

# 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

May 14, 1998

The Academic Council of Duke University met in regular monthly meeting on May 14, 1998, from 3:30 until 5:16 p.m., with Prof. **Leonard Spicer** (RAD, BCH) presiding as Council Chair. In calling the meeting to order he expressed appreciation for those attending by the somewhat earlier than usual starting time in order to accommodate a long agenda.

### MINUTES

While the minutes of the April meeting were not ready in time for pre-circulation for approval at this meeting, the summary was included with the agenda in view of the one continuing item discussed at that meeting, to be voted on at this meeting. The Secretary has a draft of the full minutes now on the Web ([www.duke.edu/web/acouncil](http://www.duke.edu/web/acouncil)).

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Duke Alumni Association is again sponsoring a Duke Alumni Admissions Forum, which will be on Friday June 26 this year. The forum is designed to acquaint high school students and their parents with the college admissions process. In the past years there has been an extraordinarily positive response to this effort, which gives Duke's view of the whole process, not aimed directly at Duke, but more broadly across undergraduate institutions. The Alumni Office invites members of the faculty and staff who have children in high school who are planning to attend college in the near term to attend this Forum. A brochure was available at the front of the room for those possibly interested.

The Duke Chapter of Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society, is holding its annual meeting as a public meeting at 5:45 p.m. today, shortly after this Council meeting. It will meet in Love Auditorium in the Levine Science Research Center. Duke Trustee and doctoral alumnus Robert Richardson, Nobel laureate, will join with a panel to discuss "The Nearly Impossible Challenges for the Research University," treating a range of topics of interest to the Council. All are cordially invited to attend. The **Chair** noted that Dr. Richardson was in the audience attending this meeting of the Council, as a guest, "to see how we do our business at Duke University."

## APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES EARNED IN COURSE

The **Chair** then called for the Council to exercise its thrice-annual function, delegated by the Faculty of Duke University, to approve degrees earned in course, at this time for award three days hence at Commencement. He called in turn upon the Deans or representatives of the College and the eight Schools to introduce their lists of candidates for these degrees, the lists to be given into the custody of the Faculty Secretary of the Council in "four certified copies." The numbers of candidates for the various degrees were offered as follows:

Trinity College of Arts & Sciences	AB, 883	BS, 398
The School of Engineering	BSE, 208	MEgrM, 9
The School of Nursing	MSN, 38	
The Nicholas School of the Environment	MF, 5	MEnvM, 98
The Fuqua School of Business	MBA, 344	
The Divinity School	MCM, 3 MRE, 2 MThS, 11	MDiv., 83 MTheol., 12
The School of Law	MLS, 1 ML, 78	JD, 207 DJS, 1
The School of Medicine	MD, 94 MHSBiom., 7	MHS, 48
The Graduate School	MA, 56 MS, 64 PhD, 97	MAT, 8 MPP, 21

With the lists of candidates all in good order in the hands of the Faculty Secretary, Prof. **Peter Burian** (Humanities, ECAC) was recognized to offer two usual motions:

**that the candidates be approved for their degrees behalf of the Faculty and recommended to the Trustees for award of their degrees, and**

**that the Provost be authorized to make such adjustments to the approved lists of candidates for degrees as may be necessary to assure that no candidate for a degree will fail to have his or her diploma awarded in a timely fashion, or that no candidate will receive a degree for which he or she is not fully qualified.**

These two motions were seconded and then **approved by voice vote, without discussion or dissent.**

#### SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Before the **Chair** could introduce the next item on the day's agenda Prof. **Burian** yielded the floor to Prof. **Robert Mosteller** (Law, EC AC), Vice Chair of the Council, who came to the lectern for a special presentation, as follows:

"This is Len Spicer's final meeting as Chair of the Academic Council, and on behalf of the Executive Committee, the Council, and the entire Faculty, we would like to thank you, Len, for two years of superb leadership.

"When I was asked to stand for election for ECAC [Executive Committee of the Academic Council], I talked to people whom I trusted about the decision, and one of their consistent responses was that I should do it because Len was going to be Chair. This was before I had met Len, and I was told that he was honest, and fair, and very able.

"Well, over the course of the past two years in an enormous number of hours of Executive Committee meetings and in a host of other settings, I have had those observations verified. And I know all of you have seen those characteristics and more. Len leads with good humor. He is positive. He wants to hear people out. He succeeds in bringing people together. And most importantly, he does it all because he believes it is vital to assure a place for the faculty in the governing of this great University.

"To honor Len, his leadership, and his efforts to connect administrators and faculty, we have had a photograph taken of Len in action. On its frame is a plaque with an inscription that reads **IN APPRECIATION FROM THE DUKE FACULTY TO LEONARD D. SPICER, PH.D., CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL, 1996-98.**

"But we wanted to put all this in a form that was at once contemporary, deeply textured in meaning, and pithy. What we arrived at was **LEN RULES.**"

Prof. **Mosteller** then unwrapped a poster-sized photograph of Prof. **Spicer**, taken unposed as he was presiding over a recent meeting of the Council, with "LEN RULES" superposed in evocation of the current "DUKE READS" series of posters in and from the Perkins Library, and presented it to Prof. Spicer with the warm applause and acknowledgement of the Council. The **Chair** responded to this tribute by thanking ECAC for their hard work over his two years as Chair, and also thanking Ms. Linda Lehman for her able assistance as Administrative Assistant in charge of the Academic Council office. He also thanked Prof. Donald Fluke (ZOO) for his assistance as Faculty Secretary, indicating that in addition to the

resolution of thanks last time there would presently be another Special Recognition in this meeting's agenda.

## PROPOSAL THAT ASIAN & AFRICAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE BECOME A DEPARTMENT

There were two issues to be voted on at this meeting and the **Chair** moved to the first of these, a change in status for Asian & African Languages & Literature (AALL) from Section to Department. The initial discussion of this matter at the previous meeting had indicated interest in having additional information, beyond that which was pre-circulated in the usual way, or that the Council had had available. Normally, ECAC would have expected to gather that additional information and provide it for the Council, but with only two Council meetings left this year, and knowing that it was important to bring this matter to the floor so we could fulfill our faculty objectives in such review of important academic matters in a timely fashion, it had been brought to the floor somewhat ahead of that usual custom. The Council had heard oral presentations from Profs. Miriam Cooke (AALL) and Jing Wang (AALL) related to the academic rationale for the proposed change. Prof. Wang was back at this time to respond to any further questions, and the **Chair** also noted the presence of Prof. Michael Gillespie (PS), who is chair of the Academic Priorities Committee (APC). He can also participate in the discussion at this second meeting. In view of the prior discussion ECAC decided actually to include some things that the Council doesn't normally see along with meeting agendas — parts of the review processes in general at Duke University. Those were the internal and external reviews of the Section that occurred in 1997, documents that are evaluated at the level of the APC and possibly some other committees, beyond the summary from APC consideration that usually comes to the Council. ECAC felt it important to show this further material as background, and for the Council to see the [APC] recommendations in the context of those other recommendations from the two specific [review] bodies. There was also a resolution, included among the pre-circulated material and revised somewhat from its form at the previous meeting, when it was introduced as an extemporaneous motion from the floor. The **Chair** then read the resolution, which encompassed the earlier floor motion and the second to that motion:

