

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 25, 2007

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): Welcome to the first council meeting of the new academic term of 2007. The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the November 16 and November 30 meetings. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

As many of you already know, since our last council meeting, one of the members of the Executive committee of the Council – Karla Holloway – has resigned. In accordance with our by-laws, ECAC invited Professor Ken Surin to serve in Professor Holloway's position until the end of this academic year. It's our current recent procedure, in this situation, to turn to the person who ran against the person who has resigned or had to leave the Council, and I'm very grateful to Professor Surin for agreeing to take this on.

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated December 30, 2006

Summary By Schools And College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	40
Bachelor of Science	20
Pratt School of Engineering	
Dean Kristina M. Johnson	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	8
Master of Engineering Management	22
School of Nursing	
Dean Catherine L. Gilliss	
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	55
Master of Science in Nursing	30
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences	
Dean William H. Schlesinger	
Master of Environmental Management	8
Master of Forestry	--
Fuqua School of Business	
Dean Douglas T. Breeden	
Master of Business Administration	66
Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Theological Studies	1

Master of Divinity	16
Master of Theology	5
School of Law	
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett	
Juris Doctor	2
Master of Laws	1
School of Medicine	
Dean R. Sanders Williams	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	3
Doctor of Medicine	2
The Graduate School	
Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Master of Public Policy	2
Master of Science	24
Master of Arts	55
Doctor of Philosophy	78
TOTAL	438

Question for the President

Haagen: We have a somewhat lengthy question, related to the lacrosse issue, for the President today:

President Brodhead, you have worked diligently to ensure fairness for all parties involved in this difficult situation and also to find common ground among fair-minded members of the greater Duke and Durham communities.

Some of the facts of this case are still in dispute and yet to be decided. Some may never be known. However it is apparently clear and generally agreed that a party was held, a stripper engaged and that the hosts of this event were the co-captains of the Duke lacrosse team.

Many will think it unwise and indeed abhorrent for such an event to have occurred. However, had it simply been individuals exercising poor judgment, many might also believe that the judicial system however imperfect be allowed to run its course before making a judgment as to whether these individuals should continue to be members of our university community.

But presumably Duke University wishes to discourage such events from occurring in the name of and as a result of actions by an officially sanctioned group that represents Duke in a very public way. In light of this, did you consider simply ruling that such individuals, who abused their right to represent Duke, be no longer allowed to do so as members of the lacrosse team, while holding in abeyance any judgment regarding their removal as students until such time as the facts were sufficiently clear to make a judgment on that matter?

Recognizing that it is always easier after some time has passed to see things more clearly than in the heat of the moment, do you think that if such an unfortunate event should occur in the future that banishment of individuals who participate in such a function from any participation in a group holding such a function would be appropriate?

President Brodhead: I want to say that I think that the question is honestly intended. But I also think it is based on some misinformation or failures of inference. It is not the case that anyone was suspended from this university – least of all by unilateral action of the President – on the basis of the party alone (about which we have learned so much). The party is acknowledged, it was known at the time, and actually actions were taken by the athletics department. There is a discipline that athletics can use, that would not necessarily be enforced by student affairs or anything like that: namely, cancellation of the first games of the season. Thereafter, the students who were later suspended were so treated under a policy called *interim suspension* that may not be familiar to all of you (I hope that it will not be familiar; I hope that the examples of it will be extremely rare!).

What I'm trying to say is, the notion that there was a party and thereafter individuals were banished, that's not the way things happened. The party needs to be dealt with in its own independent terms. The word "abhorrent" was used in the question. I've used that word in public; I've also used the word "dishonorable" about it. And I actually believe that many students who might have thought such an event was somehow acceptable at that time have had very powerful further reflections as a result of the effects of this party.

But to go on the question of the separation of students, there is a policy, I was not surprised to learn, at Duke (I was not surprised because I was familiar with this policy from a previous university – and when we later checked twenty four comparable universities, we discovered that they all had something similar). There's a policy called *interim suspension*. It is invoked in cases where there is reason, without knowing for certainty whether this is likely or not, but where there is reason to think that there may be a possibility of harm to members of a community or indeed to the person themselves. One of the categories in which it is considered with some regularity is when a student is under indictment for a crime that has an element of violence, as rape does. At that point, many schools understand it's just a matter

of prudence to separate the student from the community, not because you're certain of what they would do, and certainly in no judgment of their guilt, but rather because the claim itself falls in a category and you're in a state of uncertainty where there would be a possibility of opening the door for potential harm to members of the community or indeed in certain circumstances – and I believe this might have been one – in which there might have been harm to the individual themselves as a result of staying in the community.

