

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
304 UNION WEST  
BOX 90928

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

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday May 8, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the April 17 meeting. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes as written? Approved. Thank you John very much for very good minutes.

The bylaws of the Academic Council provide that it meet monthly during the academic year from September to May, and at such other times as the Chair or Executive Committee (or ten members of the Council) may request. In recognition of the fact that it is likely to be difficult to convene a meeting of the Council during the summer, or between terms, the Christie Rules provide that this Council may at the May meeting delegate to ECAC authority to appoint a committee to act in a consultative role to the administration when the University is not in regular session. On behalf of ECAC I will now introduce a motion that this Council give ECAC that authority.

**Whereas the Christie rules provide that at the last meeting of the Academic Council in any given academic year, the Council may delegate to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, the authority to appoint a committee of at least 3 council members to serve in a consultative role to the administration when the University is not in regular session. And whereas the Christie rules note that this committee should normally consist of members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, if they're available, ECAC recommends that the authority to create such a committee be delegated to the Chair of the Executive Committee to the Council, and that such a committee, once formed, would remain in operation until the first day of the Fall semester of the 2008-2009 Academic Year.**

[Motion passed without dissent.]

McClain: (I really like this part of the last meeting!) Earned Degrees....

### *Earned Degrees*

#### **Diplomas dated May 11, 2008**

##### *Summary By Schools And College*

##### Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

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

Bachelor of Arts	771
Bachelor of Science	445

##### Pratt School of Engineering

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

Bachelor of Science in Engineering	217
Master of Engineering Management	52

##### School of Nursing

###### [Dean Catherine L. Gilliss](#)

Bachelor of Science in Nursing	-
Master of Science in Nursing	54

##### Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences

###### [Dean William L. Chameides](#)

Master of Environmental Management	106
Master of Forestry	3

##### Fuqua School of Business

###### [Dean Blair Sheppard](#)

Master of Business Administration	538
-----------------------------------	-----

##### Divinity School

###### [Dean L. Gregory Jones](#)

Master of Theological Studies	14
Master of Divinity	122
Master of Theology	7

##### School of Law

###### [Dean David Levi](#)

Master of Laws	98
Juris Doctor	201
Doctor of Juridical Science	1

##### School of Medicine

###### [Dean Nancy C. Andrews](#)

Master of Health Sciences	61
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	13
Doctor of Physical Therapy	40
Doctor of Medicine	90

The Graduate School  
Dean Jo Rae Wright

Master of Public Policy	40
Master of Arts in Teaching	3
Master of Science	46
Master of Arts	132
Doctor of Philosophy	151

TOTAL 3213

Provost Lange: Might the Provost be authorized to congratulate Dean Thompson since is the last time that he will be performing this function for Trinity College of Arts and Sciences?

McClain: I think he should be, yes. Thank you  
Bob. (applause)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Voting on Honorary Degrees

*Election of Faculty Ombudsman*

Next on the agenda is the appointment of a very important position: the Faculty Ombudsman. This position is described in Appendix M of the Faculty Handbook. With your agendas you received brief information on Professor Jeffrey Dawson, who is ECAC's nominee for the Faculty Ombudsman. The faculty handbook indicates that the ombudsman reviews complaints and has jurisdiction over issues relating to the faculty at Duke....

Jeff is a Professor Emeritus of the Department of Immunology. Many of you probably already know him from his having served multiple terms on Academic



Council, the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee and the Executive Committee of the Graduate School. Jeff has served on search and review committees and chaired the President's committee on Facilities and Environment.

**ECAC now moves that the Academic Council endorse Professor Jeffrey Dawson for a two-year term as Faculty Ombudsman.**

[Motion passed without dissent.] Congratulations Jeff. We are really pleased.

*Proposal from the Nicholas School and Pratt School to establish a dual Master of Environment Management and Master of Engineering Management*

The next item on the agenda is a vote on the proposal from the Nicholas School and Pratt School to establish a dual Master of Environment Management and Master of Engineering Management (MEM/MEMP). The proposal was presented at the April 17 meeting and if there are no additional questions on this we can proceed to the resolution:

**Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal to establish a dual Master of Environmental Management and Master of Engineering Management (MEM/MEMP) degree.**

[Motion passed without dissent.]

*University Priorities Committee Annual Report*

McClain: Warren Grill has just completed his first year as chair of the University Priorities Committee. Warren will highlight some of the committee activities and take your questions.

Warren Grill (BME): Thank you Paula. This is our committee [slide] and I'd just like to point to a couple of things about our committee. First of all, Katherine Schipper, who is a professor in the Fuqua School of



Business, was invaluable on this committee in translating arcane complex financial issues so that people like myself could understand them. I don't know if Katherine is on the Academic Council, but a special thanks goes to her. And as well Hof Milam from Tallman Trask's office and Jim Roberts from the Provost's office were extremely helpful in supporting the committee and very responsive in providing information that we asked

for as well as helping to set the agenda for the committee during the academic year.

