

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, September 20, 2007

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you to the first meeting of the Academic Council for the 2007-2008 academic year. Although this is the first Council meeting, I want you to know that your Executive Committee, ECAC, has been working already; I think we've already had 4 meetings... The members of your ECAC, are Ken Surin, Lori Setton. Susan Lozier, Dona Chikaraishi, Thomas Metzloff, and Amy Abernethy, along with John Staddon and myself. One of the things that ECAC is trying to figure out this year, and maybe you can help us, is that we've been discussing ways to afford faculty more input into the agenda of the Academic Council. We're trying to figure out ways to do that, and so we would like to hear from you.



At some point, if we have a meeting where we don't have a lot on the agenda, we may be able to ask people to raise issues. Of course we wouldn't be able to discuss everything at that time, but it would give us some sense as to how we should schedule things. But if you have something immediately, please feel free to send us an email so that we can talk about it and figure

out a way to discuss the kinds of things that you as faculty of Duke University are interested in.

Our first order of business is to approve the minutes of the May 10th meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Announcements

Now, a couple of administrative things. Please remember that you need to initial the attendance sheets that will be going around. This may be the last place at Duke University where attendance is taken. And by our by-laws you can actually flunk out of the class after 3 consecutive unexcused absences! So please call or email the AC Office – and the office is Linda, right here [lml@duke.edu] – if you are unable to attend.

Also, if there are any questions or comments coming from the council members today after the presentations of Provost Lange and President Brodhead, please make sure that you identify yourself, and that you speak up for the record, because the meeting is being taped.

According to our by-laws, ECAC must select from the Executive Committee a member to serve as vice-chair, and I am pleased to announce that ECAC has chosen Professor [Susan Lozier](#) as this year's vice-chair for Academic Council, so we are very pleased that she agreed to serve in that capacity.

Considering the full agenda today, we have arranged with Provost Lange to move the APT Report, currently scheduled for today, to be presented at the October or November meeting.

We now move to the nomination of candidates for Earned Degrees, and I have to tell you that this is one of the most, for me, last Spring, amazing processes, where once the schools stand up, I mean, it is so amazing that it almost brings tears to your eyes. So now we get to do it again, for the summer schools.

In accordance with the University by-laws, I will call on representatives for the various schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for various degrees. These lists will be pre-

sented to the Secretary of the Council and forwarded by the Provost for Approval by the Board of Trustees.

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated September 1, 2007

Summary By Schools And College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	41
Bachelor of Science	10

Pratt School of Engineering

Dean Robert L. Clark, Jr.	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	4
Master of Engineering Management	11

School of Nursing

Dean Catherine L. Gilliss	
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	-
Master of Science in Nursing	22

Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences

Dean William L. Chameides	
Master of Environmental Management	14
Master of Forestry	-

Fuqua School of Business

Dean Blair Sheppard	
Master of Business Administration	1

Divinity School

Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Divinity	4
Master of Theology	2

School of Law

Dean David Levi	
Juris Doctor	2
Master of Laws	2

School of Medicine

Dean R. Sanders Williams	
Master of Health Sciences	1
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	4
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	5

The Graduate School

Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Master of Public Policy	2
Master of Arts in Teaching	15
Master of Science	21
Master of Arts	42
Doctor of Philosophy	74
TOTAL	277

Faculty Hearing Committee

Paula McClain: Professor Benjamin Ward is currently in class, so we will move the Faculty Scholar Report to later in the meeting when he and the faculty scholars arrive. With your agenda you received the names of the current members of the Faculty Hearing Committee and the four proposed new and/or reappointed members. The names are **Thomas Bashore**, Medicine. **Kerry Haynie**, Political Science. **Garnett Kelsoe**, Immunology. And **Robert Mosteller**, Law. Is there any discussion? [There being none, the nominations were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Revision of the Athletic Policy Mission Statement

McClain: The next item on the agenda is the revision of the athletic policy mission statement, and President Brodhead will take a few minutes to introduce and talk about the revised statement. If the Council is in agreement, we will call for a motion to endorse the revision. But I encourage you if you have questions, to please pose them to President Brodhead.

President Brodhead: I wish you a happy new year. I did not realize that we would arrive at my moment on the agenda quite so quickly, although I'm happy to do it. Those of you who were on the Academic Council last year remember that following the work of a faculty committee, we fairly extensively reworked the nature of the Athletics Council at this university. There had always been good work and devoted service on that crew, but there was a perception, especially by members of the Athletics Council, that it had something of the quality of a black hole, in that no one knew when, how, or if any input ever went into that group, and no-one knew when, how, and if any output ever came out from that group.

And so it was a fairly obvious question: Could we devise an Athletic Council that was more open to the rest of the university, that took charges from relevant administrators, included a wider faculty presence, and that at the end of the year reported all its views and findings and was in more or less continual conversation with all of us as the year went on? This was highly relevant at that point, because there were faculty who wondered if there was adequate faculty input into athletic policy and – what the faculty may not have been so aware – there was even greater sentiment on the part of Athletics (the last thing Athletics wants is isolation in this university) not to be its own separate world: unknown, un-understood, and so on by everyone else.

That was a very thoughtful plan, and I am grateful that **Michael Gillespie** has agreed to chair the Athletics Council. This is not quite a fulltime job for him, but the way he's doing it, it's almost one. And I would also take this occasion to thank our new Faculty Ath-

letics Representative, [Martha Putallaz](#), whose name was supplied to me also by ECAC.

