

Duke University

Durham
North Carolina
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

PHONE(919)684-6447
FAX(919)681-8606
EMAIL: ACOUNCIL@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU

April 23, 1998

The Academic Council of Duke University met from 3:45 until 5:22 p.m. on April 23, with Prof. **Leonard Spicer** (BCH, RAD) presiding as Council Chair.

A MOMENT OF OBSERVANCE

The **Chair** began the meeting with a memorial resolution in faculty recognition of the many contributions of President Emeritus Terry Sanford, who passed away on April 18. In the front of the room was displayed a framed and embellished copy of a resolution of the Academic Council, drafted and signed in 1985 and kept in the Academic Council Office, in recognition of Terry Sanford's service as our sixth president. Before presenting a further resolution addressing the present occasion, the **Chair** read that resolution of 1985 once again.

"Whereas Terry Sanford accepted the Presidency of Duke University during a period of national unrest and at a difficult time in the institution's history, and, by reason of his openness, goodwill, and indefatigable energy, helped recommit the University to collegiality and reasoned discourse; and

"Whereas Terry Sanford has assisted the members of the faculty of Duke University and particularly the various members of this Council and its Executive Committees by cooperating with those bodies successively over the years in augmenting their contact with the administrative officers of the University and with the Board of Trustees; and

"Whereas Terry Sanford has sought out alumni and friends of the University across the land and with good humor and affability has confirmed their interest in the institution and encouraged their support for its programs; and

"Whereas Terry Sanford has been influential in increasing understanding between the University and the City of Durham and through his associations in the State of North Carolina has communicated that same sense of good will and openness to the Legislature and

the people of North Carolina while representing this University and other private universities in their quest for support and acceptance;

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Council, on behalf of and in the name of the Faculty of Duke University, extends its sincere thanks to Terry Sanford for his years of service in making this university a greater one and its best wishes to him and his family as he leaves us."

The Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ECAC) now offers the following resolution in reaffirmation of this resolution of 1985:

The Faculty of Duke University most respectfully notes the passing of its sixth president, Terry Sanford, and expresses its deepest condolences to Margaret Rose and the Sanford family. In recognition of President Terry Sanford's signal contributions to the life and growth of Duke University, the Academic Council, on behalf of the entire faculty, warmly reaffirms our resolution of February 25, 1985 and the abiding respect and affection that it expressed.

The Council most respectfully **adopted this resolution**, in solemn voice vote, for communication to the Sanford family.

MINUTES OF March 26, 1998

The minutes of March 26, having been circulated in advance for review by the Council members, were offered for adoption, with one minor change on the last page. In the fourth from last paragraph Prof. Schmalbeck's statement should have read "Year to year we've had between 5% and 10% of African American students." [rather than faculty]. There being no further corrections or comment, a motion to approve the minutes as amended was accepted, seconded, and **approved** by voice vote, without dissent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The new members of the Council were welcomed to this first meeting after the election, and all members of the Council were invited to a reception immediately following the meeting, in the Rare Book Room, Perkins Library, so that Council members might introduce themselves and get acquainted.

As a second announcement, especially for the new members, there are rosters circulated during each meeting for members to initial indicating their attendance. There is a Council Bylaw governing attendance, and the rosters also serve to indicate the presence of a quorum.

QUESTION FOR THE PROVOST

The first order of business, not on the agenda since it was received after the mailing to the Council, was a formal question submitted in writing, for the Provost. The Council does entertain such formal questions to the President and the Provost, provided to these officers in advance, for preparation of a response. The questioners are known to EC AC, but not otherwise unless they choose to identify themselves. Dated 16 April, 1998, the question is as follows:

"I note in yesterday's *Chronicle* that you have approved the recommendation of the [University Schedule Committee] that Martin Luther King[, Jr.]'s birthday [holiday] be observed as a University holiday with the cancellation of classes. I am somewhat puzzled by this decision.

"I certainly respect the contributions of Dr. Martin Luther King[, Jr.] to the civil rights movement. However, the University does not observe the birthday of any other person as a holiday on which classes are cancelled. Since Dr. King's contributions to our country are no more meritorious than those of several of our presidents such as Washington, Jefferson, or Lincoln, I cannot understand the justification for singling him out for this honor.

"The *Chronicle* article mentioned that a number of other private schools, including Harvard and Stanford, observe Martin Luther King[, Jr.]'s birthday as a holiday. What the article did not say is that Harvard and Stanford also observe President's Day as a holiday."

The Provost was invited to come to the lectern to respond.

Provost **John Strohbehn** said that he had indeed approved the recommendation of the University Schedule Committee to observe Martin Luther King, Jr., Day as a full University holiday. Recognizing that it is a judgment call, he saw it as the right thing to do. The Duke Student Government had initiated the proposal, which he had brought to the Deans' Council for discussion, and it received that body's support. It may well be that a number of other schools that observe this holiday also observe Presidents' Day, which we do not. Other schools may cancel classes on still other occasions. We can find a full range of what is or is not observed if we look at institutions across the country. However, he only looked at other universities as benchmarks; Duke needs to make decisions based on what is best for Duke. He had approved the cancellation of classes on this particular day because he saw the holiday as a prime opportunity to make a statement about diversity and race relations on a campus that was segregated not that long ago. As an institution in the South, we have a legacy of segregation, notwithstanding the courageous stand taken by Prof. John Spencer Bassett (1903) and others like him over the decades. Canceling classes on Dr. King's birthday permits us to provide more opportunities for gathering as a community to reflect on some of the most important issues of human relations facing us in the late Twentieth Century. He did

not believe that canceling classes on this day will have any [significant] negative impact on our academic calendar; in fact, our Divinity School has already been observing this day as a holiday. He had asked Dean Gregory Jones (DIV) and others to spearhead the thinking about University-sponsored events in order to maximize the opportunities of the day for affording reflection, self-examination, celebration, and rededication to the ideals Dr. King stood for. He also believed that Terry Sanford would have agreed with this special observance of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Day. The Provost thanked the Council for the opportunity of this explanation.