We (UPC) covered a large number of agenda items. We met about twice monthly during the academic year and our charge is not particularly to vote. And in fact we don't vote on anything. Our charge is to advise the administration on how the resources of the university – namely the money that we have – should be aligned with our academic priorities. We review how money is being spent and the strategy by which the university is pursuing our mission and aligning that mission with our financial resources.

I'd just like to highlight a couple of things, because they will come before this committee next year. One, which is quite far down our list and which we spent two meetings on, is a revised policy for the distribution of patent revenue.

If you are an inventor at the university then of course Duke is your employer and they own your invention. But unlike most employers, who keep all the money, the revenue, from that invention for themselves, the university shares that money with the inventor. Currently the split is that you as the inventor get 50% of any revenue that comes in after expenses. The laboratory gets 10% and the other 40% goes to the administration.

There is a proposal to change this split so that you as the inventor will get 40%, 20% will go to the Graduate School to further our mission of graduate education and the other 40% will be returned back to the deans – because the deans have been supporting the Office of Licenses and Ventures and previously they have not had any revenue. So it is a better alignment between revenue and expenses and it will also take money that previously was going to the inventor and the inventor's lab that is benefiting one and giving it to the Graduate School where it can benefit many.

I'm not asking you to vote on this today. I just wanted you to be aware of it because it will come up next year. Any questions. Alright thank you...

### *Name change for the Nicholas School*

McClain: Dean Chameides has arrived from the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences. He is here to request that the school be renamed Nicholas School of the Environment.

You received supporting documentation with your agendas and Dean Chameides will make a few comments and respond to any question you have. Bill..

Dean Chameides: Thank you. That was quick.

McClain: We run a tight ship!

Dean Chameides: That's true of the entire university because of our fearless leaders.

Good afternoon. I've been here about 8 months and I'm here to request that we change the name of the school from the *Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences* to the *Nicholas School of the Environment*.

Some time around 1991 we changed our name to the Nicholas School of the Environment and I can tell you that as someone who has been in the field, in fact as

an earth scientist, when the name was changed it sent a ripple through the entire community as a really profound and original idea. Because we always talked and thought about the fact that we study the earth and study the environment we need to study it as a whole. I spent, as director of a school, about a year deciding to change our name from the school of geophysical sciences to something else and we finally came up with earth and atmospheric sciences. And then we heard about this School of the Environment and we were very, very impressed because it captures...what it really is about when we say we want to understand the earth and...the environment as a whole.

The Duke school's name was changed again – I believe sometime around 1998 or 1997 – as a result of the integration of geology with the School of the Environment – to the *School of the Environment and Earth Sciences*, as a recognition that we had two separate faculties, in a sense, joining the school.



There was a significant difference in philosophy and approach between the folks who were working in the Earth Sciences and the folks who were in the School of the Environment. Since that time I think we've made a lot of progress in terms of integrating and recognizing a joint vision, a joint mission and a combined understanding of what we are about. So when I arrived here about 8 months ago, interestingly enough,...it took me a couple of weeks to a month to actually realize that the name wasn't the School of the Environment, but was the Environment and Earth Sciences. I started thinking about that and I really felt that it was perhaps time to change the name back, if for no other reason than we have made so much progress...to becoming a unified faculty. I felt the name, the School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, was symbolic or a reminder of all of us that we were once two faculties and it was time to change the name back as being symbolic of the fact that we are now one faculty.

After some discussion...the faculty agreed unanimously ('with one exception' is an interesting way to put it) to change the name back to School of the Environment with the understanding that when we say the School of the Environment we mean it in the most inclusive sense, including what we might call the more

physical sciences of the earth, the earth sciences – ocean and atmospheric sciences, for example.

And so I'm here today to request I guess your approval (is that how it works?) to make the change. I think it's going to be a very positive step for us. I think a lot of people out in the community actually don't realize our name was changed and I think it's going to be good for everybody's understanding of what we're about to be called the School of the Environment once again. ...Thank you.

### Questions

Joel Marcus (Divinity): I was wondering, if someone was interested in studying geology would they be attracted to a program that advertised itself as the School of the Environment. Would they know to apply there?

Chameides: Well, if they came to our website they would see that we have a division of Earth and Ocean Sciences. I think that it is definitely true that we will probably lose some hard-core students who are interested in studying geology, just as we might lose some hard-core students who are interested in studying ecology because we are not the School of Ecological Sciences. But I think it's far more important that we recognize that our vision at Duke, in terms of understanding the environment, is significantly different from the vast, vast majority of environmental-earth type programs around the country, and indeed around the world, in that we are multi-disciplinary. We are interdisciplinary. We are inclusive. And so I think that we will lose some students. We'll gain a lot of other students. And it will send a message to us as well as the rest of the world of what we are about. Thank you.

McClain:

**Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal from the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences to change its name to the Nicholas School of the Environment.**

[Motion passed without dissent.]  
Congratulations!.

