

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 March 20, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): We have, hopefully, a short meeting today... The first item of business is approval of the minutes. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the February 21 meeting? [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Our faculty secretary John Staddon is attending a meeting in Florida – at least that’s what he says! – so my colleague from ECAC, Ken Surin will serve as honorary faculty secretary for this meeting. Thank you very much Ken for serving in that capacity.

Postdoctoral Policy

Next on our agenda is a follow-up to the postdoctoral policy proposal which Provost Lange presented at the December Council meeting. As you will remember, some concerns were raised from the Basic Science faculty. Since that last meeting the Basic Science Faculty Steering Committee has been consulted and its chair, Herman Staats, has communicated that the policy is now acceptable to the BSFSC.

Jim Siedow and Sally Kornbluth are here today to elaborate on the changes and if the Council is agreeable we will have a resolution and vote on the proposal. Jim, Sally...

Jim Siedow (Biology/Vice Provost for Research): Thank you Paula. I’m sorry Peter isn’t here because I wanted to thank him personally for having filled in at the last meeting when I was out of town. In retrospect I sort of feel like I sent him over the top at the battle of the Somme in World War I and neglected to mention that there might be a few Germans with machine guns on the other side. I won’t do that again (I’m pretty well cured of that...)

In any event, first of all it’s a pleasure to be here and let me also introduce my two partners in crime as it were: Sally Kornbluth, the Assistant Dean for Basic Sciences in the Medical School and Molly Starback, who is the director of our office of postdoctoral services. The three of us have been largely responsible for shepherding the post-doc policy through the hoops for a good number of years now.

In rereading the minutes of the Academic Council meeting in December, I can see that Peter did an awfully good and thorough job of covering the background behind the postdoc policy. So I would just remind you that this is part of a long-term trend that basically started in the late 90’s, when postdocs – particularly in the biomedical sciences, but even elsewhere as well – began going from tenure periods of two to three years to 4, 5, 6 and even more years. As such, they became as a group a little more concerned about the fact that by and large they were not recognized at the institutions in which they were working. I might add Duke was a good example, in that there was no policy of any sort that even mentioned postdocs.

So, in 2002 or thereabouts, the Duke University post-doc association was formed. They worked with Peter and Sandy and I believe it was in – yes, spring of 2004 – that Peter announced two things to the community. One is that an office of postdoctoral services would be set up. And also that there would be a task force put together to try and come forward with a set of recommendations for a postdoctoral policy.

That task force was put in place in the fall of 2004. It was chaired by Jo Rae Wright who at the time was in Sally’s position – Assistant Dean for Basic Medical Sciences. It was a fairly large committee and consisted of both faculty and administrators and at the end of the day – in late fall of 2005 – it came forward with a series of recommendations. So they were at it for well over a year before their recommendations came forward. Peter, [to Provost Lange, just arrived] I’ve already acknowledged that I may have erred..

Provost Lange: And I was going to come to speak on your behalf.

Siedow: In any event the office of postdoctoral services actually opened in January of 2006 and about a month later a final version of the Task Force report came forward and, as Peter said last time, everything was supposedly in place so that the policy would roll out on July 1 of 2006.

That simply was just a pipe dream, because none of us who were involved had any notion of the complexity of trying to take that series of recommendations

and, if you will, morph them into an actual policy, human resources, legal – you name it. All sorts of people had say in what we put down and it was an arduous task literally slogging through every paragraph.

But ultimately we did manage to reach a point earlier in the fall when we had a policy we thought we could roll forward. At least we felt we had covered all the bases.

What I'd like to do is to basically go through the highlights of that policy very quickly, with the changes that have been made since last time. As Paula noted, the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee had raised some concerns. We met with them and we communicated with them on several occasions and have instituted a couple of changes in response, in the document that you have before you. In addition, after discussion with a number of people, including ECAC yesterday, there is a last-minute change we would like to make as well and I'll spell that out in just a second.