If I use the words desperate measure, I mean by that, it's an in-extremis move; the fewer occasions that arise for it, the better I would say. But this was not done in conjunction with the party itself. It was not done, as you may remember, until the time of the indictment; the students who have been under this, until two or three weeks ago, were not put on interim suspension until the time of the indictment. And I think this is pretty much the answer to the question.

If I failed to answer the deep question that underlies it, whoever asked it is welcome to give me another crack at it. What I'd say is, in the ordinary course of things, there are ordinary processes for discipline. There are the ones lodged in Student Affairs, there are parallel and interlinked ones lodged in Athletics. One of the things we learned last Spring is we need to try to be much more careful here to have communication about student conduct among all the relevant areas of oversight and jurisdiction. We discovered last year that things were known by one part of the university that weren't completely known by other parts. And so now we have a much more highly articulated system of intercommunication between the domain of undergraduate student conduct and the domain of athletic oversight.

I'll pause and try to get a sense of if that is considered a sufficient answer. I'm hoping it might be.

I will now launch into an extempore comment, in which I just want to say: you know the day may come when you want to ask me questions about other matters (laughter). I hope that day will hasten. I'll answer them as long as I need to.



I wrote you a letter in which I answered every question I thought a person might want to ask, only to have

my letter criticized as “too long.” (laughter). I’ll tell you, my answer to that is, you’re wrong. My letter wasn’t too long, the situation was too complex and too protracted. But I tried to answer such things; I met with the Arts and Sciences faculty the Thursday after classes started and we had a thorough discussion and many more questions were answered.

I gave a long interview to the Chronicle in which a lot of questions were asked and answered. And I’m doing this outside the university as well as inside. But I want to go back if I can to something that comes towards the end of that letter, because I need your help with this, and you know it. And actually I know you’re willing to give it. Which is this: we passed through a situation which has been immensely absorbing, which requires our attention and continues to require our attention in all appropriate ways, but we also need to remember that we have other business than dealing with that situation and its not illegitimate for us to pursue that business. We need to remember that this is a great university, that we all profit from its greatness as a university, that we all contribute to its greatness as a university.

We all need to remember that part of what makes this place great is not its addiction to the status quo but its willingness to challenge itself and its willingness to change itself. And if that is part of what will happen during my time as President, I say that will be continuous and not discontinuous with the history of this university. When I was here in the Fall, we talked about a strategic plan, there were lots of ambitions, and we need to remember that we have not one challenge, we all the challenges a great university has; and if we only pay attention to some of them, we will discover later on that we have missed lots of opportunities. I want to remember those and remind us.

I just want to say one another thing, I spoke at an event in Atlanta last night with about 400 Duke loyalists there. There have been huge events in all the cities I’ve gone to. Richard Lischer, of the faculty of the Divinity School, spoke on “reconciliation” and he gave an absolutely memorable talk. In it, he alluded to a cultural commentator whose work I must be unfamiliar with, but I surely am [familiar] with the phenomenon. He invoked someone who had given the name “culture of argument” to a feature of our time. What the phrase meant was a culture in which people who talk mostly to each other are increasingly asked to visualize themselves as inside completely separated polarized camps, and whose response to others on the other side of that divide is to feel some injury that provokes them to higher and higher levels of anger and of things that follow from anger.

This may be a simple diagnosis of something complicated, but we all have some familiarity with this phenomenon and we all know that the situation on this campus has played itself out to the nation in which that has been one of the active ingredients. I just want to say – and here I don’t offer it as just my own thought – when I heard the phrase “the culture of argument” used to de-

scribe that, I thought: that is exactly the wrong word for it. That’s not a culture of argument, that’s a culture of failed argument or it’s a parodic culture of argument or something of that sort.

For me a culture of argument is one in which people do indeed care about things and don’t see things identically but in which they actually make the acquaintance of people who don’t agree with them; in which they take enough trouble to figure out what’s different about the different way somebody else thinks. To be able to put yourself at least temporarily in that frame of mind, to make your own arguments such that they’re persuasive not just to yourself but potentially to somebody who doesn’t agree with your premises. And of course, in the ideal case, in which as you teach somebody something, you learn something from the point of view that was at first completely alien if not unacceptable to you. That would be my idea of argument – an idea of no argument isn’t my idea of argument either. I’m always using the quote from Blake- “without contraries is no progression”



and so I have expounded.