WHEREAS, Asian and African Languages and Literature is currently organized as a tenure granting Section in Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, and

WHEREAS, the Asian and African Languages and Literature faculty have requested their unit be changed to a department in Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, and

WHEREAS (earlier omitted inadvertently), this request has been reviewed and approved by the Provost's Committee on Academic Priorities, and is supported by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost,

**BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Council approves the establishment of departmental status for the current Asian and African Languages and Literature Section within the Trinity College of Arts and Sciences.**

### **Discussion**

Prof. **Jing Wang** (AALL) noted that Prof. Miriam Cooke, Director of the AALL Section, was out of the country, so she (Wang) would speak on behalf of the proposed change for AALL. To recapitulate briefly what was presented last time, AALL is a coherent unit in terms of its curricular missions and its intellectual agenda. The curriculum integrates literary/cultural studies with languages studies, and the intellectual identity of AALL is marked by a continual rethinking of traditional area-studies categories and methodologies. To quote from the report of the external review committee, which the Council has in hand: "This rethinking undertaken by the AALL faculty is at the forefront of a process now underway nationally to criticize and reconceptualize the boundaries within which study of the world has been undertaken historically." She wanted to emphasize that their curriculum bears out this vision of reinventing a single-area focus.

That said, she also wanted to add a few comments about the possible collaboration among the Triangle universities, mentioned last time, and understood to be one of the sticking points for the APC when they first began to deliberate on the change for AALL. Should AALL become a department when the intention of possible collaboration with Triangle universities on the instruction of lesser-taught languages has not been thought through? The Council may recall that Provost John Strohbehn at that last meeting offered as his view that AALL should not be held hostage to an initiative which may take several lifetimes to come to fruition. She herself had a somewhat different reading, that while this possible collaboration is no longer an issue she did think it very important to provide the AALL perspective on such a collaboration. The gist of the matter lies not in the issue of such collaboration but in a rationale that takes for granted that the languages taught in AALL are indeed "lesser-taught." That rationale about resource allocation supposes that it may not be necessary for each Triangle university to have a strong home base in those languages and cultures. She and her colleagues in AALL would question this rationale. Half of the languages taught in AALL are in fact no longer considered lesser-taught languages. The winter 1996 Modern Language Association newsletter published the results of its Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments which indicated as follows: More American college students are now taking Chinese and Arabic, and at the expense of the commonly perceived popular languages. Japanese is now the fourth most studied language, up from fifth in 1990, while Chinese has become the sixth most studied language, up from eighth. This factor, that "lesser-taught languages" have become commonly taught languages, changes the whole picture in respect to what the entitlement is, referring specifically to our entitlement to name ourselves what we already are. Thank you very much.

The **Chair** invited further comments and Prof. **John Board** (EGR, ECAC) suggested that since Prof. Michael Gillespie wasn't present at the last discussion, as chair of the APC,

nor were there any other members of APC present who had actually participated fully in the discussions of this matter, perhaps Prof. Gillespie could just give a very brief precis of his view of the APC's final opinion about this proposed change for AALL. Responding to the invitation, Prof. **Gillespie** said that there were really several issues involved in first APC consideration of this matter. The language [departments] at Duke are undergoing change at present, not just those languages that are part of AALL but all of the languages. In part this change relates to the undergraduate curricular review now in progress and the suggestion that we will be expanding the language requirements in a variety of ways. One of the concerns for APC was that any decision that we make now could be precipitous if it should have to be revisited as a result of the review of the curriculum as a whole. That concern was an important issue for APC because it involved a consideration of what the structure of language education as a whole ought to be at Duke. It had been their suggestion that the Dean of Trinity College form a task force that would look at the way in which the instruction of language is organized.

Although that was the major issue, a further issue before the APC involved a question of what a department is at Duke. Is there a minimum size for a department? Ought departments to have graduate programs? Things of that sort were concerned in the APC discussion of the change proposed for AALL. It was noted that at present all departments do have graduate programs at Duke, although the graduate program in Slavic Languages and Literature is being phased out. But this AALL proposal could call for establishing another department that would not have a graduate program, and that circumstance had some impact upon the thinking in APC about what it means to be a department and what departments could expect in the future. As a result of these subsequent discussions APC came to a conclusion that while we didn't believe that a graduate program should be a hallmark of every department at Duke we did feel that departments should be of such quality that they could offer a graduate program. In considering AALL in that light the difficulty with the idea of their [having the potential] of offering a graduate program has to do with their relatively small size, particularly in respect to tenured faculty. There's a double bind for AALL, that unless they become a department it is difficult to see how they can attract and sustain a type of tenure-track faculty that would make them of the quality that we saw [as associated with] departmental status at Duke. On the other hand it was clear that if they didn't get [departmental status] they might not make it [to that measure of quality]. [This dilemma] was a source of ambivalence for APC in considering the AALL matter and led ultimately to a decision to support the change, by a vote of seven in favor, but with two abstentions. He would be glad to answer any questions.

The **Chair** invited further comment or questions. As Prof. Gillespie has said, this is one of the most important types of decisions that faculty make. From the point of view [of faculty governance] it is very important that there be full discussion, and in particular that the faculty engaged [in the change] are protected in the full sense of what department faculties should be in a quality institution.

Dean **William Chafe** (A&S) reiterated as his position on the AALL change that as part of the discussion throughout both the internal review, the external review, and the APC discussions, there were three questions. Has the section worked? Is it ready for transition to departmental status? The answer appears to be enthusiastically yes on the part of both the internal and the external review committees. Indeed, the external review committee, which was chaired by the head of the Language Center at the University of Pennsylvania and co-chaired by the Dean of Arts & Sciences at the University of California at Los Angeles, commented specifically on how effectively this unit had moved toward merging and effectively coordinating the teaching of language and culture, a model of how to proceed in this kind of program. So in effect the section had proved itself able to function effectively as a department. Second, there's the question of whether or not having departmental status automatically entails a graduate program. Once that concern was clarified with Dean Lewis Siegel (Graduate School) it became clear that that was not the case [nor to be considered a precedent] at Duke. Third, there's the issue of our having in fact a language task force looking at the way we teach languages. But there is not at present [any specific intention] about how to reconfigure how our language programs are structured, per se. We do not intend to abolish Romance Studies or Germanic Languages, etc., and we feel that given the situation in which we currently function and plan to function in the future that it is entirely appropriate that AALL be able to join those programs as a fully franchised department.

With the discussion coming to a close the **Chair** drew attention again to the resolution before the Council, noting that the APC might more officially be referred to as the Provost's Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities. He called for a voice vote and the resolution passed, without dissent or abstentions of record.