The guts of the policy boiled down as follows. Salary: Duke University sets a salary minimum for first-year postdocs that is pegged to the NIH/ NRSA minimum. After that, increases of salary are not pegged to the NIH salary at all.

Leave: again, there are two kinds of postdocs. Let me remind you: Postdoctoral associates who are being paid off your grant, for example. And postdoctoral scholars, who are paid either from a training grant or through, for example, the NRSA – the university gets paid but the money goes to the postdoc; these are the so-called non-comp postdocs and what we're calling postdoctoral scholars.

So, the postdoctoral associates then we're basically defining their eligibility for leave and basically they are eligible for three weeks of vacation (that's 15 days) and they may accrue up to 20 days vacation. In the last version that number was 30 days. A member of the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee pointed out that when you looked at other institutions, 20 was more common. We had chosen 30 simply because that was the Duke University employee policy at the time. We're certainly accepting the fact that, while it might have been a more generous policy perhaps than other universities, to be in line with other universities is not unreasonable. So we knocked that accrual down to 20 days.

The vacation accrual will transfer if the postdoc changes labs or departments within the university. But if the postdoc leaves and hasn't used any sort of leave time, they cannot be paid for any of that.

Scholars fall into a slightly different category. They are not employees, so, as you will remember from what Peter said last time, one of the issues associated with the postdoctoral scholars that drove us all nuts had to do with trying to get health benefits for someone who is not an employee. We came up with a system whereby if you have a postdoctoral scholar coming into your lab you should hire them for a month on your own money, which will vest them in the em-

ployee health plan although it doesn't vest them in any of the other benefit plans such as retirement.

I would like to point out a couple of numbers here that are important in this regard. There are about 800 postdocs on campus roughly 2/3 in the medical center and 1/3 on campus. About 10% of them in any given year are postdoctoral scholars, so they have their own money or they are on a training grant. And last year only 3 of them roughly 10% of the 80 came with their money ahead of time. So in fact 90% showed up here as postdoctoral associates and then wrote a successful proposal for a fellowship subsequently. So they would already have been vested even without anybody have to pay anything because they were here quite a few months before they ever got their fellowship. So it's a fairly limited number that we're having to worry about, but it's an important group to have to worry about.

Postdoctoral associates are eligible for Duke parental leave. Scholars are not, because, again, they are not employees. So this is a benefit that we can't give. However, it turns out that with the NRSA fellowships there are actually some well-defined specifications related to parental leave and vacations.

I might add, if you are here as a postdoctoral scholar, for any given fellowship guidelines associated with that fellowship take precedence over anything we have in our policy, and that's as it should be.

So the last thing had to do then with benefits and that has to do with supplementing a postdoctoral scholar's health benefits. Now if the fellowship they have has an allowance for benefits then that's the first call; and again in the NRSA, which are the majority of our postdoctoral scholars, there actually is a very generous allowance that will in fact cover both individual health insurance and in most instances even families – most if not all family benefits. So that would be the first call.

Beyond that, payment would come either from the PI's discretionary fund in the department, or the school, i.e. the dean. And one of the things we changed in response to discussions with the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee was that, in fact, if a supplement is needed, the funding decision will be at the discretion of each school, with funding coming either from the PI, the department, or the dean.

In essence, we're making it clear that each school will set its own policy about how that is suppose to work.

And then finally, if you go to –sections 2b on page 2 (and 7a, on p. 7), the third bullet, the way it reads (in the copy you received both 7a and 2b read the same), it has “payment method” and it defines the postdoctoral scholars payment as “the postdoctoral scholar receives a stipend from a training grant, i.e., NIH, NRSA or fellowship awarded either directly to the university or to the individual.” Now this “or to the individual” phrase creates a problem, because there is a category of direct-paid people – who come, often, from foreign countries – who are paid directly, not

from the university, but paid directly. It turns out, we don't have a good handle on those folks and to include them at this point in the policy [is problematic]. Many of them come here for very limited periods of time. They are not really postdocs in that regard. They are more easily categorized as visiting scholars.