### *Global Health Initiative request to appoint regular-rank, non-tenure-track faculty*

Michael Merson who is the director of the Global Health Initiative is here with the Institute's request for approval to appoint regular rank non tenure track faculty. You received the proposal and rationale with your agendas. Michael will make a few comments and respond to any questions you have.

Michael Merson (Medicine, Director, Global Health Institute): No request yet for a change of name! Thank you for inviting me here. We want to request authority to appoint regular-rank, non-tenure-track faculty. Let me say, as an ex-dean at another institution, I appreciate the importance of this request and realize that nothing is more sacrosanct than the faculty. And we're doing this because we feel that this is important for the institute, particularly in situations where we have faculty

(and I must say this will be *occasionally*), who are highly interdisciplinary and don't ideally fit with a particular department or a particular school. I imagine that these will be more in the research track and would fulfill an important need of the institute's research agenda. It might also occur occasionally in the practice track.

I think the most important thing I can tell you is that since I've come, about 18 months ago now, we have set up bylaws for the institute that were done in consultation initially with the Provost. We then got feedback from the Executive Committee of the institute, which is made up of 20 faculty from across the university. We then created what we call *members* and *affiliates* and it would be the members that would vote on this faculty according to very strict guidelines that were set out in the proposal before you.

I guess the last point I would make is while, as I mentioned, I can see us doing this only occasionally, I would wherever possible hope that we could still find departments and schools that would appoint such faculty, perhaps giving them secondary appointments rather than primary appointments.



My goal may be lofty...but my goal would be that any faculty we would appoint in a primary way, any regular-rank non-tenure-track faculty, my goal would be that they all would have a secondary home on campus. That would be my goal. I don't know if we would always be able to do it, but that would be my intention. Our institute is really a university institute. Fortunately, we've managed in a short period of time to work with many partners around the campus and part of that is sharing faculty. So I guess I'm requesting your approval to allow us that authority.

### Questions

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): How are these faculty supported financially?

Merson: I think all of them would have to have adequate funding or we could not appoint those faculty. We would either fund them through institute funds or their own research funds or other funds that they would bring with them. We could not appoint anyone that we did not have sufficient funding for.

McClain: This is similar to what came through on SSRI. There is now a template that the provost's office has developed that these requests have to follow. So this is in line with the SSRI.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): Could you sketch out the role that these faculty would play in undergraduate education?

Merson: In undergraduate education...well I might imagine a faculty member – perhaps this would be occasional – but I might imagine...I have a faculty member now with me who has a Ph.D. in social psychology; pretty much her full time work has been working with undergrads and helping them to develop research projects for their time abroad.

Now they all have mentors, in principle, in their own departments, but it's helpful to have a full-time faculty member or...(right now she's not faculty, but a full-time person who knows methodology) to work with the undergrads. She doesn't have a faculty appointment right now – she's a Ph.D., as I mentioned, in social psychology, but she's an excellent methodologist. And I would imagine we might consider someone like her for such an appointment. She has a number of publications as well related to her educational work. Before coming here she was at MIT. These are not going to be common.

But another example I might give you is we have...in our operation in Tanzania we have an epidemiologist who is very good and many students who go to Tanzania have an opportunity to work with that epidemiologist. He doesn't have a faculty appointment right now, but I think he's a Ph.D. epidemiologist with a number of publications and I think we would probably consider him for a position. And indirectly that would certainly help students when they go abroad. Maybe those are two concrete examples that I think would help undergraduates.

Warren Grill: The same issue that I raised when we discussed this previously is: this is another step down a potentially slippery slope, where we are now, if I understand correctly, using institutional funds which might otherwise have gone to support a tenure-track faculty member, to support non-tenure-track regular rank faculty. And I'm wondering where this is going to stop. We had SSRI earlier. Now we have this institute and each one of these is taking resources away that otherwise would have supported traditional faculty members.

Merson: Maybe I should address my own situation rather than all the institutes. But from my own standpoint we have already participated in (I don't have in front of me) but I would say at least 10 recruitments of tenure-track faculty and we have at least another 10 planned over the next two years. So I want to reassure you that the vast majority of our faculty-recruitment funds are going for recruitment of tenure-track faculty



across the university. That's the first point I would make.

Secondly, I think an institute like ours, which is very interdisciplinary, needs different talents. We have an education mission, a research mission, a policy mission and a service mission. There are occasional faculty that I think would be best recruited not in the tenure track, but would still be very important for much of our work. So I would like to think that, at least in our case, we will provide a lot of support for tenured faculty and that these additional resources – and they would only be

start-up resources, I mean our faculty especially the research faculty would have to fund themselves. So I want to reassure you that this would not be in our case the predominant use of our faculty recruitment funds. So, I don't really think it's a slippery slope. I want to assure you that most of our funds are going for tenured faculty. I can't really comment on the other institutes.

McClain: If there are not additional questions ...OK.

**Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal from the Global Health Institute to allow the institute authority to recommend appointment of regular-rank, non-tenure-track faculty.**

Approved unanimously. Thank you. Congratulations Michael.

