

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 22, 2007

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): I'd like to call the March Academic Council meeting to order. The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the February 22 meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

John is out of town today. His brother-in-law died last night and he's flown back to England to be with his sister. I'm sure our thoughts are with him at this time and with his family. My colleague Chris Counter is the honorary faculty secretary for today's meeting, thank you Chris.

This will be the last Academic Council meeting for many of you. No cheering here! Others of you will be continuing on the Council. I want to take this opportunity, at the beginning of the meeting, to thank you for your service on behalf of the faculty of this university and for the indulgent good humor you have shown me as chair. Your service in this, the only university-wide representative body, is critical to our traditions of shared governance and to maintaining and furthering the dynamism and humanity of this university.

For those of you who will be completing your service on the council, remember you are always welcome to attend council meetings, to participate in deliberations, or otherwise ensure that your voices will continue to be heard.

Commencement

Mary Champagne, the chair of the Commencement Committee, has asked for a few minutes on the agenda today: Mary.

Mary Champagne (Nursing): Good Afternoon. I'll keep this very brief. Over the last few years, faculty participation at our commencement exercise in Wallace Wade has decreased, and it's reaching a point where we have maybe a 175 faculty come. And as we look at the faculty who attend, many of them have gray hair, just like mine. So this is just a gentle invitation: [I hope you'll think about attending commencement](#). It's a very special day for our students, it's very beautiful, Wallace Wade. And I also hope that when you go back into your departments that

you'll talk to some of your colleagues. We know it's Mother's Day. We know that you have school – other ceremonies going on. But we really hope that each department will do its best to have faculty represent their department. So, I hope to see you or some of your colleagues there this May. Thank you.

Haagen: I'm not sure this is an additional incentive, but since I am the honorary faculty marshal, I'd like to have a parade behind me, and now that we have the Harry Potter backdrop, it's much more festive.

Athletic Council Reorganization

For the next item, we will invite President Brodhead to the podium to talk about the Athletic Council reorganization.

President Brodhead: Thank you Paul. So is this the last meeting you will chair?

Haagen: No. I have two more.

Brodhead: Oh, that's what I thought. Because I was about to improvise remarks that I have now postponed...

When we gathered last time you'll remember that we had a kind of general discussion about a variety of questions, not all of which had been on the agenda. Some had to do with the question of advising athletics in the university. I told you at that point that there was a proposal that was working its way to the Academic Council, and today it comes here.

There is at Duke something called the Athletics Council. It's a group that has faculty, it has students, it has alumni, it has athletic staff, it has quite a variety of people on it. It was constituted in a form that I believe was put in place in the year 1983. And when I came to Duke as President one of my early meetings was with Kathleen Smith who continues to be the Faculty Athletic Representative [FAR], and she said to me, my notes prove, that one of the things I should do early on was to review the Athletics Council.

Now, maybe I filed that away somewhere, but the point is I knew there was no point starting that review at my first day at work because I did not yet

know why one would want to review the Athletics Council or toward what end one would be conducting such a review. By the end of last summer, such matters were clearer (laughter). And at that point, I asked a quarter of you, again with Kathleen's full consent and indeed her recommendation, I asked as you know a committee that was chaired by Roy Weintraub to look at the current Athletics Council structure, and it said (you've had a chance to read it and I'm sure you have) that speaking without prejudice to all the good-will of the people who participated in that body, but as a helpful administrative structure, the current Athletics Council was, in its judgment, broken.

The group had too many people on it who had little sense as to why they were there – it wasn't clear what their formal business was, what they were authorized or charged with doing. Indeed, it was not clear who they reported to or, indeed, that they reported to anyone.

When I have been on such committees, you know what happens: someone has to make up an agenda to fill the meeting and the other people have to attend the meeting and the certain sort of spectatorial or disengaged quality results from these things, a sense that this is not absolutely the highest use that one's time has ever been put to – which has consequences on who will participate and how intently they will participate – and so you have a quality of passivity, disengagement, anxieties about levels of involvement, and I will say, and I know the members of the Weintraub committee also said: that's not good.

It would be fine if athletics didn't matter in a university or it would be fine if athletics didn't pose any questions in a university, but since in fact athletics does pose a variety of questions it's important for us to reason about, we need a structure within which such reasoning can effectively take place.

Roy's committee brought in a bunch of suggestions and you've had a chance to read them. It seems to me that those suggestions could all be grouped under four purposes that they were trying to achieve.

Their effort was to make the work of the Athletics Council more substantive and that has to do, among other things, with making the purpose of its various subcommittees more sharply focused: who do they take their charges from?

A second purpose was to increase the degree of faculty participation in the Athletics Council.

Third was to clarify who the Athletics Council reports to, or I might even say that its reforms were able to clarify that the Athletics Council does indeed report to someone, that it's not the kind of black hole of communication that it's sometimes have felt itself to be.

And then another of its suggestions was aimed at trying to disaggregate the roles of the leadership of the Athletics Council from the role of the Faculty Athletic Representative. Those two roles have been

played by the same person for many, many years as it is structurally specified. And, many people, including the FAR, thought that that had its problematic aspects.

You've read the report that came in. You like committees to take problems, theoretical ones, and put a real can-do practical intelligence to work in creating a solution to them. I think that what came in was something that really did have very clear ideas about how to make the work of the committees more substantive. How to make space for more faculty to become more knowledgeable about athletics...

It does clarify who will charge these bodies, who they will be with at the end of the year to report to, including their coming to this body, to report.

And it also did propose a system for a different way of chairing the Athletics Council.

I was very grateful for this report. When I first saw them, I thought I had a certain – I don't know that I would go so far as to use the word – anxiety, a certain trepidation about one of the suggestions. If you've read the report you'll remember there was to be a second body that had to do with the academic-athletic interface that was joined in an exceedingly complicated way with the academic subcommittee of the Athletics Council and it had overlapping membership. Really, it was a sort of Siamese-twin kind of structure. I was worried about this, and if we were about to adopt it, I still would be worried about it: that you were going to create two bodies that have substantively the same reason for being. Surely they would not both effective? And why should we ask anyone to be on any group that won't be effective?

It seemed to me that if instead of creating rival bodies, we took the Academic Subcommittee, beefed up the amount of faculty participation on it, and made that be the place where academic aspects of athletics are deliberated on and followed through with, you might come to a more practical solution.

The second thing in the committee's proposal is that the Athletics Council be co-chaired by the FAR and the head of that other ECAC semi-autonomous committee that oversaw athletic affairs. I have seen problems with bodies that have co-chairs. Usually one person effectively becomes the chair and the other effectively not, but which then should it be?