After some last-minute discussions and negotiations, our sense was that that wording "either..." and then subsequently "or to the individual" that that "or to individual" needs to be taken out. And basically that issue needs to be looked at very closely in the future in future considerations of the policy because frankly the more we delve into, the stickier that issue became, and I think we're better off at the moment not trying to complicate the policy with a number of people – frankly we don't even know how many there are. The feeling is there probably aren't very many that would actually be postdocs. And so I think it just would be again a cleaner policy, an easier one to implement at this point, if we take that phrasing "or to the individual" out of those two sections of the policy. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Questions

Warren Grill (Engineering): Could I ask you to clarify the difference in benefits between associates and scholars? If I understand it correctly, the postdoctoral associates would have the same benefits that other employees of the university enjoy, including the 403B contributions.

Siedow: If they are appropriately vested, yes, access says to 403B.

Warren Grill: Postdoctoral scholars are not?

Siedow: That's correct. And we can't do that because they are not employees and we don't pay FICA tax on them or any of that so we simply cannot by law vest them in our retirement plan. The only way we can vest them in our health benefit is this one-month thing. We can vest in our health plan with the one-month thing, but we can't vest them in our retirement plan.

Douglas Marchuk (Molecular Genetics and Microbiology): One of the more difficult things that came up with in the Department of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology when we looked at this proposal was the issue of discretionary funds, you know, things sort of rolling back into the discretionary fund. I was interested that the Basic Science Faculty Steering Committee sort of put the onus on the school to decide. What does that mean because I can see our department basically standing here trying to see ...still not liking that...

Sally Kornbluth (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology/Vice Dean Basic Sciences): I can tell you in the School of Medicine, Dean Andrews has already said the dean is going to cover it. There is going to be a memo. We didn't want to put out a memo related to the policy until the policy passed. But it only comes to about \$100,000 for the whole school, actually, based on the numbers that Jim was talking about – people who don't have insurance coverage sufficient in their fellowships.

Douglas Marchuk: Thank you that would make them very happy I'm sure...

Siedow: We can't speak for Nicholas or Arts and Sciences at this point as it's left up to the schools.

McClain:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the Duke University Postdoctoral Policy with the amended wording in sections 2-B and 7-A Payment Method: "The Postdoctoral Scholar receives a stipend from a training grant (i.e. NIH NRSA) or fellowship awarded directly to the University."

[The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.] Thank you. The motion passes unanimously. We now have a postdoc policy.

Duke University Guidelines for Authorship and Authorship Dispute Resolution

Jim will continue with the next item, which is to inform the Council on the Duke University Guidelines for Authorship and Authorship Dispute Resolution.

Siedow: Thank you, Paula and thank you [related to postdoc policy] it's been a long strange trip.

Alright, let me give you a little bit of background so you can understand where this is coming from exactly. On the campus side – and I don't know for certain on the medical side – but on the campus side, about 2-3 times a year someone will come to the research misconduct officer with a claim of misconduct, and it turns out to be an authorship dispute where there is really nothing related to misconduct involved. And so our Standing Committee on Misconduct in Research isn't really positioned to take those. On a couple of occasions we gave them to them and they very quickly came back and said this isn't misconduct. It's not our issue in point of fact.

In looking around at other universities, we found that not infrequently there are in fact published authorship guidelines. So we put together a committee consisting of Judy Dillon in the Office of Research Support, Judith Ruderman is the campus misconduct research officer and Joe Corless, who at the time was the Medical Center misconduct officer.

What we've placed before you is not a policy per se. What we needed to put together here was a mechanism by which, when there is an authorship dispute, an aggrieved party has recourse to deal with it. For example, things like the harassment policy, make it clear that if you've got a dispute it's really best to handle it at the local level first – at the level of the person you are working with, at the level of the chair of the department next, and then at the level of the dean.

But if none of that works, for whatever reason, then the purpose of this policy is to provide a mechanism, an Authorship Dispute Board, that will be a way to try to resolve authorship disputes.