Prof. **Kenneth Knoerr** (NSOE) identified himself as the questioner, saying that he still felt largely as he had in drafting the question. He certainly respected Martin Luther King, Jr., for his contributions, but was totally against focusing on one person whose birthday is to be so celebrated. He would have no objections to canceling classes on Dr. King's birthday, if we were similarly to recognize others. If we want to focus on diversity [there are other occasions to consider within our history]. We can talk about Japanese Americans [and their internment during World War II]; we can talk about American Indians; and we can talk about Hispanic migrant workers, a Migrant Worker Justice Day, and the list probably goes on, in recognition of other groups of victims of injustice. So if we're going to select one day, and it could be Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, birthday or any other day, it should be a day on which we in fact focus on the injustices in this society, with a different theme to be selected for each year, and that we not focus on just one group within our society.

Prof. **Strohbehn** responded that he had had a particular proposal put before him. It came from the students originally and it was discussed with the Deans' Council, and he had made a decision about that proposal. If Prof. Knoerr [or the Council or some other body] wants to make another proposal, about another thing to look at, he would be glad to entertain that as well. He did feel that there are special reasons why Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Day is an important day, a day to have special information and special classes and programs. That doesn't mean there shouldn't be other such days, but these are the ones that were brought forward. It is important to this University [at this time], with a number of task forces at work, as we know, on issues that have to do with diversity and race relations. These are very important issues to Duke University, and [special attention focused on Martin Luther King, Jr., Day] is a reasonable way to commemorate [these important historical concerns].

Prof. **Sydney Nathans** (SocSci) suggested that Dean Jones might consider expanding the planned events, taking this suggestion under advisement. It could be expanded to include the Poor People's March on Washington, by poor people. It could focus on the Vietnam War, or on Jesse Jackson and the Rainbow Coalition. He saw this as the kind of idea that can [prompt a range of observations] of that day. The **Chair** invited other suggestions from the Council.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council then went into Executive Session (faculty only) to act on an Honorary Degree nomination.

ELECTION OF NEW ECAC MEMBERS

Returning to regular session the Council proceeded to the election of new ECAC members, first with thanks expressed to members completing their terms (Profs. Peter Burian, John Board, and Robert Mosteller, the latter of course becoming next Chair of the Council). The Chair introduced the slate of three pairs of agreed candidates nominated by ECAC: Profs. Karla Holloway (ENG, AAAS) and Kristine Stiles (ART), Profs. Robert Hochmuth (ME&MS) and Randall Kramer (NSOE, ECO), and Profs. Stephen Nowicki (ZOO, NEURO) and Richard Palmer (PHY, CPS). The candidates present were asked to stand as they were introduced. The Chair called for any nominations of other slates of agreed candidates, but there were none and the Council proceeded to vote by ballot, with Profs. Peter Burian (Humanities) and Jeffrey Dawson (BasSci) serving as tellers. In due course the tellers returned with their report and the Chair announced the election of Profs. Holloway, Kramer, and Nowicki, with the Council's warm thanks to Profs. Stiles, Hochmuth, and Palmer for their willingness to stand for election.

ELECTION OF A FACULTY SECRETARY

The next item of business was the election of a Faculty Secretary, done annually for a one-year term. Prof. Emeritus Donald Fluke (ZOO) was completing eight successive terms in this office, having "served very effectively, with good humor and an experienced perspective that has been extremely helpful to the Council and the Executive Committee over the years." When he told ECAC earlier this year of his intention to step down, ECAC had asked the committee appointed to identify candidates for Chair of the Council to take on this additional responsibility as well. That committee, chaired by Prof. Gregory Lawler (MTH), had after diligent search brought forth the name of Prof. Emeritus A. Tilo Alt (GER), currently completing a term as Secretary of the Arts & Sciences Council. Background material about him had been precirculated, and Prof. Alt was asked to stand, to be introduced to the Council. There were no other nominations offered and in due course Prof. Alt was elected, by voice vote. Prof. John Staddon (NS&M) asked to introduce a resolution of thanks to Prof. Fluke for his years of service "well beyond the call of duty," and this kind intention was endorsed by the Council with gratifying applause.

TENURE LINES FOR AFRICAN AND AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES (AAAS)

The next item on the agenda was the continued discussion of a proposed major academic change, to establish tenure-line positions in a specific program, African and African American Studies (AAAS). This matter was before the Council last time for initial discussion. Although Prof. Spicer had not been at that meeting he had read the minutes very

carefully and talked with Prof. Robert Mosteller, who as V. Chair had presided over that meeting of the Academic Council. He noted that there had been a good discussion related to that proposed change. For those new to the Council he explained that the normal procedure [for matters considered of far-reaching importance, usually requiring approval of the Trustees] is to introduce the topic and discuss it at a first meeting, to provide time between that and a second meeting for further reflection, and bring it back to the Academic Council for resolution by vote at the second meeting. He called attention to a handout resolution, somewhat modified in the light of previous discussion, and focusing in particular on where the tenure of the tenure-line positions would be vested. EC AC was reminded of that clarification partly because of the fact that the academic oversight of the AAAS Program will move from the Provost's Office into the Trinity College of Arts & Sciences (TCAS). The modified resolution establishes those tenure lines in TCAS. The revised resolution was read:

Whereas the African & African American Studies Program has [requested] that tenure lines in Trinity College of Arts & Sciences be [established] for the program, and

Whereas this proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Provost's Committee on Academic Priorities, reviewed and endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, and is supported by the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Provost,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Council approves the establishment of tenure lines for the African & African American Studies Program in Trinity College of Arts & Sciences.