I referred these and other mysteries to this year's ECAC with which I actually had certainly more than one discussion of these. It's a fairly important subject and getting it right is very important.

And back came your suggestion, about how to integrate the academic consideration within an enlarged subcommittee and your suggestion – which I myself quite favor – of just simply separating the role of chair of the Athletics Council from the role of the FAR. The FAR will still be on the group, he or she will be one of the ex-officio faculty members on the academic subcommittee, but these will now be different responsibilities.

This proposal, after it had been vetted by ECAC, it had come back and we reached some agreement. I consulted with Roy as well. As you know, athletics policy at Duke is authorized by the Trustees, and so I took these proposals to the Trustees at their meeting in the last week of February. There was quite a thorough discussion of the proposals for change, and I think, quite a thorough appreciation of the reasons why these would be sensible changes to make. And so they were approved then.

I believe that we must realize that the new structure has to be regarded as an experiment. Let's not wait another than twenty-four years to see whether the new system works. It's important, we're doing this for a purpose. Let's do our best to make this work but let's check in after a little while to see whether in fact it does work and what corrections it might need.

So I think as we adopt this, we ought to ask ourselves for a little review of the structure after say three years or so.

I don't remember if this has been publicly announced, if not, shame on me... The faculty athletics representative for the past two terms – but ending at the end of this academic year – has been Kathleen Smith. I am very pleased to announce that the new Faculty Athletics Representative will be **Martha Putallaz** of the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, who is here and to whom I am most grateful.

A curious thing you will have learned from the report is that the FAR is suspected to be the President's agent. But I do want to say that, after all, the FAR is a faculty member who is standing as a faculty member, it is of the essence in my sense of your performance of your role. And indeed your name was suggested to me by ECAC and I would not propose it without consulting ECAC.

ECAC also suggested to me possible faculty members. We have not yet secured every assent from the list of people who have been asked to make the augmented group of faculty participation on that Council. But the person ECAC suggested to chair the new Council I thought was also a good suggestion and I've asked that person and secured his consent – this is **Michael Gillespie** in the Department of Political Science.

So I actually believe that, actually, if you sit there and read the (you know put on your green eyeshade and read) by-laws changes and scratch your head and make sure you got them all just right – this is deep bureaucracy! At the same time, wait, sometimes you go into deep bureaucracy in order to lay the administrative foundations for really important things and I think that this will be quite important.

Questions

Charles Clotfelter (Public Policy): I've got a question about the purview of the committee, and it's going to sound trivial – I want to know if the

cheerleaders are covered by athletics. I understand that the team would be. My understanding, back a couple of decades ago, was that the Athletics Department was in some sense in control of the band and the cheerleaders...and the reason I ask is that at least two basketball games that I went to, there is a time in the game when the cheerleaders, our cheerleaders, are holding up signs advertising in one case Harris Teeter and in another case holding up signs that says "CROCS," which I think is a kind of shoe. This might seem like a minor point, given the vast commercial value of some of our student athletes, but to me this presents a more direct engagement of our students in the commercial enterprise than I have noted before – and I wanted to know (you don't have to speak on its merit!) would this be part of the purview of this committee?

President Brodhead: Professor Clotfelter, I have an aspiration, and may it come to pass, that the day will come when I know the answer to every possible question that will ever asked, but I have not reached it yet. I have been to many games and I haven't seen this. I associate the cheerleaders with signs that say "D U K E"... If this turns out to be a serious structural issue I certainly would refer it to this committee. I believe I could probably get an answer to your question short of that process and I will attempt to do so.

It is my understanding that the cheerleaders aren't a team in the sense of a varsity team but I believe that the head of the cheerleaders is appointed within the Athletics Department so I know that there is a reason for your question.

Haagen: There is actually a specific response to that one. It has been referred to ACSAC for them to consider initially on the theory that it is part of a broader issue: when do we ask students to participate in any kind of commercialized activity? This faculty sub-committee clearly has control of its agenda, they can look at that. We've also asked UPC to look at the larger question of what kind of general rules and other considerations ought to go into commercialization in general. That's part of how you support this activity and it is on the agenda for UPC. So, I don't know that other groups can't pick it up but it is actively under consideration.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): To what degree are these presidential appointments or ECAC appointments to the academic subcommittee? Did that get worked out or changed from the original recommendations from the committee?

Brodhead: It may seem in practice that the difference is greater than it is. Because, I'll tell you the truth, when I appoint this group, I'm going to lean heavily on the advice of ECAC, and that's the whole point of the structure and indeed I tell you that the person I asked to be FAR was referred to me by ECAC. The person I asked to chair the new committee was, and actually all the names of the people I invited to assume the new faculty roles were as well.

Earl Dowell (Engineering): Since this is a review which was presumably precipitated by the lacrosse incident, would you comment on how you think the new structure would deal more effectively in the future with comparable incidents should they unfortunately occur?

Brodhead: Well, I would begin by saying that although this review was initiated in the wake of the lacrosse situation, one of the things you can learn from my remarks is that the desirability of the review was clear to those who had worked closely with this long before the lacrosse situation, and I know that Kathleen Smith is not the only person who had that view.

In the wake of the lacrosse situation we were eager to do a great variety of things. One was, and we did not wait for any committee report, to open up clearer communication between the world of student life and the world of athletics. This was revealed last spring to be a very problematic area. That there were things that certain parts of the campus knew about student conduct that weren't fully known on other sides and we have a much, much fuller system of reporting and the President himself is included in. I think that that's a safeguard.

I've been at a university that had a good functioning oversight body of this sort; I want this group to be like that. It is a very, very important thing. It's important for athletics because athletics should never be, and I do not believe it wishes to be, isolated from the rest of the university.

And also many of the questions about athletics that seem as if they have very simple polemical answers; in fact, you're going to have to go into considerable detail before you learn where the nature of the problem is or where the nature of the solution is. I actually think that that kind of good working process, year by year and not only in crisis, is very badly needed here. Have I given a sufficient answer?

Earl Dowell: I don't think you actually answered the question

Brodhead: I think I did though. Because, a disciplinary matter for athletes would be first of all potentially a matter in athletics because there's way coaches and athletics discipline student athletes – that is a function of the fact that they represent a university on a team. You know that people sometimes are not allowed – have to sit out a game as an athletic penalty separate from any university discipline. But then, of course, other disciplining would be done within the process of undergraduate student discipline.

The important thing it seems to me is to have there be some appropriate path of communication and coordination between those two things. The disciplining of individual students and sitting in judgment on individual student cases will never be the job of the Athletics Council. Overseeing the policy universe within which we identify the goals for students and

the nature of our program – that certainly will be within its province.