Authorship is a tricky thing, we realized, as we tried to develop the policy. We can't mandate any-

thing to anybody when it comes to authorship nor should we try. So we basically came forward with the notion that if you get to the point when you take something to the authorship dispute board you can go one of two ways:

If both parties agree to binding arbitration; then both parties agree to what the board says.

But if one party or the other doesn't agree to that, then they bring it to the board with the notion that the findings of the board can be made public.

And that seemed to be the best way we could figure out of making that work. Now, if I can back up for just a second and talk about the guidelines again. When you look around, you don't have to look very far to recognize that different disciplines – even I might add within the natural sciences, but certainly between the natural sciences and say elsewhere – have remarkably different cultures in dealing with authorship. And we don't want to instigate a policy that in any way interferes with that. However, we have put forward a set of guidelines we hope will guide people's thinking about issues related to authorship, so that they give it a more thought ahead of time. Again, there is nothing in here that is meant to be a strict policy per se. And we're talking about principles of authorship that are recommended only within the context of whatever culture you as an individual might happen to work in.

We felt you couldn't just put together a dispute board without a set of principles that were guiding the whole process. So with that as general background, let me just summarize: we really feel that we've got a gap here and that we not infrequently get authorship disputes coming forward. We've got no way of really dealing with them now and I think we probably need a way of dealing with them. And so with this set of guidelines we're proposing a way of putting together an authorship dispute board. And I'm bringing this forward to you today to get your approval or comments.

Questions

Martha Adams (Medicine): I guess I need to know a little bit more. Tell me again this comes up about 3 times...

Siedow: About 3 times a year.

Adams: And what's the gravity of the items. Is it big enough to warrant...

Siedow: It's big to the person that brings it forward, that's the problem. I mean yes, the couple of them I've seen, I frankly didn't honestly necessarily think they had a case, but nevertheless it's important to them and our problem is we've got nowhere for them to go. So I would say at a personal level there's gravity. In a few instances I think there are probably some really legitimate issues about authorship that really need to be dealt with.

Now, is this a big problem? No, it's not a big problem. I mean it's not a huge problem and if we don't have this policy, you know, life will go on. But we simply at the moment have no mechanism; there

simply isn't a mechanism anywhere for someone to take a grievance of this sort. And we don't even address the issue of authorship, so the notion that the first thing you need to do is try to solve the problem locally doesn't really appear anywhere. We're just not giving any guidance to anybody.

Diane Dimond (Law): So what's the size of the board you are talking about?

Siedow: Eight. We have to make sure that all of the vested parties are at the table. So we have 4 faculty members, two from the administration, a graduate and professional student and a postdoctoral fellow. So we're trying to make sure ...again, oftentimes the aggrieved party is not going to be a faculty member, but a student or a postdoc and so we would like to make sure the board itself has representation from those two views. That's the reason those two are on there. You know we need administrators on it because we always need something to do...(!)

Dimond: I just had a question. This doesn't just apply to the School of Medicine right?

Siedow: This applies to the entire campus, the entire university.

Dimond: OK, so I wondered why the dean of the School of Medicine is the lucky dean on this board. Does this mostly happen in Medicine? Or is this just the first one and you are going to rotate this around or what?

Siedow: Well no the Provost and the Dean of the School of Medicine appoint...those two.

Dimond: Well, why the dean of the School of Medicine?

Siedow: As opposed to not the Dean of the School of medicine?

Dimond: I just wondered if there was any connection with medicine or whether sometime it might be the Dean of the Law School? I'm just curious as to why...

Provost Lange: Because the School of Medicine represents half the budget and more than half the faculty.

Siedow: Again, the Law School is going to be represented by the Provost.

Dimond: I'm not worried about the Law School.

Jo Rae Wright (Dean of the Graduate School): Actually, if I could speak, having been in a position of mediating several authorship disputes as the Dean of the Graduate School and, actually, when I had Sally's job – and recently one in my own lab. I would say that a guideline like this, and a board to which complaints could be taken if it can't be resolved, is extremely valuable if only it makes the student or the postdoc feel like they have a voice beyond the department. And I think that this is a great step forward and would be enthusiastic about it.

