

Duke University

Durham
North Carolina
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

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

April 22, 1999

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on April 22, 1999 from 3:45 until 5:25 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor **Robert Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

MINUTES

The **Chair** called the meeting to order. As there were no corrections or additions to the Minutes, he asked for and received a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 25th meeting as submitted. They were **approved** by voice vote.

Before proceeding with the session, Prof. Mosteller asked for permission to note a tragic event that happened since the last meeting, namely the untimely passing of **Wesley Magat** of the Business School. He passed away in late March at the age of 50, survived by his wife Joan and his two daughters. Prof. Mosteller reported that there was a wonderful memorial service conducted for him in the Chapel on the twelfth of this month and he could not do justice in the time available to who Wes was and what he gave to this community, but he will read one line said by his Dean, Rex Adams: "Wes was to us the conscience and the core of the school." So he'd like to spend a moment of silence in honor of Wes and what he gave to this university. [Council members passed a moment in respectful silence]

QUESTIONS FOR THE PROVOST AND PRESIDENT

The **Chair** referred members to their packets and the questions posed for the Provost and for the President. There was a written form of both. A written form of the question to the Provost also contained John Strohhahn's answer.

Provost **Strohhahn** read the question out loud: "Apparently, a large investment of new development funds is to go to non-academic projects, such as the extensive residential renovations presented to this Council earlier in the year, at the same time several core departments in the Natural Sciences are at levels below those in comparable schools, and well below what would be appropriate for Duke. Could the President and Provost explain to the Council the process by which academics and non-academic priorities are to be balanced and debated?"

In his response, the **Provost** explained that there are two committees, PACOR and APC, whose responsibility is to look at these types of questions and make recommendations. Since the question itself had to do with the natural sciences, the Provost elected to talk a little bit about the natural sciences. As regards talking about the tradeoffs, it's the sciences in general, he said. While the biological sciences have been reasonably well supported, the physical sciences have historically on a relative basis been less well-supported than the other divisions in Arts and Sciences, and there are data which would support that. The President, Dean Chafe, and he began to address this situation with the most recent two-tier tuition increase. This step permitted planning for thirty new faculty to be added to over [a period of] four years in Arts and Sciences. Their goal started with making sure to hold the top ranking that Duke now enjoys with Botany and Zoology and looking towards the other areas, the next goal is to move forward in the physical sciences through selective recruitment which Duke is committed to in the new two-tier tuition plan. That includes three new faculty members in computer science, two new faculty members in chemistry, two in physics, and three in mathematics. The cognitive neuroscience and interdisciplinary initiative has added five new positions. So some steps had been made to try to work on the imbalance in the area of the physical sciences. He wished to say that the above strategy will move Duke forward significantly, but there does need to be a 'Phase II' in the physical sciences and this area is under discussion. He thanked his audience.

The **Chair** now called on President Keohane to respond to her question.

President **Keohane** said that her response had not been printed out but that members have in their packets a question which she will read: "In conjunction with the recent announcement of Mary and Spike Yoh's gift in support of a new training facility for the Duke football program, I noted that this gift was part of the athletic department's \$ 65 million campaign goal to increase student scholarships and athletic facilities. As a member of the Library Council, I also know that the library's campaign goal to provide seriously needed renovations, upgrades in technology, and increased support for collections development is only \$ 30 million. It seems to me that we have our campaign priorities backwards. How can we justify seeking more than twice as much money in support of the business of athletics than in support of the major resource for faculty scholarship?"

First, she proposed to give just a bit of context, and then to provide a more direct answer to the question. She said that it was important to remember that the highest priorities of the campaign in terms of both dollar goals and emphasis in Duke's activities across the institution are endowed scholarships, faculty support, endowed funds for academic programs, and annual fund support for

ongoing operations at the several schools, and so to compare the library goal against the athletic goal in isolation is too narrow as a way of judging their priorities. Even if only that comparison were taken, however, some useful points emerge. First of all, both the library and the athletic department depended on support from the central administration, President or Provost, but the way in which their budgets work, and the historical relevance of fund-raising is very different in each case. The unrestricted annual operating budget for Perkins Library is about \$16 million, plus more than seven million for libraries across the institution for a total budget of about \$23 million. The campaign was designed to provide some relief for this budget through endowments and annual fund support, but the latter would be relatively modest. The library annual fund has been running at just over \$ 200,000 annually, they must surely increase that figure in the campaign. Their goal is about \$ 15.5 million over seven years. That's a bold and ambitious increase. She wanted to assure everyone that the administration has a very clear commitment to the library. In fact, they are using some very ambitious figures, considerably higher than 15 million at this point (in the \$ 90-100 M range), to talk about multiphase capital renovations and improvements to Perkins Library over the years to come. In the case of athletics by contrast, the annual giving rate rather than 200 to 300 thousand dollars has been in the range of 5-6 million dollars. Athletics has appropriately a much smaller subvention of only \$4.7 million from the university to support a portion of our athletic scholarships, but the rest comes in from revenues. Duke would like to at least hold steady on this annual giving mostly from Iron Dukes, but we also want to encourage them to shift their perspective to scholarship endowments and faculty facilities. So \$ 20 million of the \$ 65 million goal is for facility improvements. The administration is very supportive also of intercollegiate athletics, and particularly to increasing endowed scholarships, especially for women. This was based on their own principled commitment, on the opportunities available and the need to comply with Title IX, all of which meant that scholarship endowments needed to be substantially increased over the period of the campaign and that was her major goal. In fact, if the two are put together, it is expected that the capital improvements figures needed for both athletics and the library will go up during the campaign and she hoped to be successful in surpassing both those goals and they expect dramatically to increase the number of people who are involved in supporting the library through the campaign, and also increase those who are supporting athletics, but the question of where you put your fund-raising efforts in terms of potential donors and return of investment has to be faced. There are fortunately quite a few wonderful people out there who want to support the library, and our library campaign committee, under trustee Carl von der Heyden's leadership, and with the full support of the library administration is doing a great job. There are even larger numbers of wonderful donors who want to give to athletics,

given the broad popular support for this aspect at Duke. So, realistically, the goals for giving in athletics are higher, even though financial commitments of the university in general, are clearly tilted in another way. Therefore, more support for Duke overall could be brought in, if ambitious goals were set in both of these areas. The bottom line answer to the question was that, in both cases, they hope to realize significant increases in financial support through giving, but they are starting from very different bases. Luckily, some of the money is fungible or triageable, and if their scholarship goals for athletics met with success, in the long run, it may be possible to release some of the draw on the central operating budget, and free up money for other high priorities, including, potentially, the library.