Earl Dowell: So the council would not be empowered, for example, to dismiss people from a student team for inappropriate behavior. Is that true?

Brodhead: Well, there are a variety of reasons why I don't think it would be so empowered. And one of them is the bylaws of the university. The disciplinary dismissal of a student would have to comport with the typical disciplinary processes of the university – which would not be lodged in this committee. Again, there is a way that certain things fall to the authority of the Director of Athletics, to the President, to whom that person reports.

Haagen: I have two additional responses. Lee asked a question about would this be a presidential committee with members appointed by the President or would it be an Academic Council committee. This may not be clear to those of you who have not had to go through the committee appointment process. There are three types of university committees. There are the President's committees, the Provost's committees which is about half the committees, and the Academic Council committees.

With the Provost's committees and the president's committees, ECAC nominates and the President and Provost select from among our nominations. That is a negotiated process and it has in my experience been a very positive helpful process. There has not been conflict.

This is a presidential committee.

The structure that came out of the Weintraub report would have had two different committees, one of which would have been an Academic Council committee, one of which would have been a presidential committee. This put them together but has a clear joint reporting responsibility; and with the reporting responsibility comes the ability of the council and of ECAC to help set the agenda. When people had talked about what this group could do, I'm sure that it shouldn't be involved in individual discipline. But you know one of the things that we're very clear on is that a critical part of this is the strength of the individual faculty that serve and chair on these committees. If you have very strong people and they have the right to set their agenda, then if we don't get it right, it's simply a failure of leadership. Clearly the faculty have the right to set elements of their agenda, raise questions, deal with parts of this, so I think we've built that into the structure.

Will Wilson (Biology): Yes, behavior on an individual basis is not a concern of this committee but at what point does group behavior become a concern of the committee? If fifty percent of a team is involved in some incident, does that then become a concern of this committee?

Haagen: You know, I think that we're probably into something where we should ask the new Chair of the committee what he thinks. I would take it that the question being asked is: Do we need to rewrite the

student athlete handbook? Do we need to look at a variety of other kinds of issues?

I don't think it's very helpful to get into those sorts of hypotheticals. This is really the group that deals with athletic policy, right? And it ought to be raising questions dealing with that set of matters. How the members of the committee will understand each issue as it arises will be critical. I expect that the committee's response will depend on how any particular matter develops and is presented, and what the faculty think about those issues in that particular context.

President Brodhead and Provost Lange both will speak to the next agenda item: the Campus Culture Initiative and the way in which we're going to deal with the next phases of the discussion of that initiative.

Campus Culture Initiative

Brodhead: I'll just say a quick word and then I'll call Peter up. At the time of the event a year ago, but intentionally meant to be separate and have a far larger scale than dealing simply with that event, as you know I asked a group to come together to ask the question: What is strong in the undergraduate culture of this place? And what could be stronger? And what are concerns and how could we address them? We understood that this was a group that would have to deliberate within itself and that would have to consult extensively outside itself – and there were many, many such meetings – and then make some recommendations.

I would like to begin by extending my very, very long thanks to Bob Thompson, who will speak soon up here, who, with Larry Moneta, co-chaired it – and to everyone who served on it. This was again not only faculty, there were also students, there were alums, there were representatives from the Athletics Office. And also I should offer my thanks to everyone who came to any of these meetings.

I trust that you read the report – it was issued at the last week of February – and that you also read my cover letter, if not committed it to memory! Just to refresh your memory, what is I think striking about this report is its extreme comprehensiveness in the areas in which it makes its recommendations.

Its recommendations extend from curricular matters to faculty-student interaction matters to issues of race and gender on campus to issues of housing and its allotment. To issues of dining, to issues of athletics, to issues of admissions, in other words it is comprehensive in its recommendations.

But the thing that I think is at least as important as that is that these separate areas of recommendation are all driven by goals that are articulated fairly powerfully in the early pages of the report. One of them is a goal for a broader and higher level of engagement: specifically for us to make this a campus not just technically diverse, but one in which students

actually experience the richness and difference of one another through their communal experience.

Secondly (I don't know what else to call it and I don't know if the committee would accept this word) it is the value of individuality. College is a time of life when people congratulate themselves on being so independent, but it is one of the many times of life in which people are actually quite susceptible to definitions of who they should be and how they should behave. And a very important part of this is trying to make this a campus in which people feel free, have the courage to be what they personally are becoming rather than simply the courage to become what everybody else seems to wish them to be.

These values of respect, values of community are very powerfully articulated in the report.

Now we come to the phase of implementation, and I just want to make clear, there is no surprise to this. There always was going to need to be another phase after the report came out. It was never the case that the report would come out and the next day the President or some other powerful person would pull the lever and all the lights would go on, you know what I mean? There are many, many reasons why this won't be so.

First of all, there are things which will take time, will require resources. It will take time to build. If we're going to change the dining model of this university, we actually have to do things at the facilities level that make that possible. It is very helpful, though, to have an articulation of the goal that can guide our work in those regards.

Secondly, there are areas where the report outlines goals I think we would all agree with, but the way to meet those goals will require further imagination on someone's part. Everyone favors faculty-student interaction for instance, but what the exact modalities are that would make that happen in some natural way is something that requires continuing imagination.

And a third reason why the switch couldn't simply be pulled on this is that we're talking about changing culture, we're talking about making the people who live inside it need to engage their understanding of these issues. We will not have changed the culture if we make external changes to the structure of a system within which everybody's personal understanding stays more or less unaltered. And so it was always our idea that at the end of this process we need to aspire to a big, rich debate about these issues in which we could hope all students would become actively involved, not only those who had come to our town meetings.

I'm actually fairly encouraged about this. To have read the series of editorials in the chronicle, the series of opinion pieces. People are actually taking up these subjects and worrying about them and working at them. So it seems to me that this is really off to a good start. Again, I say, my thanks to the committee, and now I call on my colleague Peter Lange to whom

I gave the highly gratifying task of sort of looking out, trying to coordinate the process of taking the recommendations for their resolution.

Provost Lange: So I was reading something this morning. I was reading a document called "Building Community of Interest: Report of the Task Force of the Intellectual Climate at Duke University." And I will offer a cup of coffee to anyone in this room, at the von der Hayden pavilion – even a cappuccino – who can tell me what that document actually is. And you Peter Burian cannot speak and Paul Haagen cannot speak and John Simon cannot speak. (laughter).

Ken Surin (Literature/ECAC): The Willimon Report.

Lange: No, no you don't get a cup of coffee. That's not right. So that's a document...

