you know how well they teach. As John suggested, the Institute might say "well no, we're not agreeable." But

we don't very often have departments that because they have a single-course need, will determine the hiring of a tenure or a tenure-track person in that area for that single-course need. Now, if it's a broader need, then the department will do it, but they may make the hire, but then they don't really have the opportunity to do the trade-off in these kind of appointments, because they're not going to get very much out of these people, because they have responsibilities to the unit that hired them and is paying.



Aldrich: If they're paying, say 25% of their salary, that's going to be a fairly ...

Lange: It's possible that it could be even an eighth, at most, for a course, for the salary.

Reichert: I think at the margin, you're right. In each individual case, you're right. If you have an understaffed department, this is a pretty inexpensive way to solve the problem.

Lange: But what I'm saying is the understaffed departments for years have been solving that problem with other mechanisms, and what we actually did in creating POP positions was to try to regularize that and reduce the number of one-off, 'one year, we'll hire you this year and we'll figure out later in the year whether you can be hired the next year' kind of solutions, which were rife in the institution before we created the POP positions.



Lori Setton (Engineering/ECAC): Could you clarify for us – I think we raised some of these concerns – how tenured and tenure-track faculty sitting in

departmental units will be involved in either reviewing or somehow in oversight of these institute professor positions?

Aldrich: Sure. For the research portion, it's done the way things are fairly commonly done now, I would assume. You seem like you're focusing on the teaching part, and so our requirement is that review and renewal is done by a committee, it begins with a committee that is at least a majority of tenured or equal-rank-tenure-track faculty. So that's one sort of source that then comes to us as co-directors or directorship with a recommendation to our Advisory Board, which is entirely tenured and tenure-track faculty. So that sort of oversight is entirely regularized in that way.

For the teaching per se, the certificate programs will be run by somebody like, say me and Scott DeMarchi – he and I are the co-directors of these – he's a tenured faculty member, also in my department. And it would be overseeing the individual courses, because we want the certificate program, or the Focus program, or whatever it is, to be as strong as possible. And finally, those programs – it's not just the directors or co-directors of the programs – that also has a Board whose members, all of whom, in this case, again tenured, as opposed to being tenure-track. I think it's right that tenure and tenure track faculty members of that – one of their programs is up there called “PARISS: Programs for Advanced Research in the Social Sciences.” So, there's lots of oversight and potential for advising by the regular tenured faculty, and it is very much in our interest to try to maintain, to create and maintain, as strong a set of programs as possible, and so that's the principal set of incentives to make sure these people are both brought in and then retained only if they're doing as good a job.

Lange: At a technical level, Lori, the faculty governing body, which is the one that has to do this voting, the majority has to be tenure or tenure-track faculty that constitute that majority, but it would often be even more, and the voting rules are the same as in the departments, so all the tenure and tenure-track faculty can vote on these appointments, but only the regular and non-tenure-track faculty who have a rank at the same level or higher can vote on the renewal or appointment rank.

Setton: But that gives some assurance that faculty sitting in departmental units have some oversight of ...

Lange: Well, they'll have the majority of oversight.

Aldrich: Thank you.

McClain: Ok:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal from the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to allow the institute authority to recommend appointment of regular rank non-tenure track research faculty.

A second is needed for this proposal. [The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Proposal from the Elections Committee

McClain: The final item is a continuation of a proposal that was submitted by the elections committee last month in response to inquiries that have been made over the past several years. They're not just inquiries, they're complaints, from faculty who do not want to vote for the required number of positions on the election ballot. In essence, we force people to vote for people they don't know in order for their ballot to be counted.

When we started this discussion the last time, there were some questions raised by Josh [Socolar] as to whether or not an individual could vote for maybe all full professors – more full professors than were eligible to be elected. So we sent the proposal back to the Elections Committee for them to take these concerns into account. Bill Reppy is the chair. He is not here. Ingeborg Walther is here to represent the election committee, and she can kind of chime in as I'm relaying this.