Prof. **Kenneth Knoerr** (NSOE) identified himself as the author of the question and said that he realized that he was pretty selective in how he posed it, but he just wanted to focus the need on the library because he has been on the Library Council for a long time, and at least for quite a while, the sense of the Library Council had been not very much attention was being given to its needs. Now that has changed, with the new leadership of the library and his guess is the most encouraging thing is that he has had John [Strohbehn] say is what is really needed is about \$100 million for the library. So that's much different than what he was seen talking about earlier. So he hoped that \$100 million will be sort of factored into this Campaign for Duke. Well, he, in fact, had in the draft of his answer figures in the range of \$90-\$100 million but he didn't know if John [Strohbehn] had discussed that with her and he didn't want to spring it on her, but "that's exactly what we are talking about. We're talking a period of time here, we're not talking next year or even in this campaign perhaps, but we are very much committed to significant capital improvements in the library."

Prof. **John Staddon** (Psycho logy/ Exp.) said that he had a question really not relevantly related to these questions but more generally for the Council. These questions are seen by most members only at the meetings at which they are responded to. It would be very helpful if they were printed in the agenda so everyone had a chance to think about them, at least for a week or so before the meeting.

He remembered last year there was a question asked about the English Department and he can remember the Dean gave a very complete answer to that, but there were no members of the English Department present, because they didn't know that the matter was going to be raised and had no chance to react to it so, in his opinion, if there is a consensus on the topic on the part of the Council, it would be a good idea to have a week's notice of the question. He would be very much for that, he would just like to hear what other people think.

Chairman **Mosteller** wished to comment on the background to this point. That request was made to the Executive Committee, and they thought about it because it seemed to him that it is in the range of what would be reasonable. Their decision was to stay with existing practice. "Why is that?" They really couldn't find a history, one hypothesis he has, or one argument in favor of it was that the questions could be asked by any faculty member, not just members of the Academic Council and could be used as a forum to basically state positions rather than ask questions, and as a lawyer, [he would say] that they wished not to be in a position to make a judgment based on the content, but there was absolutely nothing that anyone could tell about either of these two questions to make them perfectly suitable to go out. So they didn't feel like changing the situation, but, on the other hand, if Council wished to direct ECAC to do that, that's Council's will. And so he told John [Staddon] that he could bring it up and if he wanted to motion and if there was a second it could be voted on, or it could be left as is, so he'd like to handle it with dispatch. He didn't think there was a lot to talk about beyond those positions.

MOTION ON COUNCIL MEMBERS RECEIVING QUESTIONS IN ADVANCE

John Strobehn said that he'd certainly make a motion, he didn't know if there was a second for it. He moved that members get these questions in advance. He then remarked that his reaction, to [Mosteller's] comment that someone could use it as some kind of forum was that there already was a forum. '[If] people want to write something that people can see, they can send it to the paper.'

Prof. **Richard White** (Botany) seconded the motion.

The **Chair** asked for a vote on the motion. The motion **passed** by voice vote. He commented that ECAC will change its practice. He now thanked both the Provost and the President for answering the questions, and then called on the President for "a very fine announcement."

President **Keohane** began by saying that before she made her announcement, she meant to bring forward a copy of the case statement which members have probably seen, Ken [Knoerr] as a member of the Library Council [has seen it] but in case others hadn't, the 'case statement' for the campaign for the library is a very interesting document, and there are statements for each of the major areas and if people are interested, she was sure the development office would be glad to share them with any of the members. If members had a chance to check their mail today, the news she was about to share will not come as a surprise, but she wanted to use this auspicious setting to announce it anyway.

"Yesterday morning, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees gave their enthusiastic approval to her recommendation that Professor Peter Lange be named the next Provost of Duke. Many [here] know Peter, who has taught at Duke for almost twenty years, served as Vice-Provost for Academic and International Affairs, and chairs the Department of Political Science. He is a highly regarded Political Scientist and a valuable colleague, well-suited by personal qualities and experience to provide leadership at this time in Duke's history. You will be relieved to know that in their conversations she did raise the issue of whether it is appropriate for the holder of such a dignified position to drive such a snazy convertible, but that turned out to be non-negotiable. Peter will take office on July 1st, in the meantime, Provost John Strohbehn and I and the other officers and deans look forward to working together to bring our Provost-elect up to speed on some of the major issues confronting Duke. One of the first things on his plate will be the leadership of a major strategic planning effort to begin this summer, including broad involvement from members of the faculty and other Duke constituencies. I want to close this brief announcement by thanking Professor Kathleen Smith and her thoughtful, hard-working search committee for producing a number of impressive and intriguing finalists, and for her good work across the year in helping candidates understand more fully what this complicated job is all about. I know that you will all join me in offering your heartfelt support to our next Provost as he takes on this very significant new post, Peter Lange." [Applause]

Provost designate **Peter Lange** began by remarking that during the curriculum review, Jim Siedow accused him of never making a speech shorter or longer than thirteen minutes and twenty seconds. Now he didn't think this speech was going to last thirteen minutes and twenty seconds, he thought it would be more like five minutes, but he does want to say a few things.