### *Athletic Council Annual Report*

Next up is Michael Gillespie...Michael is a familiar visitor to the Council this past year. The Athletic Council's annual report was included with your agendas and Michael is here with a few comments following his first year as chair of the recently reconstituted Athletic Council that took effect in the fall.

Michael Gillespie (Political Science): You have received I take it a copy of the report from the Athletic Council. I would like to make one correction. Obviously, we didn't meet with Coach Cutcliffe on November 3, 2007. He was then still coaching for Tennessee. That's a misprint; we met with him in February of 2008. Otherwise I think the report is fairly self evident and I would be happy to answer questions about that. Before I go on I have a few remarks that relate generally to athletics at Duke and to the strategic plan. Are there any questions specifically about the report? Let me then go right into my remarks.

I want to discuss some of the benefits that athletics provides to the Duke community, the costs of athletics, and the status of student-athletes at Duke. I will then

address several concerns that have been voiced about our athletic program.

First, intercollegiate athletics are crucial to the success of Duke University as an academic institution. Championship athletics is one of the major factors that makes us so competitive for the top students, and that enables us to compete with institutions that are older, wealthier, and academically stronger than we are. As we continue to improve our academic stature and undertake other initiatives, such as Duke Engage, to enhance our attractiveness to students, we cannot neglect the factors that have made us so successful and that are essential to our position in the academic marketplace.

Second, in order to maximize resources for the academic enterprise the athletic program must be as inexpensive to the university as possible. The good news is that it is pretty close to this minimum at present. No other model that is conceivable for Duke would allow us to run our athletic program more economically. In this respect ACC, television, and licensing revenues are crucial to our bottom line. That said, the cost of athletics to Duke is considerably less than other ACC schools and less even than Princeton, as George McLendon pointed out at the last meeting.

Some have suggested we move down to Division II or III football, adopting the Georgetown model. This would be a very expensive proposition, since it would mean leaving the ACC, and thus losing all of our ACC revenues. Moreover, the cost of athletics to the university at Georgetown is far greater than at Duke.

The increases in the athletic budget over the last twenty years that Richard Hain pointed to in the last meeting are in part the result of increases in salaries and facilities in a competitive marketplace but the largest factor by far has been the development of women's athletics. If we eliminated women's sports, the athletic department budget would still run a deficit but it would be very small.

The real financial costs to the university in this respect are largely due to the decision of the federal government to require gender equity in athletic programs, a decision that was good and just and that few here I believe would want to reverse.

One important point that must be emphasized with respect to budgeting is that the athletic department is currently dangerously over-dependent on basketball for revenue and reputation. This will not continue forever. The success of basketball will not continue forever. (groans!) The athletic department thus needs to improve the other revenue sport, football, which is the only other possible source of significant revenue, a process that is now underway

Third, student athletes at Duke are more successful academically than student athletes at all or nearly all other Division I schools. Our admissions standards are very high, higher by far than Berkeley, Northwestern, or Wake Forest, to take only three examples, and there is no plan to reduce them. Moreover, over the last few years the Athletic Department has put in place new facilities and hired new personnel in academic support that

will ensure that the academic performance of student athletes remains at its current extraordinary level. The handout on the Academic Progress Report that I distributed highlights this success.

Now let me respond to four concerns raised about our athletic program.

1) Some have suggested that our graduation rate in men's basketball is surprisingly low. Most of this is due to the early departure of three players in 1999 to play pro basketball. The players who have come to Duke over the last decade have graduated either from Duke or another institution, or are currently pursuing their educations at Duke or another institution, or are earning \$1 million+ per year. Some of us can understand why it might make sense for...now that said, when those 3 athletes left they did not leave in good academic standing because once they decided they were going pro they went and started doing training for that rather than finishing their studies.

In my discussion with the athletic department, and with Brad Berndt in particular, they recognized that's a problem and they work very hard to make sure that that doesn't happen to any of our athletes going forward.

2) Some have asserted that there is a growing academic gap between our athletes and the rest of the student body and that this difference is creating two groups of students at Duke. I think this concern is really two-fold: first that athletes are isolated from and do not interact with regular Duke students as much as we would like, and second that their academic performance is significantly different than that of other students, including their choices of majors.

The first of these concerns is part of a larger problem with the self-segregation of various communities at Duke. We should not see athletics here in isolation from the larger social phenomenon. It would be an interesting question, for example, whether there is more self-segregation among athletes or Asian students. We should recognize, however, is that while athletes do spend a great deal of their time with other athletes, their teams are often places in which some of the class and racial barriers that we are also concerned with are broken down.

On the question of the academic performance of athletes, many of our teams have average GPAs that are nearly indistinguishable from the rest of the student body, and the teams that do not typically have large numbers of minority students, many of whom come to Duke with less preparation for college work than most of our students. That they do less well than the typical Duke student is thus not surprising. They do not, however, fail and most of them leave Duke immensely better educated than when they came. Moreover, while they may not have closed the gap with other students by the time of graduation, it is almost certainly the case that they have narrowed it.

