

# 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, September 21, 2006



Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council):  
Welcome to the first Academic Council meeting of the 2006-07 Academic year...

The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the May 11 meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

### *Announcements.*

Welcome to the first meeting of this academic year in our new location. We did this both to have nicer surroundings and as an experiment, on the theory if you have new challenges it will help to ward off Alzheimer's. So all of you who have managed to find your way here are well on the way to fighting off that dread disease.

Please remember to initial the attendance sheets that are passed around at each meeting. This may be the last place at Duke where attendance is taken. We do it because our bylaws direct that you flunk out after three unexcused absences. Please call or e-mail the Academic Council office if you are unable to attend a meeting. Also, for any questions or comments coming from the Council members today, please speak up and identify yourselves for the record.

### *Earned Degrees*

#### **Diplomas dated September 1, 2006**

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

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
<a href="#">Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.</a>	
Bachelor of Arts	38
Bachelor of Science	21
Pratt School of Engineering	
<a href="#">Dean Kristina M. Johnson</a>	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	6
Master of Engineering Management	12
School of Nursing	
<a href="#">Dean Catherine L. Gilliss</a>	
Master of Science in Nursing	32
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences	
<a href="#">Dean William H. Schlesinger</a>	
Master of Environmental Management	9
Master of Forestry	1
Fuqua School of Business	
<a href="#">Dean Douglas T. Breden</a>	
Master of Business Administration	105

Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Divinity	8
Master of Theology	3
School of Law	
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett	
Juris Doctor	5
Master of Laws	4
School of Medicine	
Dean R. Sanders Williams	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	8
Doctor of Medicine	1
The Graduate School	
Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Master of Arts in Teaching	13
Master of Science	24
Master of Arts	23
Doctor of Philosophy	70
TOTAL	383

### *Questions for the President*

Haagen: We have two questions for the President. The questions were e-mailed to you earlier today and I will now call on President Brodhead at this time. I would also like to recognize that, not in keeping with our usual practice, we did not give President Brodhead as much notice as we normally like to give but he has graciously agreed to answer them anyway.

The first question is:

[In light of the announcement of Harvard and Princeton that they are discontinuing the early admission option for applicants, is Duke reconsidering its early admissions program; if so when will the result of such reconsideration be announced?](#)

President Brodhead: In spite of the fact that these questions didn't reach me acres of time ago, I am happy to answer them. They are questions of interest to all of us as members of the university and members of our society.

If you will permit me to answer in more than two sentences, but not terribly long. Let me just ask you, on the subject of early admissions for undergraduates, you know something of the history of that. It goes back to the time when it was recognized that there is some very, very small number of people who have known forever exactly what school they wanted to go to – and who are also visibly qualified for admission to that school so that it seemed such individuals shouldn't have to wait until the end of April to get the good news. That's the basis of any legitimate early-admission program.



From that came a great flourishing development that we're all familiar with: students heard that their friends were applying early; some people saw other people get in early. And all of a sudden there began to be a kind of a national landslide to apply early... So, instead of students who actually had it in their heart that they wanted desperately to go to a school, people began to strategize about these things. Where might they most likely to believe me if I pretend that this is where I really want to go? And then as you also know – and I think this a dangerous part of the story – some schools, including some quite good ones, began playing that game back by saying that we will pretend to want you if you pretend to want us in the first place.

This was what led to a world where a legitimate thing became of source of sort of national gamesmanship. This was then thought to add stress to people in the month of October and November. And then of course people did notice something, which is that students who applied early tended not to match the profile of the students such schools wanted at the end of the day of their admissions pool. They tended to include fewer candidates for aid, more people from wealthy backgrounds, more people from the schools with lots of college advisors.

It's in the face of that development that Harvard first and now Princeton made their announcement. And they have done away with all early admissions (or intend to do so next year). Now I stop and ask you: that's a bold solution to the problem I just outlined. But, we ask ourselves, how many problems will actually be solved by that step? A world in which no one can get in early is a world in which the average very, very smart student is going to have to apply to fifteen schools in order to have confidence of getting into five of them.... So the notion that stress is going to be reduced by this phenomenon seems to be unconvincing.

Furthermore, it is said that this is a way to strike a dagger through the heart of families who are over-resourced in their ability to aid their young applicant. I'll tell you that if everybody is applying to every school and waiting for the same day to get in the notion people are going to lay back at that

point... People are going to hire teams that used to only hire individuals to help their students. This is not a simple problem. It is a cultural problem. It is not a formal admissions problem. And the notion you can solve it by making an admissions change is unconvincing.

The other thing we all know is that we worry about selective universities having student populations that are skewed toward higher incomes. You know that the real basis of that problem doesn't have to do with admissions office protocols, it has to do with deep realities in the American life that have to do with the very high correlation between the availability of high quality education and the way that that tracks along certain lines of income distribution in our country. The notion that by changing your early program you're going to solve that problem ignores the nature of the true underlying difficulty.

This is a long way of getting back to your question which I now will answer. I say to you that I think Duke has to its credit the fact that we have really held to the legitimate, original aims of early decision. Some schools have admitted as much as 50 some up to 60% of their students from the early pool. Duke has never admitted, I think, more than 30% and has actually been closer to 25%. And we have tried to reserve early admissions for those people who convincingly and compellingly want to come here and are so visibly qualified for admission that they would be almost certain to be admitted whether in were in the Fall or whether it were in the Spring.

I think our version of it is the defensible – and I think I might say the only defensible – version of the early program. And in view of that we have not at this point decided to change. It must be said though that this is a subject that as the national debate continues we do continue to reevaluate. In the event the time is right to make a change that will be the time that we will make a change.

Haagen: The second question is longer:

A recent article in the *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 9, 2006) describes the aggressive strategy that Duke pursued during the presidency of Terry Sanford to recruit and admit students, who otherwise would not have been admitted to Duke, for the purposes of university development.

a) To what extent is Duke currently admitting such students for the purposes of development?

b) To the extent that any remnants of that strategy remain, please explain precisely how the policy works. Who initiates the process, who makes the final admission decision and what criteria are used?

c) What are your views toward using the admissions process for the purposes of university development?

President Brodhead: These are questions that can very legitimately be on people's minds and I'm

very, very happy to have a chance to speak to that and to discuss it at more length if people wish.

The story in the *Wall Street Journal* is kind of a tasty excerpt from a book that has come out called *The Price of Admission*. It has chapters on Duke, to be sure, but also on most of the other schools that one would like to be linked with – a particularly savory chapter on Harvard and one on Brown and so on and so forth.

But the *Journal* article in question talks about practices that are described as taking place during the presidency of Terry Sanford. One thing I want to say is: we associate Terry Sanford's presidency with the phrase *outrageous ambitions* and with the idea that this was a university that could really try to lever itself up to be a much greater kind of thing entirely than it was then. Now the truth is, at that time, Duke did not have the means to become what it wished to be, and I think it was part of a conscious strategy, as I understand it, of the Sanford presidency, to try to find the means to make this a greater school. I believe the attention to development aspects of admissions was one of a range of actions that took place at that time.