If you are concerned that there will be people spending a lot of time on this, I don't actually think it will have to be mediated that often. But just the fact that there is a path to mediation I think will reassure

people – especially students and postdocs – that they have a voice.

Nancy Short (Nursing): Will this become part of the Faculty Handbook or where would one access this?

Siedow: The plan is to have it as a supplement to the Misconduct Policy so the answer to your question is yes it will be part of the Faculty Handbook as an appendix or supplement to an appendix.

Short: And if you are a student or postdoc or whatever that is involved in one of these disputes where would you access this?

Siedow: I'd go to the Duke Homepage and google authorship dispute and I suspect it will show. We'd just have to assume that the person would know how to be able to access something like that.

Lori Setton (Engineering/Surgery/ECAC): So, Jim I might suggest in response to that, that we also post on our website for responsible conduct in research that students who are interested in getting guidelines for authorship wind up at that website.

Siedow: That's excellent and I might even add to that that we have on the Office of Research support – their webpage has the Misconduct Policy – so we could certainly have authorship dispute on there as well. So if they went to that webpage they should be able to find it there as well.

Martha Adams: So it doesn't feel like misconduct.

Siedow: Well it's not misconduct, but that's where people seem to see it as belonging.

Adams: The second question I have is we have an ombudsman, right? Can't that person mediate to begin with?

Siedow: They could, although the ombudsman is a faculty ombudsman, although I don't think that restricts them to just faculty. But again, as Jo Rae pointed out, we are trying to make a policy here that applies to the entire Duke publication-active community and not just faculty, but faculty and students and postdocs and whatnot. Again, I think we're trying to put a little bit of a stake in the ground here, recognizing that this happens several times a year and we'd like to make sure that people realize that there is a mechanism that is specifically associated with authorship disputes. Whereas the ombudsman is a bit more broadly dispute-oriented. It's an interesting point though.

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology/ECAC): I might add, this was originally part of the misconduct policy five years ago and misconduct as defined by NIH and RCR as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism. And then there was this other category called "other" in the Duke handbook and amongst the "other" category was authorship dispute. I've actually sat on some misconduct hearings. I mean the full-fledged thing that considered authorship dispute as misconduct. So you talk about a lot of time to adjudicate this sort of stuff. A full-fledged misconduct hearing is an enormous amount of time. So, to be handled with a board I think is much more efficient.

Siedow: And I think that's again on the campus side, I think the one time I was around when we tried that they very quickly came back and said this is not misconduct it's just not our job. A good point though, thank you.

Kathryn Andolsek (Medicine): Could the charge of this group be somewhat enlarged to also be educational? I mean it strikes me that some of these representative situations that come up might be worthwhile either to incorporate in the guidelines or to use as learning opportunities so that people know how to do it right. I mean some of this may be purposeful, but a lot of it just may be people who don't know – and I don't know where along the line they are ever instructed and how...

Siedow: We do do responsible-conduct-in-research training, where I think authorship ... Jo Rae do you want to speak to that?

Jo Rae Wright: We do actually deal with the issue of authorship on our training of graduate students in responsible conduct in research. The graduate students are trained, ...

Andolsek: But I think the faculty and other...

Wright: Well communication sometimes and I think this articulates the point that you need to communicate about this early. And if it becomes part of the culture through the Faculty Handbook and through various websites I think it will improve the communications.

Andolsek: But I think this group, knowing one of things that are coming out, could get fed back into the instructional...that we use to try to help people do it right...

Siedow: Absolutely to the extent that we find that there are certain kinds of problems that appear we can help sort of modify this as needed to make it more useful.

Andolsek: I would want that group to be both educational as well as have a focus on communication or mediation or whatever else...

Siedow: Good point.

McClain: I would like to ask the Council for endorsement of these guidelines:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the Duke University Guidelines for Authorship and authorship Dispute Resolution and asks that these guidelines be inserted in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix P, as a supplement to the Misconduct in Research Policy.

[The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.]
We have two new things today – great!