We should also recognize in this context the impact that these minority athletes have in increasing diversity at Duke. To take just one example, almost half of our African-American male undergraduates are stu-

dent athletes. With respect to the choice of majors, more athletes have tended in recent years to choose majors in the social sciences and fewer have chosen to major in the sciences and humanities. This trend, however, is not confined to athletes but is characteristic of our undergraduates as a whole: 60% of whom major in the social sciences, 25% in the natural sciences, and 15% in the humanities.

The only real difference between athletes and the general student body in this respect is that they generally cannot major in the sciences because of scheduling conflicts between athletics and laboratory courses. This is a real problem and one we need to work on and one that our committee recognizes we need to work on. I think that the Athletic Department is aware of it as well. Whether there are solutions to this in a long run I think depends not just upon athletics, but upon flexibility in the sciences, etc., etc.

3) Some have asserted that athletes spend too much time training for their sport. Athletes do work very hard but they generally do not do so because it is required. Athletes work approximately 40 hours per week at their sport but much of the time they put in is driven more by a desire to succeed than the demands of coaches. It is not clear to me that we should limit this any more than we should have told my former student who won the university concerto competition that she couldn't practice the piano 6 hours per day. Pursuing activities with great passion is a form of human excellence that many of us share and almost all of us admire. I'd hate to tell any of my colleagues that they shouldn't work 50-60-70 hours a week pursuing their passion.

It is also not clear that requiring student athletes to spend less time on their sport would improve their educational experience. Exit interviews and anecdotal information indicate athletes typically party one night per week while many if not most other undergraduates party three or more nights per week. Does anyone want to suggest that it would be better for athletes to train 10-12 hours less per week and party 10-12 hours more?

This said, I still believe that we should investigate ways of channeling some of their time into activities other than partying and other than athletics, especially those that give them some time away from Duke. I also agree with Orin Starn that we should take a leadership role in the NCAA in trying to further limit official demands on athletes' time. This includes not just time in practice, but travel time, etc. We have to realize that we live in a competitive environment.

4) Many also worry that the demands of Division One intercollegiate sports leave athletes less well prepared for life after Duke than other students. In fact, all the evidence suggests that after graduation athletes at elite institutions do better, at least financially, than non-athletes – even when we control for the income from professional sports. The ability to work hard, to work with others, to manage one's time, to focus on the goal at hand, etc., that come from an experience in athletics are skills that are of great value in life after college.

In conclusion, while I believe that there are a number of things that we need to try to do to improve the educational experience of student-athletes at Duke and move them more into the mainstream, I also believe that many of our students who are not athletes are significantly disadvantaged by missing some of the lessons that most of our athletes learn. Thank you.

McClain: It might be a good time to roll into discussion of the strategic plan...if you remember from our last meeting we were carrying over discussion of the Athletic Department Strategic Plan and so I asked that you read the plan and this is a continuation of that discussion.

### *Questions*

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology/ECAC): With regard to the involvement of the strategic plan in terms of providing HPER first of all for graduate students and professional and then for staff and faculty: it wasn't clear to me that these facilities were going to be open to staff and faculty.

Gillespie: I think the question of staff and faculty should be clarified in this respect. It certainly is going to open to faculty and staff, at least, I think, on a limited basis. This is question that came up with respect to medical center staff. Obviously, I don't think we intend to provide – were imagining that we would provide – facilities for all employees of the medical center. I think with the respect to the rest of the faculty and staff the notion was that these facilities would be open to them certainly in the same way Wilson is available now.

Provost Lange: Maybe I can make a comment on the academic portion of what you said, and the Plan. In meeting with the coaches I think it's worth understanding that there's far less pressure from the coaches about the standards we apply in admitting students. In fact at the moment I think there's almost none. And I think the plan is reflective of that. Where the coaches are feeling a tremendous amount of pressure is the constant earlier and earlier recruitment and trying to get commitment letters, not the official commitment letters, but the what they call letter of intent, from student athletes.

What our coaches are really facing – the most dif-



ficult situation they are facing – is a student they want to

recruit under normal circumstances being recruited by some of our peer schools at the end of the sophomore year, in a few cases, and sometimes early in the junior year. And trying to get commitments from the students.

If the NCAA is going to do something, in my view the first place that they could do something really constructive would be to see if it was possible to sharply limit that practice. Because the early recruitment of students is first of all it is a slippery slope. If you want slippery slopes that is really a slippery slope!

Second of all, it is extremely unfair to the athletes because the notion that you can select...think of any of us in high school in their sophomore or early in the junior year making a firm selection or semi-firm selection about where you are going to college regardless of your athletic ability. That's something that's not... in the plan. It wasn't much mentioned in Michael's remarks, but in fact if you talk to the coaches it's come up repeatedly in talking with coaches that they are feeling this tremendous pressure. Chris may want to comment on this further.

Chris Kennedy (Interim Athletics Director): Another potential answer to that problem is not just through the coaches organizations, because coaches would really love to limit the amount of time that they have to spend out on the road recruiting. But if coach x from Princeton is recruiting, you feel like you have to be on the road as well. And so individual sports can do something about that.