If there is such a thing as a culture of argument around us...then we have to mount a counter-culture, a culture of real argument, a culture of productive educational difference, a culture in which contraries can lead to progression rather than simply to contrariety and the bad feelings it can create.

You may think that because I’m in the Divinity School I have felt it my business to give you a sermon, but if so, the first rule of sermons is that they have to end after a short time, and I will end mine only with this note: if it is true that we need to work on the things I am talking about here, then it is true that the faculty have a special obligation. The faculty are the leaders. They are the lead educators of a university and so we all have an obligation in our own practice and to model our behavior to students to look to us for examples, to make this a time when we really take the trouble to try to find out people who don’t already agree with us, to try to learn the strange way it is they actually think, so we can make our case more persuasively than them, and so potentially we can learn something in return.

I don’t regard this as alien to this place, I regard it as in the spirit of this place, but I do think this is a time

where this has to be an important part of our work. Do people have questions for me?

John Staddon (ECAC/Psychology & Neuroscience): Amen!

Please be sure to make your answer in the form of a question (!). I thank you very much, but I am serious about this. You know, creating the atmosphere in which all of this can be turned into a positive – that's not guaranteed to happen, and that's not guaranteed to fail to happen. It can happen, but it won't happen unless a lot of us make it our business to create the atmosphere that is the precondition for it happening. Thanks a lot.

Council Chair Nominations

Haagen: I think we should recognize that the secretary joined in your sermon metaphor here, and was pleased to be in the Divinity School.

The next item on the agenda is one that I will have to recognize is near and dear to my heart. It is a report from the Academic Council chair nominating committee. This is an important matter; for good or ill, I have been asked to speak on your collective behalf far more than I expected to over this past year, and I had also spent a bunch of time thinking about the following matter.

A number of people said it is lucky that in this year someone who is a lawyer and who has as one his specialties *sports* was in this role, but I've been fearful that, like the essay proving that trailer parks attract tornadoes, I was the cause of all of that. So you may want to be very careful what you do when you vote for the next council chair. At this point I would like to recognize Professor John Board to give the report of the committee.

John Board (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Thank you, Paul; and Let me first thank my colleagues, [Blanche Capel](#) from Cell Biology, [Fritz Mayer](#) from Public Policy, [Laurie Shannon](#), who's here I believe, from English and [John Staddon](#) who's here of course from Psychology, for undertaking this task with me.

One of the things about Duke those of us who have been here for a while cherish, is that the voice of the faculty generally does matter here. Successive administrations generally have been good about remembering to consult the faculty – as the placard on their desk reminds them to do – they even consent to come before this body to answer difficult and important questions. Many of us on the faculty lack the shyness gene and are quite willing to offer our opinions on university matters to any and all who might or might not want to hear them. The voice of the faculty however is most effectively channeled through this body, its executive committee, and most importantly, its chair.

We were tasked to identify not only one but two worthy successors to Paul Haagen as chair of this body. Fortunately, many Duke faculty are well known to be willing to invest a portion of their energy and time to service to the broader community, so developing a short list of candidates was fairly easy for us. Convincing two of them to agree to stand for the position was somewhat

more involved. To their credit, neither said yes right away. Both took their time to do their homework about the workload associated with this position, before agreeing to the possibility of a significant detour in their scholarly lives for the next two years.

Happily I can report that in alphabetical order: Professor [Craig Henriquez](#) from the Pratt School and Professor [Paula McClain](#) from Trinity College have both agreed to stand for chair of this Council at next month's meeting. Their full biographies will be distributed to you in advance of the February meeting. Let me just introduce them to you briefly.

Craig Henriquez is a Duke lifer – he earned his undergraduate and doctoral degrees here and he's been on the tenure track faculty since 1991. He's currently a professor of biomedical engineering and of computer science with an active research program in computational biomedicine. Among his many service activities over the year, he currently serves as chair of Pratt's own faculty council and is a veteran of ECAC.