Department of Asian and African Languages and Literature, Name Change

The last two items on the agenda today are proposals for department name changes. The supporting documents were distributed with the agenda. We will present resolutions on the name-change proposals following the discussion. The first one is from the De-

partment of Asian and African Languages and Literature. Professor Leo Ching is here to present the proposal. Leo..

Leo Ching (Asian and African Languages and Literature): So on to a more I guess mundane stuff here. I come in front of you to seek your support and approval for department name change from Asian and African Languages and Literature to Asian and Middle Eastern Studies. Just to give you a very quick sort of timeline: Asian and African Languages and Literature was a section in 1988 and in 1998 it was approved to be a department. So obviously in 2008 we are seeking the next step. It all seems very logical to me!

And also just to give you a sense that right now in the United States there is only one other institution, the University of Florida-Gainesville, that has a similar department with a similar configuration. So you can tell how popular this name has been. So ... and what I heard is they are actually decomposing themselves so maybe we have to move forward.

We seek this change for two reasons. One based on representation, or rather the lack thereof, and the other on a coherent intellectual vision that has been developed over the past few years. So first the lack of representation of African components in the department. Other than Northern Africa, which is Arabic-speaking countries, we currently do not offer and we have never offered any courses on sub-Saharan Africa.

Swahili, the only African language that was taught at Duke, was relegated to UNC in 2004. And we have not replaced it, that was emphasized here, with any African languages at Duke since then. And furthermore, with the emergence of the program in African and African and African American studies, in the last few years, and its recent hiring positions in African studies through Anthropology and Literature, we felt that it is best that we concentrate on our current strength which is languages and cultures in Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese and Korean.

[One reason to seek a name change is to] avoid redundancy or misrepresentation – because oftentimes we have students coming to our department seeking guidance on Africa and we often cannot provide it even though some of us try with very little success.

However, I would like to underscore here that representation and redundancy here are not the only reasons that prompts us to seek a new identity and to assess our current configuration. We could have kept the name – I mean after all AALL has a pretty good ring to it rather than AMES. And also we could still be having the illusion that 20 faculty covers 80% of the world, and I'm sure nobody would suspect or even notice! But what really I think enabled us to move to a different stage in the department's growth is the emergence of a coherent intellectual vision what I would call a critical vision of studies.

I'll speak very briefly about what I mean by that. So by formulating critical regional studies in two ways intra-regionally and inter-regionally, within Asia and

within Middle East or across these two putatively unified regional categories.

We have already developed courses, such as Intro. to East-Asian Cultural Studies and the Palestine-Israel Conflicts, that have been well subscribed by students. And in those classes what we try to do is to at least understand or analyze historical conflicts through the representation of literature, culture, language, so on and so forth.

So in the respect we are actually encouraging students to actually pick up or learn more than just one language within the region. So for example Hebrew and Arabic will be an obvious choice; Japanese and Korean as well. We are in the process of figuring out how to develop combined majors that will enable these kind of possibilities. And I have to underscore that in most other area-study-based schools this is not done at all. This will be innovative, but also revolutionary. Most other schools keep the limitations, so Arabic students study Arabic and never cross to either Hebrew and Chinese; Japanese, Korean in the same way.

Beyond intra-regional focus, a number of students recently have expressed an interest in learning language and cultures that cross these regions. One example, which I have talked about to a lot of people through this name-change process, is actually one of our recent graduates Kevin Fong who is currently a Ph.D. student at Yale in History. He studied both Chinese and Arabic and he wrote a senior thesis that chronicled the travelogue of Zheng He, a 15th century Chinese explorer of southeast Asia, and his impressions of the so-called Muslim population out there.

This kind of project enabled us to think beyond power that is simply based on an East-West model, that we see the Western European as simply the colonizer and in relation to the non-West. Now we can actually develop a very complicated and historically specific way of complicating the notion of power and representation and so on and so forth. We can actually imagine something called a Chinese Orientalism that Edward Said has never even I think tried to figure!