Haagen: Make him drink Starbucks (laughter)

Lange: Absolutely, great idea. I would gladly do a Starbucks. That report was written in response to the concerns about the campus climate in 1994 by a committee which was chaired by the esteemed Professor Burian and which also contained your chairman, Paul Haagen. That report covers many of the same points and arguments that are in the CCI report. Many of the same points – thirteen years ago. And I'm sure that if you go back – I don't have archives old enough to find a report twenty years ago – you will find other reports that cover some of the same points.

So those same themes are also in the planning document that were written in the task force for the planning of Making a Difference as an undergraduate experience document. These are not new themes. We've a long history of these themes at Duke. What might having such a long history tell us?

Well first of all, if you read the Burian report, or some of those earlier documents, one of the things you do learn is that a lot has changed. And one needs to be careful not to think that nothing ever changes in this university. And I think all of us who have been here a while are well aware that many things have changed. The way our students approach their learning, the way they approach each other, the way they approach us not all for the good, not all for the bad, but many, many things have changed.

Also it tells us that there are structural forces in higher education and institutions of our type which are not unique to Duke, that are not special to Duke, they influence all our institutions. And I think alcohol, the laws relating to it, and the way alcohol ends up being treated on campuses, is probably the most obvious of those structural forces.

Also we know that when themes like this continue to arise it's because they're built into the history of the institution and all the ways that history gets built into what we do, who elects to come here, what they learn about how to be a student once you get here, all those things which are the continuity of tradition. And I would say that they also are built into certain structural features – and now we get into the

most Duke-like thing probably. Structural features of our institution which handicap solutions, prohibit quick fixes, if such things exist. Think about the fact that every time people come up and say wouldn't it be great to have residential colleges. Of course, if you go to residential college places, they might not always agree with you, many of them would, but obviously building residential colleges is an enterprise which would be so expensive that we can't do that. So that's a solution which we structurally are impeded from doing.

Now I stressed how much has changed and how much persists that underlined the challenge that was faced by the CCI committee. And that we now face and are trying to move from that report's analysis and initial recommendations to operational plans for change, and that's the way I see it: that report has laid out an agenda. We do not want to have my successor or my successor to the successor of my successor as Provost get up here and say, "I was just reading a document – how many people in this room can tell me what the CCI report was?" We don't want to have that. And then go through this thing with me that I just went through.

So we have an excellent report which sets a powerful agenda for us with a set of recommendations that need to be taken with the greatest seriousness. At the same time, as the President has underlined, while the report is a critical foundation and a critical platform for change and for improvement, it also requires further reflection. And as Dick just said, it also requires us to engage a wider community than that committee could possibly have done. I say that not only because of the limited time that that committee had to do its work, but also the times in which the committee was to do its work. I mean just let's just remember in this somewhat more placid Spring what it was like in the early Fall or last Summer and try to think about taking on those themes in that atmosphere in a big public debate.

It wouldn't have actually been a terribly useful debate, perhaps, or a very constructive debate. Now we have the opportunity to do that. So very much part of the effort that we're now going to take is to pursue that debate. But around what kinds of questions?

Here I'm adopting much of what the President said in his letter. How can we create a Duke where every student will get the richest development of his or her personal powers while contributing to and benefiting from the larger community? That is, how can people grow as individuals – understanding that growth of individuals requires individualism or individuality – as well as the fact that that exists in a communal structure of many different types of people and many different types of groups?

How can we strengthen the values of inclusion, respect, and mutual engagement and at the same time, and I would stress this, learn how to disagree with one another in meaningful and respectful man-

ner? Because I believe we not only have to learn how to get along with each other, but we also have to learn how to disagree with one another. Either we create an environment in which everyone thinks the same or where everyone who doesn't think the same just submerges his beliefs in a context of this sort of popular belief.

How can we assure that athletics assumes the healthiest positive role it can, contributing to the development, health, and talents of our students through both inter-collegiate and intramural activities and through its contributions to the broader community? Or more generally, how can we build on what's already excellent to make Duke the best institution we can imagine?

The CCI, as I said, developed in a pressure-cooker atmosphere that meant its engagement with all the community could not be as deep and as wide spread as they might have wished...Now is the time to take its recommendations and push that discussion deeper and wider into the community as a preparation for advancing very specific recommendations for change which then themselves need to be directly acted on. In doing so, let me stress, we do not take it that all good ideas are captured in the CCI report. There are probably some people out there on campus or even in this room who have good ideas whose ideas did not make it into the report. Nor do we take it that all ideas put forward in the report will prove as good as they might be or as might prove to be the case after further discussion and reflection. We can learn things through that kind of discussion and we intend to do, we're going to do that. Now how are we going to actually proceed?

Well, we're taking a couple of pathways around some initial premises. First of all, as you all know, some things have already been implemented. Partly in response to what we were learning from the leaders of the CCI process as it was going forward, partly in response to other things, things like DukeEngage directly address themes and recommendations that are in the report. So we're already moving on some things.

Some things will require, as the President said, facility enhancements and the report provides us with a critical basis for thinking about how we best do those facility enhancements. I mean we're in a lucky position where we have a strategic plan, we've committed money for doing many of the things that need to be done, but we haven't spent the money yet. Imagine if this report had come out three years later and we had spent "x" hundreds of millions of dollars (or whatever the number would be) on facilities that we know said: oh my God, if only we had known.

Then there are two pathways. Many of the recommendations in the report need to go to specific committees and processes that are already in place. We do not intend to create new committees. One of the recommendations in the report is to reduce the number of faculty committees, so we're certainly not

going to create new ones. We have the committees out there.

As an example, there is a recommendation for a change in the Arts and Sciences curriculum with respect to the specific way the cross-cultural inquiry requirement is implemented. There is no reason to create a new committee about that. We can send a very specific charge to the curriculum committee of Arts and Sciences to examine that recommendation and bring forward its view of that recommendation and either endorse that or endorse some variant of it and explain why it endorses a variant of it in a fairly measured time period and we all know that can't be put in place in any case until the fall of 2008, so we can do this on a measured forced pace but not one which exceeds the capability of that committee.

Similarly, there are aspects for instance relating to admissions that are recommendations. We have an Admissions and Financial Aid committee – and it's in fact one which we've discussed with ECAC just yesterday – the strengthening of which will be a perfect place for those recommendations to be vetted and thought through. Even as they then go to other committees as we go along.

Other requirements require extensive engagement of students and faculty. And when we do this, we have to go beyond the usual suspects and that is probably the biggest challenge that we face. How do we talk to the people who don't talk back? Or when they talk back you don't want to hear them.

