

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

March 26, 1998

The Academic Council of Duke University met at 3:45 on March 26 for its regular monthly meeting, with Prof. **Robert Mosteller** (Law) presiding as Vice Chair in the absence of Council Chair Prof. Leonard Spicer (RAD, BCH). Prof. **Peter Burian** (Humanities) served in place of the Faculty Secretary (Prof. Donald Fluke) who was also out of town.

MINUTES of February 19

As a first item of business the minutes of February 19 **were approved** as circulated, by voice vote, without discussion or dissent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **V. Chair** noted that this was the last meeting of the 1997-98 Council, an occasion for thanks to all who have served our purpose of faculty governance this year, whether returning with the next Council or not. Prof. **Kenneth Knoerr** (NSOE) spoke up, noting that the election results in terms of the new Council list had not yet been received, "so we don't know who to say farewell to." It was explained that illness had delayed a mailing from the Academic Council office, and that the lists would be out the next day. In any case, thanks are due to all who have served, returning or not.

The **V. Chair** noted a switch of two agenda items and pointed out that a Duke Management Company (DUMAC) Newsletter had been included among the pre-circulated materials, for information, no action intended.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council went into Executive Session (faculty only) to receive an honorary degree nomination.

A PROPOSAL TO ADD TENURE LINES TO THE AFRICAN & AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM

Returning to regular, open session, the Council next took up a proposal to add tenure lines to the African & African American Studies program. The **V.Chair** announced that Provost John Strohbehn would introduce the topic, with Prof. Michael Gillespie (PS, chair of APC) and Dean William Chafe (A&S) present to aid in the discussion. Prov. **Strohbehn** began by noting that Prof. Karla Holloway (ENG, Dir. AAAS) would be the principal presenter. He saw the proposal as a simple one, with a strong AAAS program now ready to become even more robust by having its own tenure-track positions, along with the current practice of tenure appointments residing in departments. Considering Duke's Southern history and location we should have one of the strongest such programs in the country. There's also the intellectual rationale for a program addressing a very important part of our culture. Indeed, AAAS has been gaining robustness dramatically in the past few years, by strong leadership and close relationship with departments under the current arrangement. Our plans for a large majority of positions to be associated with AAAS is to have them still reside in a department. But the program will be stronger and even more robust with some positions that are basically in AAAS itself, with secondary appointments in departments. Such tenure lines are needed because AAAS is an interdisciplinary activity, with expertise residing across many segments of the University. Because AAAS is so interdisciplinary there will be faculty we want to attract to Duke who don't fit readily into departmental niches.

A second reason is that AAAS, from the undergraduate point of view, has been growing. The infrastructure to keep the program running needs individuals who are really committed to this part of the program. Having everyone on joint appointments has them torn in two directions. How much of their time should be given to the department, and how much to AAAS? It's important that AAAS have a few individuals with that as their major responsibility. This proposal has been looked at carefully by the Academic Priorities Committee (APC), in at least three meetings, and Prof. Gillespie can reflect that discussion as needed.

There are some issues of policy and infrastructure to straighten out before making this move. Comparative Literature, it turns out, was created before there were particular rules, and has tenure lines. The policy against having tenure lines in programs came later. Yet AAAS should remain a program, because it is an intellectual entity running across the University. We want people involved from many different departments; keeping it a program distinguishes it from a department, where there is a more distinct discipline, however broad, that [organizes] a majority of the activities. For AAAS much of the activity is [oriented outward], even with the set of tenure lines we are ready to bring before the Trustees. The senior administration strongly supports this recommendation; the President, himself as Provost, and the Dean of Arts & Sciences think this an important step for Duke at this time and endorse it.

Some [consequent] changes are needed. AAAS at present reports to the Provost's office, presenting a conflict of interest with respect to separate tenure lines in recommendation from the program. The reporting relationship should transfer to the Dean of Arts & Sciences, a switch of solid and dotted lines on our organizational chart. The budget would remain with the Provost's office, primarily because that budget is much broader than just the faculty of the program. With that, Prov. Strohbehn introduced Prof. Karla Holloway, "whom you all know," William R. Kenan Professor and Director of African & African American Studies, and also Prof. Wahneema Lubiano (LIT, AAAS), who could assist in answering questions. As Prof. Holloway came forward the **V. Chair** remarked that this matter is one to be dealt with in two meetings; the draft resolution handed out at this meeting would be offered for vote at the next.