And now I have to ask: if we were to look back in retrospect and ask ourselves, was Terry Sanford right or was Terry Sanford wrong about that? It's actually an interesting question because if you wanted it to be a greater school you had to find some way to get the means to lift it to that level, and if this university shelled out this year over a hundred and twenty million dollars in aid for undergraduates, for graduate students, and so on, how did we ever end up in the position to do that and all the things that that implies – in terms of the quality of students we can now attract, in terms of the diversity of students we can now attract? All kinds of things we take for granted about the mature Duke were enabled by amassing resources, and that didn't happen by accident.

I think what we talk about is one of a variety of strategies that helped with that. That said, it seems to me we are describing something that that characterized an earlier phase of history and, I have to say, Terry Sanford has not been the president here for a couple of years, and I regard this policy as something we have benefited from, but which I would not now be eager to continue.

Is it the case now that a university like Duke should pay absolutely no attention to the question of whether a candidate's family could make such a contribution to the university as enable us to build new libraries, or have summer programs abroad, or fund financial aid or things of that sort? I hope you won't despise me if I say I think it would be naive to say that a any president in a university should pay no attention to those things.

The question that arises is: how much attention? And my answer to that would be: in some cases, perhaps some attention but in no case very much attention.

The truth is, the way you have to do admissions in a great university is by thinking case by case about the qualifications of a candidate, and the people you admit have to be qualified to do the work and have to have the desire to avail themselves of the resources of the university.

Now applying those criteria doesn't cut the applicant pool down to the size of the entering class and so other kinds of considerations come to play, and in admissions, as practiced here and in schools comparable to Duke, there have been a variety of so-called plus factors that in an individual case can make you say: well in this case, maybe yes. These plus factors have included family affiliation with the university, since we value a sense of loyalty and continuing support. There have been plus factors for people who are children of faculty and staff, that's another form of loyalty that's important for us to have. There have been plus factors for a number of minority groups. There have been plus factors for people from international places. At Duke it's a plus factor if you come from North or South Carolina, There are plus factors for a great range of these things. And to some extent development as well.

I don't think that that fact itself is troubling to me. The real question I ask is: how should the proportion be struck, and it seems to me the real answer is, the plus factors. It's not illicit or illegitimate to consider them, it's just you never want to weigh a plus factor more heavily than the individual qualification, in any case and you don't want any plus factor to dominate excessively across the whole student body.

Many of the students who come here who have wealthy parents are in fact superbly well qualified and do great things for this university. I am not going to pretend that there is no consideration of the development aspects of admission, but I do think it is very important that it not be the dominant consideration, in any case or as we think of student bodies in general.

Here, I'll tell you one thing you may not know: When I became president there was still at Duke a vestige of the old order of things. At the end of undergraduate admissions, they used to do something called the Provost's Round where the Provost met with the Dean of Admissions to decide about particularly problematic cases that had a double admissions and development base to them. But when I became president I asked that that be discontinued, and that is no longer practiced here. Rather, those things are done within the jurisdiction of the Dean of Admissions.

Haagen: Do you want to make your announcements?

President Brodhead: There are two things I am happy to announce, and one of them is that, at the end of Nan Keohane's women's initiative a body was set up called the President's Commission on the Status of Women. That was a group that was called to-

gether to monitor the progress of the many different parts of the recommendation. That group has done very serviceable work for the last couple of years. At the same time, it seemed to us that it would be a good time to try to convene a little more of that committee-of-the-whole feeling that characterized the women's initiative in the first instance. So, while there will be separate women's issues, for faculty, separate women's issues for graduate and post-docs, separate for undergraduate, separate for staff, it will be helpful to have the group that convenes this fall. I myself am the chair, it will be called the [President's Council on Women](#), it will have a staff, administrative representation, faculty representation and student representation.

Now this will be a chance to keep alive the question: what is the status of women at this university? Where have we made adequate progress and where does the progress still need in significant measure to be made? These are problems that aren't going to be solved in a year or two. One of the things I most admired of Nan Keohane's presidency is the attention she paid to these issues, and it is something I want to keep alive in my own tenure in this job.

The second thing I wanted to announce is that I have asked a group, predominantly faculty, to consider the workings of the group called the Athletics Council. This is a trustee-faculty-student group that looks over the practice of athletics at Duke.

Last spring, you may remember, there was something we all became aware of: that athletics was a big thing at Duke, that it seemed that there were big gaps between it and the rest of the university. And many people said to me: why isn't there any group that can review questions of athletics in admissions, that can review this question and that? To which curiously, the answer was: there is such a group: the Athletic Council. But, I'll tell you, if that group existed and people still had so many questions to ask, you might say to yourself: was it really performing the function that we had in mind: the regulatory and supervisory function?

That's what made me think it may be a good idea for us to call a group into session to look into the workings of that Council. What should its jurisdiction be, what should its agenda look like? What should its constituency look like? I'm very grateful that Professor Roy Weintraub, who was your [Paul's] predecessor some time back, has agreed to chair this body, to bring in recommendations six weeks to two months after – that should be an extraordinarily important thing. I see some of other members of the committee in this room, and I'm grateful to people for doing this work. This group was last reviewed in 1983, and I say to myself: I've learned a concept from certain of our trustees called shelf life. We may have reached what is termed the shelf life of the current version of the Athletics Council, and it will be time for us to refresh it; I think that will be a good thing.

Haagen: Roy was my predecessor in more ways than one. I bought his house when I moved to Durham.

### *Faculty Scholar Award*

We turn next to one of the Council's happiest traditions, which is receiving the report of the Faculty Scholar Award committee. The committee report has been distributed today. Professor Ben Ward, the Committee's chair, is teaching at this hour and is unable to present the report in person. Although he cannot be here, for the record, I want to thank him and his colleagues: Professors Patricia Bauer, Jan Ewald and George Truskey for their good work.

The Faculty Scholar Award, as most of you know, is an honor bestowed by the faculty from a fund established by members of the faculty in 1974 to honor truly outstanding undergraduate students. Professor Ward's report outlines the criteria of selection and gives us the names of two faculty scholars ([Joseph James Babcock](#) and [James Yang Zou](#)) and 3 students acknowledged with honorable mention ([Julia Parker Goyer](#), [Brandon William Levin](#) and [Amy Rachel Motomura](#)). May I ask now for a motion to ratify this report? We are hoping to have members of the committee and the faculty scholars attend our next Council meeting to be introduced and acknowledged. [Motion passed by voice vote without dissent.] Thank you.