"First of all, I am gratified by the confidence that the President is showing in me by offering me this position, and I am excited by the opportunities which lie ahead further to enhance our endeavor to become one of the finest national international universities. I am also most appreciative of the enormous effort made by the search committee. The time taken by the many people with whom I officially visited, and the great support of friends and colleagues, as well as my family, throughout the many months of the process. Viewed from the perspective of a candidate, which is surely a unique perspective, the search was thorough and challenging, and more personally I would add exhausting. It required me to articulate for the many audiences my aspirations for Duke and how I felt we might best reach them. It also demanded that I listened intently to faculty, to deans to the president and to other academic administrative officers about our current strengths and weaknesses and about our aspirations and concerns. In the months and years ahead I look forward to working with all

of them to achieve and exceed the goals I expect us to come to share. As chief academic officer of the university, the Provost must provide a strategic and intellectual leadership necessary to retain our goal of becoming one of America's truly preeminent universities. This will require innovative thinking, the highest standards, clearly articulated academic priorities, and a firm commitment that all we do in the university must be directed towards building the best faculty, attracting the finest students, and attaining outstanding achievements in research and teaching, which requires teamwork between the provost, the other senior officers, the deans and the faculties of the individual schools. The ultimate strength of the university rests not just on the individual qualities of the schools, but also on the strength that arises out of their interaction. As provost I will work daily to ensure that we do what we must to reach the lofty aspirations which are in reach, and I am looking forward to working closely with the entire Duke community in this effort which I hope inspires us all. Now originally I was going to stop there, which is a lot shorter than thirteen minutes, but I was instructed by several people that the faculty and Council colleagues would be desperate to know something more about what I was intending to do which went beyond these, so I'll go on a little bit more.

It would, of course, be premature to start listing detailed initiatives that needed to be undertaken, so those who are looking for that, will be disappointed. In fact the first order of business must be to establish a clear set of academic priorities that are publicly articulated. These must infuse and discipline every discussion of major expenditures of university resources. Whether they be of money, of space, or of attention. The campaign and the resources it will generate only further underlines the need for this approach. Strong advocacy of the academic sector making its sustained success the standard against which we measure our progress requires a clear picture of what we're trying to accomplish and how we expect to get there. Thus academic planning must be our first task, one we should continue this summer as the president has outlined, building on the initiatives taken by John Strohbehn, one of which he reported on today. The formulation, public articulation and implementation of academic priorities cannot be done within the provost's office alone. It will require sustained engagement with the Academic Council and its Executive Committee, with the Academic Priorities Committee, and with PACOR. Above all, it must be done with the deep involvement of the deans of all of our schools. We need to make the deans an absolutely integral part, not only of the academic priority setting process for their school, but also for the university as a whole. If I may use a metaphor drawn from politics, my own discipline, the deans must be like the ministers in a cabinet government. Responsible for the success of their ministries, but with a strong involvement and a commitment to the success of the government, that is the academic mission of Duke University as a whole.

This said, there are some principles we must be attentive to in this planning process. There are also some obvious areas to which we must devote priority attention in the earlier stages of this planning process. I would like to start with some of the principles. First, we must do all we can to maintain and improve the quality of our faculty throughout the university. This means not only looking at the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure and I would remind people that AP&T actually stands for Appointments Promotion and Tenure, we sometimes collapse it all and think of it as this abstract thing, the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure process from the department to the dean, to the APT committee to the provost, and from initial appointment to tenure decision and finally promotion. But also we must think hard about how we make Duke a place that as few as possible of our best faculty want to leave. Retention of our finest scholar teachers rests not only, and perhaps even primarily on paying the highest salaries --in fact, someone told me we are paying cost of living adjusted salaries, I don't know if it's true; I didn't feel like it when I was a faculty member, but of course now that I am a provost I think it's absolutely true -- but in assuring that they have access to excellent graduate students, fine colleagues in their own and cognate areas of the search, with which to interact and programmatic support, including excellent library sources. All these should act as a magnet, or perhaps a metaphor of a change, in which no link can be weak is better, a magnet or a chain, making them want to stay at Duke and drawing others to the university.

Second, as we think of the university's academic mission, we must think not only in terms of schools and departments but also in terms of areas of knowledge and how they span schools drawn together in many parts, faculty in many parts of the university. This involves a further deepening of our commitment to interdisciplinarity, and to the creation of centers of excellence built on ideas and research programs. Departments must be strong, and some must be among the absolute best in their disciplines. But they cannot be strong in all things, and the linkages between faculties of different departments and different schools can, if properly fostered, help strengthen the department and the academic sector as a whole. This is not just an intellectual discussion, by the way, but it is a strategic one as well.

Third, we need to think beyond the boundaries of specific areas of knowledge to the linkages between them. I was really struck, to take a recent example we all heard, by Dean Ed Holmes' discussion of 'genomics' in this Council at our last meeting. What Ed discussed was a very broad scale initiative that would have its scientific base in several departments and programs in different schools, but that would also draw on faculty from the humanities via ethics and the social sciences via policy in a way which could make Duke a truly innovative contributor in this central development in science and society as well as a central development

within science itself. Clearly, there are other such spanning initiatives that can complement those that we take in departments and across cognate departments. One of the provost's responsibilities must be to foster these intellectually and administratively.

Fourth we need to recognize our resource limitations and, of course, every provost and administrator gets [many funding requests]. We know we can't do everything with severe resource limitations, but I believe Duke has some, obviously, and we have competitors who have fewer. This implies several things: for one, Duke can afford to make fewer mistakes than our richer, sometimes much richer competitors. Of course, the danger in recognizing this is that we then become so cautious and slow in responding to opportunities that we miss them. Striking the right balance here is extremely important. Further, we must be always striving to assure that at Duke, the whole is as much or more than the sum of its parts. Again, intellectual merit here intersects with strategic necessity. Finally, in this regard we need to think beyond our borders as a university about how we can best draw on and use intellectual and other resources that lie beyond our walls. Improved educational technology in the classroom, library and labs is only one such need. There are many others. I am not in a position today to discuss in concrete terms specific departmental or cross-departmental initiatives. It would be premature and in fact presumptuous on my part. There are, however, fairly obvious broad research areas in which Duke has great existing advantages that it should exploit. Examples, all too obvious, I suspect, include biomedical sciences, environmental sciences and policy, cultural studies, but these are rather generic and we will need rapidly to move beyond them both to much closer levels of detail and to the recognition of additional school and departmental cross-school and departmental strategic foci. In this regard, John's recent millennium report has initiated a discussion about specific academic priorities in the sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences, each of them broadly understood in that cross-school way that I outlined above. That discussion will be picked up almost immediately. There are also earlier planning documents like Lew Siegel's report on the sciences and engineering, and the more recent planning for the Franklin seminars and the humanities center, which opens up a discussion of important initiatives outside the sciences. There is no question in my mind that the sciences are a place where Duke would be putting significant resources of money, attention and space in the next few years, but there will be many other important initiatives also mobilizing substantial resources. We are entering a period of great opportunity for the academic mission of the university. We can expect a major infusion of resources. These, when combined with excellent university leadership and faculty involvement, can allow Duke to really make a push to be, and I'd like to say this, as good as we sometimes think we are. As good as others sometimes think

we are, and perhaps as good as we would like to be. This will require teamwork and initiative and we will get going quickly to seize this opportunity. Thank you."