#### ELECTION OF EDITOR FOR THE *FACULTY FORUM*

After the positive vote last time on continuation of the *Faculty Forum* the Council was ready at this meeting to elect an Editor. ECAC placed in nomination the present *FF* Editor, Prof. Victor Strandberg (ENG), for reelection to this position. Since the Council has seen Prof. Strandberg's report, no further information about him had been included with the day's agenda. He has been Editor for the last two years and this will be his third year. The position was advertised during the past month, with no other candidates or nominees appearing. The **Chair** asked if there were any nominations from the floor, but there were none offered. The **Chair** invited a motion to close nominations, which was offered, seconded, and **adopted**, by voice vote. The ECAC nomination of Prof. Strandberg was then put to voice vote as a motion and passed without dissent. The **Chair** declared the re-election of Prof. Strandberg as Editor of the *FF*.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE FACULTY SECRETARY

Before moving to the report phase of the meeting the **Chair** took a couple of moments to honor Prof. Donald Fluke (ZOO) upon the conclusion of his work for the Council as Faculty Secretary. "This is really a joyous occasion in some respects because it's always

really interesting and fun to reflect on the accomplishments of a colleague and a person who has become a friend during the past working relationship that we've had in the Academic Council." At the last meeting there had been a resolution thanking Prof. Fluke for his outstanding service as Faculty Secretary. Some may not be aware that there are indeed a number of other things that he has accomplished in that office. We're in a period where there aren't many who have the longevity in the University that Prof. Fluke has. He came to Duke some forty years ago as an Assoc. Prof, of Zoology and in fact during that period of time he served ten terms on this Council, including having been its chair and serving on EC AC. More recently he has been the Secretary of the Council for eight successive one-year terms. The **Chair** could not count the number of compliments that have been afforded the Council, and in fact the Office, for the quality of effort represented, particularly in the minutes that Prof. Fluke has reflected to the full faculty. These minutes have not only reported to them in writing about the work of the Council, but have come also to be put on the Web, so that they are accessible both on and off campus.

The past forty years of experience that Prof. Fluke reflects have represented a wealth of information, advice, and counsel to the Council office and to EC AC, not only during the past two years of Prof. Spicer's experience as **Chair**, but he was sure also before that time as well. It has helped both the functioning of the Council and the accomplishment of its work exceedingly well. So today, we further recognize Prof. Fluke's contributions by officially presenting him, on behalf of President Keohane, the Academic Council, and all of the faculties at Duke, a living symbol of his substantial efforts and steadfast support of the objectives of Duke and its faculties. This spring a young red-flowering buckeye tree was planted in the Duke Gardens, identified as an appropriate symbol. Today the **Chair** could announce officially that the tree is planted in honor of Prof. Donald J. Fluke in appreciation of his outstanding service as Faculty Secretary (1990-98). A framed picture of the young buckeye was brought forth to show the Council, and was presented to Prof. Fluke. The **Chair** remarked that the tree is in full bloom even though just planted, a wonderful living symbol, and the picture will stay up front so that Council members can look at it after the meeting. "Also, I should add one other thing that many of you know, that Don's from Ohio and Ohio of course is the Buckeye State. So we'd like to very much offer this symbol of appreciation, Don." The Council most graciously applauded this recognition of Prof. Fluke, and the **Chair** moved on to the reports phase of the meeting.

## PROCUREMENT PROCESSING UPDATE

The **Chair** recognized Executive V. Pres. Tallman Trask to report on a topic initially introduced as a question from the floor of the Council [December 1997], a request that EVP Tallman Trask comment on the changes in the purchasing area at Duke University. Some early experiences were reported with the new system that one Council member commented on, asking for some further input to the planning process for the changes, and information about how we would proceed. More recently, the Medical Center Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee (BSFSC) has also forwarded a letter asking for continued discussion of this area as we go through the transition. In both cases the interest is in how to make

purchasing a more efficient effort, knowing that change is inevitable in respect to our ability to deal with the computer age, etc. But of even greater concern is the process by which those changes are actually made, and how we consult with one another during that process. So ECAC has asked Dr. Tallman Trask as EVP to respond to these issues and update the Council on procurement processing and indeed the whole area related to purchasing. He had offered to do that earlier this spring, but deferred because the Council agendas were crowded and the presentation would have been less mature at those times. He has also pointed out the timeliness of such discussion, most appropriate as we now go into the newer protocol for purchasing and are gaining some experience with it.

EVP **Tallman Trask** expressed his appreciation for this opportunity of reporting on purchasing. It had become clear to him in just the last couple of weeks that there is more urgency to that discussion than he had hoped would be the case, for a couple of reasons he would get to. The decision to modify the procurement process, in an attempt to simplify it, reduce costs, speed it up, and reduce the bureaucracy, goes back a number of years, in fact to a time well before he came to Duke. There has been a lot of conversation over the years about [such reform of purchasing]. It had become clear to him in the last couple of weeks that a lot of that conversation [about how purchasing should be done] was with the wrong people, and there is currently a lot of misinformation and miscommunication floating around. Having said that, it is clear that this is now an issue that he [as EVP] owns, and he had spent a fair amount of time in the last week trying to figure out exactly what to do. The current status could be considered in three parts which really are quite distinct, but can become confused in some people's minds and pieces of one such part get transferred to another.

The initial part of the procurement simplification began last year with the issuance of what are in effect credit cards. There are now about 3000 such procurement master cards out to members of faculty and staff. This change was simply an attempt to simplify a problem with our old system, that in order to buy almost anything you had to complete a rather large form. As best could be told it was costing \$50 or more to process each of those forms through the entire transaction universe. But America has now become dependent on credit cards and they seem to work fairly well. So why should Duke still be completing forms in triplicate to buy boxes of pencils? The introduction of procurement master cards gives anyone who needs one such a credit card. Documentation [of purchases] comes automatically from G.E. Capital, which provides the cards. The intention was that these cards would be used for low-dollar purchases, almost to the level of impulse buying. We do get to some of that, as Council members may recognize [is a possibility]. Although there have been some such problems of inappropriate use, the cards don't work very well in such cases, and there are other complications that arise [for those attempting such misuse]. There are some issues that can be gone into in more detail if desired, about how one actually allocates the credit card data to the accounting system. One form has probably become more complicated than it should be and we're working to simplify that.

[Independent] of the procurement card system, and coming later, is a new electronic software system from SAP which will handle our ordering and our order processing as we

bring it up [to speed]. The SAP system is the most widely used accounting procurement system in the world and is run by the majority of the Fortune 500 corporations. There is no doubt that it works, but still of course a question about how it works for Duke, with some interesting issues there to talk about. A number of those present were probably extremely annoyed to receive a letter from [Procurement Services] announcing that standing orders, as they had come to be known, were being abolished. He would have to say in hindsight — and he hadn't seen it in advance - that that letter was about as ineptly worded as was possible. It is true that what we now call standing orders as such do not exist in the SAP system, which instead calls them contract orders. That wasn't pointed out in the letter, and so the recipients could imagine that we had completely lost our intelligence, and here late in the 1990's had bought a procurement system that couldn't handle repetitive orders with the same vendor, which is not the case at all. "I hope we've got that straightened out, but we certainly shot ourselves in the foot." None among the Council will have seen much of the SAP system yet. It has been up on the back office in Procurement Services since the 6th of April, processing orders. As best we can tell so far it works as we expected, and quite well. We have one design problem in it right now which is probably of our own making and which we are going to correct. It has to do with what part of the address is on the outside of the box and what part of the address is inside, which has made some deliveries more difficult than they should be. Other than that the system seems to work all right.