As the **Chair** prepared to open the floor for further discussion, the Director of the Program, Prof. **Karla Holloway** asked to speak, in amplification of her presentation at the previous meeting. She remarked that she had "a shorter version and a longer version" of what she intended to say, and would read the shorter version, but really she wanted to respond specifically to the much appreciated questions that were raised in the previous discussion, about notions of diaspora, other particulars, and the focus of the Program more generally. In reference to questions about what diaspora is as a focus of the Program, it's the interdisciplinary study of cultural experiences of black people of African descent that necessarily involve critical attention to the dispersion of those people, most broadly for AAAS in an area known as the "Black Atlantic," which includes Great Britain and the Americas. This is called in this field an external diaspora. However, Duke's Program is designed to highlight interdisciplinary interests within Africa as well, and thereby the internal migrations of the African diaspora, people [moving] within Africa, for whatever reasons ~ politics, economics, social, and historical. The movements within that continent are important to the Duke Program as well, both in historic and contemporary aspects. In terms of issues in the field which might be of interest to the Council, consistent across this study is scholarly interest in what cultural experiences cohere despite, or perhaps because of, the particular histories of the diaspora. Inconsistent [across] the field are discussions involving

the ends of this scholarship. However, it is important to make clear that the debates within the field do not center on whether or not it exists, and make no effort to erase or ignore more than a century of scholarship across the humanities and social sciences about the cultural experiences of black people. Those whom we would appropriately expect to shape the arguments of the discipline - the scholars themselves ~ understand its history and its contemporary vitality. [She had a longer version exploring some of that history if anyone wished to ask more about it.]

Instead, the debates within the field most consistently involve whether or not the ideological politics of its 1960's institutionalization of black study, and/or the politics of a subsequent political movement — black nationalism, an arena that generates the label or the language of "Afrocentrism" ~ should [constitute] the generative framework for scholarly inquiry. In other words, for some the question concerns the objectives of the field. Recently, for example, there has been some discussion of a "transformationalist" model, one where there is a responsibility to produce scholarship and scholars who are actors in a political arena. In short, on various campuses, these programs are corrective, prescriptive, or descriptive, among which Duke's program is that latter, descriptive. Our Program forces a critical and scholarly attention to issues of material cultures, political economy, aesthetic traditions, and social histories of black people of African descent in the Black Atlantic and in Africa. Ours is actually a cultural studies program that begins with the notion of culture and explores the ways in which culture has been constructed ~ specifically through a racial lens that has itself been culturally shaped. So, its ideology is actually an interdisciplinary scholarship that includes the humanities and social sciences, that has analytic and empirical rigor, and that is formed with a vigorous and creative intellectualism. It is different from a single departmental kind of focus on concerns of psychology or anthropology, or history or literature, say, because it brings together a core curriculum and a faculty that considers these disciplines collaboratively. It is anticipated for example that literature and history, or sociology and public policy, will be in constant conversation with each other. Sometimes, as in our introductory and senior capstone courses, this interdisciplinarity happens within one class. But in many cases our curricular design urges it.

The focus of AAAS on diasporan studies involves not only the decision, as any departmental program would make, that our faculty's scholarly productivity is rooted in this kind of work ~ from Africa, Great Britain, the Caribbean, South American and the United States, from North America sometimes comparatively, sometimes not — but also the very name of our Program: "African & African American" compels attention to a diasporan frame.

Our focus on Gender Studies, similarly, comes from looking carefully at the scholarly strengths of the faculty we have at Duke (those currently here as well as those we anticipate will be joining us shortly). We have scholars who work on black women and slavery, on DuBois, on black women and the civil rights movement, on gender differences in access to health care and survivability of major medical trauma and illness. We have West African and United States women writers and [works of] black masculinity, these making a

particularly compelling congregation of interests and curricular possibilities, and making a critical difference in the shape of the field, both nationally and internationally. We have, therefore, made a reasonable strategic decision to build on those strengths so that students in our undergraduate and graduate curricula might have a reason to choose Duke, knowing that this is where they can do focused work in those areas, as well as knowing that here they will find the tradition of strong disciplinary courses that one should expect in a rigorous black studies curriculum. We have also determined, as a faculty, that the intersections of gender and culture will play a very significant role in defining black studies in the coming century.

From the students' perspective, only within the collaborative and mutually responsible structure of a department, or of a program that has its own faculty and its own tenure lines, will they be able to depend on a curriculum that reflects focused attention to the interdisciplinary requirements in the field. From the scholars' perspectives within this same structure, our work comes into an essential contact with others who have selected a focus on race and culture, and our work is enriched and challenged by this contact. It's important to remember that scholars with appointments in AAAS have chosen interdisciplinarity as their scholarly model. We believe that the University can be responsive to helping us work within this model. With that, she would again welcome questions.

Prof. Staddon expressed his appreciation for her having taken the time to provide some additional intellectual background in this area. He had not been able to attend the last meeting, and could have supposed that some of this [explanation] was in sort of a gray area, but could see that it was not, actually, from the further presentation just heard, including the defense of the two areas of diaspora and gender studies. But that latter [area] raised some concern about possible tendency toward people of too similar ideology. Is that a concern here? Prof. **Holloway** agreed that the Program could behave enough like a department to raise this concern, but their interest in gender studies interests focuses on both genders, in distinction from a women's studies program, say. There's a complexity and a contrariness within the collaboration that mitigates against that concern, even if she were inclined otherwise. Prof. **Staddon** felt reassured by that word "contrariness."

Prof. **Helen Solterer** (Humanities) asked about the intended balance in tenure-line positions between African and African American headings and Prof. **Holloway** remarked that just such a question would be engaged in a day-long retreat planned for May 9. Sensing the completion of discussion the **Chair** voiced his own impression of a strong program with wonderful leadership able to make a real difference, effective already while moving toward an excellence that is emerging in this area. In reading the materials that were put forth from the Provost's and the Dean of Arts & Sciences' Offices, it looks as though there is a wonderful opportunity here with strong leadership to make a real difference in an institution of this sort, bringing together people from a variety of areas to work with a core group of manageable size, people who are focused towards that program as their main concern. It may be, and hopefully will be, a very effective way to achieve that progress, what the request is really based upon, how to be most effective and move as quickly as possible

towards the excellence that is emerging in this area. The resolution was then read again and put to voice vote, **passing** without dissent. Congratulations.