Following upon that plan, it was one of the many things that made us think that now it's time to get to work doing another thing for Athletics, namely engaging in the work of strategic planning. Last year this group heard about the strategic plan for the university, and adopted the plan, called "Making A Difference." But when that plan was adopted, some people looked at it and said: "108 pages (or whatever it is) and it never mentions athletics?" Does that mean that athletics is not part of the university? Of course, that was not at all the intention. It was, in effect, an academic plan for the University, but it raised the question, what about athletics? Of course, if you raise the two words, athletics and planning near each other, you'll see why you might want to take this seriously. The landscape of intercollegiate athletics in America is a very rapidly changing and a very challenging one, as we know by reading about schools elsewhere. There aren't that many universities that want to have the standards of integrity and the standards of academic seriousness attached to the athletic program that characterize this place.

And so in view of these emerging challenges, it seems to me one has two choices: Is the strategy just to muddle along from year to year, making whatever ad hoc adjustments seem to make things work out pretty well, or might we engage in a planful exercise, trying to visualize present and future challenges? And what would be the way this university would choose to try to fix such challenges – not so we'll beat everyone else or be the same as everyone else, but so that we can have a superb program on the terms that we would choose to have such a program.

You have a draft of a charge document for a planning group. There were some clear things that need special attention: the finances of athletics are done in very different ways at different universities. What the dimensions of that are, what the inputs should be, needs reflection. A great deal of work has been done on athletic facilities at this University, but if you have tried to use the restrooms at Wallace Wade stadium, you would probably join me in agreeing that more work is probably in order.

But there always needs to be thought about what the priorities should be and what the arguments for them would be. I delight in the fact that our football program had a victory last Saturday, but of course as you know that was the first in some period. So we need to figure out not how can we have the same football program as School X, but how can we have a football program that's right for this place but that gives us what our student players and our fans and community want from a football program, and so that needs some thought as well.

However, when we got the planning exercise lined up, then something else became clear, which is that you can't plan until you've told people what the mission is the plan needs to accomplish. And so then

someone said, don't we need a mission statement for Athletics at Duke? And after a while a very intelligent and historically minded person said, "In fact we have one." And in fact there was one; it's been circulated to you. It was adopted, I believe, in the year 2002, but I will tell you, I've been President now, I'm in my 4th year, and I believe I first made visual contact with this document after we got pretty far into this discussion. A mission statement that no-one is familiar with corresponds to a mission that no one understands, or that no one has articulated, and so this seems just a good time to try to figure out, what are we going to lay out there: simple truths, not every last thing that could be said about athletics, but how could we briefly and concisely identify the aspirations that frame our athletic program and that therefore would frame any planning exercise we would have it in?

If you read both documents, you'll see that the old one is quite long, it does not aim at eloquence, and it includes many things as if they were issues of mission that are really issues of operation.

It also treats matters at some length that were probably of considerable historical importance at that time, but that we can now take somewhat for granted. Through a rewriting exercise, it is our hope that this document has gotten significantly shorter and that it now tries to do just 3 or 4 or 5 things. It tries to say not what athletics is or should be in athletic terms, but rather in university terms. And so it names the values, the deep underlying university values, that athletics at this university want to be consonant with. Those are values of excellence, and values of education. It tries to spell out the nature of education that athletics promotes and athletics provides us with. We need a vision of education that is adequate to the task. It tries to say what level of athletic results would we look for here, and that language comes to us pretty much unchanged from the older document. It also tries to say what academic expectations will we have and insist on having for our student athletes.

It has a new, a brief section, but I believe an extremely important one, about our obligation to the sense of well-being of student athletes. Student athletes are put under such very heavy demands (a) by their sports, and (b) by everybody else, that it's important for us to remember that we have an obligation towards the well-being of the people at the intersection of all these demands, to help them figure out how to meet them, to help them figure out what is reasonable amount of demand to take. And so there is a paragraph there that talks about well-being. It talks about conduct expectations we would have of students, and it also talks about our idea that the Athletic Program would promote broader virtues – of service, of citizenship, and things of that sort.

It then talks very briefly about the fact that athletics will perhaps always predominantly refer to intercollegiate or varsity athletics, but certainly in a university, an immense amount of the good it supplies is also supplied at the more informal levels: club sports, IM

sports, recreational sports, and so on. And there the document ends.

This document has now been vetted and has received some comments from senior leadership, from ECAC, with which I discussed this a couple of weeks ago, the Executive Committee of the Athletic Council, and in 9 or 10 days I will bring a draft to the Trustees, who are the ones who will finally authorize it. But I was eager to bring it to this body, and to hear if you have questions or thoughts or reflections.

Questions

Charles Clotfelter (Public Policy Studies): I have a question about mission statements, and it's not the athletic mission statement, but it's our university mission statement that was handed back in the '90s, and



you may or may not have seen it. I did a little analysis of mission statements of colleges and universities ranked in the top 50 by *US News*, and it turns out that almost all have the same characteristic as ours in that there is no mention of anything like Big Time Athletics. But if you Google Duke and anything, athletics will come out with many more hits than almost anything else. It is a very prominent part of what we do, and we just have to face that fact, and so I guess the question I'm asking is not relevant to the athletic mission statement, but the mission statement of our university. What do you think is the proper mention of intercollegiate commercial athletics when we talk about the mission of the university?