The other side of the problem of course, over which we have no control at all, is the 9th grader who perhaps announced his commitment to Duke to play basketball whom we've never seen and don't know anything about.

Martha Putallaz (Psychology & Neuroscience): And to follow-up on that: there are students who commit and then the institution later finds another athlete that they feel is a better fit or is a better skilled player and then withdraw the offer. So the students are also left hanging. It's a problem at both ends.

And about the HPER question. There was a committee that had graduate students, undergraduate students, and professional student representation on it. The charge was not to look at faculty and staff in the context of this plan – actually in terms of welfare and health

programs that's also part of the strategic plan – and also in terms of facilities that would broaden the club sport aspect and recreational facility aspect for graduate and professional in addition to undergraduates.

Michael Gillespie: I do want to say that the changes that this body made in the Academic Council made a big difference. And one of the ways was the involvement of many more faculty in exit interviews with athletes. And Martha Putallaz and Jacki Silar put together, along with Dick, a new exit-interview procedure that I think is really going to serve us well in the future and give us a much better grip on what's going on with student athletes.

Lee Baker: I sort of agree with all of your comments here and the numbers sort of speak for themselves. You make very compelling arguments specifically with regard to the extra 10 hours, etc. I think we all agree, but from your perspective – which is a unique one – what are the downsides? Because in my classroom all that happens, yes: great students, students learning happens, but there's also the downside you know. Surgeries have to be done in the middle...elective surgeries have to be done right before finals, people coming in in the morning totally exhausted because the coach had them out because they couldn't get practice schedules. I mean a lot of the other sort of sticky side...from your perspective what are the points that need some attention? You painted a sort of rosy picture, but where are the points that need attention?

Michael Gillespie: Well I think one of the huge problems is scheduling practices and scheduling classes. If you talk to athletes, almost every athlete would love to have classes at 8:30 in the morning. Our department and lots of other departments now have to offer classes at 8:30 in the morning, but I'm sure most of you are doing what we're doing which is to say we're offering classes taught by graduate students or visitors at 8:30 and not the central required courses which get offered in the middle of the day because that's when they attract the most students, right?

We might teach the intro microeconomics course at 8:30 and have 50 people in there and teach it at 10:30 and have 350 people in it. A lot of it has to do with student choices, about when they are willing to go to class, and departments trying to maximize the servicing of their students. I think athletes often get lost in that shuffle.

A strategy that Princeton adopted a number of years ago is to have an afternoon time that is free for extra-curricular activities that include athletics and a whole variety of other things, so that no class is scheduled during that time. That's something we could consider. I think that that might make some difference.

But just from talking to George and other people – we don't have a lot of rooms. We need to schedule classes pretty much around the clock in order to just to have the space in order to do what we want to do. So I do think that's a big problem. I think that we need to think about...there were a number of athletes in the exit interviews who said they thought about majoring in Bi-



ology when they came to Duke – at least two of them that I talked to – Martha has not yet collated all the final results from everyone – but it just turned out to be impossible. They just couldn't schedule classes with labs and you know part of that is not...the sciences departments tried to be flexible and to have labs at different times of the day, but you know convincing my colleagues to teach at 8:30 in the morning is not the easiest thing either.

Chris Kennedy: Let me add one or two things. It isn't impossible for student athletes to major in Biology or Engineering, but just from a scheduling standpoint it is very difficult. And a lot of them opt not to do it because of the obstacles. As a faculty member myself, I think all the time about travel, about majors, about missing classes. And I hope it is reassuring to this group to understand that we don't believe we've got it exactly right. We don't believe that we just need to go forward in the path that we've always been on because of the success of the student athletes. We can't rest on that success. We want them when they come to these exit interviews, to say "I made the best choice I could make in coming to Duke and I had a wonderful experience. It wasn't just athletics, but it was also academic, social" and whatever aspects of it there are. And so I never stop thinking about ways that we can try to address these problems. They are real problems.

Gillespie: I do think if you ask yourself why athletes spend so much time doing what they do, they are not so dissimilar from the reasons that lots of us do. And some of that has to do with peer pressure. Some of that has to do with what other people are doing around us. And I think for that reason athletes having a chance to get away from Duke and away from teammates to be on their own...whether it's a summer course in Geneva or whatever. I think that's something that we need to really work on. The difficulty is convincing athletes that doing that won't basically put them at the end of the bench.

Joel Marcus: I was a little bit confused about how the athletes are contributing to the diversity of the university when they are living a segregated life. I'm just trying to put those two elements of what you said together.

Gillespie: I think a lot of groups at Duke live with their friends – you know, whoever those friends may be. We noticed that a number of athletes – it's certainly more true of women than of men – are members of sororities. They really do try to circulate. A lot of athletes, at least if we're talking about minority athletes, certainly interact with lots of other minority students on campus even if they happen to be football or basketball players. So I do think that...