The **Chair** thanked Peter Lange and remarked that one of the delightful aspects of the job he has is to work regularly with Duke's senior officers, with John [Strohbehn], with Nan [Keohane], with Tallman [Trask]. I also had the pleasure to be on the Provost Search Committee and in that process came to know Peter better and to become convinced that he was superbly qualified for this task, and to lead us for the next five years, and he thinks Duke will be extremely well served by the choice of the President and the Trustees in that regard. He would like to invite everyone to come and have a word with Peter. There will be a reception for new members of Academic Council and as a special added benefit with Peter [Lange], immediately after this meeting. There is a lot on the agenda, he is going to do his very best to get people out of here very shortly after 5. The reception will be in the Rare Book Room in Perkins Library.

As the next item of business, Chairman Mosteller turned to the election of new officers to the Executive Committee of Academic Council. People who are members of Academic Council are elected for two year terms, and unfortunately three of those people have aged out, and he regrets that desperately. John Baillie, Gastroenterology and Medicine, Jan Ewald from History and Emily Klein, Earth Sciences and NSOE are finishing up their two year terms. Three new individuals are to be elected today and Peter Burian and Paul Haagen are acting as tellers and passing out the ballots at this point. They will collect them in a few minutes; only Academic Council members are supposed to vote, and under the rules members have to vote for one of the two candidates paired, so a total of three candidates have to be voted for, i.e. one of the two for each pair on the ballot is not valid. So everyone be sure that they comply with that. Under Council bylaws, an additional set of nominees can be presented from the floor. In the absence of any nominations from the floor, the Chairman declared the nominations closed. He asked the nominees to stand: Dale Martin, from Religion, Tina Williams from Psychology/Experimental, Craig Henriquez from Biomedical Engineering, Lawrie Virgin from Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Jeff Dawson from Immunology and Jane Onken, from Gastroenterology. As soon as the ballots have been counted, he will announce the results.

The next item of business concerned the Faculty Scholar Award. Chairman Mosteller referred members to the materials mailed to them containing a report from Ben Ward, who is chair of the Faculty Scholar Committee. He explained that the award is given by the faculty through the Academic Council and through this committee to members of the undergraduate student body, usually junior class who

perform superbly in various aspects of their schoolwork. The report indicates the process of nomination. The Faculty Scholars Committee has selected four winners of the award: **Sarah Elizabeth Dean** of Mathematics/Physics, **Matthew Rhodes Peters** of Physics/Computer Science, **Ori Preis** of Biology and **Emily Ashworth Trueblood** Program II in Biomechanics. Those are the individuals who are nominated to win the award. Three other individuals are to be recognized as **honorable mention: Tara Silver Medoff** in English, **Scott Matthew Michelman** in Political Science/Religion, and **Matthew Phillip Zisow** in English. Anyone wishing to read any more about the faculty scholar program, can do so on the Academic Council web site. He asked for a motion to approve the report and take the nominations as presented. It was **approved** by voice vote.

Prof. **Richard White** (Botany) wanted to raise the issue that the four finalist awardees, although he is not a member of the Council, all tilt toward the sciences which is a concern, and that the numbers from the various departments is low relative to the number of possibilities, and he was wondering if that committee judged by the Academic Council could do something to try and spread more of the nominations more broadly because he felt sure there are wonderful candidates outside of the sciences and it would be appropriate to spread the awards some, lest we be viewed as rather biased towards the sciences.

The **Chair** said in response that Council will take that up with the Committee and have a discussion. He took this to mean that that was not in the nature of a motion to reconsider.

Prof. **White** said "not in any way." He was also pleased as a scientist to see a biologist appointed; it's just a matter of the distribution and that the number of nominations is appropriate for the quality among the departments.

Prof. **Mosteller** replied by saying that Council will ask Ben [Ward] and other committee members to come and talk with us about it and try to get explanations. He was sorry Ben couldn't be here, he was teaching. He wanted to thank him and the other members of the committee, Hugh Crenshaw, Zoology, Linda George, Sociology, and Dean McCumber of Electrical and Computer Engineering for their work.

Before calling on John Strohbehn to give Council the annual report on the Strategic Plan for Black Faculty Development, the Chair wanted to alert members to the matter of residential life, and to expect to spend a considerable amount of time introducing issues on residential life which represent an instruction issue, and a funding issue. He announced that there will be no vote today. The vote will occur in the May meeting, which is May 13th, Thursday. Depending on how the discussion goes today, Council may decide to start the meeting somewhat earlier on that date. So members should

be attentive to the notice that goes out. For those of who are new on the Council, significant matters are treated in two meetings. The item is put on the table, then there is a basic discussion, and then vote is taken in a second meeting. Sometimes it's almost all the discussion heard in the first meeting, sometimes the second but it's basically a matter of notice. Today will be the first discussion of the residential life construction plan and funding plan. We will also discuss very briefly, or it could go on as long as people want to, but he thought it will be relatively brief, Appendix C changes which is also a two meeting issue. A vote on that will be taken in the May meeting. There will be a third issue that Council will be voting on in the May meeting that is in member's materials but in his judgment is only a one meeting issue. It needs to be voted on but there is really no need to discuss it over two meetings. It's a name change to change the Division of Earth Sciences to the Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences. It will be voted on in the next meeting and that is contained in a letter from David Bell that is within the materials on residential life, so it's before members, but he can see no need for a discussion today, although if someone before closing would like to raise an issue about that, he'd be happy to [accommodate it]. The Chair now called on John Strohbehn to come forward and give the annual report on progress with respect to hiring minority faculty.