Brodhead: Well, to tell you the truth, since a lot of the prose in here comes from my own pen, you can find my own thoughts by re-reading the mission statement. I take a valuable suggestion from what you're saying, which is since universities actually devote time, attention, emphasis, resources to athletics, it seems to me it would be better to talk as if it were part of the university, rather than to act as if it isn't, or in fact to most of the world that's the only interesting thing that happens in universities.

I actually think this is quite important and we've really been paying very systematic attention to this to make sure that we ourselves are not guilty of the kind

of bifurcation of Duke and Duke athletics, which actually would be self-defeating to both parts.

It seems to me that people raised the criticism: "you didn't talk about athletics in the Duke Strategic Plan." There's an answer to it, but it's a good criticism because after all when you're talking about the university, you should talk about the things that are the active ingredients of the university. If you ask me what the role I see for intercollegiate athletics, you know that there are countries in the world where university systems don't have anything like organized sports and you also know that there's something about the vitality and adhesive power of American universities that corresponds to the much wider array of activities we have together with academic ones.

I personally do not believe in the idea of athletics as something that should be run as a mostly commercial, professional activity with no relation to the rest of the university. I understand the inputs it gives, the alumni loyalty, fan support, a sense of community, and so on, but I personally believe that a university should insist that its students get educational benefit from coming to the university because they're going to live a lot longer than their sports careers will carry on. If you haven't given them that benefit, you have not done right by them. That's just my personal view, but I think it is pretty much the philosophy of this university, and so we aim here for true excellence in athletic accomplishment as one value in a constellation of the pursuit of excellence of which there will be continual emphasis for everyone who participates, also on the academic side. Do we disagree?

Clotfelter: I guess my point goes back to the university; should the university mission statement include athletics?

Brodhead: You know, to tell you the truth, the next time we revisit it, I hope someone in this room will remind me and if they don't I hope you will shame me for having forgotten. I think it's a completely legitimate thing to mention, and I think that in a world where athletics is such a visible part of every university, except for a very, very small number, that it is strange for universities to get in the habit of speaking as if they don't recognize that it's part of what they do, still less as if it's not a valuable part of what they do.

Kathryn Andolsek (Family Medicine) My question is, and it's my ignorance, but what was the student participation in this mission statement?

Brodhead: There is a student Advisory Group that meets on athletics; this mission statement has also been shown to all the employees of Athletics. I also will tell you that there are student members of the Executive Committee of the Athletics Council, and this morning we actually had (I see Martha Putallaz who was at the meeting there with me), the student input at that meeting I thought was quite valuable.

Kathryn Andolsek: Representing both student-athletes and non-athletes?

Brodhead: Well, I can't promise you that this has formally been under consideration in any place where

that's true. I will tell you that there has been a very great deal of discussion of the culture of this university involving hundreds and hundreds of undergraduates including some athletes and many who are not. And I'll tell you one of the things we hear most repeatedly is that non-athletes value the athletic programs at this university. They value the friendship, they value the outlets, they value all aspects of them. So I don't regard this as a very controversial mission statement. I think – I hope – myself that it's the sort of thing that people would read and say: "that's pretty much what we have in mind." Let me put it more ambitiously. That's what we hoped to mean by Duke.

Paula McClain: Do I have a motion to endorse the revised mission statement as received? [There being no further discussion, the motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Undergraduate Experience

Provost Lange: Thank you all for I hope reading some or parts of this interim report. I want to take you through how we got to where we're going, or how we got to where we are, and how we're going to keep moving forward with this set of issues, which as you know arose in the wake of the lacrosse incident, but I think now have taken on in a very positive way a life of their own among administrators, faculty, and students

So let me begin by reminding you where we came from, as the Campus Culture Initiative (CCI) Task Force delivered a report in February of this year, and in the charge to that report, which was then met by the report, they were asked to recommend actions to promote the goals that you see on the screen [slides]: social responsibility, civic engagement, increased faculty and improved faculty-student interaction, building respectful community across bounds of race, gender and other social divisions – I should say that over time the expansion of the understanding of diversity in this report has been rather substantial and I think in very good ways – a more responsible use of alcohol and an integration of athletics into the life of the community, which of course we've just been discussing.

The Task Force released its report in February, and there were many recommendations in the report, and they have met various fates. Some of those recommendations have gone to existing committees; for instance, there was a recommendation that a curricular change should be made in the nature of the Cross-Cultural Inquiry requirement in the Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Curriculum. That recommendation has been referred to the Arts and Sciences Council and to the Curriculum Committee, because in fact the curriculum belongs to the faculty and that is the appropriate venue for them to deal with it.

Recommendations regarding athletics have to some degree been forwarded to the Athletics Council and are being dealt with as part of the agenda of the new Athletics Council, and of course I would say that

that Athletics Council itself is in part a reflection of some of the issues that were raised in that report.

There were other issues which became "hot-button" topics of broader interest. They were issues around selective living, around alcohol, around other aspects of athletics, gender relations, and how we engage difference on this campus. I would say that these issues were seen almost immediately to require another round of broad discussion, in part because the CCI task force met under extremely difficult conditions, and therefore we needed another round where we could have a more, I might say ventilated discussion.