### *Faculty Hearing Committee*

Haagen: I want to thank both the continuing members and those who are candidates for election at this time for their willingness to serve on this committee. The workload of this Committee is unpredictable. It depends on the number of cases that are brought. I am sure that we as a Council hope for all kinds of reasons, including the well-being of our committee members, that the workload will be light or non-existent. We also need to recognize that we cannot count on such a Panglossian world, and therefore I want to acknowledge, on behalf of the entire faculty, those who are willing to commit themselves to this service should the need arise. Professor Bob Mosteller will chair this committee.

I'm going to read the names of the proposed new and reappointed members. We, via the very able assistant to the Council, were notified just yesterday that one of the incumbent members (Pete Kyle – Fuqua) has left the University. The Chair of the Council actually knew that some time ago, because Pete told him, but failed to note that his name was on the list of members of the Faculty Hearing Committee – for which oversight he apologizes to both the Council to the Council assistant. One of his Fuqua colleagues and a current Council member, Paul Zipkin, has kindly agreed to complete Pete Kyle's term so we put his name forward at this time as well. The proposed members are:

[John Board](#) (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

[Ann Marie Pendergast](#) (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology)

[Laura Underkuffler](#) (Law)

[Christina Williams](#) (Psychology and Neuroscience)

May I have a motion to approve this slate of candidates? [The motion was passed by voice vote, without dissent.]

### *New Vice-President and General Counsel*

I would next like to introduce Duke's newly appointed (on July 1, 2006) Vice President and General Counsel, [Pam Bernard](#). Pam is a nationally recognized leader in education law. She comes to Duke from the University of Florida where she received her undergraduate and law degrees and held the appointment of general counsel and vice president under 5 presidents. She is past president of the National Association of College and University Attorneys and is serving on the General Counsel Advisory Board of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Pam Bernard: Thank you Paul, I have very brief remarks which I was requested to keep brief and that is challenge in and of itself for any lawyer. I would say that it is strange that the last thing Paul mentioned was my appointment to the NCAA General Counsel Advisory Board, which is a group of lawyers – about 8 lawyers advising. Because when President Brodhead offered me this position, he promised me that I would have no issues in athletics at all that I would have to deal with! And as I told him since that time in law we call that bait and switch.

But I have enjoyed my time here so far very much. I must say it is a real privilege for me to be here at Duke University. This institution has come a long way in a very short time. And it is amazing to me to see it first from afar and now close up. And one thing I think I have figured out in my 3 or 4 months of being here – and there are a lot of things I haven't figured out – is that the main reason we have come so far so fast is because of the quality of our



faculty and that is people like you. And that is what makes this so different for me to work with people of that quality. So thank you so much for welcoming me. I look forward to helping you and serving you in the coming years. Thank you. (clapping)

Haagen: I can tell you that I have been following the university counsel on a regular basis since July 1 for advice on matters dealing with the faculty and protecting our interests. The next matter is the

### *Faculty Athletics Associates Program*

I guess that I have achieved a level of something, because for the first time in my life someone other than my students or children thought I was worthy of a parody. At the risk of appearing like some hapless congressman on the Colbert Report, I will give my earnest account and explanation of the Faculty Athletics Associates Program.



In the wake of the events of this spring, it became clear to me that the Athletic Department and the coaches in particular were isolated from most of the rest of the Duke community in ways that were not healthy for this institution. I started to think about ways of facilitating connections with the rest of the campus, and particularly of creating human contact between faculty and coaches – groups of people that normally do not interact with one another on this campus.

I saw an article in the *Princeton Alumni Weekly* about a program at Princeton that linked faculty with teams. That particular program had a number of features that appeared to me not well suited to Duke at this time, and were not in keeping with my responsibility to protect the prerogatives of the faculty. Specifically, at Princeton, the participating faculty are selected by students on the teams, from among their favorite teachers. It seemed to me that if we were going to do this, the selection process should be retained by the faculty as part of its normal committee processes.

I looked into similar programs at a variety of other institutions, such as Middlebury and Trinity. In those programs, the faculty are understood to be ambassadors or advocates for the teams. That also seemed inappropriate for our situation at Duke.

Some of these programs also required the participating faculty to mentor members of the teams. I thought that was also not appropriate here. There are existing mentoring programs and relationships that I did not want to compromise or interfere with, and I wanted it to be possible for faculty to participate, who did not want to take on that level of responsibility or commit to that level of support to the athletic enterprise.

Over the course of the summer, I discussed the idea with members of the faculty and with various members of the Athletic Department, including coaches. Some were quite enthusiastic. Some were very uneasy about allowing people outside their control structures to have such a level of access to their teams, especially if they did not have a role in the selection of those persons. Eventually, I got the agreement of the Athletic Department to go ahead with the idea for all of the athletic teams at Duke. In the end, there was agreement that whatever the additional burden on them, it would be positive if each of the coaches got to know at least some faculty, and to have the input of faculty.

The effect of the program will be to give Duke faculty greater access to teams than, to the best of my information and belief, exists at any other Division IA school.

Because this is self-consciously designed as an experiment, it seeks to put as few constraints as possible on participating faculty, and leaves to their individual initiative and judgment the optimal way for them to interact with the coaching staff and student athletes on the team they would be associated with. The only two constraints were that no one would be allowed to continue with any one team for more than three years, because we did not want particular faculty members to become too associated with that team, and the persons selected should not be so openly hostile to the team with which they were associated that they would be disruptive.

What could come out of this? At a minimum, it should improve communication. It also has another goal. Duke invests substantial resources in intercollegiate athletics. For most faculty, what happens on those teams is a mystery. The coaches speak of themselves as teachers and educators, but the form of teaching and education is quite different from the teaching and education on the rest of the campus. I understood this as an opportunity for faculty to find out what that activity is.

Some people have suggested that this is an attempt to build support for athletics, and are fearful that it will just be an opportunity for the Athletic Department to co-opt individual members of the faculty. The Athletic Department administration clearly hopes that if faculty know more about what it is that they do, they will be supportive. They are confident enough that they are prepared to give access, and to permit that access on terms that they do not control. I think that it is good that they have such confidence,

but neither I, nor ECAC, make any such assumption about what familiarity will breed. Our assumption is that the faculty will observe, interact and reach their own conclusions. Given the nature of faculty, I think it inevitable that at least some will conclude, after seeing Division IA athletics up close, that they like it even less than they thought they would. Others will in all probability find features or aspects of the experience that are more positive than they had imagined.

In the announcement that ECAC sent out, we stated that we hoped this program would increase faculty understanding of athletics. Some people have suggested that there was an implied suggestion that athletics, and athletes, were – like the Jets in West Side Story – misunderstood. No such implication was intended. Rather what was intended was that the faculty would gain access that would give them a level of understanding not available without that access. By analogy, UPC has sought and gotten access to detailed budgetary materials, including those related to athletics, not because we fear that Vice President Trask is misunderstood, but because without that access we will not adequately understand the decisions that his office is making. No part of this was intended to suggest that there were not other forms of information or discussion that were not as or more important.