[It was at this point in the meeting that the results of the ECAC election were announced.]

REVIEW OF THE *FACULTY FORUM*

The **Chair** moved next to a second discussion occasion and vote on continuation of the *Faculty Forum*. There was some discussion on whether it should require a vote, as he had read the minutes from last time, but consistent with the request of the Council and the preliminary evaluation that ECAC made over last summer and brought to this body, ECAC had felt that having a vote was important in order to demonstrate that things are back on track with things the faculty was interested in and wanted put into discussion in that request a year ago. The Council is aware of the initial discussion along with the report from the Editor suggesting some of the changes that have been made over the past nine months or so. Taking note that Prof. Victor Strandberg (ENG, FF Editor) was present, the **Chair** invited any further comments from the floor. There being none the **Chair** called for vote on the continuation of the *Faculty Forum*, and actually an appreciation of the efforts that have been made to reinforce this publication. It has been seen as important, in talking with faculty, to have a means of publication that is totally the responsibility of the faculty. That has been recognized, along with the hard work of Prof. Strandberg as Editor to respond to what the faculty wants, in some of the things he has initiated in the last year in response to our comments. The motion to continue was then put to a voice vote and passed, without dissent. The **Chair** reminded the Council that the election of an Editor will be on the agenda for next time. Prof. Strandberg has suggested that the term be longer, three years in fact. ECAC will be working with him, and if he decides to stand for election, this would be his third year. So indeed, following this [possible reelection for one more year] we might consider going to the three-year term recommended.

AWARDS OF FACULTY SCHOLARSHIPS FOR 1998-99

The next agenda item is a particular happy one to bring to the floor, the report of the Faculty Scholarship Committee, a committee of this Council. Being named a Faculty Scholar is really one of the most prestigious honors that undergraduates can aspire to, and they know it. The nominations come from the faculty, solicited broadly from Directors of Undergraduate Studies, from Deans, and from a variety of sources. Those having a chance to see these [application] files and talk with the individuals who come forth really realize that the very, very best in American scholarship is represented. It does truly give reason for pause at the strengths that reside in the future of some of our students. It's a joy, actually, to sit on the Faculty Scholarship Committee, and even so we are very grateful to those who have carried that happy responsibility. Prof. Benjamin Ward (PHL) in particular has provided the leadership of that committee, [and is unable to be present by reason of his class

schedule]. For the record the **Chair** read the names of the five rising seniors who will receive the Faculty Scholar awards, which include a modest financial award:

Christopher Edward Beasley	(PHY/MTH)
Arthur Craig DeAlmeida	(MUS)
Andrew Olstrom Dittmer	(MTH)
Neil Ashok Hattangadi	(BME/CHM)
Sheri Lynae Shepherd	(HST)

The Committee also once again, from the many meritorious nominees, awarded Honorable Mention to:

Stacey Lynn Dershewitz	(SOC)
Andrew Lewis Miner	(BIO)
Roderick Tze Ian Wong	(ECO, MTH)
Hao Zhu	(BIO)

Prof. Ward thanks the other members of the Faculty Scholarship Committee, Profs. Hugh Crenshaw (ZOO), Linda George (SOC), and Aarne Vesilind (C&EE). In offering these colleagues for the thanks of the Council the **Chair** added Prof. Ward, for truly a labor of love, seeing the product of what we all do and love to do best, teaching in the classroom and meeting and getting to know these students that are attracted to Duke, and [seeing close up] the quality of their education at Duke. The **Chair** also briefly commented that some past concerns with how the proceeds of the Fund connect with their administration through Financial Aid office have been alleviated in some degree by discussions with that office and the Provost's Office. There have been some concerns in the past about our ability to really provide meaningful financial awards along with this honor, partly because of the financial aid restrictions. We've been working to find ways that truly allow use of the money that has accumulated in the Faculty Scholarship Fund to offset real expenses that are incurred by these students who are outstanding and have excelled in the classroom and in their research efforts.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF AFRICAN & ASIAN LANGUAGES & LITERATURE FROM A SECTION TO A DEPARTMENT

The last item in the day's agenda, an important and substantive matter said the **Chair** was the introduction and first discussion of a request from the Section on Asian and African Languages and Literature (AALL) to change their status from Section to Department. Some of the materials to support this discussion were circulated with the agenda, including the consideration by APC, the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty of Arts & Sciences and of Trinity College, and including the request by the Provost to evaluate the request and give an opinion on it. Antecedent to that information provided were the internal and external reviews mandated periodically for Sections. AALL has been a Section for some ten years, and the requirement for Sections is that they be reviewed every five years. The most recent

of these five-year reviews occurred in 1996-97, more precisely the **Chair** thought, 1997. Those review committees said that the Section had made strong progress, and both had recommended that it be considered for a change in status to that of a Department. The rules for Sections say that as a result of the review that occurs every five years, three options are possible: to maintain the current status as a Section, to be elevated or changed to a Department, or to be changed to some other status, presumably something on the order of a Program or some other academic unit in the University. He thought that AALL might previously have been a Program, but Prof. Cooke said not. His purpose was to provide this little bit of background and ask the Provost and the Director of the Section, Prof. Miriam Cooke, to provide an overview for this request and to amplify on the materials as they see fit relative to the academic justification and rationale for it.