That committee met with lots of people, but it was a fairly internalized discussion to the Task Force, because it was very clear that these issues were not ones in which decisions from the Allen building or some other administrative headquarters were likely to be received successfully at the level of undergraduate student life without substantial engagement and involvement of students, and in some cases faculty, in the process.

So you could have recommendations, and you could even pass rules, but they weren't likely to be implemented unless there was substantial discussion, and at some level, buy-in – which does not mean necessarily agreement with – the recommendations coming forward. So the President asked me and (I want to also recognize for his phenomenal effort) John Simon; he asked us to organize a process to do another round of discussions.

I'm not going to review with you here all of the meetings we held all Spring, but if you look at the report you will see that there are dozens of groups of students and faculty with whom we met, at all odd hours of the day and night. We also conducted a great deal of research, including reviewing the very large body of research which was undertaken by the CCI Task Force, and calling other schools to see what they were doing and so forth.

The challenges that we were trying to meet through that process are listed here. First of all, we recognized that we needed to get broad community engagement if we were going to be able to move forward on the specific issues, and that included an important agenda which was to engage students who are not the "usual suspects." I can tell you that one of the things you will find among students, as you find among faculty, and as ECAC certainly knows, there are faculty who appear on many committees and there are faculty who never appear in any discussions.

Pushing beyond the usual suspects to engage the broader community is a challenge, but it is also something which, when you're dealing with the broader undergraduate campus culture, you really need to do. So we made some major steps to try to expand the discussion. Some of them were successful and some we still find as challenges, and we're still trying to round up some of those people. We had to engage faculty, and there again, we took some steps in the Spring and we'll be taking more this Fall. We've tended to focus

on organized faculty groups, we will continue to do that and also see if we can reach other faculty in other ways. We wanted to expand the discussion as well into other corners of the community that interact with students. You can see them here, the pre-major advisors, the folks in student affairs, the RAs, that's the residence advisers, those are fairly obvious.

I think actually on this list the most interesting thing we did was the meetings that we held with the housekeepers on East and West Campus. Some of you may have heard last year complaints that students – through their behavior – not in interpersonal relations, but through the way they treat their environment – are perceived at times to abuse the fact that we have housekeepers and that those housekeepers perform essential services that keep the environment of those students fit. So we thought it would be good to actually talk to the housekeepers, which was an interesting thing to do – I'm telling you it's not so easy to get, you know they work strange hours! So we had discussions. We had one large assembly with the East Campus housekeepers, and another one with the West Campus housekeepers, and as you might expect the differences that we all know as faculty between those two communities are directly reflected in the way the housekeepers relate to the students.

In the East Campus housekeepers you have a sense of almost maternal/paternalism ... a feeling which we did *not* find on West Campus! Nonetheless, I think it would be fair to say that we found considerably less hostility or sense of abuse on the part of the housekeepers with respect to the students, than might have been the impression from other things that we had read. And I should mention, by the way, that the faculty also came in for a little bit of criticism, having to do with the policing of classrooms.

And I will tell you that one other thing we learned is that our policies themselves are not always consistent. At the meeting I had on East Campus, we were in the Richard White Lecture Hall, and I was doing my spontaneous thing and there was a sign on the side that said that "food and drink may be used in this classroom only under the following conditions: consent of the instructor" and as I'm talking and reading this rather small lettered sign over here, some people in the audience kept pointing over my shoulder. And I finally turned around, and on the front wall it says "no food or drink". Now, first of all we all know that "no drink" in terms of water is extremely unlikely to be obeyed in classes anyway.

The larger point is that we have policies to address, but housekeepers were just another very good community to talk with. So we knew we needed to frame a set of options that we'd be able to narrow down from the large number of recommendations that were in the CCI report, and we also knew, and I want to stress this for my own salvation, that at some point this would no longer be the Provost's responsibility, but would instead be the responsibility of the Dean of Undergraduate Education, Steve Nowicki, and that day

is rapidly coming. Some time as we finish this process this Fall, Dean Nowicki will take over the process, and he will be responsible for implementation, reporting to me about what he's doing.

In the course of our Spring discussions with students, faculty, and staff there were a number of items which emerged that represent what we either call low-hanging fruit or which I sometimes analogize to running a clinical trial with an experimental drug, and figuring out half-way through that the drug is incredibly effective, and so you stop the trial and start giving people the drug.

These items were things we discovered in the course of our discussions that are so widely wanted, and which we could address (not all of them, some of them were crazy ideas) that were either so widely wanted and so easily effectuated that there was no reason to wait for the whole process to be completed.

The *Upstairs at the Commons* was simply to use a space that we already had during the day and make it into a space that in the evening was available to students for sit-down dining. We had no effective sit-down dining on west campus and it seemed So that's just an example; it's been a big hit. There are a hundred or more students there every night. It replaces the old Oak Room, those of you who've been here for a while remember we used to have a facility here like this. And then it went away¹. And now we've replaced it and it was one of those things: very obvious, very easy to do, and in this case, quite successful.

Dean Thompson started a program to try to draw together all the faculty who teach especially large freshman classes. We found that there are characteristics of teaching large freshman classes that hold across subject matters, so it would be useful to have those faculty in contact with one another – to be talking about the shared kinds of issues they have in teaching freshmen.