The third part of the effort had to do with our storerooms, and he would say at this point that it is probably the least successful part of the story. Along with a number of other universities, and after a competitive process, we last year awarded a contract to VWR [Scientific Products] (Van Waters Rogers) to operate campus storerooms and to supply most of our [commodities]. That contract includes fixed prices and we have been watching their performance with some interest. In the initial months of the contract we heard a number of complaints from faculty about the timeliness of delivery in response to orders, and we in fact put in place a monitoring system to figure out exactly how fast they were delivering what had been ordered. It has turned out, to his great annoyance, that they were delivering [only] about two-thirds of what they were supposed to deliver when they were supposed to deliver it. "We pulled their chain pretty hard." He had been watching the numbers on a monthly basis since, and in the last four to five months that number [of on-time deliveries] has been over 95%. In terms of timeliness of delivery we have at least gotten their attention, and he was hearing much less concern than he had earlier. More recently he was hearing increasing concerns about what VWR is in fact stocking in their storeroom operation. More disturbingly still, in the last week he had heard several allegations of prices [that do not appear to meet the terms of the contract (TAPE TURNS)]. We're going to ask for refunds, and to the extent that they are not as responsive as he thought they should be he [was prepared] to exercise our cancellation rights under the contract [if necessary].

There has been a lot of miscommunication [about these changes in the procurement system]. As said, there have been some attitudinal questions and issues within the Procurement [Services] department, but he continued to think that the basic efforts toward simplifying and automating the process make an enormous amount of sense. To date he

would give us on the implementation side maybe a C+. We made a couple of pretty obvious and silly blunders and he intended to send a letter out next week to the Basic Sciences faculty in the Medical School and also the [Natural] Sciences faculty in Arts & Sciences trying to explain exactly where we are in trying to [revamp the procurement system] and promote at least some understanding of [our current status]. "Having said that I'd be happy to try to end your confusion."

Prof. **Kenneth Knoerr** (NSOE) noted that he had raised the initial issue and would like to comment about [the letter from the Basic Sciences faculty of the Medical Center raising] some of the same issues as he had raised. In Botany and in the Nicholas School this credit card system was putting a lot of burden on the local units in terms of bookkeeping, in trying to keep track of things. They were getting frustrated with what may be saving the central system some dollars but represents a lot more work in the schools and departments, and they didn't have the money to get the people to help them with it, a real frustration. Another concern was that when they called Accounting or Purchasing it was hard to find knowledgeable people to help them with things, or to help them buy things, because these people were realizing that things were being downsized. As a result people were jumping ship, and were being replaced by temporaries who had very little knowledge, a further real frustration. EVP **Trask** said that he was convinced, having looked at it with some care, that the net amount of work going on here has been reduced. That is, there is a back-end processing piece that you have to do after credit card use, but that has replaced all the paperwork of filling out forms in order to make the transaction in the first place. The total amount of work has gone down. But it was also clear to him that in the design of this system there were some assumptions about how departments work that are incorrect. He did not yet understand how they [had arrived at these assumptions] but departments are indeed different animals, with different rules and different behaviors. This system had assumed that we had 100 English departments as far as he could tell, and it had to be modified to deal with that [misperception], and that's what we're working on.

Prof. **Steven Baldwin** (NS&M) said he was curious about VWR. Chemistry relies very heavily on this [stockroom-replacing contract]. Is there an expectation that we will continue with VWR in this capacity, or that we will not? He didn't see a fallback position. EVP **Trask** said that it was his hope and expectation that we will continue. When we challenged them on timeliness of delivery they were responsive. It's only in the last week that he had heard these allegations about price games, and to date he really didn't have in hand any definitive proof. If they have been doing that he was going to be extremely upset. We went through a process to pick them over the other people in that process. He didn't see us going back to the old way of doing things, so he was not anxious to terminate them, but he was going to be extremely upset if they've been playing price games.

Prof. **Baldwin** said that he had some anecdotal information about this price-creep way of doing things. It involves comparative months and [of course] everybody's favorite item for such tracking. EVP **Trask** said that that kind of information was what he was trying to collect as well. Under the contract with VWR things get priced three ways; some prices are

three ways; some prices are fixed for a year, some prices get fixed for a quarter, and then there are some sort of odd commodities where they pass through [cost increases as they occur?] There shouldn't be any changes in prices except annually or quarterly. [We need dates in order to] understand price changes and what's going on with mem. At this point we don't have enough data to do it but we're looking at it.

Prof. **Theodore Slotkin** (PHRM & CB) came forward to claim the role of "designated hit man" from the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee, with a rather lengthy set of comments to make about this matter, with the Council's indulgence and the Chair's permission. The BSFSC in its official capacity as elected representatives had sent a letter to Prof. Spicer to put on record with the Academic Council. Rather than just read that letter [in its entirety] he would be more talmudic and read the main points, with some commentary about them. In a way this [letter gives] a sense of [the faculty] frustration and anger with the matter of process, which we feel violates [expectations of] faculty governance and therefore involves all of us in the University and specifically the Academic Council. It compromises the ability of faculty to pursue their research endeavors, which after all is one of the two main tasks outlined for us in the Faculty Handbook (research and education). As a third matter, there are fiscally reckless elements in the way in which this [change] has been instituted. And so, without further ado, the BSFSC at its May 1 meeting approved a resolution requesting that the Academic Council formally consider the recent changes in purchasing policy that have been implemented. The BSFSC notes a number of problems with the nature and [manner] of implementation of these policies which will dramatically affect individual faculty in terms of day-to-day operations of University academic departments.

1. The new policies were implemented without significant solicitation of faculty input, as Dr. Trask has indicated and [as we explained when] we met with him earlier this week. The firm that was hired, with our bucks, to give the input to enable this system to be designed, were either instructed or took it upon themselves to deal only with middle level management and never to go to the end users of the system (the faculty). So they may think we are a bunch of English departments [and not] realize that people who do research and have outside grants and contracts are a series of individual entrepreneurs, each of whom has very specific suppliers and needs that cannot be met by this [revised] system. So that's an issue, in essence, of consultation and governance; the faculty were never consulted. We were simply told about implementation.