Prof. **Karla Holloway** directed attention to a pre-circulated letter of January 12, from her to the Provost, as the document proposing tenure lines for AAAS. It outlines the review and rationale for the proposal, offers some background on the history of AAAS as a program at Duke and on black studies nationally, to use that term for a number of similarly intended programs in U.S. colleges and universities. It includes recent developments in AAAS and its current status as the basis for the discussion of the proposal, which she and Prof. Lubiano could augment as needed. Black studies nationally and internationally, and AAAS as it is called at Duke, focus on the experiences, historic and contemporary, of black peoples of African descent. It includes their music and literature, history and art, socio-economic [status], political systems, psychology and health, and public policies that are relevant and/or specific to this cultural and racial community. Across the range of US academic programs there are differences and omissions, but AAAS at Duke has certainly made a difference. Its remarkable twenty-five year persistence through various shifts and changes in the program's administration is important and commendable. But frankly, AAAS [does not yet meet the expectations] for an institution of Duke's stature given the intellectual strengths of our students, the scholarly reputation of our faculty, and the significance, breadth, and impact of what they study. So, our [AAAS] faculty discussion over the past year and a half, and with colleagues across the country and internationally, has focused on an identity for the program, taking into account three factors, our student body, our faculty scholarly identities, interests, and reputations, and third, the international identity and trajectory of the intellectual discipline.

There is significant complementarity: the disciplines gathered within the AAAS program have their interdisciplinary core not only in matters of race, culture, and class, but critically in the expression of these matters across and within Africa and within the world's communities that over centuries and under various circumstances have received Africa's black populations. Our research and teaching concerns how these experiences are shared, [exploring] the continuities of culture and race that impact class and that make the distinctions as well as the similarities critical factors for scholarly inquiry. We explore these matters in the context of global diaspora, connecting the ongoing and developing initiatives at Duke, such as the Oceans Connect project of International Studies, the emerging collaboration with the Carter Center, and the DeWitt Wallace Center's project on

democratization and media issues in Ethiopia. There is a visiting position in the Nicholas School in environmental equity and a justice, a collaboration with the Africa News Service for the development of a new center in the University, the Center for Africa in the Media that connects scholarly projects in Africa as well as our scholarly projects in Europe — the Collegium for African American Research, the Centre des Etudes Africaines at the Sorbonne, and projects at the University of Berlin and Tubingen. These all indicate the serious international presence of black studies.

So indeed, our understanding that global cultures can be the means and measure of our national culture informs and articulates the core of our AAAS Program, creating coherence among a collection of disciplinary scholars and arguing the intellectual [core] of a program that is both traditional in its black studies focus on U.S. matters of race, class, and culture, and cutting-edge in defining the future of black studies within a diasporan matrix. Our program's objective is that students, undergraduate and graduate, select Duke not only for the essential work the AAAS program does with U.S. black studies, but for an emerging expertise in contemporary Africa and for its skill in articulating black scholarship within a diasporan context, including Black British studies — Africadian, Caribbean, and Afro-Brazilian — metaphorically, the "black Atlantic."

By way of summary and in anticipation of the questions and comments of the Council she returned to some of the points from the initiating January 12 letter. Complex issues of diversity and national identity will emerge as the global challenges of the 21st century. These matters need and deserve academic leadership with rigorously intellectual and scholarly input. Duke's AAAS program has the resources and the energy to be the site and the source for this work. We are pleased and satisfied with our coverage and are ready to assume this responsibility, but we are also fully cognizant of our absolute need to operate within an infrastructure that will best serve these objectives. A core of tenured faculty working with the assistance of secondary faculty appointments will encourage the integrity of the program's development as well as its national stature. With that, she and Prof. Lubiano were ready for questions.

Discussion of the AAAS **Proposal**

Prof. **Knoerr**, as a first question, asked what precedent this proposal might represent for other programs wanting tenure-track positions. Is this going to be the only one? Prov. Strohbehn recognized that it would be setting an example and that there are other programs that can be expected to ask similar modifications.