On the crazier end is probably the Duke Bikes Program, which I will say was just a sort of inspiration of some of us sitting around one day, but that's actually also worked out pretty well. We have 130 bicycles that we bought that we started on campus and the demand is exceeding the supply, although as the temperature falls that may not be the case. So we prepared an Interim Report, which you were able to read if you had the time. The report is really built around what we learned, so it is "interim" in the sense that it is more of a reflection of what we learned than it is a statement of what we must or should do, although there are some directions taken.

It is what we learned from students about how they actually interact in terms of issues like diversity and gender relations, how regulations structure the way certain activities are undertaken on campus, the way responsibility is viewed, the role of alcohol, the importance of inter-class relations – by which we mean rela-

¹ The old Oak Room is now part of the Mary Lou Williams Center.

tions across basically the three classes after freshman year – mentoring and selective living.

On other fronts we have moved ahead through other channels, the report had a significant athletics component, and that has been referred to the Athletics Council. They are working on that as I've said. There are admissions issues, and those will be addressed by the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee this Fall which is a committee that has administrators and a number of faculty recommended, I think, through the Arts & Sciences Council, and then there is faculty-student interaction. Now on that particular issue I want to pause for a moment.

There are a number of issues relating to faculty-student interaction; actually we've been talking about them for a long time, and for those of you who have been on this campus for 10 or 15 or 20 years you will know that there has been a cycle of efforts to somehow promote greater faculty-student interaction, some of them more expensive than successful. That is, we put money in, and nothing came out. So we are again at one of those points in the cycle, and I think it is a very important one, but we are very clear that this cannot come through some kind of administrative action. The administration can be responsive to initiatives that faculty suggest and promote, but we cannot be the animators of new models of faculty student interaction. So we have been discussing with ECAC and ECAC has been working with ACSAC which is the Academic Council Student Affairs Committee, ACSAC, and also with a committee created by the Arts and Sciences and Councils and Engineering Councils called The Faculty Student Interaction Committee, and those committees we're hoping will bring us initiatives that we will then respond to, to the extent that administrative action is required.

But fundamentally this is an issue which we are placing in the hands of the faculty, because that's really where it belongs.

What are some of the more specific issues that we discovered in our discussions? The first one is, you cannot underestimate the importance of space and the nature of the spaces we provide on this campus, and the way they are allocated. How spaces are designated and used is foundational to the undergraduate experience on this campus in the sense that it shapes what happens once you have the human material that has arrived. It is obviously not the only thing that shapes it, but it most definitely shapes it in significant ways. Second of all, the structure of space and its availability influences how diverse groups of students come together, and here again I want to stress, we're not just talking about racial diversity or ethnic diversity, we're talking about all the kinds of diversity that a student population such as Duke's brings together: International students with US students, students from lower-income areas and students from higher-income families, students from different parts of the country – because we have a national student body. When you talk to students, they will talk to you about diversity in all

of those frameworks, and they have said "I have gained a great deal from the fact that I showed up and I've always been from New York and I roomed with a kid from Montana...", a quote from somebody we heard last night.

But the point is there are multiple forms of diversity; and how space, and how it's, allocated structures the extent to which our students are able to take advantage of that. So housing, dining, and social spaces are at the crux of the Fall discussions we are holding. We're approaching those through a couple of fundamental principles, I'm not going to read these to you, these are drawn from the report. What I would stress is that they emphasize the individual, and his or her growth, and the role of the individual within the collective, and how the individual adjusts to being in a collective setting.

After all we're dealing with adolescents, and one of the things they're trying to do is establish identities for themselves. All of us who are parents are well aware of the struggles that go on about that. But at the same time, they must learn how to do that within a context in which they are in a social setting. And it is important find the right balance between them. Not only that, but these principles obligate not only the students, but also us as administrators and as faculty to engage these issues. We cannot leave it just to the students for this to happen, we too need to be aware of how the climate we create, whether through administrative actions or through our interactions with the students, helps to foster the kinds of broader principles we have.

These are the other three principles; the students made very clear that they like having homes. Not all of them, some of them love their independence, they are guarding the independence of their living. Others really like to have homes, but many of them who would like to have a home, by which I mean a fellowship or a small community in which they live with friends, do not want to have that community be limited to the options which are currently available, which are the selective housing options, primarily fraternities and to some lesser extent, non-fraternal selective housing.

So one of the things we kept hearing is we would like other ways that we spontaneously could form communities, whether it's blocks, whether it's the theme houses that we talked about. So one thing is to create more of these communities but to recognize that they cannot be the dominant or the overwhelming portion of how a student structures his or her life.

In fact we hear a lot from our students that Duke is a big joining institution. Our students love to participate in lots of organizations. In fact last night I would say that we had a student who told us – we were talking about whether students liked to have grab-and-go dining or sit-down dining – and this student said "well if I have time to sit down to eat I know that I should go join another organization."

So we need to recognize that housing, where you live, is one part of your life, but there are many other

parts of the students' lives, and the important thing is to get the mix right, so that you have that home if you want it, but you also have these cross-cutting opportunities, where you meet lots of kids in other settings. Space can make a difference to that.

The second thing we heard is that students really like the fact that they can interact with students who are older than they are. Sophomores really want that inter-class interaction, and the older kids also want it. In fact one of the motivations that a number of students had for joining fraternities is that they are the setting where that inter-class mentoring most goes on; that is one of the attractions of selective housing and fraternities.

Another driver that we found was we've got to find ways of promoting the kind of inter-class interactions which exist to some extent in residences in ways that don't necessarily require the selective housing system we have now. As we say, the academic, living, and social aspects of Duke students experience should be mutually supportive. I think that's fairly obvious.