2. A second issue is one that compromises our ability to do research. As they're currently constituted, these new policies have displaced existing functional purchasing procedures, with no transition period. The SAP procedure which is running in certain people's offices is not available at the moment to the faculty at large to do our own purchasing. Office staff in departments who handle purchasing for some faculty, but not for many of us, also have no instruction in this [new system] or way of handling it. [As] SAP has been instituted [with a] downsized purchasing staff, we have had a nightmare of incorrectly filed purchase orders, purchase orders that have vanished into the ether, and

purchase orders that have been duplicated. Large amounts of money are involved that have to be covered by faculty out of their research grants. And of course no one ever seems to be responsible, in part because some of the very long-term purchasing personnel [have left]. As one instance he knew of someone who has been there thirty years and is very reliable, a person upon whom many relied to do what Purchasing is supposed to do ~ get competitive bids, going ahead to do the things we pay our overhead for. This individual was simply given a pink slip and dismissed. These sorts of things have reduced our ability to do research. While these problems might be considered as a sort of the breaking in [of the] system, if it compromises our ability to do our jobs that is an issue the Academic Council needs to deal with.

3. There is a third issue, one of fiscal responsibility. The storeroom is just the tip the iceberg, because while it may be possible first of all to document specific items for which VWR charges more than the price we could get elsewhere the simple truth is that with the monopolizing of the storerooms by VWR other outside vendors have canceled their contractual arrangements with individual groups of faculty. We are no longer capable as an institution of dealing in the marketplace for the best possible prices on sets of items that in some cases represent significant proportions of grant funds. VWR has absolutely no incentive to provide these [price advantages] for us. As one simple example, a relatively large supplier like Fisher, who used to just truck things in and therefore charged no shipping fee for procurement of supplies by Duke faculty, now gets to charge shipping fees because we no longer have the same contractual arrangement that we could have gotten [apart from the] VWR monopoly. A second problem of fiscal irresponsibility is that of passing the labor of purchasing and handling of the financial burden of this new system to faculty and to department personnel. When we negotiate our grants there is an item called overhead, and [the cost of] purchasing is part of it. [There's a] paperwork burden of handling the transfers, which by the way uniformly require on every single purchase that if you're on a research grant every purchase you make must be [recorded by] journal voucher and transferred by somebody. That somebody is us. The overhead burden of purchasing has simply been transferred from an indirect cost within a purchasing department, to faculty, who cannot possibly recover those costs. In the minds of many faculty it also represents a violation of the negotiated indirect rate with the federal government, which puts the institution in danger of an audit. Thank you [applause].

EVP **Trask** acknowledged the meeting earlier this week with the group of Basic Sciences faculty to which Prof. Slotkin had alluded. To walk through this [meeting] case by case, he didn't agree with some details, but didn't disagree with some matters of basic principles. He didn't propose to get into great detail about the Christie Rule [the right of the faculty to be consulted in advance of significant change] and [what that might require in reference to] credit cards, but it was clear to him that there was an assumption in this process that talking to departmental business managers [would mean] that faculty views were somehow being reflected. It was clear to him that while in some cases that may well be true in many cases it's not true, and we're going to have to figure out a process to involve faculty as we try to correct some of these annoyances. At the same time [it's impracticable] to

involve 2000 faculty in [this effort]. He had asked the School of Medicine, where much of this concern comes from, although obviously the same issues apply in research-intensive departments elsewhere on campus, to provide him a group of faculty he can work with.

In terms of the system itself he thought that there are a lot of assumptions about what SAP does or does not do. The fact of the matter is that no one here has seen it. It is operating only in the back offices of the purchasing department, and nowhere else. Nobody else outside procurement Services], except for himself, has touched it as far as he knew, and any assumptions made about what it does or does not do remains speculative. He was working through questions, with some guessing here about how things are in fact going to work. There was no doubt in his mind that the new system will require less processing [work] than the old system, although we do need to continue talking about where that work load should be placed. There is certainly no attempt here to push work from one place to another and call it economy. He clearly recognized their responsibility, within the funds that we have as overhead costs, to provide procurement services. He didn't think this is a question which interests the federal auditors at this point, but he welcomed their participation if they would like to be [involved]. He wasn't trying to push this work off on somebody else.

Prof. **Slotkin** responded that the comment that [the protesting faculty] are unfamiliar with this [new system] and that it works in the hands of those who are doing it flies in the face of a fact; consulting any of the faculty who are here today and asking them if purchasing was working better today, with SAP, than it worked six months ago with pink forms, would find that the answer would be no.

The **Chair** asked if there were some systematic way that we can get at that problem, in some time frame. He thought it true, judging from what was coming across his desk, much of it quite recent, [that there was a lot of negative experience with the advent of SAP]. There probably are a lot of specific cases that may or may not be the best way [to think about this matter], but somehow that input and advice has to be incorporated in a strategic plan for actually refining what we're doing. EVP **Trask** said that he agreed with that impression entirely. And as he had said earlier, it is both clear and unclear to him [in various parts]. His attention in recent months has been much on other issues and he had not been tracking Procurement Services as closely as [in retrospect] he should have, but it was clear to him that there has not been sufficient faculty involvement in those discussions. We are still at a point in the process where we have the ability to modify what we use and we need to figure out with a group of faculty what those modifications ought to be. He still believed absolutely that the underlying principle [of effective faculty consultation] that was stated is correct. As he had said, at this point he had in the last couple of weeks gotten into some of the details [and was] less than impressed by recent [operation of the system].

The **Chair** said that actually with the forbearance of the Council and the discussants at this point he would like to suspend this discussion for a specific reason, namely that the next person on the agenda to report is in the middle of quite extensive [labor contract]

negotiations from which he was able to take a recess to be here. We will come back to procurement in fifteen minutes if people would like to have additional commentary, but for the moment he proposed to move forward on the agenda to accommodate what otherwise is a very important activity of Assoc. V. Pres. Clint Davidson (Human Resources) as well during this very busy week. And (parenthetically, eyeing Mr. Davidson's folder of probable transparencies), he hoped that the overheads would not absolutely be needed, since no overhead projector had been ordered and set up, although we almost have one of our own now for the Academic Council. We're finding the process of acquiring one a little bit slow. At any rate, without objection, he would move on to Item 7 on the agenda.

## AN UPDATE ON MANAGED HEALTH CARE ASSESSMENT

He recognized Assoc. V. Pres. Clint Davidson, noting that he had been at Duke now for almost a year. Today's report is a follow-up to the discussions of last November and December when some of the outcomes from the initial survey of managed health care participants, faculty and staff, were finally evaluated and presented. There was a great feeling that not only was the survey incomplete but it didn't follow the wishes of the faculty who had tried to provide advice, partly because it was serving a number of functions that faculty weren't very interested in serving, principally accreditation [of the Duke Health Plan].

Laying aside whatever his intended transparencies, Assoc. V. Pres. **Clint Davidson** got directly to business. He had met with the Council last fall as part of the review of the [first] managed care assessment survey, had listened to the concerns and in particular the methodological questions about the data that we were trying to gather, interested in how to answer the questions we are all interested in. Certainly, as Benefits and Human Resources administrator and fiduciary [he wanted to know] how well our plan is performing and whether it is doing what we want it to do for us. Since that time he had had opportunity to benefit from a number of discussions with the Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC), and recently with EC AC, about how really to revise the process and increase the effectiveness of our collecting data, to determine whether our health care plan is indeed delivering the services that we would like, qualitatively and quantitatively. There are in fact very fundamental figures [that are needed], and from his administrative role he was decidedly interested in measuring the effectiveness of this plan. For him that process starts with asking and answering the [right] questions, which in some cases may have partial answers and in others none. We want to know what should represent the metrics against which we compare.