Provost **Strohbehn** said that he would give some introductory comments and then turn the lectern over to Prof. Cooke for deeper discussion. What we are talking about, as Prof. Spicer has said, is a change in the status of AALL from a Section to a Department. It is important to note that the AALL has tenure lines already, so they have tenure-track positions at the present time. As has been stated, a Section is reviewed every five years. The idea underlying a Section is to look at intellectual entities, given a five-year term, to encourage their programs and see if the Section is ready for a larger step, to departmental status. In this case it has called for two five-year reviews and everybody who has looked at the progress thus far, he thought, agrees that AALL has made substantial progress. As most Council members probably know, under the languages area, they are teaching Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, Hindi, Persian, Swahili, and Korean. They teach languages and literature, and also cultural studies, in those areas. In a sense, they've been operating like a department, in having tenure-track faculty making those decisions, about what emphases to include. They have been setting curriculum, obviously, in terms of their intellectual direction. The proposed change is not to imply one way or the other whether AALL would necessarily also have a PhD. program. That would be a separate consideration, if it is proposed, to come sometime in the future.

It should be noted that a subcommittee of the APC made a recommendation that the application for departmental status for AALL should be tabled. There were a couple of reasons for that recommendation, which really had nothing to do with AALL itself and the quality of their programs, but recognized that there had been a lot of discussion about languages [and language instruction] in general and the fact that there is an undergraduate curriculum review underway within Arts & Sciences and we can expect that they will be making certain suggestions about language study in general. In addition, a second reason for delay is that discussion has been going on for some time about whether in certain areas there could be further collaboration between [Duke, UNC-CH, and NCSU in terms of language instruction]. Those are some of the things that prompted the subcommittee to recommend a delay in upgrading AALL from a Section to a Department at this time. After several discussions through some three meetings on this issue the APC has decided that while they understood the reasons for that recommendation these reasons did not really [justify holding up on the recommended change for AALL] at this point in time. Trying to get the proposed

collaboration among the three universities may outlast some people's lifetimes. We certainly «are interested in those collaborations and we should continue our efforts to achieve them where we can, but the status of such discussions are still very much in the early stages and we don't believe we should be holding up the AALL program on that basis.

So we do feel - he and many others - that AALL is a good program, one that has come to add a lot intellectually to the University, not only within its own group, but with many other particular programs outside it, and we're at a point where we should move forward to departmental status for AALL. The material circulated to the Council includes a letter from Dean Chafe (TCA&S) giving his reasons for his support for this program and for our positive view of its fruitfulness as well. It has achieved a lot in these ten years as a Section and it's time to make this change.

Prof. **Miriam Cooke**, picking up on the comment about what AALL was before it became a Section, felt it might be useful for her briefly to go over the history of AALL, and how it came into being. It started in 1981 with a course that she and two colleagues taught together, herself in Arabic and the other two, who are no longer teaching with us, in Japanese and Chinese. The course was called Introduction to Asian and African Literatures. They continued as independent faculty for a year, recognizing that they had a lot in common. The areas that they were dealing with ~ Japan, China, and the Arab world - were very different in terms of language and history [from before] the colonial period but seemed to share a lot in the periods they were all interested in, the late colonial and post-colonial periods. She was connected to Islamic and Arabian development studies, the person in Chinese was connected with the History Department, and the person in Japanese was connected, as she recalled, to Classical Studies. So, within a year of having taught that course, they were actually brought together under the Center for International Studies, somewhat exceptionally, and for a short period. There they were under the leadership of Prof. Charles Bergquist (HST), since departed but whom some may remember, and they had a completely anomalous position in the University. By 1985 they had added a couple more faculty, including Prof. Jing Wang, who would also be speaking to the Council presently.

Between 1985 and 1986 it became clear that the group had something more than a course here and that they in fact had the potential for being a group of faculty that could benefit from a more formal institutional framework, to help facilitate the cohesion of their research projects, and also to begin to think about a core curriculum. So in 1986, Prof. Bergquist - Marxist scholar that he was - announced that we had just conducted a coup d'état and that he — in jest of course — recognized that we were ready perhaps to start thinking about self governance. A report was made from outside the University by Charles Ferguson, a linguist, who thought we were doing a stand-up job and that we should indeed have independent status and not be linked in this strange way to the Center for International Studies. As a result they were under a troika arrangement for a year: three faculty members, one each from History, Anthropology, and (she thought) Political Science. By 1987 it became clear that it was time to put the group together within a new institutional framework. She recalled that [now] Dean Lewis Siegel (Graduate School) was one of the people who was

very supportive of this change. She also thought that this move had coincided with [first] use of the term Section for [such a unit] outside the School of Medicine.

This was also the time when internationalization was [gaining considerable attention], during the time of President Keith Brodie, as sort of the hallmark of his presidency. It had been their understanding at that time, when they became a Section, that it was to work as Provost Strohhahn has just explained. It's important to understand that their expectation in becoming a Section was that a Section was an academic unit that was a [kind of] proto-department. It wasn't something that was to go on [indefinitely]. In other words, the notion that every five years in perpetuity one [would keep] being reviewed and renewed was not part, by their understanding at least, of what a Section was. That understanding of how a Section works meant that from the moment they were established as a Section they started to think about what we were supposed to turn into. At the beginning they had had five tenure-line positions, and they have continued to have [those] five tenure-line positions. As a Section they were allowed to have two more.

Within about three years of becoming a Section they had changed the way they thought about how they were going to teach the languages that Provost Strohhahn had listed. At first, they had thought they wanted to have both a literature and a linguistics [emphasis]. But that came not to seem to make sense because they never had a goal of growing very large. In fact, they were pretty much at the size they wanted to be, except for needing a little bit of help at the level of introductory language instruction. So they had eliminated linguistics and focused their reappointments in these tenure-line positions [instead] on literature or cultural studies. That had been the first way they had started to streamline pedagogically. After that, they had professionalized their first-year and second-year language instruction, meaning that they had brought in professional language instructors in Professor of the Practice positions. The third, fourth and fifth years of these languages are taught by people in tenure-line positions. They had done this [organized their language instruction] in a way that she thought no other language department does it at Duke. It was her impression also that it's unlike the way it is done in many parts of the country as well. They feel very strongly that in AALL they must try to retain a balance between teaching culture and language, meaning that each one of them, regardless of what level their position, teaches language, and that all the language courses from the very first day in class have a very strong cultural focus, around which the faculty is very closely integrated. Very often one thinks of Professors of the Practice or perhaps Lecturers as being a problematic division, but for them it has worked really well because each language is autonomous and Professors of the Practice work with tenured faculty all the time. The usual problems of status [for these regular-rank, non-tenure-track positions] she hoped they had been able to overcome.