Provost **Strohbehn** noted that since members had already seen the report, he was not going to go over all of it so he'd really just like to hit some of the highlights and leave an opportunity for questions. "First of all, as far as progress is concerned, steady progress is being made in an attempt to double our black faculty members, but percentages are still small and gains have occurred largely in the non-tenure track group. The most comparative data which is data that was collected by Harvard hints, it's a year behind, it takes a year to get all of the information down. In the most comparative data in 1997-98, however, it showed that Duke has almost the same percentage of non-medical tenured black faculty as the other schools, and a higher percentage of non-tenured, but still tenure track black non-medical faculty. Duke's progress at the assistant professor rank bodes well for the future. In the Medical School the university lagged only in the non-tenured number where the average percentage of all the schools surveyed is twice as high as Duke's. The Medical School does better in the higher ranks, and the rest of the university is split. We're doing better in the low ranks, and not as well in the high ranks. The university has done very well with graduate students in the humanities and social sciences, but not as well in the sciences and engineering, and as you know that's a narrow pipeline, there aren't as many individuals out there. Law and medicine have made the most dramatic progress in matriculating black professional school students, and so that's kind of the overview broadly of where we are.

Looking towards the future, there are some action steps that we are recommending. First of all, this program works in part because when a department has identified an African American candidate that they feel would be of real value to a department, without having to go through a normal search, [the hierarchy] will look at that individual, to see if that individual meets Duke's standards, and the department will have the opportunity to hire that person. In order to help the department from a financial point of view, there's a 'walkdown.' The first year, the total cost of the faculty member is covered by central administration, and it walks down over three years and in the fourth year it's in the budget of the department or school. Secondly, the intent is to maintain the committee oversight structure, but retain leadership in the Provost's office. The original Black Faculty Strategic Plan had appointed an individual, George Wright, at that time who was made primarily responsible for this strategic plan. He felt it was better that his office be involved directly, so there is a committee that meets on a regular basis looking whether we're really being aggressive in trying to find individuals who meet the standards looked for, but obviously the new provost will have the opportunity to reexamine that question. I am tempted, of course, to hand it over to him to look at it. Third, we want to make sure that C.T. Woods-Powell's role is well known. She has worked in my office to do a couple of things. One of them has to do with making sure when African Americans come to campus, that they get to see Duke in the broad sense and the Triangle in the broad sense. She has been a major contributor for holding [open?] house, having people from other schools, other universities meet with candidates etc. ; but she also plays the larger role for the whole university, for anybody who has a partner question, from a point of view of bringing somebody to campus, that she is the individual who looks and tries to find connections for anybody on campus [to facilitate] going after the primary candidate. And so she's played that [role] very effectively and we owe a great deal to her. I also think that the requirement for annual departmental and school reporting on black hiring and retention needs strengthening, and should routinely include this requirement as one marker for external as well as internal evaluations, and think about strengthening disincentives for failure to comply. It turns out that in some evaluations of a department or a school, that is something that they actually address as possibly being seen both by the outside agencies as well as the rest of us and I think more attention needs to be paid to that. It's good to get outside expertise about these type of questions. Third, Dr. Jackie Looney, who had left us for a while, has come back to Duke, and we want to utilize her to reestablish relationships with the HBCUs which are important to building our graduate school population in science and engineering.

Next, the university wants to make sure that faculty and students have their own 'safe spaces' and carefully monitor the university

service demands on blacks. In particular, if junior faculty are asked to do so many things, it makes it more difficult for their teaching and scholarship career. We want to track our PhD students after graduation with an eye towards recruiting them back to Duke in future years. Basically, it is the policy outside of the Medical Center not to hire our own PhD's directly after they get their PhD's. We think that's a good policy for Duke, but there are people, African Americans who belong to our graduate program and I think it's important to follow them and see them later in their career when they wouldn't mind coming back to Duke as a regular faculty member. Then we should more proactively court visitors with an eye towards recruiting them for the faculty, that is, when somebody is on campus for a normal time to visit, to see whether or not it is an individual we'd like to keep at Duke, and as is known from the recent things in English, that this was done and it's worked very well. Finally, we want to raise expectations for departmental mentoring of junior faculty. That's the broad picture. I also wish to comment on a couple of numbers that I thought at least are useful for those who have the material. Attachment I shows a net gain of 11 for all schools in tenure track appointments between 1993 and 1998. They are about halfway through this tenure plan. Those numbers [show], that Duke is not quite on track for the tenure track faculty. That will have to be increased in the future. Looking at the other regular ranks, we went from 8 to 25, which is an increase of 17, we're doing quite well at least as our benchmark linear regression. So total we went from 44 African Americans in the regular ranks or in the total regular ranks, tenure track and non-tenure track, to 72, an increase of 28 which puts Duke overall ahead of the timeline for the next period. The other data I would like to at least quote from is the Harvard data which is Attachment IV a. Harvard collects this data from a number of institutions, peer institutions. It's always a year in advance because of the time it takes to get the data, but if you look at the non-medical, Harvard when they do this data breaks between medical faculty and non-medical faculty and they don't have what may be called the non-tenured regular rank. So this is just people that are either on tenure track or are tenured in this data. But if one looks at full professors, Duke has 7 full professors in the non-medical grouping. That's about 2% of the full professor ranks. With respect to other schools, Duke ranks 7th out of 16, that is, Duke is in the middle of the pack, we're not ahead of anybody, we're right in the middle. Go down to assistant professors, where we have 14 African American faculty, that's 8.6% of the assistant professors and Duke ranks second out of 15, i.e. in that area we are competing, we are doing as well as virtually anybody else. So that's obviously the faculty of the future and that's certainly something we think is positive. We also have to make sure we keep them. Looking at the Medical School, the full professors have three African Americans, that's 1.2% of the population in the Medical School. In that area Duke ranks 4 out of 9 so it's about in the middle. If you go down to assistant

professors, there are 4 assistant professors which is 1.4% of all assistant professors, Duke ranks 8 out of 11. So in that area we are not doing as well in the Medical School in junior appointments as the rest of the institutions. So with those comments, I'll be glad to try and answer any questions."

Prof. **Steven Nowicki** (ECAC/Zoology) said that first he wanted to thank the Provost— and that he felt sure many of his colleagues would agree with this— for the strong leadership he has shown on this issue. Second, he was wondering if he could comment on the disproportionate number of non-tenure track faculty, especially in some units, for example in the Medical School where there is quite a gain, but they are all out of the tenure track and how that impacts on retention of the best people here.