How do we talk to the people who don't show up at the meetings who don't show up at the open forums? And that can be not only students, it can also be faculty...So in that spirit we've started a process which in its first phases this Spring is designed to show everybody we're dead serious.

So let me tell you what we've been doing to show we're dead serious. In the week following the release of the report – the report was released on a Tuesday – by the following Wednesday my little group, which is really myself, [John Simon](#), [Susan Roth](#) and [Judith Ruderman](#), who are the ones who are sort of the core pushing this process right now, had met with the inter-fraternity council, the Pan-Hellenic council, the National PHC and the Inter-Greek Council – that was one meeting – the Campus Council and Duke University Union, the Duke Student Government, the Inter-Campus Council. We've had an open forum organized by Duke Student Government and we met with the President's Council. John had also undertaken a dorm tour and we had two charming dinners with [DSG President]Elliot Wolf.

That was the first phase. As you've seen in the *Chronicle*, the students believe that actually something has happened, which is a welcome sign, and I think their editorial policy also reflects that.

Now we're going to do our next phase which is between now and about the 19th of April with students, because that's about the end of the time we can really work with students, where we'll be meeting

with only the Pan-Hellenic council – so only the women’s sorority group, the Baldwin Scholars, Kappa Kappa Gamma, Delta Sigma Phi, (you know all these places, good luck) Brownstone, Black Student Alliance, Asian Student Alliance, Student Athlete Advisory Board, and a meeting with unaffiliated men – male students not affiliated with any fraternity or sorority or any other selective housing group or selective living group and unaffiliated women, who are not affiliated with any of the women’s groups.

So by the middle of April we will have had one round of interchange. And each of these really is a round of the kind of discussion I’ve been outlining to you. Where we say here’s our way of looking at the report, here are some recommendations; they have a sort of seminar-like quality. They talk, we talk, we push back, we try to get them to focus on issues, we try to know what they are really thinking about them.

And you get really interesting ideas as this comes out. Some of them converge, some of them are very different. Sometimes you hear different things when they are in mixed groups then when they’re alone, which is also itself an interesting thing to observe and there’s just a conversation that goes on. And we’re going to take all of those, those conversations and over the summer we’ll be taking a lot of the research that the CCI report generated as well as what we’ve learned from this, and there’ll be nothing done in the summer that we’re not sure that everybody will like. There will be some things done in the summer but nothing controversial. The students are deathly in fear, by the way, that the whole plan is to talk to them now and then do everything when they’re done. Which, after all, being a student of the sixties, I know the fear.

And then in early Fall, we’re going to meet again with a number of these groups, but having formulated a set of options around the goals, including the recommendation usually from the CCI report, perhaps only that, perhaps other ways of approaching the same goal and generate a more focused discussion from some of the same groups, new groups, and also to create a sort of advisory council that will meet on a regular basis that will bring faculty and students together. Ah yes, you might say. What happened to the faculty?

Well, we’ve already met, we have a whole set of meetings set up with all of the faculty representative bodies. But as is the case with the students, the challenge will be to get to the faculty that care about the culture of the campus but don’t show up at any of the meetings. Again, we’re going to need the help of ECAC and Arts and Sciences Council and Engineering Council and the Nicholas School Faculty Council to figure out ways of engaging those faculty in some of these things. It’s our guess that it’s better to do that around some focused options rather than simply around the report in general.

And then it’s our intention to bring to the President a set of specific recommendations or options for

recommendations late in the Fall which will then be put into the action at his direction, I hope very shortly.

So that’s the basic process we’re working on. I think it’s a serious one. I think we won’t have that conversation: whatever happened to the CCI report? I’m fairly certain we won’t have that conversation, and I think we’re going to be able to make some real, significant changes and we could not have done it without the great work that Bob and Larry and the CCI committee did over the last few months.

So that’s my report and I’ll be happy to take any questions or comments.

Questions

Earl Dowell: Peter, I was very encouraged to hear you say you have not yet spent the money that is earmarked for the Strategic Plan and there’s the opportunity to rethink at least a portion of that. And when you made your presentation to the Academic Council some time ago on the Strategic Plan my recollection is that we’re talking about 1.3 billion dollars for the total plan about 900 million for physical facilities of which 600 million is in Central Campus. In light of that, what portion do you think will be redirected towards implementing whatever recommendations come out of this process? And then you expressed some skepticism as to whether we could afford a residential college plan. Do we have an earmark, benchmark estimate for what a residential college plan would cost?

Lange: Well I could tell you a few things about that. First of all, I think that there is in fact a discussion going on right now with various faculty committees and it’ll eventually come up the Academic Council about how we prioritize the projects within that scheme in order to assure that we spend our money prudently and appropriately over some phased-in period of time.

That said, one of the critical things is how to balance changes on West Campus with the Central Campus project. Because I think we’re all aware that West Campus is one of the places where there are real opportunities and also real needs. Any of us who wander around in West Union very often will recognize that its not really a venue which we take full advantage of to promote the kind of life we would like among our undergraduates or interaction between faculty and students.

So those projects are still geared up towards the front. Now do I have a price tag on the residential colleges? Not exactly but I was told from old days and Tallman may know this. I think at one time didn’t we get an estimate I think of something like 100 million dollars per?

Tallman Trask (Executive Vice President): it depends on how big (rest inaudible).

Lange: Dick has experience and says it’s way up there.

Brodhead: I wonder if I could butt in on this? You asked your question as if the CCI report would make us understand the need to divert funds from some project like Central Campus for other purposes. Actually, my reasoning would be somewhat different. If you have this plan without the prospect of building Central Campus you would lack many resources for making its aspirations come true. This is a residential college but it has proper housing for nothing like the fraction of students we require to live on campus, if you think of Central Campus. To actually have the chance to build something that is an intentional communal space that has the effect also of helping to break down the boundaries between undergraduates and graduate and professional students, that actually puts some faculty in the neighborhood so students aren't in some generational ghetto, in the way they tend to be in American colleges, that's a highly important thing.

Central Campus also has the aspiration to build lots of arts facilities. You know the CCI report doesn't say this, but one of the things that is true that the CCI report hints at is that we need more things for students to do on this campus. One of the reasons that people drink so much or that the social life takes the alcohol center to that, is that it doesn't have enough rivals. It isn't that students would always prefer those in other cases. The event that was held in the library this year (did you go to this thing?). This party in the library that everyone was invited to. 2500 people were there. I thought it showed that students craved social life that isn't based entirely on, what would I say, the John Belushi model, if you know what I mean.