So, at the moment AALL has ten faculty in regular-rank positions, five tenured or tenure-track, and four Professors of the Practice, with one more coming next year, and they have a couple of Lecturers. It's not hard to recognize from what the Council has seen in the report that Swahili is their weak suit, but she thought it fortuitous that she should follow Prof. Holloway in talking at this meeting, because what we will be doing she hoped down

the road is to collaborate more on the African side. That is clearly their weakest side and they are hoping that collaboration [with AAAS] is going to be possible.

Beyond matters of institutional framework, AALL started to award a *certificate* she thought in 1990, and has had a lot of students working [for that credential]. But actually not as many students are currently taking the certificate as are taking a minor which has also been started. The certificate was in fact extremely arduous, quite difficult to get. In fact they had only had to add a couple of courses to it to get it approved as a major, which they had done last year. In the first year of their major program they had had just one student in the major, but twenty-one minors, going this year to six majors and eighteen minors.

A last point to talk about is the effect departmental status will have on AALL. Provost Strohbehn has said that we don't anticipate there being any radical change. We have been functioning as a department and she could see absolutely no difference in the job that she does as chair of AALL and that her husband Prof. Bruce Lawrence does as chair of Religion. They do exactly the same job, and she could not think of a single difference, except -- coming back to what she was saying earlier -- for their understanding of what a Section was. Right from the very start they have expected to become a Department, and to do so within ten years. This expectation had led them to perhaps mislead candidates for positions, by telling them that while we were a Section that we [expected] to become a Department. That [expectation] was clearly seen by people who came here, people whom we were able to [persuade to come] to AALL, at Duke, who were at the time being recruited by big, leading institutions in the country, and still are. They made their decisions to come to our unit as opposed to going to a big China Studies program, say, or a big Japan Studies program. That expectation that AALL would become a Department has meant that they *would* see themselves otherwise very clearly as marginalized. There are some arguments [that have been offered against their becoming a Department]. There is a comparison with the Literature Program, but Literature with a very different history actually chose not to become a Department. They were never a Section and it was never an expectation that they should necessarily thereby become a Department. In a comparison with the AAAS Program, as Prof. Holloway has explained, becoming a Department of African and African American Studies is not something that they particularly want. We do want it for AALL, and it's very important to AALL. A key outcome will be to enable their holding onto the extraordinary young faculty they have been able to bring here. When it had begun to look as though the process were going to be much delayed, [those young faculty] began to lose faith in the process. That matter of expectation was, and has been, very, very important. She then deferred to Prof. Jing Wang to add to this [explanation and advocacy].

Prof. **Jing Wang** (AALL) felt that Prof. Cooke had covered almost the entire ground very well, and would have just a few words to add. In reference to the missions of educational and intellectual coherence for AALL one of the most frequent questions asked of them is how they do go about creating such intellectual and curricular cohesion within such diversity. And [the answer is that] from the very beginning, when they became a Section, they have shared the vision of reinventing traditional single-area based curriculum and

research agendas. In that shared process they had created both a teaching and an intellectual community that none of them would now want to trade for a more conventionally configured single-area based Language and Literature Department of the type that exists in other universities. That process of seeking and refining their collective identity was built upon their areas of expertise, but not confined within those areas. The major, just mentioned, that they also created, equips students with proficiencies not only in the language and literature of the immediate area of interest but also in critical thinking that fosters intra-Asian/African perspectives. In their scholarship they nurture a view of literature and culture that connects the envisionist and the global. It's a scholarship that is informed by local histories of internal developments as well as by theories of interdisciplinary and cross-cultural influence. So this vision of connectedness or interconnectedness is embodied in everything AALL does in their major, how their languages are taught, and how they pursue their scholarship. As Prof. Cooke has just pointed out, they function as a Department, and have done so very productively as an academic unit for ten years now. AALL is here today to seek the approval of the Council for moving beyond Section status to Department status.

Discussion of the Change of AALL to a Department

Prof. Lawrence Evans (NS&M) asked if this matter were a two-meeting issue [one requiring discussion at two successive meetings, with vote at the second]. The Chair responded that it would be a two-meeting issue if there should be a resolution offered. So far, there has not, and there is no a resolution before the Council. Prof. Evans: Will there be? The Chair answered that he didn't know. There are two parts to this agenda item, in a sense. One is that the Provost has expressed an intent, supported by the APC, which is advisory to him, and by the Dean [of Faculty of Arts & Sciences], to support this change. Now, that change will have to come to the Trustees, to create a Department. A second part is that in coming to the Trustees it needs by the Christie Rule to be informed by discussion within this Council. So this opportunity of discussion by the Academic Council is crucial to the proposal that the Provost or the President might make to the Trustees. Evans: But no committee of this Council is bringing forward this proposal? The Chair confirmed that indeed no committee of this Council has brought forward a resolution, as yet.

Prof. Peter Lange (SocSci) was not sure he understood what this means. Does it mean that unless a resolution is moved today, and voted on at the next Council meeting, that [the matter] will not go to the Board of Trustees? The Chair said that if the Council followed its usual procedures, that would indeed normally be the case. But there has been a certain flexibility in the past and it was his sense that as long as there is adequate airing of this issue on the Council floor - and one of the reasons for bringing it and making sure it is on the agenda at this meeting is that there could be [such adequate airing], in the event of a resolution now or later ~ then the Council could, by asking for that privilege [by offering a resolution, that is], vote next time, still before the Trustee meeting. It's not a matter of trying to maneuver in any way, but of trying to do exactly what the Christie Rule says, and that is to have debate.