Provost **Strohbehn** responded by saying that that was certainly something they have been noticing and he thought one way of looking at it is that in general they have found more opportunities to attract people who would for one reason or another not go into the tenure track line and convinced them that Duke is a good place to be. Most other universities do not have this special rank [of 'Associate']. This is something that Duke only implemented a number of years ago. So in some sense it is an area we concentrate on, most people would see better situations at Duke than at other universities who just don't have that rank. So he thinks that's part of it. But the other part is that there is tremendous competition for African Americans; for every two that Duke recruits we [expect] to lose 1 to another institution over the next X number of years. So far it's just been more stable at the non- regular ranks, the non-tenure track.

Prof. **Arie Lewin** (Fuqua) said that recently he had the privilege to serve on a re-appointment committee for one of these non-tenure track appointees and he must say that they were really struck by the really good record and nobody could explain to him why this person with a non-tenure track appointment [was not offered a tenure track appointment ?] because Duke has created this kind of a category, is there a tendency to put more people on this [track?]

The **Provost** replied that he could not give him a good answer, he didn't know the specifics of the one he is talking about.

Prof. **Lewin**: "It's a serious question."

Provost **Strohbehn** acknowledged that "it is a serious question," and that it is the first time it's been raised. [In] most of the other cases he thinks he understands the reasons why, he doesn't obviously in this case.

Prof. **Karla Holloway** (ECAC/African-American Studies) interjected that it is of concern not to feel that these are the ranks which

are almost a reserved category and that we don't grow also and equitably with tenure track ranks; it is critical to keep an eye on this imbalance, especially in the Medical School where this is seen as lax and other areas where the non-tenure track ranks are wonderful and have the opportunity to grow; growth there should not occur at the cost of the tenure track ranks.

Prof. **Edward Shaughnessy** (Engineering) commented that in engineering especially although perhaps this might be true in the sciences [generally], departments are small units. Hence, when they are looking for faculty, it is vital for them to kind of target their priority to perhaps a new and exciting new area of technology. The thought that has occurred to him over the years that the three year financial walk down in fact does not represent as aggressive an investment as the university ought to make in this sense. Supposing in the course of his professional life he discovers a black faculty member that he thinks is attractive here, but perhaps that member of the faculty overlaps an area or is not an authority [in an] area, and are we not kidding ourselves that a walk down over three years really provides an investment versus an incentive and shouldn't we be thinking about an investment, i.e. if this is really a goal we all support, does it not take an investment instead of an incentive.

Provost **Strohbehn** replied that one way or another eventually the individual has to be in a department or a school and somebody has to support that. So far he has not felt that was the reason that in engineering we haven't been successful. He is aware the Engineering School has been looking for an African American individual. Some are convinced that what is holding us back is one of the things that we have pointed out here is that for a while we were working with HCBUs and other universities more proactively than we have more recently. Obviously, there are few targets and it's also true that in engineering they get fantastic offers in the corporate world so that he has been in more than one situation when we had an African American faculty for a number of years and IBM has made a better offer. It is also more competitive from that point than in other fields. He is not yet convinced that it's mainly money holding things back, partly because he thinks Engineering has been looking at this and trying to identify people.

The **Chair** thanked the Provost and expressed his appreciation for his work in this effort and his report. He invited Judith White to come to the lectern at this point, as it was time to turn to the residential life construction project and the funding scheme that goes with it. He reminded members to consult their relevant materials which had been passed out in advance, i.e. three memos, a cover memo and two memos from Judith White. One was basically telling people what the construction project is roughly like, the second was telling them why. Passed out today were a number of

other documents, and, of course, there was no chance to read those and members should look at those between now and the next meeting. The very first of the documents is a proposed resolution offered by the Executive Committee, a draft resolution in support of this set of initiatives. Attached to that is a favorable recommendation by PACOR, President's Advisory Committee on Resources, and a favorable recommendation by the APC, Academic Priorities Committee. After Judith gives an overview of what's being pushed here and discussed, Roy Weintraub and David Bell will both speak for a few minutes about their committees' perspectives on this set of initiatives and he hopes there will be some time for the president to speak as well. At this point, Prof. Mosteller had received the envelopes [with the election results] and he proceeded to announce the winners. He expressed his appreciation to all six people standing for election to the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, and announced the names of the three people who were elected: Christina Williams, Craig Henriquez, and Jane Onken. He congratulated them and welcomed them to work with ECAC very shortly.

Dr. **Judith White** now presented her overview of three large pieces of a package that had been put together and three topics and the way she and her committee have come to talk about them, so she would tell members what each of these means and to talk about what other people are going to talk about.

"The goals of this proposal are those related particularly to the residential plan. What is intended for our upperclass residential experience and what we think the architecture can help us do. So I'll talk more specifically about what we are now calling the 'proposal.' There is some jargon and I think I should introduce members to it because I'll probably use this language for the rest of my short discussion. There has also been a discussion of priorities both with the Academic Priorities Committee, with PACOR and with ECAC and out of that set of priorities a decision was made to focus on a short set of capital projects which has been put together as the package, and that's in the memo from Tallman Trask. A number of funding issues have been discussed, part of the residential plan is already budgeted but part of it requires additional funding. So what we have put together is a funding package for all of the capital priorities that we are going to talk about. We have an imaginative approach to that which has come to be called the 'mechanism.' The issue has been discussed non-stop for the last month, but I really appreciate Roy Weintraub agreeing to give members a more technical explanation of the mechanism which is the use of a 0.5% draw on Duke's endowment which Roy and Bob Mosteller will talk about. What I want to do, having given you the jargon is to talk very specifically for a few moments about our hopes for the upperclass residential experience and what we think the architecture which has been proposed to us can help us do in achieving those goals. As I said in the short essay that I sent