Prof. **Knoerr** then asked about the view that the Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (AP&T) process might take in relation to such interdisciplinary scholars, a concern from experience in the considerably interdisciplinary NSOE. Will scholars be viewed across their mix of disciplines or will they be compared within disciplines more in isolation? Prov. **Strohbehn** thought the analogy with the NSOE quite apt. The AP&T committee already deals with faculty who don't fall into strict disciplinary lines, whose work

impacts a much broader field, and who come from a small entity. This concern is broader than AAAS; we have departments now which can't assemble a critical number of members for a tenure recommendation, where two or three people have to be added from [related areas]. It might be wiser to have a group that's associated with the program be part of the tenure process, identifying the people from outside the group. Having some people with tenure in AAAS might reach more closely the core size of a department.

Prof. **Holloway** saw another dimension that might help. It's so important to have a senior, tenured cohort of scholars as junior faculty [elsewhere] may be deciding to become more disciplinary scholars, identified as historians or sociologists or political scientists, and seek to move to Duke to establish an identity within AAAS. And she personally was not confident that there are as yet enough programs in the United States producing African & African American Studies PhD's [to represent a discipline]. We need that cohort of tenured faculty to make up this smaller body while not losing the intellectual passion of assistant professors.

Prof. **Lawrence Evans** (NS&M) was interested that Comparative Literature was given tenure lines before there was a rule. Whose rule is this? Prov. **Strohbehn** looked to Dean Lewis Siegel (*GS*) as the authority about rules, while Prof. **Gillespie** explained that it was a [policy recognized by] the Board of Trustees, articulated by the then Provost but never voted on, so it's not a standing rule, but a policy. **Evans** said he knew it had not been discussed in the Council, so, it's a rule that people would like to follow, but don't have to. Prov. **Strohbehn** said that was correct. **Evans:** So you're not asking to set aside a rule? Prov. **Strohbehn** said no.

Prof. **Evans** then told Prof. Holloway that he had not been able to go by the Academic Council office to read the list of core AAAS faculty. Could she read it, with their departments? If it's too long that's alright. Prof. **Holloway** listed [four] full professors: Charles Payne (HST), who just joined AAAS in January, herself (ENG), Barry Gaspar (HST), and Vonnie McLoyd (PSY-SHS). There are two associate [professors]: Richard Powell (ART) and Wahneema Lubiano (LIT); two assistant professors: Charles Piot (CA) and Donna Daniels (CA); and Research Professor Paula Giddings (WS, POP in AAAS and HST). **Evans:** that's about ten? **Holloway:** representing 7 departments. **Evans** asked whether any of the existing core faculty who are now in other departments would [likely] be released from those departments, and **Holloway** answered no. **Evans** next asked how many tenure lines were anticipated for the core; the **Provost** said about four or five. **Evans** pondered whether those might be additions, and Prof. **Steven Baldwin** (NS&M) asked if it were indeed a net increase in the faculty size over what it would have been. Prov. **Strohbehn** saw different ways of answering that; it could be some by replacements, but is being thought of in terms of some likely faculty increase.

Prof. **James Rolleston** (Humanities), trying to visualize the future relationships, asked about Religion, seen as a conspicuous absence. Prof. **Lubiano** said actually AAAS did have intentions for Religion, and Religion for AAAS. Some other departments were also in

formal conversation. There were certainly courses cross-listed with Religion. **Holloway** said there were about seventy faculty across the University community who have spoken with AAAS, a reason for proposing the model of a larger group of secondary faculty and this smaller core, because of this relationship which is critically valuable. There is need to build on and depend on a core which does not feel divided.

Prov. **Strohbehn** mentioned the concern for trying to recruit in competition with other universities which do in fact have a department.

Prof. **Rolleston** asked, in analogy with Literature, whether the next thing to be discussed is a graduate program. Prof. **Lubiano** confirmed that that was indeed a matter under discussion, with increasing student demand. Prof. **Holloway** added that those demands had led to adding a graduate certificate program in September 1996, with now thirty students enrolled. There have already been two graduates from [History?], two related to the MALS program, with one AAAS-MALS graduate, and a few PhD graduates with AAAS certificates, in May. At some point conversation about a different version of graduate studies will emerge, and there ought to be a core faculty gathered to have that kind of conversation and to lead it. Right now we mostly can't, although it's certainly something that comes up.