In the parody, it was suggested that what we should be doing is inviting coaches to participate in the lives of departments. This suggestion, by the way, met with some interest among the coaches. If someone wants to organize it, there may be takers.

Coaches and faculty occupy very different places at Duke. There are about 60 of them, and there are about 2,500 of us. We, by virtue of our status as faculty, have governance responsibilities, and substantial say over the structuring of education at Duke. They do not have such governance responsibilities.

I have heard the objection that this is not a good use of faculty time. It may not be. It is an experiment. At the experimental stage, it seemed wise to let individual faculty be the judge. More than 80 responded that they would like to participate.

Procedurally, this was approved by ECAC. ECAC understands this to be in effect a new committee. As a result, this comes to the Council as an information item, and one that does not need Council approval.

Are there questions or concerns about either substance or procedure? Or do any of you have direction for ECAC about the wisdom or direction of this initiative?

Barbara Ramsay Shaw (Chemistry): You just said there are 80 faculty who have asked to be associated?

Haagen: Yes.

Shaw: And how many of these are women how many are men?

Haagen: There is a significant number of women who have asked. There is a significant number of men who have asked to be associated with women's teams and women who have asked to be associated with men's teams. Half the people who asked to be associated with football are women. But I didn't go through it... I was concerned to see that there were women.

Steve Baldwin (Chemistry): Is there a way people participating in this program report back to this group or another group.

Haagen: It is my intention that there will be such requests for feedback. Is it formally instituted at this point? The answer is no. The hope is – and one of the suggestions is – that we give preference to people likely to be involved in various forms in university governance, so that comes back into our collective discussion.

Linda Franzoni (Mechanical Engineering): 80 faculty responded. So are all the teams covered or are there some teams that still need faculty and are there teams that have excess associates?



Haagen: If you will note that when I sent out that thing, I did not ask people to indicate teams. People did however indicate teams and there are some teams that have a significantly larger number of persons interested than we'll be able to accommodate. Women's basketball, men's basketball, men's lacrosse...have the largest number. To the best of my information and belief no one indicated fencing. I'm not sure that there was anybody for track and field. But you know who said they wanted to do it. But we accepted that people intended that they were expressing an interest in the program, not in a particular team. Some people indicated they were interested only in certain teams.

Karla Holloway (English/ECAC): I have a response about the question about the gender breakdown from the 70 respondents. 12 were women and the rest were men. That was on the 6<sup>th</sup> of September.

Haagen: I didn't count them.

Barbara Shaw: How does that number compare with the proportion of women athletes?

Haagen: Women are 40 something %. I think women are about 40%.

## *Implementation of the Strategic Plan*

That leads us to the final matter which is one of the central matters that this faculty is going to need to deal with this year along with planning of Central Campus. This is the second meeting. We're operating under a two-meeting rule and I now call on President Brodhead.

President Brodhead: I'm really just coming down as a warm-up act for Peter Lange who will come and present this at more length...I hope you can allow me one digression about this athletics subject. One thing I want to say about it is: I myself am not a partisan of what was proposed. But it will be excellent for this university to really have closer relations and greater mutual knowledge across...Athletics does not profit from separation or segregation of athletes; we should not promote it, we should not seek it, I actually think to some extent we should not tolerate it.

There are many new things; I haven't been brought here in front of you to speak to them, but for instance you probably know that after last Spring there is now a new system whereby conduct infractions by student athletes must be self reported to their teams, and they are dealt with; and the way they are dealt with is monitored and made the subject of a report that goes to the Director of Athletics, but also to the President, so these things are known, and that's one way of bringing things into a tighter relation. But that's of course a purely negative one. I think equally important is the fact that Peter Lange has included the Director of Athletics into a group that he works with, what's called the Undergraduate Leadership Group. That didn't used to be the case; the Director of Athletics had no way to hear what was going on or what the outside perspectives are. Nor did anyone on the academic side have a chance to hear what his concerns were. So it seems to me, that however, whatever, the formulations, it seems to me important that we really seek every way to bring these things back together so that they could be in a healthier balance, but we need relationships to make that balance work.

That is the end of the digression, and I now I begin my introduction to Peter Lange.

When I was a candidate for the position I now hold, I was sent a variety of materials and one of them was a thick, thick – well, not the thickest thing I ever held! – document called: The Strategic Plan of the University: Building on Excellence. I read it with care, it was impressive, I'm not sure I would say I was completely bowled over by it. The goals were admirable, but they were ones that were shared by many universities. What I will say is, coming on to this campus, having read *Building on Excellence*, I had an astonishing experience, which is to see that what differentiated Duke was not the goals that were in the strategic plan, but the fact that it actually does something about those goals. This is a difference,

something we should all be conscious of, and I think proud of.

That report said that for this to be a great university, it had to become significantly stronger in science and engineering and one comes back five years later and there's CIEMAS, there's the French Science Center, and there's all the kinds of faculty that those resources attract.

That report said this university needed to step up its efforts on the international scene, and five years later, we've gone from being a trailer to a leader in securing government grants for area studies and that kind of international study.

That report said that Duke had to make a much more aggressive investment in information technology and link it to the role of learning, and lo and behold, you come and the library has a child. Now there's Perkins and Bostock, and if you haven't been back to Perkins, Perkins itself has been retro-fitted in the image of Bostock and it has been made, not a very nice library circa 1967, but a pretty fabulous library circa 2006.

These things did not happen by accident, they happened partly as a result of the process of strategic planning, and it seems to me, these things show, what a strategic plan can be. It can be a bureaucratic document produced by a bureaucratic exercise with very little consequence beyond that, but it could be something else, and Duke shows it could be something else: strategic planning could involve the making of choices such that day by day, the university moved intentionally and opportunistically to advance toward of the goals that were most important. This is pretty much the backdrop to the exercise we have gone through now – ever so many of you have been part of it. Every school has produced a strategic plan, and now there's a plan on top of the plan, as we might say, that comes to you today, and I thank everybody who has worked so hard on these things, including the members of Peter's staff, and again what I see now that the new plan had in it is three things:

One, it does quite frankly address things that are not yet excellent in this university, and I would say that the recommendation about the arts falls in that category. There are great arts programs here, and since the Nasher opened, we now have the resources we didn't used to have, but that's a place where we are now in the position to make a step and the report calls on us to do that.

The report also urges us to take maximum advantage of the things Duke is good at and can do that other schools can't do so easily, I would put everything interdisciplinary in that category. But it seems to me that really the heart of the matter is that twenty years from now the answer to the question whether or not this really actually was a strategic report or not, that answer will be delivered according to whether we did or didn't correctly guess the question about what universities are going to be asked to turn into in the next generation or two. What work will we be asked to perform for our

asked to perform for our culture? What wisdom will we be asked to deliver? Because the university that begins now to shape itself to do what will be seen as most important in the future will be the university that is best positioned to be recognized as excellent.