And so really, it seems to be that the building of central campus and if we think of West Union as a dining space, look at something like Twinnies in the Engineering School. When I go over there and I see the actual success that that has as a place where faculty, students, graduate students, nothing could be more natural or them to hang out together, run in to each other, because a space is provided that enables that.

If we're going to spend some money to rehabilitate West Union let's not just fix up the existing rooms, let's make it have that kind of functionality for the rest of the campus. I actually think that one of the really interesting – and as Peter said, fateful and happy coincidences – is that a certain amount of architecture will take place more or less coincidentally with the aspirations of this project.

As for a residential college system, I know a fair bit about that subject and I don't, I have not heard anybody, seriously advance the notion that is in Duke's future, but I would say to build what is seriously meant by a residential college, would probably, it would be a project of several billion dollars. At Princeton where they have tried to build the free-standing college, the price tags on them are very, very, very high. And making the transition from one

model to another is itself very full of difficulty as your friends and colleagues will tell you. It will probably be better for us to say, let's find the genius of Duke! rather than imitate the genius of somewhere else at an expense we can ill-afford.

Berndt Mueller (Physics): At least in my view, maybe the central issue here is alcohol. And when I read the report and it mentions that seven emergency-room cases happened during orientation week, then this is clearly not an issue that is primarily off-campus but it's brought onto campus to a significant extent. And so the report speaks in one of the final sections about adjustments to recruitment and admissions. This clearly would require some changes in how we describe ourselves and a serious consideration of our feedback and "branding" through the admission process.

The very thought is not to remind you, you're very clear, about how seriously the university is in attacking that issue. So I wondered whether you or Dick could say something to that.

Brodhead: Well I'll take it if you like, Peter. You'll know better than I. It is true that every college has alcohol problems in the first week of the freshman year. But that's not when they stop. You have ones there that are really the most alarming you encounter. If you stop and thought about it, you can ask yourself who has those problems? Is it students who've done lots of drinking before they get here – in some cases yes. But also in some cases it's students who have not been in atmospheres...you know there are places in this country where drinking is common in middle school. And then there are people who come to college from environments where that has not been part of their life. In my experience it's those people who have the greatest difficulty with the initial freedoms of college.

And so to some extent you can't solve that problem at the level of admissions. You can't solve it. If you could prove that you're only admitting students who have never had a drink before, you might actually find that the hospitalization rate went up the first week. The truth is, what we all know is, wouldn't it be nice to live in a country where drinking was thought was to be one of the social accompaniments of social life rather than the principal means to anti-social behavior calling itself social life? That's the system that would be the easiest.

Again, at the party at the library, it was not a dry event. Any student of legal age could drink and everyone who was of legal age I believe had a drink. But there was nothing out of control about it. It was just the social form of drinking and nothing else. That's a problem that's not altogether in our power to solve – the legal conventions created by the American drinking age.

As for admissions, you did use some words that I think are quite important and I think very much in the spirit of the report which is trying to make sure that we avail ourselves of all the feedback loops that help

Admissions know what kind of gamble pays off in what kind of way. It's not actually altogether easy to trace that causality. If you sit down with a hundred folders and trace a hundred careers but one would try to learn certain lessons.

You also used the word "branding" – I assume by that you mean the extent to which this school has been known for its play-hard atmosphere. Well that does an injustice to this place. It does an injustice to this place. And this has been a serious work of mine this year – I've spent a lot of this year on the road speaking to at least three thousand alumni in ten or twelve cities by this point. I have taken along with me faculty and students who exemplify the great uses you can make of an education here, and actually I have thought the audiences to be extraordinary grateful to be reminded of these kinds of possibilities. We have got to play up our strengths and make our strengths be more central to the identity we project.

Provost Lange: But I think the other thing, if I could just add, goes back to something that Dick just said a few minutes ago. The more options we create for people to do other things than drink themselves into oblivion, the more options we create where they can even drink but drink as part of an activity that is no different than that which most adults do, the better off we will all be, and the better off our campus will be. And then we will still have a problem. But that problem will have been reduced and it will have become more socially isolated because others will recognize that it is a problem. The problem right now is that it's not socially isolated.

Lee Baker: I have one question. I think the way that you're involving faculty discussion and going as well to the students, I think that's important. I guess my concern in terms of implementation is the group that is going around and synthesizing this, really does seem, well, to be frank, the second floor of the Allen building and a lot of the information and the report was generated from sort of the college and other students and how would you respond to people thinking that this is going to be a sort of top-down implementation? And I guess my big question, is what's the relationship between your research in this phase and the undergraduate leadership team which is really a nice integration of different schools and folks around?

Lange: I actually think that what I'd like to do is defer that question for about five minutes and let the president do the third part of the program and then I can either come back to it or he can.

Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas School): A general question in terms of, going this route, I just wonder to what extent we've developed a kind of consumer culture. It's really hard for me to imagine that there's not enough options on campus. This constant, let's build more, let's build more spaces, let's build the plaza. At some point, let's think of this becoming a type of consumer kind of culture. There is a lot of stuff to do on campus. There must be a lot of stuff to

do in Durham. At some point – there's not enough stuff to do and we have to provide options.

Lange: Well that an interesting question. First of all, it depends about what we're talking about doing. There are literally four hundred student organizations. Isn't that right, Larry [Moneta]? Four hundred. Okay. So we don't lack... So that's what one student organization for every 15 students... But I mean there are many things of that sort, what I'm talking about more when I say that is the kinds of opportunities to hang out around recreational activities in sometimes, well, it's basically hang out space. The von der Hayden is a big hit, but you do have to read in there or at least pretend to read or sleep. I mean a lot of students sleep, adults do too. But if you talk to students for instance – and I think Larry's here, he can confirm and Bob was working with the committee, you know – if you ask students what do you do between classes? it's an interesting question. What happens if you have a class on west campus and then you don't have another class for an hour and half. What do you do?

What's the usual answer? Email. Hey, which is a pretty isolating experience. We don't have a lot of, where you just wander over. Maybe I'll go shoot some pool or maybe I'll go bowl a string or whatever. Or it's – I'll go to von der Hayden. We have to find more opportunities for those kind of hang out. And there's a reason not just to occupy their time but those are the places where diversity and meeting kids from lots of different backgrounds around some activity that you all want to do, despite where you're coming from, so to speak, that we need more of that. That's what I'm talking about.

Undergraduate Education and Experience

Haagen: The last item on the agenda is Undergraduate Education and Experience and President Brodhead will make remarks.