Do minority students and non-minority students interact as much as I would like? No. But some of that is...maybe we don't have enough places for that to happen. Some of that is just their own preferences and I'm not so sure we should tell them exactly who they ought to hang out with and who not.

I do know that we already have a social problem with the 3-1 ratio between African-American women and African-American men. If you took athletes out of the mix we'd have a 6-1 ratio. You know if you ask African-American women they would be really unhappy I mean they are already unhappy – they'd be even more unhappy...

McClain: Michael you'd kind of going off track...

Gillespie: I'm sorry.

Lee Baker: ...classrooms where they have...

Martha Putallaz: We do have a housing requirement. So they have to live on campus for 3 years, not like NC State where they have an athletic dorm that would further isolate them. They may room with athletes for scheduling purposes. They want to get up early in the morning for practice. But they are in dorms with non-athletes living there as well. So there are ways to mix there.

What is striking to me – a number of people raised at the Athletic Council – was if you ask them if they are participating in extra curricular activities they are usually ones where they do community service with other athletes. So people ask if there are opportunities to do community service with mixtures of athletes and non-athletes and perhaps another activity that would really intrigue both them and non-varsity athletes would be athletic research around topics of interest to athletics. So whether it be some research...is there such a thing as the key clutch performer or leadership in different kind of roles? That might a way also to engage both athletes and non athletes together in a common activity.

Gillespie: There's a wonderful leadership program that the Athletics department runs. We've talked extensively about coordinating that with several other programs at Duke. So I think there are ways...we can certainly do a better job at...that's correct and you know...

Towerview Drive should not be a barrier to interaction back and forth, but I think too often it is. I think the Faculty Associates program has helped. That in many respects, I think, I've been trying to get the coaches to come – have lunch in the Faculty Commons – things of that sort that I think can really make a difference in terms of interaction first at that level, but also at the student level.

Susan Schneider (Nursing): I would also urge you – you've been talking about the advantages of athletics and how you are very carefully monitoring in exit interviews. But a part of your plan is that your facilities will increase for club sports, for the non-athlete student and how that will increase their well being and the student experience. I would urge you to evaluate those experiences as well for the regular student population and look at how increased facilities and club-sport opportunities enhances their education experience.

Gillespie: We have a representative and an alternative representative both of whom come to our Athletic Council meetings from club sports. So we do have some feedback from them, but that that's really a good suggestion.

Kennedy: Also, we're going to do a survey this fall. We haven't decided on the scope – it will be to help guide us as we go forward with the recreation plan.

Joel Huber (Fuqua): One thing I learned from the plan is how carefully Duke and your group attend to the portfolio: which sports to support and which not to support. And I have two questions. One is what are the general criteria by which you decide which you support and which you don't? And second what is the process by which those criteria are worked through? What's the decision-making group and what are the ground rules you try to live with? Who gets money and who is chosen?

Kennedy: Well there is a history there. If we were to start all over again it might not have the same shape it has now. A lot of it is inherited and there is the weight of tradition that you can't discard lightly. But the first formal effort that I'm aware of to make those decisions – think about the program and make those decisions – was Terry Sanford and Tom Butters in the early '80's. As in a lot of other cases like this, it was in the middle of some kind of budget crunch. And they decided that they would allocate resources based on decisions about which sports, given Duke's recruiting pool and demographic, which ones would most likely be successful – Principle #1.

Principle #2. Look for sports that were likely to be successful that had small teams because there were fewer scholarships...and fewer everything else. And they made some decisions that I wonder about, like not to fund swimming. Swimming you think would be demographically favorable for us. But they identified the tennis's, the golf's, field hockey, soccer, at that time and decided that track, for which you can give 18 scholarships, didn't make sense as opposed to men's tennis for which you give 4.5 scholarships. So they weren't going to eliminate sports, but they were going to reallocate the resources that way.

The next somewhat carefully thought out attempt to think about resources was the late 90's when we decided that we were really going to comply with Prong 1, Title IX: proportionality. And the original plan was to add 33 women's scholarships – it turned out to be more than that. And that again involved deciding what are we going to do with those scholarships, how are we going to allocate and what women's sports do we add in order to get us the division we are in today? We were pretty close to proportionality.

The Athletic Council if you are talking about elevating a sport to varsity status the Athletic Council is the decider there that the club softball team for example could come to them with a proposal and they could argue for why they should make varsity status and the Athletic Council then makes a decision. And that was a big part of the process when rowing was added in the 1990's.

Gillespie: I will say that as part of the new mission statement for athletics that was approved by this body in the fall we did adopt a championship metric in terms of our sports. Our goal is to produce not just sports that are

OK, but that can compete for championships. Going forward that obviously has to play some role in our thinking about which sports should be varsity sports.

Joel Huber: Might there ever be a procedure to alter...have sports been dropped in recent history?

Chris: The last sport to be dropped was women's gymnastics in 1986. And dropping a sport is a risky business these days in this litigious society.

Josh Socolar (Physics): I wonder if you could comment a little more on the impact that the athletic department has on the student population in general and I'm thinking of two specific issues, but it's a broader question than that.