Prof. Gillespie said on behalf of the APC that they had examined this question quite vigorously and concluded that this program really can be an exceptional addition to the curriculum at Duke. He thought that Prof. Holloway has actually understated the future of the program, which has potential national and international distinction. Putting new positions and tenure lines into AAAS is a crucial element for that anticipated success of the program. The APC, after vigorous discussion, came to a favorable consensus that was not only unanimous, but enthusiastically so. Prof. **Lubiano** wanted to add that her second semester here she'd had a letter from a scholar in Croatia, who knew about AAAS at Duke, even while AAAS is relatively new to many people in the U.S.

REPORT ON THE *FACULTY FORUM*

Thanking the presenters and reminding the Council that this matter would be brought back for vote at the next meeting, the **V. Chair** moved on to the next matter, a report on the *Faculty Forum (FF)*. The Editor, Prof. Victor Strandberg (ENG), had been detained - the reason for the reordering of the agenda — and still had not arrived. But the Council could get started. He reminded the Council that a motion at the May meeting had directed ECAC (the Executive Committee of the Academic Council) to bring to the Council a report on the costs and benefits of the *FF*, and the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission. ECAC spent some time over the summer looking at this matter, coming to the opinion that still more time was needed. So, in September an interim report was provided, one paragraph of which he would read.

"ECAC has come to the conclusion that the issue is not ripe for final decision at this point. We propose continuing the *FF* for an experimental period with a report by the Editor at the end of the academic year and a decision by the Academic Council regarding the *Faculty Forum* continuation."

That's our situation for this meeting, and for vote at the next meeting. If the decision is to continue the *FF* we need to re-elect the Editor, which could be at the May meeting. The report called for in the interim recommendation of the Council had been pre-circulated. Item 1, election of an Editor, [is premature at this meeting], but the rest of the document is appropriate for consideration, how the *FF* has responded to the recommendations made by the Academic Council and others. There was no requirement that any of our recommendations be followed; what ECAC wanted to have was a period of time in which the *FF* examined its operation with a view toward its improvement. ECAC had thought about how to evaluate, how to gauge the recent trend of the *FF* and bring it to the Council, but had come to a sense that whatever metric was picked tended to decide the issue. ECAC has been unable to recommend an action to the Council, and the Council will need to decide without an anticipating recommendation from ECAC. To get it before the body ECAC brings an affirmative motion, **that the Academic Council continue to publish the *Faculty Forum*.** That is the motion which [in default of some other] will be the basis of the vote at the next meeting. The matter was thus opened to Council discussion, whether to continue the *FF*, or not.

For starters, Prof. **Knoerr** didn't see how to have such a discussion without the Editor here to respond to issues that are raised. The **V. Chair** agreed, but the Council would have to do the best it could, with the Editor here next time, when the Council might either vote or again postpone. Prof. **Knoerr** ventured as his opinion "that Vic was trying to ruffle a few feathers and people didn't like it and so they're trying to shoot him down." That's how he saw it.

Prof. Evans remarked that the *FF* doesn't cost a lot of money and it offers a place for people to say what they want to say, if they have anything they want to say. On that basis, it seemed to him that the burden of proof would be with the people who want to discontinue. They need to say why. The *FF* ought to continue unless there's a compelling reason otherwise, and he had not heard one yet. Prof. **Rolleston** agreed, remarking also that Prof. Strandberg as Editor has been responsive to the discussion last fall. The **V. Chair** agreed with that estimate; Prof. Strandberg has been very diligent in talking with and working with ECAC and in listening to what we said.

At that point Prof. Strandberg arrived. The **V. Chair** alerted him that the discussion was in progress, in hopes that he would be able to attend. Prof. **Strandberg** remarked that he'd rather still be at the dentist, but here he was, although he had already said everything he wanted to say in his report.

Prof. **Rolleston** asked him to tell the Council more about the guest-editing intentions. Prof. **Strandberg** said that he looked forward to working with Prof. Jing Wang (AALL) on such an edition, expected in September. It's an experiment; we don't quite know how it's going to work out. It probably will not fill an entire issue, so he would welcome any other contributions as usual, and keep them on reserve for filling the blank space. But he thought it would be a promising thing and hoped it would stimulate other people to [try guest-editing an issue].