The first step in [achieving] the revised process is both updating standards, and in other cases insuring that we have standards, for going into the marketplace and other places, to measure. For example, some of the things that we need to be measuring, by way of illustration, are that we need to have standards and measures regarding access to our providers, those who deliver care. We need some standards concerning access for routine care, for urgent care, and for preventative care. Another area where we should have standards is referrals. What are the time frames in which referrals are made and what are

the types of referrals that should be made? Another obvious area of interest involves claims processing. How accurately are our claims being processed? Again, what is the service time or turnaround time in which those claims are handled? So, the first element [to have in place] before we venture off into a customer-satisfaction survey is our having a good contemporary and well accepted group of standards to measure against, working with the FCC and others who have experience in this arena, to develop those standards for our own plan as it relates to surveys, in addition to assessing against those standards.

Last time we had one survey. This time we would propose that there be three separate surveys. One survey should include faculty and staff generally who are being serviced by our Health Care Plan. But within that faculty and staff group overall there is a group that heavily utilizes the services of the Plan, receiving much more care and attention from providers, so a separate survey should look at those higher-level utilizers. And then the third survey, that we would add to the mix, is to survey the health-care providers. In discussions with our clinical and medical colleagues we find that they too are interested in this kind of data as well as in providing input through an assessment survey. So, in addition to having standards for measurement, where we measure performance, we would conduct three separate surveys. And then in collecting all of those data from across the University community, from the high utilizers as well as the general population, we would in addition gather data from the providers.

In respect to interpreting the survey information, he could tell the Council that we have changed consulting firms to assist with this process. We have talked early on about the need for comprehensive statistical analysis and doing different runs [on the survey data] once we begin a process of communicating [our findings]. With all of that data collected, we anticipate early on having a good set of expectations [for that information-sharing phase]. Our expectation is that at Duke we have a very high utilization level so that we would follow up through a number of different mechanisms to be sure that we get a high response rate. The statistical analysis would be completed and then the results would be communicated in several different ways.

There are a couple of other elements that hopefully would strengthen this entire process. In addition to this kind of assessment survey of the Health Plan there need to be discussions between members of the FCC and members of the Physicians Diagnostic Clinic. Recently we held the first of those events, bringing together a group including a subset of the FCC and some of our clinical practitioners to talk about our health-care claims experience and its utilization, and access to physicians. Not surprisingly there were dramatically different perspectives about what was working and what was not working. The most beneficial outcome of that discussion, in addition to understanding where we disagree, was a commitment that we should continue those kinds of discussions. So we have agreed [among that group] that at least on a quarterly basis we will come together, share data, compare points of view, and attempt to work out strategies and efforts that will strengthen the overall performance of our Health Care Plan.

Most of the design work and consultation with the FCC will be done this summer. We have assurance that we will be able to spend [enough] time together to finish our design by the end of the summer and begin the necessary communications in the early fall. During the late fall and early winter we will administer the survey. We hope before the end of the year to begin the statistical analysis work, and to have results out to the community, most importantly for use in updating the design of our health-care Plan early in the next calendar year. Those are the changes we have been working on. He expressed his appreciation to those on the FCC. They have been very helpful, and certainly persistent, in [pressing] the issues and the concerns that were discussed here last year, and he felt that some good progress has been made.

The **Chair** remarked that many of the issues addressed in the strategy [just outlined] relate directly to comments that were offered from the floor of the Council, and he thought that the FCC had heard these comments and taken them to heart, and had included them so that they figured in that subsequent discussion. Prof. John Payne (Fuqua, FCC), who chairs that committee, was planning on being here but in fact is actually accessing managed care instead, his wife having broken a bone in her leg this afternoon. But during the meeting with ECAC this week he did comment on the fact that he felt things were moving along the right track relative to the kind of participation and cooperation that people had envisioned early on, and he was looking forward to a very fruitful process in the planning of these surveys. The other thing he had pointed out by way of information to the Council is that he felt it was a good idea to have the FCC, or he as its chair, report through ECAC to the Council on a fairly regular basis - maybe quarterly ~ as we move through this process, to keep people informed. That's a common theme we're hearing, but the better the communication we have the better off we're going to be in terms of understanding and utilizing these services provided to the academic sector. With that he invited questions or comments.

### **Discussion of Survey of the Health Care Plan**

Prof. **John Board** (EGR, ECAC) asked if it might not be well to alert people that Sanus would probably continue to do its own surveys as well. Assoc V. Pres. **Davidson** said that one of the issues last time was that we had designed a survey to meet certain accreditation requirements, and in so doing we may have compromised the methodology needed [for our own useful information]. As a result we've taken the position that we need to design a survey that helps us measure [how well] the plan is performing [for us]. Sanus, does have some needs and interests of its own relative to their certification, and they will accordingly do their own survey which they are certainly free to do. So part of the risk of the change we've made, or the exposure [we engage], is that Sanus will do an independent survey much more structured along accreditation lines. So, many among the faculty and staff may have two sets of survey [questionnaires] to respond to. They will not come at the same time but he wouldn't be surprised to have some discussion arise from people feeling over-surveyed as a result. But we're [determined] to design a survey that meets our particular needs, [whatever that liability of over survey].

The **Chair** said that he thought that the FCC, as we go through this transition, would ask that people bear with the process until we really find the best way to optimize [our informing ourselves about the Health Plan in operation]. As has been said over and over, we have faculty on both sides of our managed care, as users and as providers. As a University we can be criticized for being too involved in both those sides. But the fact is we have resources on both sides that are crucial for optimizing an effort like this, and it's only in our best interest to take full advantage of that fact. There being no further questions, he thanked Assoc. V. Pres. Davidson and wished him good luck with the "other side of your work here," as he returned to the continued negotiations.

#### PROCUREMENT PROCESSING UPDATE, CONTINUED

The **Chair** invited further discussion of the interrupted subject of Procurement Processing, appreciating the Council's indulgence in the interrupted ordering of the day's agenda.

Prof. Lawrence Evans (NS&M) remarked that it's an old story, about failure to consult with the end users. In fact he couldn't think of a case off the top of his head where the end users [were appropriately consulted]. It's our norm. He was chairman of his department, Physics, for almost ten years. He was still chairman at the time that the departmental managers were called for these meetings. The departmental manager in Physics raised almost every objection that we have seen raised here, and was totally ignored. He was also not invited to come back with views of the faculty in the department. They had talked about it in his department for awhile, and he had sent Mr. Richard Siemer, who was in charge of procurement processing at that time, a rather heated e-mail. This was probably the "20th or 30th or 50th or 60th" time at Duke that that exact same thing had happened, in one way or another, where the end users, the people who have to actually live with the system, were not consulted before a system was changed. Again, until the people who make those changes in the system see that their careers will suffer if the end users are not consulted, [that will be the situation]. There has to be some way [to make it] painful for those people not to consult [as they should].