And finally, our facilities must be aligned with our principles. Just go back to the Upstairs at the Commons; if we want kids to have a place to sit down and talk over food, which is a fairly adult sort of thing to do, and occasionally if you can show you're over 21, even have a beer or glass of wine while you're doing it, you need to provide the opportunities for them to do it. If you don't provide the facilities for that, then you know you're not living up to your responsibilities.

These are the four pillars of what we consider building a pluralistic community. First of all, we need multiple residential and social communities in which none dominate. And as you recognized in the CCI report, one of the major criticisms was that at Duke, at the moment – and this is something we've known for years, or even decades – is that at Duke for a long time one style of selective living has dominated. So we need to create multiple residential and social communities which have and share in what I would call the advantages of the ability to generate collective action.

One of the difficulties, and one of the reasons that fraternities dominate the culture, is not just because of something called privilege. It is also, and I would say far more, a function of what I would call advantage, the advantage to generate collective action. We have a set of rules which require organizations or groups of students to be able to act collectively.

If you have set of independents it is very difficult; you have a lot of startup costs to act collectively. The fraternities have solved those problems. So it's not surprising that they have advantages in a system which privileges collective action. So we are looking to create the opportunities to overcome that. We also need to ensure that we have cross-cutting activities which expand students' horizons and challenge their comfort zones.

We need to have as a third pillar, spanning activities, which really draw together multiple communities.

And finally we have to have broadly shared experiences and values. I'll come back to those in a minute.

Some specific questions around particular issues – and these are the questions which were driving through our discussions this Fall:

Number One, what housing model best optimizes the pluralism of the community? We're actually talking about a mix of five different housing models for the future. Selective fraternal; selective non-fraternal – by the way there's an over-demand for that particular category, we have selective housing which is not fraternal but we have not been able to accommodate all the students who want that. What we're calling here theme houses, which are houses built around shared student interests and which will probably be more volatile in their rise and fall; blocking; and independents. And we're not privileging any one of them; we see them as 5 streams rather than the 2 streams we have now, 3 if you will, we're talking about 5 streams and students can flow into these at their own will, and in which they would be able to take some initiative.

The second, related, question is: What are the appropriate expectations we have for groups of students who are allocated space? Let me go back to the first one. The other feature that this new model would incorporate far more than the current one does is co-educational grouping of students. At the upper-class level, the fraternities are obviously not coeducational. We want more, and this came out in the gender-relations discussion very clearly, we want more coeducational opportunities for the students in their living, and the theme houses would obviously allow that and coeducational blocking, which is currently not part of the system would also allow that.

So what are appropriate expectations? If groups have housing, we have the right to expect them to contribute to the broader community as well as to just have a good day within their own community. And certainly as we develop these new options, we're going to talk about that.

Actually last Spring at the urging of Student Affairs the undergraduates themselves began to develop a code of expectations with regard to that. And obviously to the extent that we can rely on something the students themselves are developing, that will be advantageous.

We've posed related questions on dining: How do we best combine individual convenience with civilized dining? You will hear lots of students say I'm really busy I love grab-and-go, or I love grabbing some food and going some other place and meeting a few other students there to eat, or I love taking food back to my dorm. But unfortunately many of them will also tell you I don't really love grabbing food and going back to my dorm, but that's sort of the only thing I can do because there aren't other places for me to eat. So again it's finding space; it ties up space and the kind of experience that students have. And we want to create the right mix of dining that allows longer conversation, learning, and building a support community with what

is an evitable part, I think, of modern life, which is grab-and-go.

I was talking to a faculty member yesterday who was very strong on dining and sitting down. I said where did you have lunch, and he said at my desk. I said where'd you get it? At Alpine. Okay, so we all do some grab and go and we all do some sit-down.

Questions posed on social spaces: What use of commons rooms is most consistent with our principles? There have been lots of discussions about commons rooms in the dorms. It is clear that the possession of commons rooms by individual groups often has an adverse impact both on gender relations and on the engagement of diversity even when they foster the development of group identity, and if any of you have been in the commons rooms that are owned by groups on West Campus, you will see both features very clearly. They definitely foster identity; groups take hold of those rooms, they put up symbols of their group spirit and so forth and pictures of each other. At the same time, if you're not an insider I can well understand why you'd feel like an outsider.

So, more generally it's widely acknowledged, although with different opinions of their values, that parties in commons rooms and sections of dorms are often quite disruptive of neighbors. Not always – sometimes the neighbors like being disrupted. But in general these bigger, larger section and commons-room parties are disruptive for neighbors. There is a potential advantage, therefore, in moving rambunctious social activity of larger groups out of the dorms. The renovation of West Union offers us the opportunity to create spaces for social events that are not associated with any one group or that are not located immediately adjacent to dormitory rooms. It will be extremely important, and I know that Steve is leading the process for West Union development, that we consider how best to use West Union to encourage more of this activity to occur outside of the dorms, so that what happens in the dorms is relatively small group activities. Get the larger group activities, whether parties or just other kinds of social events that are very disruptive to neighbors, out of this space .

A charge which you may read if you read *The Chronicle* and which is also a matter which we've debated frequently in our discussions, is creating new ways for people to live. We're creating new ways for groups to meet. But how do you create that broader community, how do you ensure that you don't so fragment it that you lose the sense of the common and the shared?