Paula McClain earned her Ph.D. at Howard university and she came to Duke in 2000 from the University of Virginia. She is currently professor of political science and of public policy and her primary research interests are racial minority-group politics. Among many other activities, she directs the American Political Science Association's Ralph Bunch Summer Institute. In her time at Duke, she has already served as a member of and as chair of the APT committee, and in her past life in UVa she served as chair of the Department of Politics. I'm pleased to commend both of them to you for your consideration at next month's meeting. I think that either will make a wonderful chair and I thank you.

Equal-Opportunity Policy

Haagen: Thank you John. The next item on the agenda is the updated proposed equal opportunity policy which is presented by Ben Reese and Pam Bernard

Ben Reese (Vice President for Institutional Equity): Thank you. I'm really happy to present this proposal because I think it provides some emphasis around an issue that I think is very important to this university. Our equal-opportunity policy, as you know, prohibits discrimination based on a number of protected classes and



it's been extended to include sexual orientation and preference. And so we're recommending two revisions or updates to the policy. One is that the word [sexual] "preference" be eliminated. This is, as I think most people would agree, an outmoded term, one that really isn't in line with the thinking of most people around sexual orientation so the elimination of that term and then the addition of the term "gender identity," which is a term and a concept that's been added to a number of policies of peer institutions. We think it's significant that we emphasize this new category because I think it really extends and emphasizes the notion of respect and nondiscrimination and equal opportunity.

So we proposed these two changes to the President and I bring it before this body for your feedback and acknowledgment.

THE REVISED POLICY

Duke prohibits discrimination and harassment, and provides equal employment opportunity without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, sex, or age. Duke is committed to recruiting, hiring, and promoting qualified minorities, women, individuals with disabilities, and veterans.

Haagen: Questions? Comments? Hearing none... [A motion to approve the proposal was proposed, seconded and approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Question Period

We now have a structural problem. Chancellor Dzau, next on the agenda, has been detained and will not be here for several more minutes to make his presentation. I apologize for this glitch – I learned about it exactly 90 seconds ago. While we're waiting for Chancellor Dzau, I'd like to use this opportunity to get thoughts from any of you about what you would like us to be doing over the last six months of my term and over this period. Any thoughts about the matters that you want to be certain that this body takes up, debates, considers?

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Could you give us an update with regard to ECAC's relationship or retooling with the so-called Athletics Council or management of the Athletics Department – the oversight of the Athletics Department? Is that something you can do in the next six months or not?

Haagen: I hope that we can do it in the next 48 hours! Earlier this year, one of the things that I think became clear out of events in the Spring was that the Athletics Council had been not been reviewed, we had not thought about the way it was operating, for a substantial period of time – I think in excess of 30 years, something like that. President Brodhead formed a committee to review the athletics committee, they presented a very full report to the President, the President referred it to ECAC for our views and the only delay in getting the response to the President is that I taught three classes in the fall and had 147 exams to grade and – so the chair was a little en-retard in responding to this.

You will be happy to know (I'm certainly happy to know!) that my grades are all in and I am now working on this. Basically the thrust of review committee was that there were a couple of fairly critical changes that should happen in the way the Athletics Council operates.

One was that a structure be created so that that committee reported to ECAC and to this body. Under the current structure it reports only to the President. We could request and did (I actually didn't realize that there was not a reporting relationship and simply arrogated the authority) ask the faculty chair to report, and she did at several points.

But to clarify that.. To expand and reshape some of the faculty participation on it, that's one place that ECAC is responding with some degree of detail to the report about the size of the faculty component,

Then there were other recommendations about a variety of subcommittees and we're also responding to those. I expect that by the end of the workday on Friday that I should have a response to the President for him to consider and to work with us about the formation of this new body. We are clearly aware that it is important to have a strong, continuing, informed faculty voice. People who are aware enough of what is going on that they can respond in real time to developments and to give direction to it.

There are certain problems in organizing that because of the NCAA requirements and because of other requirements about the shape of the larger committee, and we're essentially trying – as the review committee did, to work within those... Yes.

Linda Franzoni (Mechanical Engineering & Materials Science): Do you have any updates regarding the program you launched with faculty and sports, you know where you matching some faculty with certain sports? At least from the Fall sports, is there any anecdotal data...?

Haagen: There has been a meeting of the group to find out how it was going. I would say that the response about people's experience was overwhelmingly positive. They thought that it had been a very positive kind of thing. We have a faculty athletics associate here. I don't know if you want to add or subtract anything to my comments?