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DUKE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BLACK FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

With the discussion about the *FF* complete for the time being the V. Chair moved on to a report on the Duke Strategic Plan for Black Faculty Development. Provost **Strohbehn** was recognized to make the report. He reminded the Council that a little over four years ago the Black Faculty Strategic Plan was developed, with the goal of doubling the number of African American faculty at Duke over a ten-year period. We're now in the fifth year of that commitment. The Council has in hand the pre-circulated report, which focuses on the last year, 1996-97. In terms of tenure-track African American faculty, in the previous year, 1995-96, we went from 40 to 45. Including other regular-rank faculty we went from 54 to 64. From 1995-96 to 1996-97 tenure-track faculty were down by 3, from 45 to 42, while all regular-rank faculty went from 64 to 65. The major reason for the decrease was that three faculty at the Medical center left, one by retirement. The campus side is holding steady. If [the goal of the ten-year Plan] is to be reached by a linear process, more or less, we need to be adding roughly four African American faculty per year, and over the last four years it has been closer to six total. So we're behind [that figure] this year and that certainly has us concerned. For the total regular-rank faculty we need to add 4.5 per year to go up 18; we're actually up 20 so we're doing better in the regular-rank non-tenure track group.

That's the bad news. The good news is that this year is going quite well; we're beginning to see the results of a lot of discussions starting from several years ago that are beginning to come to fruition. At present, we have four tenure-track faculty signed and in fact one of those started in January. We have two files before the APT committee right now. We anticipate their going through successfully, and if they accept our offer then we will have seven tenure-track faculty coming on board for this fifth year of the Plan. Right now, by his count, Prov. **Strohbehn** said that there are about five other faculty we're in discussions with, a strong backlog, especially in a world where African American faculty are in great demand. We're competitive, with good cooperation from the faculty in terms of our long-term look.

A part of the ten-year Plan was to increase the number of African American PhD. students, and over the four years we've had about a 50% increase in enrollment in African American PhD. candidates. That's especially gratifying considering that over the last couple of years there has been a decrease in applications for PhD. programs nationwide, and also at

Duke, in terms of African American applicants. It's a tighter market and if we can hold steady we will feel that we're doing reasonably well. He invited questions.

Discussion of the Strategic Plan

Prof. **Emily Klein** (NSOE) asked if the five that are in current discussion now are all for positions [in Arts & Sciences]? With some recourse to Prof. Holloway the **Provost** said that one was in Religion, one in Public Policy, and one in Economics. Prof. **Frances Ward** (BasSci) asked at what level we are recruiting; the **Provost** thought that the proposal heard earlier, to add tenure-track lines in AAAS, would allow us to attract more people at a higher [level].

Prof. **Knoerr** remarked that declining [demand] for PhD. programs emphasizes a concern that he and others have raised in the past, that until we can do something to have an impact on the educational process in the early grades, we'll have difficulty solving the problem of low numbers of African American faculty. Our outreach into the community, with retired professors helping with the schools, probably has more impact in some ways than some things we're doing [on campus]. It may not be benefitting us directly now, but to the extent that that activity is nationwide it may. His three sons went through [Durham] schools that were largely black. There were some very capable students but also many capable students who didn't have the support system that encouraged them to go on into academics. Anything we can do to help there is worthwhile.

Prov. **Strohbehn** agreed. Such efforts within the community are important for the pipeline for new faculty candidates, including African American. In the long run it takes an educational process and there are a number of programs going on both in Duke with the community trying to invest initiatives. We are putting some of our energy into helping [in these ways]. In part, it involves getting students who are doing very well in college to think of an academic career; that's part of what we're trying to do.

Prof. **John Board** (EGR) commented that faculty searches in general are quite a bit scarcer in the past few years, especially in Arts & Sciences. He understood that when searches are approved they can be for very narrow sub-disciplines, sort of predefined in probable relationships and cross-appointments. Such very specific searches would be a problem when minority applicants are too few for allowing us to identify candidates. Could there be comment about how narrowly defined searches can coexist with our also going after targets of opportunity that might arise?