You've read it, I trust, I don't want to a show of hands, I can't tell you how many times I've read it, it's a very familiar text to me, but you remember that there are a certain number of things that are advanced in this report as Duke guesses about what direction learning and the work of universities are going to take.

One, that we sit at the end of a very long and very crucial era when intellectual advances were achieved through specialization, through the division of labor, the division of fields, the division of sub-fields. But everywhere we look we see that now comes the time when every curious, creative person wants to know how to recombine their specialty with some adjacent specialty that had been defined as separate but now they want to recombine these things.

Why is it that the modern biology department wants to have a tie to biomedical engineering, why it is that it wants to include computationalists instead of exclude them the way it used to, wants to include ties to physicists, include biochemists, etc. Why is it that people working on health, not just as a medical science issue, want to include business schools since the major health issues are health management and the economics of health and why is it that they might want ties in future to people who engage in the study of cultures, since there are many places in the world where we have cures for diseases that are culturally read as negative rather than positive and you know, you cannot solve that at the level of medical work alone.

So we look to the future as being one where people are going to need to collaborate, where disciplines are going to want to pull themselves together, and this means, among other things, we look to the future as one where people are going to need to learn to work in teams, even more effectively than they have yet, not just teams of people doing the same task, but teams made up of people with different experience, different expertise, players whose differences are what enable them to solve the problem that's before them.

If we're worried about these things, the university needs to think about how to build up every traditional strength, but also preparing these new strengths, and that means to say, preparing for them in a way we are ready to recruit faculty, in the way we build up facilities to house faculty: it matters if you build a building that links medicine and engineering like CIEMAS or links the physical sciences the way that the French Center will do, or whether it separates them. So this makes very relevant your questions of faculty, questions of curriculum, questions of building.

And something I personally want to say, I have found extraordinarily interesting through this exercise, there's all kinds of familiar processes and values that anyone living in the modern university lives in that actually when you see them through this lens, take on a new interest and even if I say, a new relevance, and here I would turn back to the role of diversity. Diversity didn't enter American universities because they suddenly became aware, in the wake of the civil rights movement, of this fact that many of the great American universities opened their doors to some people and shut their doors to others based on the categories those people came out of, rather than their individual skills. And so, the opening of the door to women, the opening of the door African Americans and other minorities, and eventually international students, this is one of the uncompleted projects of American education in the years since 1968 or so, and we all know far it has brought us, and we know how far remains to be traveled there. We know that there was a phase where the first work was to get more different kinds of people into the university, and then there was a need for a second phase of the work, having gotten them in there, you had to get them to be able to engage with one another more than it seemed that they did,

And this we told ourselves, and we were right, was because the modern student is going to live in a world where no lucky person will live in a world with all people like themselves, they'll live with all different kinds of people and they have to know how to function, function respectfully, function creatively and so on and so forth.

My own sense, and you might be able to guess who the author of the premise of the strategic plan is, my own sense is that in the future, and maybe in the light of what I sketched out a minute ago as a guess about the future of universities, that the values of diversity, by which we mean the values of inclusiveness and respect and deep cooperation among people, are going to be more, rather than less, important in the next phase of the university, as it becomes increasingly important for people with different expertise and different backgrounds to be able to come together in teams to solve problems that no one group or individual would be able to solve on their own. This is one of the forms of thinking that underlies the plan.

I do think that while part of what's interesting about the plan is that, the plan doesn't mean to be a laundry list or what they call a Christmas-tree list, as they call that sometimes in congressional bills that they stick together, it's got ever so many different things and ever so many different kinds of projects, building projects, constructions of teaching spaces, building a whole new campus, institutional creations like elevating Sanford to a school, outreach programs to Durham and internationally, curricular aspects to it...

But the point is: this plan tries to think of all these things as ever so many separate projects that nevertheless have some deep values linking them at the bottom such that they have to work on them separately, but if you did them all separately, they'd add up to something that carries us forward to make this the kind of university that will increase in value and that we increasingly need in the future.

The one thing we need to remember is: that be the plan ever so good, you haven't really done any of the work, the writing and approval of Building on Excellence did not cause those things to happen, it was good preliminary work, but it was all the work of imagination, of pushing, of collaboration and so on, that brought the actual changes into existence in the last five years that got us there, and that will be true of the new plan as well. So really, what we do today is to present something as a basis from which to move forward, but also a reminder to us that the work of moving forward remains to be done. It will always in large part be the work of the faculty.

Provost Lange: Thank you very much. This plan has been in the making for two years. And it's worthwhile, and it links up to what the President just said, if you think of the deep things, the most notable things, that happened in that two years. Because it links the past plan with a new plan. So just in the last two years, I just would remind you – it's easy to forget – we opened the following buildings. And I don't present buildings because they are the most important things – they are just the most visible big thing we do. Universities produce lots of incremental goods and we tend to change in incremental ways. Change of faculty hiring position of one kind of thing to another. That's the way we make change. But the big things we remember, the big things we see the big lumpy goods, are the buildings. So just let me remind you:

In the last two years we opened Bostock, Nasher, Law, CIEMAS, the Divinity addition, Rubenstein, largely completed Pratt as well as opening many new classrooms and basically changing the physical features of our campus. Those buildings are important because they measure they way we, as Dick said, thought ahead about the things we needed to do. They are also important because they created a capability for us to do even better certain things than we were doing before.

Now our new Strategic Plan is really designed in some ways, in some fundamental ways, to take the next step based on what we've already accomplished. It doesn't exist apart from the preceding plan; it exists as the next step arising or stepping off from that. Our new strategic plan is called "Making a Difference" and the title is not chosen haphazardly. I think the President has outlined to you some of the ways that we believe that the plan should be characterized that way. It is really about how we bring our university to be a leader in the kind of university we believe

we need to have to be successful in the next century, not the last one.

It's worth remembering that the model of specialization which the President spoke about really is almost 130 years old. There are a few institutions in the world that are fundamentally unchanged in their structure and the way they perceived of themselves over 130 years that could be successful. The university has done remarkably well with that, but it requires constant vigilance to make sure that the old model does not just become the old model, but remains a successful model. And part of what our plan is about is in fact beginning to rethink how we can be most successful as a university for the reasons that the President has outlined today and that the preamble for the plan sets out.



It is a process and a project of rebalancing, but it is a project which builds on enormous strength that we have had here at Duke and that we have been building at such a good rate over the last 5 years. OK plans don't emerge without an enormous amount of work. We have arrived where we are because so many faculty have taken serious roles in our planning process. And I would attribute that to the fact that during the period of our last plan faculty saw that work actually paid off. That things that you committed yourself to actually happened. That ideas that you thought were good ideas could actually come into existence. No one can ask a faculty member to spend a lot of time doing things that are worthless. The whole point of strategic planning is to outline the things that will be worthwhile and then to get commitment. There is no way to build the things that will be worthwhile unless you find out and engage the faculty in determining them. So our strategic plan was built on an enormous amount of faculty commitment.