to you, we are talking about an inclusive campus, one in which all of our students will have opportunities to feel at the center of the enterprise here, geographically and spiritually and they will have opportunities to feel that they are reflected in Duke's plans both for the architecture and organization of student life. Last fall we gave you a copy of a report that was developed during the fall. I think it was distributed before the architectural consultant gave his first report in December. For those who are new to the Council, I want to explain that it was decided at that point in the fall to engage an architectural consultant to work with them on how they would put together both the work that needs to be done in renovating Duke's dormitories, our seventy year old facilities are much in need of upgrades in terms of utility systems, all the things that people would probably have upgraded significantly if their house is anywhere near as old as this building, but at the same time to try and think about what new construction, what new capacity in the buildings would allow us to achieve. In December, the architect came back and said instead of simply renovating our current buildings and leaving them the way they were and then going somewhere, probably in the parking lot near Edens quad and building new beds, he thought [showed] that Duke was using its buildings rather inefficiently and that it should reorganize them to be more efficient, more flexible and to allow us to have the same mix of facilities both on Main West and in the addition. He suggested in fact that the addition be additions to our current Main West. So we are thinking now about facilities that will expand the opportunities for students to live on Main West rather than simply leave the center of campus the way it is, and put some more people there, move them from Trent and put them somewhere else. This has allowed us in the last few months in discussions with student groups and staff of residential and housing management as well as faculty groups to begin thinking about what the architecture would allow us to do. We think that it will permit the creation of a much more inclusive atmosphere, because those upgrades can be achieved as well as put more people there, so originally we can simply have more assets. What is being proposed is that 400 more students would be able to live on West Campus without sacrificing the size of rooms. In fact, we hope that rooms can be standardized and have fewer of the rooms that are generous singles but presently being used routinely as doubles, and generous doubles, moreover, are really being used as triples, instead we try and standardize those rooms. So that this is not a proposal that gains more bed space at the expense of the quality of rooms and the kind of crowding that we do not think will add to the social experience or intellectual experience of our students. But at the same time, the architecture is giving us more flexibility to do things in a different way in terms of how groups of students, individual students are supported and how social organizations are supported with space in dormitories. In our report in the fall, when we asked for architectural assistance, we said that we knew

it was necessary to talk about the program and how our current organization and future organizations of students would be managed within the building, but we asked that instead of having that conversation on the assumption that our buildings would look like they do now, that they wait until more ideas from the architects are forthcoming, so conversations are still ongoing. I hope to be able to finish by five o'clock, because there is yet another DSG forum on housing this afternoon in which a wide variety of ideas have been presented. Just briefly, however, I want to mention that the current model, because things are still far from the design stage, would allow more variety of room types than is allowed now, [such as] adding suites which is something students have expressed desire to see as an option and more flexibility in the way that the buildings are used so that we would be able to accommodate more groups or fewer groups for that matter because there are proposals that would have groups as small as 10 which chose to live together and have a certain amount of social space. There are also proposals that instead of dividing the students into a lot of little groups that students would like to have something to look rather more like East Campus in which 100, 150, 200 students would actually live together in a building. They would have a name, they would not be called independents randomly living in House DD. They'd be in Bell House and create an identity out of a random group of students who had chosen to be somewhat more adventurous in the way they want to live together. There is also talk about more shared facilities so whatever organization there is with students would not have lots of little facilities distributed all around, but not only for efficiency, but also for community building. We would cluster the laundry facilities, the computer facilities so that students would need to share those. A reallocation could also be done as well as a relocation of social space within the building. We're talking about roughly the same amount of square footage, but there are a number of proposals on the table as to how that square footage would be distributed. The principle being worked on is that it would be distributed much more evenly than it is currently distributed within the organization. I want to stop here simply to say that we are still in the planning stage but we are asking today for an endorsement of a proposal that should be presented to the Trustees that the next step of making concrete plans for this campus [be taken]."

The **Chair** said that it probably makes sense to ask Roy [Weintraub] to come up at this point and talk about the package and then David [Bell] to comment as to that. He then introduced Roy Weintraub, head of the President's Advisory Committee on Resources.

Prof. **Roy Weintraub** remarked that PACOR had been discussing this since last year, [i.e.] this project, the project itself. "The issue is that more is always better. The original project design would put an infinite number of students in a building about this big that would go straight up in the sky so that everybody would

have exactly the optimum space. Short of that, it's a resource issue. What kind, what size project could Duke afford within the budget? What are the trade-offs that are involved? Once it becomes necessary to match a financial plan with an actual academic plan, PACOR got very involved and we were pleased that the Academic Priorities Committee met jointly with us so that we could begin to shape this discussion. As it worked out, there were several different pieces of a combined project which had four components. First there was the residential life component which involves an addition of 400 bedspaces to West Campus and Judith just talked about that. Second, there's the retrofit of Trent once the beds are shut down for residential life in Trent. Third, there's Hanes Annex which currently sits in academic propinquity with Trent, but is unused now. Also, members had a presentation from David Ferriero about the library and the phased renovation construction that is going to be necessary for the library over a period. Over a period of time, these four projects all became linked because of the funding mechanism issue. We could afford to fund a certain amount of residential retrofit on West Campus because Housing Management, recognizing that it was operating with 70-year-old roofs when the useful length of them, is 60 years, has been putting money aside so there is a fund that can be used to finance construction, retrofit on West. Originally we thought that something in the upper \$50 million was possible, it turned out that with the lifting of the cap on debt financing, on tax free bonding authority of the universities, because they can use the tax free bonding authority, there is available approximately \$ 65 million in current housing department planning budgets to contribute towards this total. In addition, there is another mechanism that the Board in its wisdom a few years ago approved when they moved the spending rate on Duke's now \$ 1.5 billion endowment down to 5% from what it had been before, and in that set-down process they created a 0.5% window that we could spend, we would spend 5%, we had an additional 0.5% that the President could recommend to the Board. Now this creates an additional 0.5% of a very large number, and that number varies depending upon the specific restrictions associated with gifts in the endowment. I want to remind you that the last time we recommended the spending from [the quasi? endowment] was a long time ago with the Bryan Center. In fact, it was money taken from the [quasi] endowment and used to complete this project. So we're recommending, I don't know if I have the exact draft, if I have it here, a series of 'whereas's.' Matching of a project with expenses with project financing, we are recommending that the project itself cost no more than \$98 million with the dormitory package costing no more than \$75 million, the Hanes Annex and Trent renovations no more than \$8 million, and that the library, the component of the library from this package be no less than \$15 million. We are recommending also that the debt financing out of the housing budget be at least \$65 million and the draw on [the endowment?] be no more than \$33 million. It was an unhappiness to me and I think to PACOR that another \$2 million for

the library for this project could not be found because then PACOR would have been the first PACOR in history to be able to give you a 9 figure recommendation."