We also have a number of students currently that are interested in both Chinese and Arabic, but I'm more suspicious of their desire to do so because I think, you know, so they can either do China Economics or work for the State Department! But I think part of our job is to graduate students and to at least make it available to them, even though that's not really the kind of students we want to cultivate. But you know, we do our best.

So we are very excited about the name change, not only because it better reflects our pedagogical interests and faculty composition, but also because we are convinced it will enable us to pursue exciting and innovative teaching and research that has always been the signature of this university. So thank you very much. And I'll entertain any questions...

Questions

President Brodhead: I have one. I only ask this out of curiosity. You used the word “decompose” in an interesting way when you were talking about ...and since you are talking about taking apart Asian and African, admittedly the name will seem strange in retrospect...when you spoke of Asian and African department unity you must have asked some days in the year 2018 if you should “decompose” Near-Eastern and Asian. And so is your answer about Arabic and Chinese, is that the basis of the answer?

Ching: I think one is kind of an institutional question and the other one more philosophical sort of knowledge-production question. So I was thinking more in terms of the institutional one right. Just to on one hand to sort of expose the kind of absurdity of combining these large entities into one and how we must move forward. But given the fact that we don't really have a good solution what to do with these critical areas...we keep talking about post-area studies. But the good thing about Duke we never had...area studies, so we were always ahead anyways. I must say – given the fact that, you know, the involvement of China in Africa and Latin America these days, we cannot think about China without thinking about Africa without thinking about Latin America.

So institutionally, I think we are hoping in a way to commit to what we are given and historical condition of our possibility. But I think you are absolutely right that for the future we have to create more linkages and different ways of understanding how these regions constantly shift, sort of national dynamics and regional dynamics as always being pushed around decomposed, recomposed, recreated in different and interesting ways. And we just want to be able to be part of that.

McClain:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal that the current Department of Asian and African Languages and Literature be renamed the Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies.

Passed unanimously. Thank you Leo.

Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy, Name Change

Professor Dan Schmitt is here to present the final proposal today requesting that the Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy be renamed the Department of Evolutionary Anthropology. Dan..

Dan Schmitt (Biological Anthropology and Anatomy): I know I'm the last thing on your agenda so I'll try to be brief which is actually pretty hard for me, but I'll do my best.

McClain: Please!

Schmitt : I feel like the previous speaker was charismatic and exciting and I want to be that charismatic and exciting. Anyway, let me just explain to you

what our motivation is and why we're so excited about this name change.

In 1988 there was the formation of the Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy and this represented a really revolutionary way of looking at departments that had taken anthropologists who were serving in the School of Medicine, anthropologists who were serving in Anthropology, as well as in other parts of the school, the School of the Environment, etc., and brought them together under one intellectual roof. But we were brought together under two administrative roofs, half of us were in the School of Medicine and half of us were in the School of Arts and Sciences.

This went along well for a number of years, and in 2004 and a few years running up to there, there was talk about unifying the department, bringing that department into the same building under the same governance. And there was a real belief – and I think it was correct – that although things were working well, we would have much more intellectual communication and collaboration if we were brought together.

And so that was done, and we were unified as the Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy under Arts and Sciences. And this was great. But it won't surprise any of you to know that this brought about a period of critical re-evaluation in which Arts and Sciences spent time some saying wow, we have some new faculty coming from School of Medicine and now we have this department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy, what do we want to do with it? And this has been great for us.

It took a few years of us deciding, developing a vision statement, and that was included in your supporting documents. What is exciting about this vision statement, what is, I think, different from a lot of vision statements, is this was a group-written effort. I'm sure a lot of you know that a vision statement, the chair has to write it and she writes it and sends it out to the department and people sort of look at it or they don't and then everyone votes for it in the end.