And I want to thank a few people. Prasad Kasibhatla, who chaired the Planning Steering Committee: that committee read everything: school plans, institute plans, working group reports, gave us valuable advice which we then fed back to those groups, which then produced new versions of those reports. Which were then read again, every single one of them, by the Planning Steering Committee. I understand the Professor Kasibhatla has gone through 3

pairs of glasses during this planning exercise, but that committee has been invaluable.

We also had planning in every school. Those schools engaged their faculty, committees, departmental plans, professional school retreats. It is clear to us that the Planning Steering Committee that faculty played central and important role in shaping school plans and that is as it should be.

There were 200 faculty who served on the provost-level working groups. These reports generated great excitement about the intellectual climate at Duke and provided us with many ways that Duke can further our institutional gains over the coming period.

Finally, many university committees, some of which are listed here, played an important role in shaping our plans and its goals. Some of those committees started work at the very, very beginning of the planning process to say: here are some areas where we think you need to work on. I can assure you that in a couple places in the planning process when we seemed to have forgotten some of the things that were said in those groups, they did not fail to remind us, they had told us those things and drew us back to some of the things that they felt were important that we might have missed.

Finally, as I do these thank-you's, I have to thank the people in my own office and in the President's office who contributed so much to this effort. Above all John Simon who really oversaw the whole thing and John please stand up. (Clapping) Jim Roberts and Richard Riddell – we had this gang of four. The gang of 4 met weekly to think about what was the next thing we needed to do that week, which section had to be written, who was going to write it, who was going to read it, who are we going to talk to. That was a great process. Many, many non-alcoholic beverages were consumed during those meetings. There was a lot of feedback.

Where does this university plan stand with respect to the school plans? I think this is a very important. Making a difference informs and is informed by the plans in the schools plus the plans of the working groups and the institutes. And they are listed here. They exist as an integrated system, not as separate pieces. There are many ways and many priorities that are in the school plans that people might say, wait a moment, where is my school in the university? I can't tell you how many deans have said, wait a moment, we are doing great things, where is my school?

The point is, our plan sits on top of those school plans is in part an enabler. When I sit down with the deans in the Faculty Enhancement Initiative the deans say remember in our school plan such and such is an important priority. Can we have some help from the university strategic plan or the central administration to empower that initiative, to hire that faculty member which fits with our school priority because we don't have the resources fully to do that?

So there is a deep integration between the two. To quote the plan, "we build success by supporting our schools and our investments in faculty and students in ways calculated to build distinctive areas of programmatic strategy within and across the schools."

It is the total package that will advance Duke University. And many of the strategies in the university plan are particularly designed to facilitate the strategic undertakings of the schools.

This slide is simply to remind you of the organization of the plan and the red numbered chapters are those which you did not see in the Spring. When you saw it in May the draft in late April and May there were chapters which were not fully developed or not at all developed. One is on Durham, the region and global strategies and the other was on assessment. Both of those chapters are new. They were worked on over the summer. They've been seen by everyone of those same committees again that I went through before. Now, before addressing the specifics of the plan and specific goals, I'd like to highlight the topics and chapters 2 and 3, the challenges and opportunities of our current planning environment, which present the landscape through which Duke must forge its own path. And the enduring themes which truly structure so many of the goals and ways we are going to act.

Now this is a really interesting chapter. I commend it to you. I'm not going to go through all of these now. But I commend this chapter to you because it really takes what's in the preamble and re-looks at it in the context of what the really challenges are we meet everyday. And I just want to highlight a few of them. By the way, the red bullet here, that's been added since the earlier draft. Anytime you see things in red those are the new items.

The first challenge that we put up here was the increased demand for public trust and accountability. And having just come back from a meeting of 60 provosts, I cannot tell you the extent to which there is a feeling out there that universities must do better at both explaining themselves and in playing an important role and a visible and self-conscious role in the society, if they are to continue to have the kind of support which we have enjoyed in the past. The days of being comfortable of being in an ivory tower – Duke was never really an ivory tower, but many universities were – the days of being comfortable in an ivory tower and expecting to have the respect and financial and political support from society are over. Cost is one of the drivers and the misunderstandings about the cost are some of the drivers, but there are many others. And it is up to us as universities to re-establish a real trust.

What's really striking is if you look at a polls, what you'll see in public opinion surveys, universities still have among the highest respect of any institution, much higher for instance than shall we say congress (let's not talk about that!). But, when you

go to concerns, people are very concerned. Why are they concerned? They are partly concerned because universities are so respected. Because it is a good which is so valued. And people who see a good and respected and value good want to have a full understanding of their access to that good and of the value that that good provides to them and to the society as a whole. So that's one of the drivers.

Increased globalization for research and education. I can't tell you the extent to which this is affecting almost everything we do. Any of you who are in the sciences and in the non-sciences as well when you look in the journals the number of articles that are now published coming from authors who may have never been even trained in the United States, much less working the United States is growing enormously. And the dispersion of patents across the globe has changed very, very markedly in just a short period of time.

These and other developments mean that universities cannot be content to sit back and expect the good, the smart, the intelligent, the best to just come to them. We are going to have to go out and seek them and we're going to have to make a case for why we are the place that want to come to. And we need to do that not only by training our students and our faculty and by the activities we do, but also by bringing those people on to our campuses, by creating the kind of diversity that the President talked about a short while ago. That complex diversity, not just a demographic diversity, but a diversity of experience and a diversity of contact, a diversity of skill in learning how to work with other people. Because so much of the work we will do will be work that is collective: small groups, large works, teams – collaborative.

So that's just a couple of the drivers that I highlighted here. We also highlighted in the plan 6 enduring themes. And the red one there is the one I want to say a word about. These enduring themes overall are ones that should be, and sometimes already are, signatures of our university. In fact, given that *interdisciplinarity* is probably becoming in some quarters the most distinguished thing about Duke and something we are highly recognized for in national studies. But we thought, we heard, and we thought and we finally wrote that even though the humanities played a very central role in the strategic plan of arts and sciences, where they are most heavily centered, although not exclusively, obviously, that it was time in this era to reassert that the humanities remain central to what any great university must do. In fact I might argue that they have become almost more central, and the liberal arts education to which they are tied, in a period in which globalization has become so important. Because it is very, very difficult to think of what we do in the sciences and engineering and in economics and sociology and the other fields and in the way to train our students, if they are not aware of the deeply human issues of cultural understanding

and historical understanding that humanities bring to the question.

So we thought it was important to reinsert that theme even as we reassert the others that are here. And of course knowledge in the service of society is probably the theme which emerges most as the new theme in the strategic plan and that is for the reason that I already started to make clear.