Prof. Peter Burian (Humanities, ECAC), just to clarify, offered as his understanding that it is possible for any member of Council to move such a resolution, if the member so chooses. The **Chair** said yes, it certainly is. Motions that can come from committee can come as well from members of the Council, and they do.

Prof **Evans** persisted. Normally something of this type comes through a committee. Something is officially presented to ECAC. The **Chair** said that it does and it doesn't. Part of the discussion within ECAC was in fact a recognition that ECAC is not a fact-finding committee. And the materials backing the votes of committees that have reviewed this proposal were in fact not complete, and ECAC had therefore asked Prof. Cooke in fact to extend her explanation here on the floor of the Council, to address more explicitly the academic strengths underlying the request, and the justification for it. [The problem in ECAC] was just that lack of such material from the [antecedent bodies].

Prof. **Burian** pointed out that there was a form of committee recommendation, by the APC, not sent as a formal resolution, but included among the material distributed to ECAC. It was in the form of a letter [in behalf of the APC] reporting a six to zero vote in favor of the recommendation. The **Chair** clarified that that letter was addressed to the Provost. Prof. **Lange** remarked that that's the way these things usually transpire. But [that letter] is not in fact here accompanied by a report, and there was an internal subcommittee report. Formally speaking, what we have is a backing of the proposal, but no motion. The **Chair** remarked that the Council could have access to plenty of material [from the APC], and started looking to see whether Prof. Michael Gillespie (PS, APC chair) might be present. Prof. **Burian** thought there might be a motion forthcoming from the committee [the APC], and the **Chair** remarked that there might be other APC members present [who could comment, or even offer a motion].

Prof. **Evans** asked to continue his question, which he had asked in all innocence, having no intention of trying to block this proposal, but simply to clarify the procedural concern. Are we going to vote next time?

Cutting through this somewhat tentative discussion, Prof. **Emily Klein** (NSOE, ECAC) offered a motion. For the purposes of [moving this matter] forward she moved that AALL (Asian & African Languages & Literature) **be moved from Section status to Department status**. There was a second. The **Chair** expressed his appreciation for the motion, noting that it proceeds from the review of the Section and is certainly consistent with the spirit of that review.

Prof. **Evans** then posed a substantive question, in terms of this proposal. He had been here for a long time and had to recognize that he did not really understand what the guidelines are for a Department, or for making something into a Department. Are there any? The Council had just heard that it doesn't make a whole lot of difference administratively, but that it does make a difference in terms of people's self esteem, he guessed. But does the University have guidelines that apply to this matter?

Provost **Strohbehn** said that probably the best person to answer that question is Dean Siegel (Graduate School), who has [more direct] knowledge of the history involved. He would rather not himself try to answer that question [offhand]. Dean **Siegel** said that there are no specific guidelines [for being or becoming a Department] because different Departments serve different purposes. The question is, is it appropriate for this particular Section [to become a Department]? The best answer to that question is provided in a resolution the Board of Trustees passed ten years ago that defines Sections. He read two "whereases" from that resolution: "Whereas it has been determined that a new academic entity, a Section, should be made available at the University for the purpose of facilitating the development of new academic efforts at the University," (and AALL has been in existence for ten years so it's certainly not a new academic effort, he interjected), and, "whereas this new entity will respond to the need for an academic structure when there is doubt regarding the advisability of a large faculty and where there [is some uncertainty] as to whether an area will become a foundation for long-term scholarly activity which would justify the creation of a Department." That language gives the definition of what a Section is, and [the resolution goes on to] mandate review and a limit on the size of the faculty, on a five-year cycle. The idea is that if this entity ~ a Section - is in existence for ten years, if it has developed from just a set of courses of instruction into a major, which it was mandated to do for the first three years, and if it has successfully hired tenured faculty, that it is no longer a new entity and appears to be the foundation for a Department.

He would further say that it differs from what Prof. Holloway talked about before in that it is arguably not a true interdisciplinary unit. It is like Romance Studies. It might be an aggregation of languages but essentially it is a discipline. So it shouldn't be called a program. The normal unit is a Department.

Prof. Lange noted that the materials distributed to the Council did not include the reports of either the internal review committee or the external review committee. He had served on the internal review committee and knew that these reports dealt with substantive matters, some just alluded to by Dean Siegel. That was not why he was here, to speak for that review, but since he was here he might as well talk about [those substantive matters] because the real case [made for changing AALL to a Department] in the internal review committee was the substantive character of the Section, not so much a bureaucratic [matter as it might seem from the discussion]. First of all, he had been on APC when the Section was originally created. At the time there was some skepticism about whether the Section would find it possible to create any kind of coherent intellectual agenda across what seemed to be disparate language groups that were thrown together because each was fairly small, and not likely to get very large. That question also motivated the second review, which was held [some five years later]. What struck the [more recent] internal review committee was in fact that that concern had been [so successfully] overcome. Prof. Wang in a relatively concise way has stressed the way that they have done that, and [the members of the internal review committee] were impressed. Intellectually, they had developed a theme across those various languages which enabled them to talk together as a unit with a coherent intellectual agenda in terms of the literatures and the relationships of the literatures to *the populations* and the

cultures and the shared experiences of those cultures. That success struck those on the internal review committee as quite exceptional, [quite beyond anything] they had expected.

He would say that from the point of view of the internal review committee that the historical weight argument which Prof. Cooke had outlined would probably not have been sufficient to convince them of the recommendation reached. The reason that it should become a Department is not just that it has been there ten years, but that it has developed a coherent intellectual agenda. There is a real sense that they have achieved that coherent intellectual agenda [that can support becoming a Department].