So there are things which we need to continue to push. We have been pushing for instance the arts and civic engagement as major features of what it represents to be a Duke student and those will both be spanning activities. Many students who do civic engagement do already know and will do more. Many students are now participating in the arts and using arts facilities in a way we have never done in the past.

We obviously have the intellectual activities and we need to expand the number of those which happen outside of the classroom, and that's part of where this faculty-student interaction thing can come in. As Dick has already mentioned, Athletics is a shared communal value on this campus. It is a point of initial meeting. It's one of those things where you break the ice. "Hey, did you see the game last night?" Or maybe, "did you see the game last weekend?"... I'll tell you, the Fall would be different around here if we won more football games; it is true. And even the fairly outrageous tailgates which we have at the moment would be different if we were winning more games, and we won games at home. Of course Florida State is Florida State...

And then we have broader spanning values which we also need to emphasize. A love of Duke, which our students have in great intensity, you should know. When you go and talk to students in the dorms with all the problems they'll beat on you with, there is still this underlying sense, "I really love being here." Individual and social responsibility, mutual respect, and something I have already stressed: a sense they participate and have the right to participate in the broader community through all these groups, and that their participation makes a difference. Paul Slattery, who's the President of DSG, can talk to you at great length about that sense of participation and of having a sense that you're participation is meaningful to the whole.

So what's the process this Fall? We're holding open forums in all the quads on West. We are holding open forums in all the neighborhoods (that's what they're called on East) we are having an open forum for students living on Central, we are having a forum for students who live off campus. Now the last one will be interesting to organize. We may just have to wind on over to the Belmont, or maybe next door to me because I have an off-campus frat-house next to my house. Maybe we'll do both. We are meeting with many faculty groups, we are engaging with and then handing off, as I've already mentioned, to the Dean of Undergraduate Education. And late in the Fall or in the Winter we will present a report to the President which will have more specific recommendations following on the kinds of things that I've presented today. So that's where we are and I'm happy to take questions or comments.

Questions

Paula McClain: This sounds wonderful, thank-you for all the hard work in this. One question that I didn't see in the Interim Report is the question of students coming back from abroad, who I think really do have problems with housing options, but I'm sure you all have looked at that.

Provost Lange: So far I would say that we've recognized it's a problem. You know there is a big difficulty here in that 70 to 80 percent of our students who study abroad during the year study abroad in one semester, only. That is a problem. It is a problem be-

cause it has a significant impact on the life of a junior class. It is a problem because it means we don't adequately use all of our housing in one semester and then sometimes have strains on housing and housing policy in the other semester. Obviously there are fairly Draconian administrative measures that we could take to balance, or at least reduce, the number of students going abroad in the Fall, whether it would balance would be an interesting question. But in the absence of that, we haven't really figured out what to do. Duke Engage may make some difference; we're not sure. We'll see. Central Campus gives us some opportunities, that's another matter that I didn't discuss here. But obviously everything we're doing here has an intersection with what we do with Residential Life on Central Campus, and that is discussing something important.

John Staddon (ECAC/Psychology & Neuroscience): You used the phrase "collective action". Could you explain a what you meant by that?

Provost Lange: Well you're obviously not a social psychologist². Collective action, there is a large literature, which in another field – if you were a more interdisciplinary scholar, John, you would know this – collective action simply means people acting together to achieve a goal. And there are difficulties in getting people to act together because there is the free-rider problem which is that any individual in a group who wishes to, may think that I don't have to act because somebody else will do it.

Now if groups have cohesion that's built in from the start, or rules of membership that require that cohesion, they can overcome those problems of collective action. If you then have rules, for instance, that say you have to have a group, it has to be pre-constituted, you have to know two weeks ahead that you're going to have a party, you have to have party monitors who have to be trained, etc, etc, you are creating barriers to entry which a capability you have to generate collective action to overcome more easily. It could be hiring a hall for a lecture, it doesn't have to be a party.

Staddon: Ah, parties! I see. I was just looking for an example of "collective action." It's not the elimination of the Kulaks, or something...

You talk about the need for more co-ed living space, is that something that comes from the students?

Lange: We had a very interesting discussion, and actually it feeds even to freshman campus, although it's complicated. If you ask students about gender relations on campus and the so-called hook-up culture, etc, first of all there's an interesting thing that we discovered about the hook-up culture, which is the percentage of undergraduates who believe that other undergraduates engage in the hook-up culture is approximately four times higher than the number of undergraduates who themselves admit that they engage in the hook-up culture. There is some discrepancy between the perception and the reality, I'm not saying

tween the perception and the reality, I'm not saying it's 4-to-1, but there's definitely a mismatch there.

But beyond that, when you talk to the students about that, they will tell you that they recognize that there isn't enough of this sort of platonic, easy-going relationship between men and women just as friends, that they would like to have. And part of that is because our housing system promotes friendships based on gender. And there are ways that we could improve that. The interesting that is that I thought freshmen, that East Campus, was co-ed. Well the East Campus is sort of co-ed, it turns out, because the dorms are divided either by floors or by half-floors, one direction and the other direction by gender, for the most part. So we begin to segregate students by gender from day one. Part of that has to do with space, and a particular space: the bathrooms. So there are complicated issues relating to that, but yes it came from the students.