The **Chair** remarked that it really is true that it ends up costing in many ways far more to try to remedy something that one could have anticipated well in advance by consultation.

Prof. **Slotkin** said that Dr. Trask had stated just before the break for the Managed Health Care survey presentation, that as far as he could see from his desk, and from Purchasing, that the SAP system was working very well. But he wanted to report from the end users about how well that SAP system works. His department (PHRM & CB) has now assigned one secretary full time to fix the problems generated in purchasing with the new system. Maybe it's working well [for the managers], from their aspect, because they don't have to fix the problem, but we have had to add a full-time person to do the job of

purchasing. To him, that's the end-user report, that SAP even in this particular phase, "before it covers the world," is not doing what it is supposed to.

Prof. **Terence Oas** (BCH) wanted to extend that comment to the individual laboratory level as well. There has been a significant increase in workload, for administrative assistants and technicians, that has been directly a result of the change in the system which has already taken place. In fact, there are now fewer dollars in his grant budget because of this switch-over, and he would like to know how those dollars are going to be reimbursed.

Prof. **Frederick Schachat** (CBI) said that he thought all these issues were important but that one of the most critical ones, one that has been alluded to, is the loss of competitive aggregate purchasing power by the Basic Sciences. There must be a way in these contracts with VWR, if they are going to be the sole supplier, to guarantee what the NIH gets guaranteed, that they will not offer a lower price to anyone else than they offer to us. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill put such a clause in their contract that they got with their stockroom supplier. Nothing like that was done for us. And right now, even if we get the prices to roll back where they were, we're still not capable of getting competitive prices from other suppliers, as we could when there were independent contracts negotiated on the basis of volume, with Fisher, with VWR, and with other suppliers. There is nothing in the process of maintaining this stockroom, short of a guarantee in the contract to maintain competitive prices, that will prevent us from being essentially a captive of VWR. Even if they only charge 5% more than a competitive price, that's still 5% more than we were paying on every item in the past.

The **Chair** remarked that it is ultimately essential to have a plan for starting to look at these things very carefully with the faculty who are most effected, and he would suggest that that plan be put before this Council at the earliest possible time, perhaps through ECAC and then to the floor of the Council when it meets in the fall. But he also hoped that we don't lose the summer, as someone has commented, because it is true that very recently a number of specific cases have been reflected by individual faculty that have come to the Council office from across campus from various Schools. It's a new enough concern that we haven't had much time to talk about [these cases] and he thought that rather than dealing with them one at a time we need to get to the core issue of just how we're really operating. So he would assume from Dr. Trask's comments (addressing him) that that was his intent, too. But please, let's talk about how that strategy will evolve in the short term and then perhaps we can worry about how to communicate some of that [longer-term concern] as well, "and urge you to work with a faculty group as you had planned."

#### UPPER CLASS RESIDENTIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

With that, the **Chair** called for the final report of the day's meeting, part of a very important activity of great interest to both the faculty and to our student body as well. As all are aware a committee was established to develop a plan for upper class [undergraduate] residential life, and that committee has reported back. The intent of that report was that its

information be broadcast as widely as possible. That [wider attention] has happened through several councils — but not all as yet — including the Arts & Sciences Council. While this is the first opportunity for the Academic Council really to view it, the fact is that when ECAC thought about that Academic Council perspective, they thought of it as more than just an information effort. What we were really interested in, since that committee reported, was quite encompassing, involving several areas and several specific recommendations. For Council purposes it is most important to hear the strategic planning methodology that is going to be used and the time frame in which those various issues are to be addressed. So V. Pres. Janet Dickerson (StuAf) and the Provost in particular have been asked to report to the Council respecting the time frame for addressing those various issues and the type of reporting process that we can expect. What can we expect to hear as time goes by and the University comes to grips with this very important overall challenge and does in fact start proceeding with an action plan?

V. Pres. Janet Dickerson (StuAf) wanted first to acknowledge the work of Dean Robert Thompson (TC) and Ms. Barbara Baker (StuDev) and their committee in providing a very thorough report, and also all those constituents who have provided feedback this past semester. In the Upper Class Residential Planning Committee's report, four guiding principles are articulated in some detail: 1) Commitment to Intellectual and Co-curricular Life; 2) Equity of Access and Variety of Experience; 3) One Diverse University Community; and 4) the maintenance of a Duke Tradition of Continuity and Change ~ respectful of past generations of students and faculty as well such academic values as inclusiveness and integration of residential and academic life. The Committee's recommendations seek to foster a learning community [based on] a developmental model, to consolidate change while stabilizing the community, to create more equitable access to campus resources, and to unify West Campus without disestablishing selective groups, which have a long tradition on West Campus.

The report was helpful in identifying some previously opaque principles and practices and in describing some recurring problems. Our discussions of the report this spring focused on a number of issues. One [such] question that emerged is that of selectivity and the continuation of selective housing, along with elective housing and theme housing. President Keohane's response, which the Council has received, affirms this element of our housing principles. The future use of Trent [Drive Hall] has been discussed, and while we have not yet identified an alternative use for that space, which is in good condition structurally, we have concluded that it is not a positive location for independent sophomores for the long term. We continue to consider the issue of capacity, [especially] a need for new residential units on West Campus. Exec. V. Pres. Tallman Trask will be speaking more directly about the residence hall feasibility studies currently underway as well as about our efforts to attain a mutual stabilization between our residential plan and the necessarily related financial plan. He is working on these issues with Mr. John Pearce, the University Architect. These issues have been the subject of discussion in PACOR (the President's Advisory Committee on Resources) as well.

We have had discussions in several settings about the goals of equity and diversity. There is general support for the proposals to move to a single room-rate for our residence halls and to make the financial aid structure neutral with regard to choice of residence. There is also strong support for maintaining a residential community — the Arts & Sciences Council was particularly concerned that we not drop the requirement that students live on campus for at least two years, and students have expressed strong support for the four-year housing guarantee. Most of us would like to see an increased upper class presence on campus, whether on Central or on West.

The diversity issue is somewhat vexing; while everyone seems to be in favor of reducing the fragmentation of the campus and minimizing the self-segregation of groups, she discerned deep disagreement about strategies. The report proposes a redefined allocation process, leading to assigning all sophomores to West Campus and to establishing many more small clusters of homogeneous groups, some selective, some elective, some based on academic themes. The Committee's vision would be that of a West Campus community [aided by having] a structural linkage between Edens Quad and the Main West Quads. They envision "softened boundaries" between groups, possibly minimizing the sense of entitlement and competition between groups and individual students [that can be a problem]. Some envision intellectually-based theme sections, like the Round Table, or the Anne Firor Scott House, as a means of creating more connections between students' residential, co-curricular, and academic lives. The minority groups have expressed a strong interest in ethnic group houses, not based on any intellectual theme necessarily, but enabling them to have access to space and resources equivalent to those available now to other selective groups. They are decidedly opposed to the "busing" model of integration, where minorities are distributed among groups in a way that forces them to assimilate into the majority culture and to serve as the "instruments" for integration. After all, they point out, they have experienced this model throughout their school years, and it unfairly burdens them.