Brodhead: I am wearing a hole in the carpet between my seat and this podium I have gone back and forth so many times. I apologize for it. I want to make an announcement that is not one of the recommendations of the Campus Culture Report but it seems to me is quite in keeping with the spirit of that report and will in fact I believe help us fulfill some of the deep aspirations of it. Namely, I want to announce a new leadership position, and in effect a new leadership structure for undergraduate education at Duke.

I think a person coming here and doing a sort of study or survey of the administrative structure of undergraduate life here would be struck by the division of labor or one might even say the compartmentalization of function. We have made clear and important provision on the academic side of things. We have made clear and important provision on the student-life side of things. But there is some separation of these things. So if it's a question of advising – well

if that's academic advising you look toward one direction, and if we're talking about career advising or psychological advising he would then be looking towards another part of the structure altogether.

And then of course there are further subdivisions because the academic support of undergraduates involves the separation between Trinity College and Pratt and then to a lesser but important extent the Nicholas School.

All this in spite of the fact that if you follow any undergraduate around everyday what will impress you is the absolute non-compartmentalized nature of his education. That everything flows into everything else and everything feeds on everything else. So where your friendships leaves off and where your classroom work begins; where your formal extracurricular activity and sort of everyday enlightening conversation takes place; that life is possessed of a quality of wholeness.

And don't forget in our own strategic plan we worked to try to press the integration of the elements of education including the formal academic or informal, extra-academic ones.

I am extremely grateful to the people who have worked in support of undergraduate education at this place. I think that they are exceptionally fine people and that they work exceptionally hard. I also think that those people have recognized the problem or issue of a kind of compartmentalization of structure here; I know they have, because I have watched the very high degree of intentional collaboration and cooperation that have been achieved, for instance between the Trinity College office and student affairs folk who recognize that these problems are not separate problems and therefore one has to stream across these lines.

And then I take notice of things like the undergraduate leadership group that Peter Lange has convened and led in years which is trying to pull together, you know, pull together student life, pull together the academic components. And then last spring one of the things we wanted to do with Athletics was make sure that athletics became a member at the table of undergraduate leadership. Because it isn't a separate issue from the university, we don't have varsity graduate and professional student teams. You know? That's also a part of undergraduate experience but also one again one that has its own administrative separation here. As I say, I think there have been heroic levels of cooperation across fairly challenging structural obstacles to get us to the place where we are now, but it seems to me that we reach a place where it would actually help to make a structural address to these issues and that's what I want to propose today.

We will be creating a new position at Duke: it will be called the Dean of Undergraduate Education and this will be a person who will give unified and unifying leadership to all the aspects of undergraduate educational experience. Many people will have to

work well with this person and I cannot tell you that we can unveil on day one the whole structural plan of who will go where and what will go where. We'll have to work that out in practice, but after all since team work and learning how to make complementary skills complement each other is one of the things we're here for, I count on that to be something that we'll be able to do in practice.

I believe this position will give us something that I think is of some importance here. If you say who is the person at Duke who is authorized to be the spokesperson for the philosophy of undergraduate education, its not altogether clear who the answer to the question is. That will be one of the important functions of this person, it seems to me. Not to blank out differences or to ignore significant differences but really to provide integration across those lines.

I believe this person must be faculty member, it must be somebody who shows the sense of the importance of teaching and the interaction that's symbolic there. Shows some sense of the nature of the resurgent university and the special resources, special challenges of conducting undergraduate education in such a setting. It has to be somebody who visibly cares for the well-being of students, both in the academic and outside the academic domain, and is willing to learn a lot about those domains and to help us think about how to put all those things together.

This position will report to the Provost. In a sense what we're doing is making a position out of the undergraduate leadership group. It's just the kind of way it happened but since we have nobody to lead the effort at an inter group structure the Provost came to chair the undergraduate leadership group. This person will now chair that group.

There is after all the dean of the Graduate School here who looks out over the issues of well-being of students across the whole domain of students of the graduate school. This will have its differences but this will have its parallels, it seems to me. I am very pleased to announce that [Peter Burian](#), who has some familiarity to the Academic Council, has agreed to chair a search for this position.

Our thought is that the first appointment needs to be an internal one. It has to be somebody who understands this place, they can't spend their first two or three years trying to think how in the world it works if their job is to help promote its integration. We will ask you for names and the Provost and I will be hoping to make an appointment into this position by the end of this academic year.

I also should say, you see why he delayed you...This – you know the “second floor,” the “second floor of the Allen building” – what a hideous phrase. Unless of course you meant it in its proper sense of yearning an admiration! But in truth, one of the things we look at, if you look at the campus culture initiative where are you going to sort alcohol, athletics, admissions, dining? These issues, they are all absolutely fundamental issues of undergraduate

experience, but they do not track along the lines of academic versus student affairs. If we think of the program like the DukeEngage program that we talked about here last time. The whole point is that is not an extra-academic nor is it a straightforwardly academic program. This is a university that really has the capacity to promote the thoughtful integration of the dimensions of experience and this position is simply meant to give us the means to do that.

Earl Dowell: How does this person relate to Vice-President of Student Affairs and what is the relationship between this person and the folk in the several schools: Trinity and Nicholas?

Brodhead: This person will have to work out the exact details of the cooperation...As you know, the Dean of Trinity College reports in important ways to the Dean of Arts and Sciences; that will continue to be true. The people who are in charge of undergraduate education in Pratt, in Nicholas, will continue to have their references within their school; but to the extent that there are issues that are issues of general undergraduate education, we will ask those offices to come within the cooperative structure that will be lead by this person. The Vice-President of Student Affairs has responsibilities that are not exclusively undergraduate. Graduate student life is also served within that office and so this position cannot be simply subordinated to the new dean.

So our idea is that going forward that position will report in a direct way to the Provost and will take direction in functional terms for undergraduate matters from the Dean of Undergraduate Education.

Earl Dowell: I'm sorry, the Vice-President of Student Affairs is going to report to whom?

Brodhead: To the Provost and will take direction in undergraduate affairs from within the position of the new dean.

Barbara Shaw (Chemistry): I'm very happy to see that there is an initiative on culture on campus. What I don't see, or what I haven't heard, is actually what is the involvement of the faculty in this? Everything you told us was, I think, coming from people from the Provost's office who are meeting with these diverse groups of undergraduates. And it seems to me that there is a lot going on among the faculty that is not being, not known to the higher administration.

Brodhead: God forbid our omniscience should ever become total!

Barbara Shaw: Obviously you can't know everything, but I would think that some of the cultural aspects of this should evolve from the faculty who are the ones who are teaching the students directly and who are having the students work in their laboratories and who don't have enough space in their new laboratories, for example, to see all their post docs and graduate students, let alone try to bring in any undergraduates who could be involved in the culture of science education.