Paula McClain: What's the process by which faculty will be pulled into discussions? You just spoke about meeting groups of faculty.

Lange: We're going back to all the groups we met with; this Council will be back here again, the Arts & Sciences Council, we met with divisional chairs, I think we have that again, John, meetings with divisional chairs in Arts & Sciences, with folks in engineering, but again there are a lot of faculty who don't really care about any of this, to be honest with you. Or they care only if it impinges on some bad experience that they've had. So expanding that conversation is difficult.

Faculty Scholars

Paula McClain: Next we'll deal with the Faculty Scholars. I saw Ben come in. If you are interested in learning more about the Faculty Scholars Program, the information and the list of previous winners is posted on the Academic Council website. Now I would like to welcome Professor Benjamin Ward who is the Chair of the Committee who will present the report.

Ben Ward (Philosophy/Dean's Office): Thank you very much. First, I'd like to thank the members of the Council for the privilege of serving as Chair. I've often said that this is one committee which faculty should actually pay for the privilege of serving on, such is the pleasure of interacting with such extraordinary scholars; it is the one committee that you will have to wrest from my cold, dead hands, among others.

This year was really quite extraordinary, we had almost a record number of nominees, I believe in the time that I have been on the committee, the largest number of nominees we've had is 28, and this year we had 27, so almost at that number. But we did have a record number of Departments and Programs making nominations. We had nominations from 20 departments within Trinity College and the Pratt School of Engineering. We've never had that many different departments and programs making nominations before, so I'm actually thrilled at that. You have seen the report, we had 27 nominations as I've said. The commit-

² True

tee met and decided to interview 9 of those students a little over a week ago. And from those interviews we decided to name 3 students as faculty scholars for 2007-2008, and also present the names of two students for designation as Honorable Mention.

For honorable mention, we have [Sarah Katherine Wallace](#) from Public Policy Studies and [Yvonne Joy Yamanaka](#) from Biomedical Engineering, and we are proposing the names of the following 3 students for designation as Faculty Scholars for 2007-2008. [Sarah Taylor Ellis](#) (English/Music/Theater Studies), [Claire Helen Lauterbach](#) (Political Science/History), and [Paul Joseph Slattery](#) (Economics/Literature).



Paula McClain: Is there a motion to approve the Faculty Committee's report? [the motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Ben Ward: I am relieved and delighted that you have decided in your wisdom to accept these recommendations, because as it happens the 3 faculty scholars for 2007-08 are in our midst and I'd like to have them come forward and give us a chance to greet them in a chance in a manner fitting their designation as faculty scholars. [Applause]: This is Paul Slattery as some of you may know his other incarnation as DSG President. Claire Lauterbach and Sarah Ellis. Congratulations, and thank-you.

Paula McClain: Thank you Ben. These are really incredible young people. Historically, the number of the young scholars have gone on to receive wonderful awards and scholarships and we're so proud of you and wish you much success in your future career. I'd also like to thank Ben and his committee for their wonderful work on the Faculty Scholars Program. I'd now like to call Warren Grill forward to give us an update on what the University Priorities Committee will be doing.

University Priorities Committee

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): I just wanted to introduce briefly our agenda items for this academic year, but before we get started while you're reading the list of the membership of the committee, I'd like to give a collective thanks on behalf of the faculty, students, and administration to the university, to [Jim Cox](#) who is my predecessor as Chair of the UPC and its predecessor PACOR, who if I heard correctly

for 17 years, he served in this role, so I think we all owe him a great debt of gratitude.



We have faculty across all schools at Duke University represented on this committee, as well as ex officio members from the administration, and representation from both undergraduate and graduate students. All these members are invited by the President, so that's how the members of the committee are selected.

Our charge, when this committee was established, is to work with the administration to ensure that the financial decisions that are made by the institution are consistent with our academic objectives. Our agenda items (many of these unfortunately probably look very familiar to you) are listed here and because we had a large number of new members of the committee this year we started last week with a review of how the university budget operates, and a glimpse of the budgets of the individual units, a little bit of education to the committee, and so going forward I think we can do a better job at addressing some of these items, including issues associated with the financial relationship of the Health System, the Medical School and the University, auxiliary enterprises. Particularly funding of things that may come out of the Campus Culture Initiative – for example new places to dine and new places to live. This not going to be free unfortunately.

Central Campus – this is a substantial investment in capital and will cause a substantial growth in operating costs to move forward, so we need to understand how this impacts the long-range financial health of the institution. The Dean's taxes, as they like to call them – or the costs allocations to the unit for central expenses; the athletic budget, it's a perennial issue of discussion on this committee, and now that we're going to go forward with it, some renovations of Wallace Wade Stadium, those are also going to be considered on this committee; cash management, that is how we can best use our short-term money because of the changes in federal research report, in particular some of the schools have great sensitivity to research support, particularly the Medical School and the Pratt School of Engineering. The endowment policies, practices, and performance and – everyone's favorite – parking.

So if you have any input for the committee we'd love to hear from you. I've met with Paula McClain and I'll continue to keep in touch with the members of the Executive Committee as we go forward this year. Thank you. Any questions?

Paula McClain: Thank-you, Warren, much appreciated. That's the last item on our agenda today. I want to remind you that ECAC is searching for ways to get information from you about the issues and things you think are important for faculty to be concerned with and for us to deal with, so please do send us messages and emails. So, the meeting's adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, September 8, 2007