Well, I'll make a couple of general comments. What people have told us is that although there has been a glitch or two, they have been strongly welcomed by the coaches, made to feel part of things; their input was appreciated, the students appreciated it, and that they were learning a great deal. Jim Salzman, who is one of the faculty associates for the women's basketball team, traveled with them to Tennessee and he said that it had been an eye-opening experience to him – that he could not imagine that the intensity of that experience before he went. He said try to think of being 19 years old and having 21,000 people screaming at you. And found that, as I said, just an eye-opening experience.

He wanted to tell me at some length about what that was. I wouldn't say he was at the point of reflecting the

next morning, but just reporting. I think that the place where there's been a little confusion is that some people seem to have tried to take on an extremely aggressive mentoring role – and that wasn't the intention – mentoring in the sense of one of the faculty athletic associates who wanted to require all of the members of the team to come to her department and to be in a room where she could watch them study. That was really a more aggressive role than I thought we were going to play. And so there was a little discussion back and forth and calming the coach down that that was not going to be required.

But, as I said, a great deal of enthusiasm, because the people doing it are so different, and because their experiences of sports going from zero to one of the faculty athletics associates who was an Olympic fencer. She has a very different relationship to the team than my wife – who came to see me play lacrosse once – and who has no interest in these kinds of things other than what it is that these people are learning. I think there's been quite a range. But Steve, please...

Steve Baldwin (Chemistry): I am associated with men's basketball – Mark Neal is the other associate. I've been to a couple of practices. I'd say (it's not surprising), I feel a little bit like I've been managed in basketball, but that's not a negative. The practices, the team (meals) have been terrific, and I'd like to echo the experience of traveling the team to New York for the Gonzaga game. It was absolutely an amazing experience. And just the intensity and the focus that so many people have – these kids are really going through a lot. So I've only been involved in a couple of practices, and the team meal and it has been very good. I've met the players. I now actually, can say "Hi!" on the quad.

Haagen: They're hard to recognize (laughter) those guys.

Baldwin: So, so far it's been a very, very positive experience for me.

Paul: I would say that most people who are in any way near the men's basketball team understand that it is a managed experience. Coach Krzyzewski runs a very tight ship. We would all be struck, to see how he scripts the practices down into three minute segments and he sticks to it, and it's quite an incredible thing to see that operate. You can have your conclusions about it, but it's a very tight ship. Other?

Peter Burian (Classics): I'd like to raise this...in a way it's a question, and it follows to an extent on what President Brodhead was saying earlier. I think that to an unfortunate degree in comments I've heard in the *Chronicle* editorials, the questions of "campus culture" and the "campus culture initiative" and the legal issues surrounding the initial problem have gotten badly confused, and I very much sympathize with the idea that we ought to be focusing on issues of student culture at this university and that faculty have a very important role to play.

Obviously, most of the students involved are undergraduate students and are therefore students in either Arts and Sciences or in the Pratt school, but it seems to me that there is a larger university-wide responsibility

and an interest also in this question on the part everybody who is a part of Duke. So I wonder, first of all, what plans there are to have any kind of discussion of the campus culture initiative specifically and questions of campus culture here in this body which is actually the only representative body of the entire university?

Bob Thompson I see is here, who is actually heading that particular initiative. I don't know how much discussion there's been about this. But I guess my question is: do we in fact also want to hear something about this, and if so, to hear from you what plans there might be for that?

Haagen: Bob knows ECAC has been wondering the same thing.

Robert Thompson (Dean of Trinity College): You'll recall that when the President first charged the campus culture initiative, the expectation was that we would deliver our final report on or before May 1st. As we began to get deeply involved in our work, it became clear to us that it would be advantageous to move that point forward in the Spring, making our report available to the President, just to enable the type of follow up conversations and discussions that you're talking about, and certainly coming to this body as part of that process. We are now at the concrete steps of working out time lines about delivering the report and then subsequent distribution. The President wants to comment?

President Brodhead: I'd say a word if you'd like and if I could go back. Just let me say that although I regret the occasion for it, the business of reconsidering the Athletics Council I think was really ripe for review and probably had been for many years.

That it's a funny body – very good people are on it, they bring good hearts to it, good interests to it, but it is not a well-connected body, questions aren't put to it, its advice does not come out anywhere. And so finding a system whereby that really is something that has a serious advisory function will have many benefits. One of them is that people will actually be more committed to it, they'll put more time and trouble into it.