There are two key messages in the plan. One is making a difference and the other, which I know you've heard at nauseam in Academic Council, which is how do we build both distinction and distinctiveness for our university. Now we need to make a difference in and for our students, which requires often thinking more carefully about our curricular or co-curricular activities, and bringing those together in a much more meaningful way than we have in the past. We also need to make changes. You've all heard about the things we're doing to increase independent studies, to increase senior theses. To have a notion that as you go through your undergraduate education you should become a more independent thinker and that we should provide the experiences so you can do that.

We also know that in most professional schools there is rethinking about the curricula going on. Just to be clear. Business has rethought its curriculum within the last year. Divinity has rethought its curriculum within the last year. Law is rethinking curricular changes. Medicine has rethought its curricular changes. How we do education in each of these fields is coming under the pressure of these external things. And our strategic plan is designed to facilitate that so that we can make a difference for our students and adapt into the world that they move into.

We need also to make a difference to our research. And there is a great deal in the plan about enhancing the research enterprise here at Duke and enhancing even further the quality of our faculty: both those who are here, to make them more able to do what they do best, and to assure that we can bring the absolutely best faculty.

And then of course we need to try to make a difference in the world. And this is the knowledge of service to society thing. Now how do we achieve our distinction and distinctiveness. We've already stressed that interdisciplinarity has become an instrument at Duke. And Dick talked about choices. And I want to stress that there is a choice here. When we recruit faculty, especially faculty for leadership positions, we find some people who when you say, this is that nature of Duke this is what we're trying to do, they say that's fabulous. That makes me want to come to Duke. And we also find faculty who say, oh, if that's the way you run, then that's not the place I want to be. OK. Now that's a choice we're making. It's an important choice. It's an exciting choice. The people who say they want to come always seem to me way more exciting than the ones who say they don't. The thing is we build a community around a

value which we understand the value in the context of continuing to know that greater interdisciplinary work is built on strong disciplines. We are not limiting the departments we are trying to enhance and work more at the frontiers. And there are very major challenges there from an operational point of view which we're going to be working on.

In service to society where we have very specific institutions that we're building within Duke to promote that goal. Making Sanford a School of Public Policy if they're able to achieve that goal. We discussed all of that in the spring. The new Global Health Initiative for which we've hired an outstanding director. The Social Science Research Institute which is for the first time really bringing some integration to our excellent social science departments, which up to now have tended to work in fairly silo fashion, for which there are great numbers of opportunities for synergy.

Now to achieve these two major things. The major difference and to achieve distinction with distinctiveness. We have 6 major goals in the plan. I'm just going to outline those for you briefly. The first is the increased capacity of our faculty to develop a community of disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge. Every school plan identified hiring and retaining faculty as their highest priority. But faculty enhancement cannot just be about hiring and retention. It must also be about providing the needs for the faculty who are here to get better. And as you'll hear in various places it's also important to recognize that as we change the character of what we do on the campus and the kinds of things we ask the faculty to do we're going to have to come to terms with how we are using the faculty's time. And that's going to be a major challenge of implementation as we move forward. And I know some of the deans are already beginning to adjust to that issue. But in the plan we have lots of funding for bridge and cluster hiring, start-up support, program support to build diversity in the faculty and to create innovation in teaching. Each of those are areas that link back to the other goal.

The second significant goal is to invest in our signature institutes. The ones that already exist: IGSP, the Kenan Institute, the Sanford Institute that will hopefully become a school, the Franklin Humanities Institute, the Social Science Research Institute and the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions. Each one of those has an important internal function, but also an important function of projecting our knowledge outward.

During the planning period we will be launching two new such institutes. The Institute of Brain Mind Genes and Behavior which will for the first time span this enormous area of brain sciences which ranges all across the medical school into the social sciences, into the sciences and into the humanities as well as into engineering and Fuqua School of Business and to the Global Health Institute which I've already mentioned.

We have recognized in the plan that we were not fully serving our graduate students and therefore not fully serving the critical function that they play in the university as a whole. We have discovered that our stipends in comparison are slipping. We need to develop a new model for how we're going to fund the graduate school and its stipends and the strategic plan provides the funding so that a bridge can be built to this new model so that it doesn't become excessively disruptive for the activities either of the graduate school or the individual schools which have already been in the discussion.

We need better integration of graduate students into the mission of the university to realize that vertical integration about which have talked which some beginnings have been made, but not enough. And as we do want to see individual learning experiences we're going to have to rely both on more graduate students and hopefully also more of the faculty in our professional schools who would want to work with undergraduates and we have not had the opportunity to do so.

Third, we need to create vigorous interdisciplinary methodologies among our graduate students and we need to better support infrastructure including a graduate student center about which graduate student association is very vocal.

The fourth goal is to foster in our undergraduate students a passion for learning and a commitment to making a difference in the world. This is really carrying forward the message that was developed in a task force on undergraduate education. It is part of what has driven this undergraduate leadership group and integration of curricular experiences in what's happening. It's tied to Central Campus and is developmental model. Where on the curricular side we want students to become more independent and on the residential side we want them to grow independent. It's an integrated part of how a person matures as an undergraduate from a 17 year old who just enters Duke in that kind of cocoon (East) to a 20-21 year-old who will launch off from Central Campus when its built into a whole new experience where they are going to be much better prepared than they have been in the past.

Fifth, and the President has already mentioned this: transforming the arts. This involves both a great deal of new money for arts programming and doing something about our less than stellar arts facilities. Have any of you been in Page Auditorium lately? Page Auditorium is built for people of my height. It is not built for people of 6'4" like Paul Zipkin (Paul just raised his hand). We have to have an undiscriminatory Page Auditorium! That's going to require real money. But we can't have an arts initiative which says we've got the Nasher but everything else can go to hell. That's not our plan. Our plan is to build facilities that are up to the arts ambitions which we have and then to assure that we actually enact those arts initiatives.

And finally we have to have great libraries and we have to have the great technology that the faculty and research and curricular activities. Now I should say since I'm not going to spend a lot of time on Central Campus – so many of our goals all get tied in to Central Campus. But I don't mean by that that Central Campus is essential to achieving them, but that Central Campus will embody and capture so many of these goals: arts, internationalization, the way we can use synergies between departments that we've never had to improve faculty hiring, our ability to enhance the undergraduate experience and to reach our goals there. All of those are embodied in that Central Campus project. But again I stress it's not because Central Campus makes those goals possible, but because it becomes a particular and special embodiment of our ability to reach those goals. OK.

Plans like this cost money. Our plan will cost us a billion, 300 million dollars over 5-8 years. Here you see the basic structure of the spending and the structure of where we're going to get the money from. We've spent a lot of time with University Priorities committee and in other settings working through how this is going to work. I would note for you that there is no expectation in the plan itself of a major campaign. So the plan is built without expectations about revenues from a major campaign. I can assure you however that as we begin to think about a campaign which I'm sure we will within the next year or two we will find things to do which we can raise through the campaign which will strengthen and advance the goals here in a more aggressive way or in a more expansive way than we could ever do with structure of this strategic investment plan.