When they tried to work out Josh's objection or concerns, they ended up in a process, in terms of constructing a ballot, that almost got us in a circular position back to where we are now, because it would require listing all full professors on one side of the ballot with “vote for no more than whatever,” and then all associate...and whatever, so it was still the same kind of process.

So Tom Metzloff did this – this is what the ballot looks like now [[Appendix](#)]. All distinguished faculty, you see!

What the elections committee ... this is the way it is now. And essentially what it says is that you have to vote for eight persons and then here's the clincher: A ballot not containing votes for eight persons, including at least two associate professors and one assistant professor, will be invalid. Ok, so you have to check the boxes for eight people whether you know them or not.

Under the revised rules, with a slight change of what is required, it just simply says that “Please vote for up to eight people from among the list of candidates.” Now, some divisions do have rank requirements, but the way this is handled is in the actual counting of the ballots, so that, as it says here, in order to complete the required distribution of representatives by rank, the top two associate professors with the most votes among the associate professors listed will be elected, and the top one assistant professor with the most votes among assistant professors will be elected.

So you can vote for whomever you want to. But, when the ballots are being counted, the top individuals with the most votes in whatever the rank divisions are will be the ones that are elected. Ok. There's just a lot of discontent with the way the balloting process is now. And so the election committee tried to deal with the objections or the concerns – they weren't real objections – the concerns that were raised, but it ended up, like I said, it got us right back to where we are now.

So you have the revised proposal, and the language, I don't want to read it, but essentially, let me tell you what we are removing. We are removing language in Section B of the bylaws for voting that says after, we're just putting a period after one section and taking out the words "And shall vote for at least as many assistant professors as are specified on the ballot, for at least as many associate professors as are specified, and for the total number specified for all ranks." The substitute language is "Each faculty member entitled to vote may vote for as many candidates as he or she wishes not exceeding the number of members to be chosen to represent the division by balloting." And then another change: "Ballots not conforming to these specifications." We took out 'requirement,' which means if it says vote for eight, we vote for nine, you know your ballot will become invalid but if you don't want to vote for eight people, you don't have to vote for eight people. Ok? So, this is where we are...Ingeborg?

Walther: I just wanted to ask that in the elections committee we took into account I think some concerns that were raised at the last Academic Council meeting, about, there could arise a situation where more – I think it was more full professors could be voted for than are actually eligible to be on the Council, and we batted that around for awhile and decided that that situation already exists in practice with the non-tenure track faculty, the regular rank non-tenure track faculty. The bylaws say that only one could be elected from each division, and yet it's always been the case that one can vote for more than one. So we didn't have an issue with that since it's already practiced, and we didn't see a problem if a person voted for more full professors than can actually sit from that division on the Council. We didn't see a problem with that, so, just wanted to make that clear.

McClain: Questions, additional questions? Ok:
Be it resolved, the Academic Council approves the revised Academic Council bylaw language to section I.B.3.b. (Membership as submitted in the proposal (revision dated 1-8-08) regarding the voting requirement on the election ballot.

A second is not needed for this. [The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

McClain: Thank you very much, we are adjourned! See you in February!

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, January 4, 2008

APPENDIX: CURRENT BALLOT

ELECTION BALLOT

DIVISION 1

February 27, 2008

Ballots must be received in the Academic Council Office no later than Tuesday, March 20, 2008. Please use the enclosed envelope and return to the Academic Council Office (304 Union West) 684-6447.

HUMANITIES DIVISION

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The **Humanities Division** is entitled to **ten** representatives (five elected each year for two-year terms) and alternates (elected for one-year terms) in the Academic Council. You have **two** representatives currently serving who will continue for another year; therefore, at this time you are to elect **five** new representatives for two-year terms, and **three** for one-year terms. The candidates from your division selected in the recent nominating process for election to the Academic Council are listed below. The distinction between one and two-year terms will be based on votes received. An ordered list of alternates will be similarly compiled.