One would be: when we talk about the excellence of the athletic programs attracting students I wonder whether there is a downside also, whether there are students who look at Duke and say "that school emphasizes athletics too much." And so I'm not suggesting we would want to lower the athletic standards, but there may be issues about how the image of the programs are projected within Duke and beyond.

The other specific thing I'm thinking of is that in my personal experience teaching all the engineering freshmen in the spring semester, the tenting and basketball event is a disaster. I have sick students. I have students who have been up all night and can't stay awake. And so the question to you is whether the athletic department is assessing these kinds of issues and sees that as its own job to make some changes.

Kennedy: I'm currently sitting on the undergraduate leadership group that meets every couple of weeks and it is one of the things we have been talking about. And thinking of ways...you know it's a nuisance at best for us. And we're aware of the health concerns and all the things that you mentioned. So we're trying to think of ways to derail that train in ways that it won't crash and burn at the same time. And I've talked to Coach K about it, and he would be thrilled to see it considerably shortened. But the question is how do we get there without being perceived as depriving the students of their divine right to sleep out in the rain? We are thinking about that.

Gillespie: With respect to the first part of the question, it is certainly true that there are students, and my son being one of them, who went to the University of Chicago who weren't interested in coming to Duke. It had something to do with athletics, but it had more to do with the general sense of Duke is a work hard, play hard school. I think that that involves fraternities, sororities the whole thing of the regular college experience that attracts a lot of students.

I don't know that...so I think you are right that that probably does put some students off. My guess is it doesn't put off nearly as many students as it attracts. Martha might want to say something...there was a discussion of attracting math prodigies and I'll let her speak about that. But that would be my general sense. I think the net gain in terms of student quality, even though some of them may be tenters and not studiers, as much as we would like, is probably really much greater with

athletics than without. Martha do you want so say a little bit about that?

Putallaz: We took some of this up on the admissions committee that I don't know if this report...Peter may want to cover this more broadly – but one of the things that Peter had us look at is role of athletics in admissions and we actually went through all of the materials to see what was the percentage of admissions materials, the percentage of slides when they went out to do slide shows or information sessions, actually dealt with athletics. First we estimated and we thought what it should be and then looked at what it actually was. It was actually lower than we had anticipated.



So it is interesting to have that perception. And in the context of this committee though the question was raised: maybe there are students that are absolutely stellar scholars who don't come because of athletics? And David Kraines was on the committee at the time and I think he sort of takes it as part of his own personal charge in the Mathematics Department to attract math prodigies to Duke. So what he looked at was an informal survey of the math – not just math but of all the merit scholars at the time on campus – he just informally e-mailed them and said would you tell me, on a 5-point scale, basically from strong negative all the way to strong positive, what role did athletics play in your decision to come to Duke University. That doesn't address students that didn't come in the first place. But I don't know the percentage of merit scholarship offers that are turned down.

But what we found in that context was of the 25 students who responded there were about 2, I believe, that had something on a slight negative. And what was interesting is that one of them said she was really turned off about the prospect of Cameron and now finds herself really intrigued by Cameron and goes in there periodically to kind of be part of that group. And another one now reported that she is working out in the gym and never thought that she would be part of the people exercising in gyms before. In contrast with the broader sense talked about turning down an MIT or an ivy league school because of the community spirit because almost the sense reading them was like this release of 'inner nerd' kind of you know getting a sense of being able to go in there and be cool for the first time in your

life. You are part of a cool set with another strong positive group...So that's an interesting question we are trying to get at that somewhat in the admissions group.

Gillespie: Any other questions? Thank you all very much.

McClain: Thank you Michael and Chris. We e-mailed a resolution to you. We have copies of the resolutions at the ends of the tables. I will read the resolution and if there are any other questions we can deal with that.

**The Academic Council acknowledges receipt of the Strategic Plan for Athletics and supports our common goal to combine athletic excellence with the academic mission of the university. We commend the efforts of the Athletic Department to engage the wider Duke community in the development of the plan.**

**In the service of this objective, we charge the Duke University administration to play a leadership role, within our conference and in the NCAA, in setting standards for collegiate athletics that include strict controls on time and travel demands made upon student athletes, on admission exceptions, and on athletic spending. In addition, performance of coaches and programs should be evaluated in terms of their success in furthering Duke's overall educational mission.**

**We urge the Administration to establish a schedule for periodic assessment of the implementation of the plan, review of priorities, and analysis of its effects on the educational mission of the University (e.g., every 4-5 years).**

[The motion passed without dissent.]

Thank you Chris. Thank you Michael. Thank everybody for all of their work.

Before we end our last meeting of the academic year I know all year you have seen this gentleman sitting down here with the headphones on all through our meetings. This is Reed Criswell who has provided this recording service for us all through the academic year and I would like to thank him for his service (applause).

Please have a safe and productive summer. We will reconvene here on September 25 in this room. The meeting is now adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon  
Faculty Secretary, June 3, 2008