I think actually one of the lessons for me of last Spring was, that everyone has views about athletics and universities, but it would be very good for many people to actually know more about it on both sides of that divide. And I'll tell you it is my experience that the Athletics Department does not crave a position of distance or isolation in the university – I think that is actually the very opposite of what they want and everything that involves building of these relationships I have found to be actually welcomed and a sort of even relief and pleasure at the attention...

As for the committee that Bob is chairing, I know it will still be some weeks before I get your report, but I want to say that is absolutely not in the nature of this kind of thing, that the report will come in and the next day the President will issue its edicts, and that will be the end of that. We're talking about how to understand everything that is wrong about the learning culture – primarily the undergraduate culture – of this school.

About the things where we think evolution is necessary and the steps that might lead in that direction.

But if we're talking culture, we're not only talking administrative measures, we're talking about what in your youth we used to be called "changing hearts and minds" – about actually making people involved and invested and wanting the changes and embracing things as part of their educational aspirations that will make certain outcomes follow logically from that.

To get to that outcome, you're going to have to have a process, and what the exact steps are I am not sure I can specify now, but they will certainly involve lots of conversation. They will involve conversation with faculty who have given so many wonderful hours to that committee. They're bound to, because actually there is a role for the faculty in all of these. It's actually going to require conversations with students of a different sort than has taken place so far. I've read in the *Chronicle* as perhaps you did: what was the headline I had saw there? "Apathy is a reasonable response."

Well, again, I quarrel with the word choice but I realize again that this is one of my failings...But the editorial was really a quite interesting editorial, I thought, and its point is: there are certain students who are highly invested in these issues and there are other students for whom this is a low priority. But once a set of recommendations come forward, I bet you will find that apathy is not one the common responses to it.

I had actually had considerable experience in dealing with the issues of learning cultures of undergraduates in my life and, you know, it's something I care a great deal about. If we can't find a way to enlist people's aspirations in leaning towards these goals, if these are only a set of disciplinary measures, they won't get us where we want to go. So we're going to have to have conversations that include the faculty but also extend far outside the faculty, and also conversations that bring students and faculty together – kinds of conversation that are now current and that are praised and ones that are not so current, but which we all have an interest in encouraging.

Questions

Ann Brown (Clinical Sciences): I want to take President Brodhead's challenge to move a little bit forward, away from lacrosse, and to ask about what you think this body's role might be in reviewing progress in terms of faculty diversity.

As we go forward, perhaps by the end of the year, it's been something we've written about in the strategic plan, advancing women and minorities on the faculty and it seems as if our hearts are all in the right place – and I think personally it would be a good use of this body's time and talent to review the progress but also the steps that had been taken to try to reach our goals, sort of an assessment: if we were not successful, what were

the problems and do we need to develop some strategies in the university to overcome those problems in the coming year. So I ask that in response to your question about what we might accomplish in the coming six months.

Haagen: Does my predecessor have any comments on this and timing?

Nancy Allen (Rheumatology & Immunology/Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development): As you recall, in 2003 the faculty diversity initiative was brought before this body by Provost Lange which was a response to two task forces – the diversity task force and the women's faculty development task force. Each year since then, he has provided an update to this Council. The most recent report was given to this Council in the Fall of 2006. And it's on the Provost's website under policies and documents, and we plan to continue that. He had originally planned to do it every two years; somehow it's ended up being once a year. Certainly, both on the medical side with your work and the campus side, we are working on a number of initiatives.

The Sloan Award that we received in September has allowed us to do some work with search committees. Jackie Looney, as the Associate, Vice-Provost for Academic Diversity, and I met with search-committee members and search-committee chairs and department chairs in places where searches are being done. There were a series of dinners and lunches where we met with those individuals in Arts and Sciences, and I think those conversations were very helpful, both in letting people know across departments and divisions what tacks there might be in these areas to enhance diversity and what other strategies could be used. So we're working on a number of different levels.

Ann Brown: And I would just like to request that we focus on evaluating our outcomes, as a form of internal accountability for our efforts.

Haagen: I think that is excellent. All right, Chancellor Dzau is here now. and at his request we are going to now be in Executive Session, which means that those persons who are not members of the faculty and senior administrative members should now leave....

Executive Session: Medical Center Restructuring. Minutes of Chancellor Dzau's comments and questions from the faculty are available for faculty members to consult in the Academic Council office.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, February 12, 2007