There are just a number of things, for example, we have a new building, and we had a volleyball

court in the old place. Now there's no volleyball court. Now that was a very good socializing place. But our new building doesn't have it. We don't have the types of lecture rooms that we had in Gross Chemistry, we're missing good lecture halls and we're supposed to be, it doesn't seem there's going to be replacements for those, either small group experience learning places. So, I guess, my sense here, and I'm not trying to be critical, I'm trying to be helpful, that I do think that, that the faculty would like to have a say and have there be some formal way of doing this, so that our, our ideas about what we think is important for the students we teach can be heard.

Brodhead: I see Peter taking to his feet.

Provost Lange: So, I elided this piece of my talk in order not to take too much time. So between now and the – just to give you a sense of the first phase and then we'll do the second phase after this summer – between now and May 15th, we will be meeting with the executive committee of the Arts and Sciences Council, the chairs of all the natural science departments, and chairs of all the social sciences departments, with ACSAC – which is the Academic Council for Student Affairs Committee – with the chairs of the humanities department, with the Nicholas School faculty council, with the Pratt faculty council executive committee, with the directors of many of the centers, with the Pratt departmental chairs.

And then in the fall when we have a series of options that- that is where I was discussing before where we intend go back, not only to those groups but also perhaps to departmental meetings, which is another way of getting at the faculty who do not show up or are not part of those other groups. So we have a fairly extensive set of discussions planned for the faculty as well, and I apologize for rather quickly going over that in my earlier remarks and I probably should have focused on that and not the students and that's my fault.

Barbara Shaw: Can I ask a question? What about those of us who are not a member of any of the organizations?

Lange: I think that's what I just, I just said. You know, I said earlier, there is the difficulty of getting to the non-usual suspects. Those of you who saw the movie will know what I am referring to. So we have to think and we have to work with faculty bodies and with faculty members who write us. One thing is to go to departments, for instance, departmental meetings. Another is to go to buildings and you know announce that everyone in the building, that there'll be a forum so we can go to the French Science Center and you could leave your students in your lab and you could come out to the meeting and we could have a meeting in French for all the faculty that are in the French to discuss issues. I mean, we have to think of mechanisms for doing that, and I fully accept that, but because we don't want to just talk to a limited set. But the place to start is the elected or ap-

pointed faculty bodies- – appointed and elected not by not by us but by the faculty themselves.

Linda Franzoni (Engineering): I just want to ask a question about timing (I know you said you're not going to implement something this summer): timing of two things, the position you just announced and when do you expect that appointment to be made? Or maybe Peter knows more, I don't know.

The second one would be the timing for these recommendations in the CCI. For example, if anything were done with respect to selective housing, would you anticipate that (obviously not for this coming Fall) would it be the following Fall?...

Lange: You know, I'll speak to the latter one. On the latter one, it would really depend on what was decided to be done. If you said the changes you needed to make to selective housing required significant changes in the dorms, if you were to say that, then obviously the implementation would take longer. If you said you could do it with the structure of the current dorms, then sure, the Fall of 2008 would seem the natural time to begin to talk about that

Brodhead: as for the first one, I meant to say it and if I neglected to, I apologize. I revealed the head of the search, and the rest of the search committee will be revealed in short order and it's our hope that that committee will bring in a list of relevant things and that the Provost and I will make that appointment at the end of this academic year and to be more explicit I certainly think that by the end of June we attempt to fill that position and have it be up and running before the new academic year takes hold.

Haagen: Thank you Dick. Peter [Burian], did you want to make any comments about the search or? (laughter)

Peter Burian (Classical Studies): I anyone has ideas they would like to share with me I would be glad to receive them (pburian@duke.edu) for starters.

Haagen: One of the things I think, along with wearing out the Divinity School's carpet that's potentially a problem in the way we presented this is Dick and Peter have come up to present each of these issues, and I think that it can give the sense that this is a series of matters being foisted on the faculty and the University by the second floor.

I believe on each of these three matters we have had absolutely extraordinarily effective cooperation on ECAC with the administration. It's really been quite remarkable, to take the example of the Athletic Council, the President appointed a committee, the committee reported to him, he had the committee meet with us, we went through additional consultative processes, several meetings with the president on ECAC, came out with proposals, and it represents, I believe, a kind of collaborative effort.

On the rollout of the Campus Culture Initiative, I was disappointed in the way the Provost presented our task force on intellectual life. It led to a great moment in my personal life along with meeting and

getting to work with Peter [Burian]. It was the only time I ever presented a report, and I presented that one because Peter Burian went off to Italy leaving me to do it, where the presentation was so effective that it led members of the Council to ask me out on dates. It certainly never happened before and sadly never since, but in light of those requests how can the Provost say that nothing came out of that particular exercise?

But on a much more serious matter, we have, we have been incredibly pleased on ECAC with the approach to the CCI report. The way in which the President and Provost have both committed themselves to insuring that the report will go through the normal faculty governance structure has been very positive. In fact, they have gone beyond those structures in trying to insure full faculty input. This carry-through frankly did not happen in 1994, and I think there was actually some deliberate resistance. This has been a very full consultative process, and I think that ECAC is very positive about it.

The last item, the reorganization of undergraduate administration, is something that we have been talking about for some considerable period of time and where I think there is very, very significant enthusiasm for change. It really represents the possibility of a uniting of things. Back in 1994 (Peter Burian may remember this) we talked about Duke, in a mocking of Jefferson's vision for the University of Virginia, as not creating the academical village but building an academical suburb in which social and academic life were completely divided.

I think we saw back in 1994 some of the problems when your administrative structure tends to mirror that division and tends to make it very hard for the people dealing with it to reach solutions – not because they're not interested in reaching solutions but because the structure tends to drive them in different directions. So the thing I want to say is that for me, today is actually the culmination of what I believe are some really productive interactions between faculty governance at Duke and the President and Provost, otherwise known as the second floor of the Allen Building.

Lange: Don't forget Tallman!

Peter Burian: Just for the record, I would like to point out that apropos faculty-administration interaction, that the second floor also houses the Department of Classical Studies. We are back where the carpet ends (laughter)!

Brodhead: As part of our move toward greater integration, the administration and the Classics Department will soon merge (laughter)!

Haagen: On the academic programs committee, the Provost presented some of the rollout of the CCI at the last meeting, and I must say I was getting very concerned about Gregson Davis, and Peter who kept talking about the need to control Greek life (laughter) and I wasn't quite sure what that had to do with the Classics Department...

Are there any other comments, questions, or concerns? There being no further business before this body I declare the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, April 10, 2007