Please vote for **eight** persons from among the candidates, of whom at least **two** must be Associate Professors and **one** an Assistant Professor, in order to complete the required distribution of representatives among the ranks. Continuing members for the Humanities Division are:

LISTED

A BALLOT NOT CONTAINING VOTES FOR EIGHT PERSONS, INCLUDING AT LEAST TWO ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS AND ONE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, WILL BE INVALID.

William A. Reppy, Jr., Chair
FACULTY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shane Battier (Assoc. Prof. of the Practice)
(Music) | <input type="checkbox"/> Alana Beard(Professor)
(English) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jay Bilas(Professor)
(Classical Studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> Elton Brand (Associate Professor)
(Asian and African Languages and Literature) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Johnny Dawkins(Assistant Professor)
(English) | <input type="checkbox"/> Matt Doherty (Associate Professor)
(Romance Studies) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gail Gostenkors (Assistant Professor)
(Romance Studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> Lindsay Harding(Professor)
(Literature) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Krzyzewski(Associate Professor)
(English) | <input type="checkbox"/> Christian Laettner (Assistant Professor)
(Germanic Languages) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trajan Langdon (Associate Professor)
(Germanic Languages) | <input type="checkbox"/> Peter Maravich (Professor)
(Philosophy) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yao Ming (Professor)
(Art, Art History and Visual Studies) | <input type="checkbox"/> Roy Williams (Assoc. Prof. of the Practice)
(Germanic Languages) |

Postscript: Please be aware that members of the Academic Council are expected to attend meetings of the Council faithfully and can forfeit this membership by repeated absences.

REVISED BALLOT

ELECTION BALLOT

DIVISION 1

February 27, 2008

Ballots must be received in the Academic Council Office no later than Tuesday, March 20, 2008. Please use the enclosed envelope and return to the Academic Council Office (304 Union West) 684-6447.

HUMANITIES DIVISION

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The **Humanities Division** is entitled to **ten** representatives (five elected each year for two-year terms) and alternates (elected for one-year terms) in the Academic Council. You have **two** representatives currently serving who will continue for another year; therefore, at this time you are to elect **five** new representatives for two-year terms, and **three** for one-year terms. The candidates from your division selected in the recent nominating process for election to the Academic Council are listed below. The distinction between one and two-year terms will be based on votes received. An ordered list of alternates will be similarly compiled.

In order to complete the required distribution of representatives by rank, the top **two Associate Professors** with the most votes among the Associate Professors listed and the top **one Assistant Professor** with the most votes among the Assistant Professors listed will be elected.

PLEASE VOTE FOR UP TO EIGHT PERSONS FROM AMONG THE LISTED CANDIDATES.

Continuing members for the Humanities Division are:

LISTED

William A. Reppy, Jr., Chair
FACULTY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

- | | |
|---|--|
| () Shane Battier (Assoc. Prof. of the Practice)
(Music) | () Alana Beard(Professor)
(English) |
| () Jay Bilas(Professor)
(Classical Studies) | () Elton Brand (Associate Professor)
(Asian and African Languages and Literature) |
| () Johnny Dawkins(Assistant Professor)
(English) | () Matt Doherty (Associate Professor)
(Romance Studies) |
| () Gail Gostenkors (Assistant Professor)
(Romance Studies) | () Lindsay Harding(Professor)
(Literature) |
| () Michael Krzyzewski(Associate Professor)
(English) | () Christian Laettner (Assistant Professor)
(Germanic Languages) |
| () Trajan Langdon (Associate Professor)
(Germanic Languages) | () Peter Maravich (Professor)
(Philosophy) |
| () Yao Ming (Professor)
(Art, Art History and Visual Studies) | () Roy Williams (Assoc. Prof. of the Practice)
(Germanic Languages) |

Postscript: Please be aware that members of the Academic Council are expected to attend meetings of the Council faithfully and can forfeit this membership by repeated absences.