The **Provost** deferred to Dean **William Chafe** (A&S) who said that the general policy is to try to make a close connection between the long range plans of a department and the exploration for faculty resources when they come up. We certainly want to make sure that targets of opportunity who are approved fit within a larger direction of the department's development, but it is not necessarily the case that specific targets of opportunity will be on the immediate list of priorities for a given department. To give an example, we have a

target of opportunity appointment in one of the sciences, directly related to the interface between Mathematics and Physics, but not in an area of specialization that would be on the list of searches that Mathematics has right now as its top priority. But this is a person of extraordinary talent and we made a determination to pursue it. The Provost emphasized that it was in an area that the department has identified as intended at some point in time.

Prof. Knoerr asked about broader definitions of diversity than black and white. Duke is sited on land historically associated with Native Americans, [in effect] stolen from them. We don't hear discussions of brown and we are increasingly brown. There is more brown now in the labor force, doing the menial jobs, and a number of Hispanics who are still living in agricultural centers in semi-servitude. Those people are contributing to society in this state as well as in the country, but we don't hear much discussion about the things we as an institution might do for them. To be really serious about diversity we need to be thinking about all these groups, not just one that happens for a variety of reasons to represent the strongest pressure put on us to do things.

Prov. Strohbehn agreed that the Strategic Plan is definitely targeted at African Americans, but there are discussions currently within the administration about the wider issues just stated. We haven't come forward with a faculty-plan, but our leadership is sensitive about more diversity, generally, within the faculty. The philosophy of the administration has been that for historic reasons African American issues are especially important here, although the further diversity concerns are important and need to be addressed. The conversations include undergraduate students.

Dean James Siedow (A&S Faculty Development) noted that the Strategic Plan mentions increasing the number of black graduate students, but what about students in the professional schools? Is there effort within professional schools, among non-PhD. students, to see how they're doing in terms of African Americans? The Provost didn't have those data with him, but Prof. Brenda Armstrong (CliSci) could answer for the School of Medicine, which has experienced a very nice increase in [such] numbers, with 16% of our students as under-represented minorities. Last year we experienced a 500% increase in Latino students, by targeting that group. This year we have been able to accept double the number for under-represented minority students, based on a fairly aggressive recruitment target. In terms of academic markers for both the group of students that we had targeted as under-represented, African Americans and also the Latino population, the standard predictors for academic excellence, MCAT scores and GPA's, were no different between the majority and minority groups. It takes work but the students are out there and a focused effort really does pay off. While the Latino population in this area is growing rapidly, the group of academically competitive Latino students is not yet growing. They're to be found now in the northeast, in Texas, and in California. Fortunately, we have benefitted from the aftermath of Proposition 209 [California] and the Hopwood case [Texas] in that we had a 200% increase in the number of applications from those two states, helping us experience a very nice increase over the last few years, going from 12% to 18% last year. Two of those students

we allowed to defer in order to finish projects at the NIH and they will be joining the class that will be entering in August.

Prof. **Richard Schmalbeck** (Law), without exact numbers in hand, thought that full representation [of African Americans] might be 12% percent on a national level, and 20% in North Carolina. Year to year we've had between 5% and 10% of African American [faculty]. We recently have been pushing about 5% or so Asian minorities, which he thought somewhat over-represents the population. We have not had very many Native American or Hispanic students, only a handful of Latino students, and he couldn't remember the last Native American.

President **Nannerl** Keohane offered as a suggestion for the report next year that the matter of retention be addressed. It has received attention in previous Council discussions over the history of this effort. She knew that the Provost and several of the Deans and members of the faculty have been looking at those issues that African American faculty might [especially face], finding that a number of their concerns are shared by many faculty. That concern has to do with mentoring of junior faculty, and a paragraph or two addressing some of the potential issues in the midcourse evaluation would be a useful part of our consideration.

Prov. **Strohbehn** said that he was going to add to that, and that a Task Force which he shared with faculty and students is looking at the wider [considerations of keeping as well as attracting African American faculty]. The Fuqua School has earned a national award for their efforts in recruiting and mentoring African American students.

There being no further discussion, nor any more business before the Council, the V. **Chair** invited and accepted its adjournment.

Presented for consideration by the Academic Council,

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