Second, from his experiences as [former] Vice Provost [for International Affairs], he was struck by the extent to which AALL had developed a professionalization of language instruction in a way that links the language instruction to the broader intellectual agenda. Essentially, that kind of cultural status achieved was all the more striking because in a number of the language programs we still have a serious problem of inability to link language instruction and the language instructors to the literature and cultural studies components. That's an ability which ultimately Prof. Wang spoke to. So the element of collegiality was the third component within that context, making the uncertainties created by the prospect of continuing as a Section fairly significant. It would erode some of the advantages that had developed over the preceding five years if Section status were again simply renewed. We should not be saying to AALL that while they've done a lot of good work they should try a little harder and in another five years we'll look again. That's not so much a historical weight argument, as sort of saying that if you succeeded, and you've been given a spur that you've responded to very well, you ought to be able to reap the advantages.

The last thing he would say is that it was his opinion, although not speaking for the undergraduate curriculum review committee of which he is the chair, that among the less commonly taught languages at Duke, AALL represents a dynamic languages area, one which is likely if anything to be positively affected by the changes which are being worked on by the committee. The curriculum review might be neutral [toward AALL], but it won't be negative. AALL does not represent an area which is likely to be undercut by anything that's likely to come out of the curriculum review committee. Obviously, the Arts & Sciences Council will do what it wants with the curriculum review, so that's all he could say [in relation to the insights from curriculum review]. He supported the resolution. The **Chair** remarked that this was precisely the kind of discussion hoped for before the Council.

Dean Chafe expressed his support of what Prof. Lange had been saying and could also report that the external review was a vigorous review. The team included the Dean of the Humanities at UCLA and the head of the language program at Pennsylvania. They had with great emphasis endorsed very strongly the movement of AALL from a Section to Department status, precisely because the Section had done so well at bringing together its intellectual agenda. There was a combination and coherence around both teaching of language and culture across different areas in the world, and their manner of doing that created the kind of intellectual excitement that the external reviewers considered quite

admirable. The combination of that external review with the internal assessment provides in a very positive way the kind of support for this motion that has been made that he personally found very persuasive.

Dean **Siegel**, adding to what Dean Chafe had said, noted that the range of that outside experience had purposely included a language center approach, and that a reviewer from that vantage was quite amazed at what AALL had done with diverse language instruction working within a common theme. This reviewer agreed that something amazing had been accomplished in which a group of diverse faculty teaching diverse languages could work together in a Department-like structure, and create a common theme within such a service center. The **Chair** expressed regret that the sheer volume of such supporting material had made its pre-circulation impracticable and hoped again that some APC members possibly present might speak, since the APC had studied all these documents. The reason it had come to [ECAC] the way it did was frankly because the materials [put before the APC] had not addressed some of the questions and insights that were coming to the floor at present.

Prof. Lange asked if the Council will be meeting before the next meeting of the Board of Trustees, and the **Chair** responded that the plan in bringing this matter to this meeting of the Council was to give just that adequate time to talk about it before the May meeting of the Trustees. It's a matter of some consequence, to create a unit, whether a Section or a Department. ECAC felt very strongly that there should be adequate discussion and that all sides of the issue ought to be addressed, including opportunity of additional materials, if needed, including materials which normally wouldn't be included from the APC with their recommendation. He would try to arrange that Prof. Gillespie as chair of APC would be at the next Council meeting for the continued discussion. The motion now before the Council will come back to the floor next time, unless the Council decides otherwise.

Prof. **John Board** (EGR, ECAC) said that he had been at the first of the two APC meetings where this matter was discussed. The Provost had already mentioned one concern that had come up, one that he might want to elaborate on further. There was some sense of general dissatisfaction, not with AALL *per se*, but with the general organization of languages at Duke. There was wording to that effect in the subcommittee report, about our not having the ideal structure for language instruction, a concern especially in the year that a curriculum review was underway. There was something of a push in APC toward seeing this as the time to be thinking more about the reimplementation of the structure of all of our languages at Duke. And that push had led to the change for AALL being tabled. Maybe the Provost or Dean Chafe would like to comment on that concern, or why that action.

Prof. **Strohbeh**n said that he had tried to do that in his introductory comments, in part at least. At the time [of APC consideration] some bigger questions had come up about language instruction in general. At the next meeting for the APC, the one that Prof. Board had not been able to attend, APC went back and revisited those issues, concluding that this program [AALL] should be moving forward. We don't know what the curriculum review is going to do, as Prof. Lange has indicated. They had felt in their discussion within APC that

AALL, with the language instruction that they are doing, is important to Duke. No matter how we end up in terms of structural changes with respect to languages, the type of program that AALL represents makes a lot of sense for Duke and brings something intellectual to the community that APC felt was valuable. One point of view, at least, was that there would be some additions [about] language [instruction] that are still in discussion, involving recommendations anticipated from a task force at work. We all know how slowly task force reports can move, especially as they try to solve a larger problem, while there really was a specific program in front of APC that has a lot of intellectual merit. Whatever the task force [decides], it was seen as not fair to hold this program up, again, [by reason of] a rather nebulous discussion aimed at trying to figure out which way [the task force might be] going. After discussion, this concern seemed not compelling for this program that has gone through all of the review internally that we would normally give.

In rounding up the discussion the **Chair** asked if there were [particular supporting documents] that the Council wanted brought to the next meeting or that should be made available at the next meeting, so that the Council can best either continue this discussion or bring the proposed change to a vote. He would try to enlist representation from the relevant committees, including the chair of the APC, Prof. Gillespie. Was there any new business to be brought before the Council? Hearing none he reminded the Council members of the reception immediately following and presided over the adjournment of the Council, at 5:22 p.m.

Prepared for consideration by the Academic Council,

Donald J. Fluke, Faculty Secretary of the Academic Council.