For this one, we sat down together and we discussed: what does it mean to be Biological Anthropologists at Duke University. What are our goals, what unifies us? We were even cool enough to have a Wiki site where we edited each other's vision statements. And it was very hip and young, or so I'm told. In the end we put together a vision statement and what came out of this vision statement...there was a lot of stuff that I won't bother you with. But what came out was what unified us, what kept us glued together in our discipline, was the study of human evolution, was the study of humans in an evolutionary context, placing human beings in their place in nature, but with an explicitly evolutionary focus. And that means the evolution of anatomy – that's the kind of stuff I study – the evolution of cognition, of the genomics that underlies this evolution, the evolution of mutual ecology within the environment. All of these kinds of things and what we wrote in here was decoding human evolution

within a specific evolutionary context in the area of evolutionary genomics, human behavioral ecology and paleontology.

And what that all goes to say is: we thought that the title Biological Anthropology and Anatomy, that had reflected for many years our dual role as both anatomists and anthropologists in the School of Medicine and Arts and Sciences, was now outmoded and that what we wanted was a name that expressed what we were feeling as a department and the kind of direction we wanted to go. And after a lot of debate, we decided that Evolutionary Anthropology expressed our goals, which is to say the study of human beings in an evolutionary context. And we're hoping...we would appreciate your support in making the name change as we proceed with a growing vision for the department.

Questions

Lori Setton (ECAC/BME): Do you anticipate it affecting the student population that you recruit?

Schmitt: Undergraduate population?

Setton: No, graduate.

Schmitt: Well let me answer your question. I don't think it will affect the graduate population and I'll tell you why. Duke is cutting edge. We are almost unique in being a department that consists entirely of biological anthropologists – often [elsewhere] it's a small core of biological anthropologists in a larger anthropology program.

And we really lead the country, if you'll forgive me for boasting up here, in the study of biological anthropology, not only as a discipline on our own, but in departments that are grouped. So graduate students, that's really not a problem at all. Our faculty size trims our students right now, but in terms of reputation and ability to recruit, that's not a problem.

There was some concern by our faculty and by previous groups I met with that we might need some undergraduate population. Because that word *anatomy* has really been great for the premeds. People who want to not really be premeds, but they want to say they got some anatomy...and what we're going to be doing is we're creating a committee of ... (Nothing wrong with being a premed; I don't want to be insulting to any doctors in the room here!) what we're proposing to the curriculum committee is we develop tracks within our major and there will be a track with *anatomy* in its name and a track with *ecology and behavior* in its name and that will be printed on their transcripts so they'll still have that. But it's a concern about that. And I guess there has been a little bit of concern about having the title *evolution* in there as well, but we feel like this really reflects our goals.

Blanche Capel (Cell Biology): Is there a home for anatomy? Will there still be a home for anatomists in your department? I'm thinking about what's going to happen to that discipline at universities. How will we teach our medical students anatomy?

Schmitt: That's a great question and you know that's really, really close to my heart. First of all, I hope to continue to be teaching anatomy in the School of Medicine at least for a little while, something that's important to us. And our discipline is founded on anatomy. The best of the early anthropologists, the people who followed right after Darwin, were the anatomists; the people who made the big strides.

Secondly, we will continue to offer highly subscribed courses like human body, forensic anatomy and a series of anatomy courses. So we want to continue our relationship with the Medical School and train postdocs. In fact we're working with the Medical School now that some of the teaching postdocs will be trained within our department very explicitly and in our labs.

So although it's not going to be in our title anymore, it's foundational to our mission and it was the foundational to Biological Anthropology. In some sense the title was redundant: to say Biological Anthropology and Anatomy is repetitive because it's so embedded in the history and core of the field.

McClain:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal that the current Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy be renamed the Department of Evolutionary Anthropology.

Passed unanimously.

As the new Council will be seated at the April meeting, today will be the last Council meeting for many of you – others of you will be continuing on the Council – I want to take this opportunity to thank all of you for your service on behalf of the university. Your service in this, the only university-wide representative body, is critical to our tradition of shared faculty governance at this university.

For those of you who will be completing your service on the Council, remember that you are always welcome to attend the Council meetings – you won't have to sign a sheet this time – to participate in deliberations and otherwise to insure that your voices will continue to be heard. That ends our meeting unless there is any other business from the floor. We are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, March 31, 2008