Here's an outline of the program support. About \$100M for the faculty-enhancement initiative itself. Another \$10M for the faculty-diversity initiative. There's about \$40M for programming initiatives. Another \$7.5M for graduate school enhancement. \$20M dedicated to the undergraduate experience and you can go on down.. Those expenditure categories some of them are worked out in details. Many are not. And I think that's actually very important because if we were to write a plan today and say here's exactly what we're going to do over the next 5 years and any deviations from that expenditure pattern will require 6 committees to get together for at least two months to discuss every deviation we will not have an effective plan. So our plan has areas where we have defined what we want to do and it creates a framework, but there's lots of opportunities for interactions between faculty, deans, Provost, to define specific goals in specific years that move us forward on those goals. And that's pretty much the way we worked in the last plan.

And I would say that the place where that shows up most dramatically is this thing called "IT Pool." In the last plan we had \$20M in the plan for something called "IT placeholder." Nobody had any idea – well maybe it's more accurate to say many

people had many different ideas – about how that money would be spent. But in fact our ability changed really the perception of Duke and the underlying reality of Duke about the way we use IT in teaching and in research over that period because we could make adaptive adjustments as new opportunities presented themselves in an area where change is so fast that the notion that you are going to predict what you're going to spend money on 5 years from now is foolish one.

In terms of capital I want to stress these are the capital goals which are in the Central Plan. Schools have specific building and capital initiatives that they are going to take at the school level. But these are the ones and what you're going to see that a shift from the last plan. The last plan we needed to build a lot of new things. In this plan we've got to catch up on a lot of things that we've allowed to degenerate. And to put money into making those better and really transforming them in many cases so they better enhance what we're trying to do.

Does that mean that we'll build no new buildings? I would be foolish to say that. And remember that word *campaign* that I used a while ago. We'll figure out what new buildings we need in a few years. We've just completed one cycle. We're going to work into those buildings and we're going to see where the growth comes, and I'm sure there will be new academic capital projects that will not be on the renovation list. But for right now these are the kinds of renovation things that we think are absolutely critical. Just to give you a quick list: the school priorities include a classroom building at Fuqua, a library renovation in Law, a building for the Nicholas School, two facilities at Pratt, three major buildings in the School of Medicine, and so forth.

When you are planning for two years start figuring out after a while pretty far into that period, but not all the way into it. But there are actually things going on now. So we've already built momentum behind a lot of what's going on in this plan. For instance we decided not to wait a year to begin some of these hiring initiatives. But this year's hiring plans schools start to bring in the idea of cluster hires or special strategic hires that they wanted to make in anticipation that we would have strategic enhancement funds. We've included a director for the Global Health Institute. We watched the Brain, Mind, Genes, Behavior initiative and have just selected 3 interim directors while we go out on a major search. That will be announced in a couple of days. We're very far into the planning for Central Campus. We have new professional degree programs under consideration this fall – 3 of them that will come to the Academic Programs Committee. We have cross school and institute school hires that are under discussion including faculty initiative where people just say you know it would be great to have a hire in this area. Let's not even wait for our department. Let's go and get ourselves together, identify great candi-

dates out there that might fit this kind of job that we really and then go to our deans and see if they will support and go to the Provost under the faculty enhancement initiative to gain support to make these kinds of hires. That's a great initiative.

Bob Thompson has just issued a call for new interdisciplinary courses in the undergraduate life. And we've created a new office of service learning. And just today we received an announcement that we'll receive \$2.5M to launch our visual studies initiative which links both to a initiative in the Arts and Sciences Plan and to our Central Campus plan.

Making a difference defines a distinctive vision for Duke University. It can further assure our place among that small number of institutions and this a quote from our Building on Excellence that define what is best in higher education and Building on Excellence I don't think we had as nearly as clear a focus on how we think we can do that. I think the combination of the preamble, the themes, the challenges we're to meet in a specific way we'll implement the goals that are outlined in this plan will enable us to really live up to this ambition and I hope you'll agree. Thank you very much. (Clapping).

### *Questions*

Berndt Mueller (Physics): Peter, the numbers that you showed us are truly impressive and speak very much of the ability of the university to be in a financial position to make that possible. The one area that seem to me, compared to what I see in the plans, low on the financial side is enhancement of the graduate program. You showed \$7.5M. And my question to you would be do you think that that is sufficient to make the improvements that we all had in mind?

Lange: I do actually. That's one of the things that we priced out very carefully. I should say though that if it proves wrong, we'll find the difference. The difference won't be huge. But we have priced that one out actually fairly carefully so that we could actually bridge over a 5 year period to get the school budgets. The issue there is that ultimately we cannot fund the Graduate School through central funding for the reasons that you well understand. And so ultimately we have to find a way to build the graduate school budget and the opportunities that we have in the school into the schools' budget. So over time we're going to have to do that. This money will enable us to get there in a relative smooth and I hope not overly disruptive way.

Barbara Shaw (Chemistry): This is very nice to hear and exciting. You're talking about new classrooms: the Chemistry Department is going into the French Science building from a place with adequate classrooms to a place which has just one auditorium which everybody in the sciences has to share. What arrangements have you made for the classrooms that we will have? I mean Fuqua for 10 years has had these very nice classrooms, so do you have

anything in your plan that will meet the needs of the sciences, particularly chemistry, although the other sciences may also have concerns?

Lange: So, we're doing a lot of classroom planning right now and there is money. If you went back you would see there is a line for in fact for classrooms and those kind of improvements. It's also the case that we are going to build a new classroom complex on west campus – in the library in fact. This will not solve your auditorium problem, but it will relieve some of the pressure on other classrooms on the campus. I mean there are several auditoriums actually in the science area for the science campus. It's not just the French I mean we have Love Auditorium...

Barbara Shaw: I think it is almost always occupied and it's also not very appropriate auditorium for having close interactions with the students.

Lange: No no. I just don't think there is an immediate demand for that. Our classroom planning doesn't show that. But, I think the larger point you are making is: are we assuring that our classrooms are well adapted to the kind of teaching we have? That's where the funding in the plan is designed to assure. And Dr. Trask and Dr. Roberts - are you waving your hand for Tallman? I wrote a note - somebody said before that they always understood Tallman and I actually have never understood Tallman. In any case, do you want to say something about this?

Vice-President Trask : As for time of renovation the plans are to leave the Love auditorium on the ground floor of Gross Chem.. It may go away for awhile but it won't go away for ever.

Barbara Shaw: So we will walk back to Gross Chem. to teach?

Trask: Yes, for a while.

Haagen: This is the second meeting on the Strategic Plan. This will go to the Board of Trustees. I would like to have a motion to accept and approve the plan, endorse it enthusiastically. Do I have such a motion. [The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote, without dissent.]

With that note of enthusiasm we can enthusiastically adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon

Faculty Secretary, September 12, 2006