The discussion in the April meeting of the Trinity Board of Visitors led to a conclusion that we need to redouble our efforts to make students responsible and accountable for their conduct; the peer culture of West is not always civil and inclusive, and can be somewhat inhospitable to those students who seek an environment conducive to study and sleep. Our staff is advocating that there be more adult presence on West, and our planning for recreation and for Bryan Center and West Campus Union renovations include proposals to expand dining and social venue options so that the residence halls can become more quiet zones. She noted that the 1994 report on the Intellectual Climate at Duke University, "Building Community of Interest" (the Burian Report), expresses concerns about many of these issues of climate. We recognize that we are engaged in an educational dialectic here -will academic and residential life be compartmentalized, or do we strive for a synthesis? How can we create a community where students can be with others, doing collaborative and cooperative work, and also have space to be alone, doing independent work? How can we imbue the concepts of risk management, and of adventure beyond one's [usual] comfort zones, into students' ideas of work and play?

V. Pres. **Dickerson** noted that the Provost will address the process to be followed during these next few months, as we seek to articulate a plan for West Campus and the upper class residential experience that can be discussed, considered, clarified, and ultimately supported by students, approved by the faculty, and endorsed by the Trustees. She wanted to emphasize that the Council's input is especially important, and the hope was to bring a proposal to the Council early in the fall which can be examined and criticized thoroughly before any formal decision is made later in the year.

Provost **Strohbehn** remarked that University Secretary Allison Haltom will be shepherding this [whole process] to be sure it's keeping on track and on time. In the fall the recommendations, hoped to be in more crisp form by that time, will be taken back again to PACOR, for further consideration from the point of view of financial issues. They will go to the APC for further in-depth discussion. Clearly, they will be coming through EC AC and the Academic Council, and the Board of Trustees.

EVP Trask was also expected to make a few comments at this point, but had another meeting, so he (the Provost) would try to pick up on these points as well. Clearly, the report includes recommendations for facilities that are very substantial. The first step that the administration believes needs to be taken is to start looking at issues related to creating some new residential life facilities. A lot of planning is needed and we really need an architect to come in to start looking at the options that are before us, and what the consequences of different options are. And so, for [the current] meeting of the Board of Trustees we will be bringing recommendations for support for going ahead and starting the planning process. This [request for support of planning] does not mean that we will be [committed to] building facilities, but we need to know what the issues are in order to make a sound judgment [about what to bring further to the Board by way of] an update. The first step is to do some planning and clearly the results of this planning will all be going back to the Board. Much of this discussion will be going on during the fall semester and probably into the spring as well.

### **Discussion of Upper Class Residential Housing**

The **Chair** asked if there were questions. He could say that in ECAC discussion of this matter there was one point of emphasis which he thought both the Provost and V. Pres. Dickerson commented on, that before final decisions are even close to being made they will be aired fully within the appropriate committees and with the student bodies. It is important that that time frame be honored as best one can, rather than [at some] last minute timing.

Prof. **Edward Shaughnessy** (EGR) said that while he was not in any way in opposition to this report, many would probably agree the Duke has an institutional memory of approximately four years, and he was now finding that his may not be much longer. But [when this matter] is to come back to the Academic Council there was one thing he wanted to bring to attention — and it was neat that EVP Tallman Trask had mentioned the Christie Rule, too. Trustee Emeritus Norb. F. (Bud) Scheafer, who had a deep and abiding interest

in residential life at this University, died in April he had noted in *Duke Dialogue*. Two institutional memories ago, he thought, he had had the privilege of serving on the Building and Grounds Committee of the Board of Trustees when it was chaired by Bud Scheafer. Shaughnessy wanted to give a little history, because if we just read this report without knowing the history of this issue at Duke, it may seem a very innocent report, but the devil is going to be in the implementation. About eight or so years ago he had had the nerve at a joint meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee and the Building and Grounds Committee to suggest, apparently for the first time, that we go to a freshman college experience at Duke. The reaction in that meeting was that absolutely every single person was against such an idea. So the first thing to be aware of, when a new idea comes forward, is that it's not [necessarily] wrong just because everyone opposes it.

Now, one of the outcomes of being forthright at Duke is that you are going to be asked to volunteer. So the next thing he knew was that he was asked to serve on what at that time was an undergraduate committee working on these issues. But at the meeting of the Board of Trustees, or at the dinner that night — as many of the Council know, many of the Council members will be going to dinner with the Trustees — [Trustee, now chair] Randall L. (Randy) Tobias had leaned over to him and said, "You know, Ed, my daughter has graduated from Duke, and is here, and she would never agree that a freshmen campus would work at Duke." It was also known at that time that Pres. Keith Brodie was opposed to this idea. So a number of people, including some present at this Council meeting, worked in secret for a year, exhausting themselves in putting together a plan. Their eventual consensus was that East should form a freshman campus and that Trent Drive Hall should be closed, for obvious reasons, but that things should otherwise be pretty much left alone. Well that's not what was done. What was done was that East Campus became a freshmen campus. We didn't [get to see] Trent closed, because the financial [implications made such a] horrendous problem. We went to a quad plan, and he could tell the Council exactly why, they may remember — because such a quad plan was [seen as] a fair and equitable way to distribute and allocate residential space. There was bitter student and faculty opposition to this change, but it was advanced [with the idea] that new groups would have the opportunity to form. But new groups did not form and he was one of the people who knew why. Looking at this current report before us, on page 6 it talks about an extensive review process for selective housing, as if such a review process doesn't exist. But as a volunteer for the last four years, along with Prof. Benjamin Ward (PHL) and Ms. Ellen Plummer (Women's Center) and eight or nine students, he had have been serving on the biennial review committee which stringently reviews every selective house at Duke every year. These groups are "graded." Some of them are put on probation and otherwise given the [word] about aspects of life that are [treated in this current report]. New groups [are encouraged to form], but they don't form. There's perhaps a perception that they can't form, but actually there are mechanisms in place to help them form. But there's a simple message from this experience; when houses are moved it's a tremendously disruptive process, clearly reflected in their annual reviews. It has caused some to fail. So before we go ahead with yet another miniature move — as he called it — he would just urge that the quad plan be given at least one full institutional memory [of four years], in the attempt to make it work. Speaking from the perspective of

the biennial review committee and its insights, by the students' own self evaluation the residential life structure that we have in place is working very well for a good number.

The **Chair** invited other comments, noting that a lot of information and reports of efforts are now at the stage for Council consideration, in a whittling out of the elements on which we can focus our attention. The discussion can be concluded with the expectation that important material will come back through committee to the Council in the fall, probably on a regular basis judging from the plans that the Provost had mentioned. There being no new business, nor any further business, the Council was adjourned, with a reminder of the opportunity with Trustee Robert Richardson that would follow shortly in Love Auditorium in the LSRC. Have a good summer.

Prepared for consideration by the Academic Council,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fluke', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

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