Prof. **Mosteller** thanked Prof. Weintraub and invited Prof. Bell to come forward.

Prof. **Bell**: "So that's the package and the funding mechanism. I had a chuckle when Judith [White] looked at me and named [a dormitory after him], because we have been around several times about the issue of flexibility and dorm spaces that have been built. Thanks Bob [Mosteller] for the chance to talk to the Council today for a couple of minutes and I'd like to thank him publicly today for his role as facilitator of the discussion of this package because I think he's made an invaluable contribution. You have in your packets on the last page a resolution text that came from the APC. That resolution came after three intense meetings over a month of work on this matter. The work in the meeting began in earnest once we had in hand the residential life initiative funding proposal produced by Tallman Trask and Judith White that included funds not only for residential renovation and construction, but also for academic capital investments for the library renovation and the renovation of Hanes and Trent towards use as academic program space. I am just going to summarize very briefly the main issues that surfaced during our discussions. First, the closing of Trent Hall for residential purposes was presented as a given by senior administrators when this discussion began at the beginning. Many of us only commenting that they are not absolutely convinced that this would be the best first step towards reform of upperclass residential life on West Campus. I think this is largely because one of the persistent problems throughout our discussions has been that we have not yet seen any convincing plan articulated that would actually leverage new dormitory space on West in order to accomplish the stated goals of the residential life initiative, that is, equity and diversity in housing. In the end, we thought, however, that reasonable minds may disagree about whether closing Trent is the best first step towards a reform of residential life on West, but reasonable minds must agree that if the choice to close Trent dormitory is not accompanied quickly by other creative measures for modifying housing assignments and arrangements to establish a better community on West, then the construction will do little to alter the present residential life situation of upperclass students on West. Ultimately, then, if the APC gives assent to the idea of closing Trent Hall, the dormitory, and building sufficient beds to move the full complement of students from Trent to West Campus, it was with the explicit expectation that this opportunity for improving residential life on West will be seized and will be used constructively. We don't think this opportunity can pass. Next, the proposed residential life package elicited a much needed and intense discussion about academic priorities in a way that clearly connected them with resource

questions. Our discussion, however, was considerably shortened by the timeframe imposed on us, obviously. We now have some 5 weeks to think about how the proposed package has an impact on what we see as crucial academic needs. We would have liked to have had time to take a broader view of things, but we have instead had to piece things together within a very short time frame. The academic priorities have merged investment in the library with renovation of Trent and Hanes [which are goals] laudable in themselves, but what is their relation to overall academic priorities? The logic of the proposal locked us into the renovation of Trent for academic purposes and we think that ultimately it is a good thing. But real programmatic detail was lacking to see how that space would be mobilized in the most rational way and there is still a lack of sense of how much space this will create and who might best use that space. Also, again, because of the logic of the proposal, that is, the necessity of renovating space that has been vacated so that it is not left empty, other options for academic construction and renovation are foreclosed in the immediate project. For example, science initiatives are not contained in the proposal. We are not certain that the omission of the science initiatives from the package is a good thing at this point in Duke's history. One very positive outcome produced by grappling with these issues is that the Provost and the Dean have made proposals and commitments in their April 16th memo to APC and PACOR which are in your packets that provide us with a clearer picture of what the next important moves in the sciences will and ought to be. In addition we note with some pleasure that [meeting] with the APC yesterday, President Keohane spoke about beginning this summer in fact a process of reflecting upon and ultimately setting crucial academic priorities that will guide Duke in the next phase in this growth and she reconfirmed it as did the next Provost. If then consensus can be reached on a residential life package as it has been proposed, the time is obviously ripe for us to turn our attention in earnest towards the choices that must be made to move forward substantially as an academic institution. Finally, you will note that in our resolution there is a condition. The funding mechanism for the residential life mission is complex. I am sure that you didn't understand all of it as Roy [Weintraub] presented it today. It's not that easy to see right off-hand, and we want to be continually reassured as the project progresses that the burden of investment is shared as equally as possible among all units of the university and PACOR has been pretty vigilant on this issue and I assume will continue to be. In summary, then, because the proposal contains significant direct funding for important academic initiatives and because improving the residential life of upperclass students at Duke has potential for improving both the social and the academic climate of the university, APC's advice to the Provost is to support this initiative and I think that would be our advice to you as well."

The **Chair** thanked the presenter and recognized the University President.

President **Keohane** said that time for discussion was needed and she wanted to make sure to get over to the reception so she would be very brief. "In the packet of material that Bob [Mosteller] has described several times there is a memorandum to APC and PACOR dated April 16th which I hope you all have a chance to read before May. The memo is designed to make several points in support of this proposal having to do with contribution of this plan to the educational experience of our undergraduates including their intellectual development. Talking about the way in which we do not see this in competition with other priorities having set undergraduate life as a priority as we look forward to contain [cost?]. What I mean implicitly by that or is partly that we hope the plan which is before you that Roy [Weintarub] has described very clearly is a plan that includes some element of backstop and we hope and expect some support from the residential life proposal will come from funding through gifts in the campaign, but no one knows how much that will be and we don't want to wait for that measure. And finally I would emphasize a point that Judith White made that there is a nice dovetail here of Duke's pressing need to renovate residential facilities on West Campus. We can't wait any longer, the money has been put on hold pending this discussion this year. We believe the neat synergy between the desire to renovate with some very clever planning and the absolute need to attempt to [perform] maintenance brings this into a very timely [conjunction.] I would add only two more brief points. This has been an evolving process and as APC and PACOR know, and ECAC as well, and I would by the way thank the faculty leaders in each of those bodies for the very salient and valuable contributions they've made to this project in collaboration with administrations, through this process, it's been evolved down from an original proposal for 600 beds which would have piled all sophomores [in one dorm?] and sustained the present freedom of choice. Believing that is beyond our reach financially at this point, and seeing many advantages in the 400 bed proposal, even though it doesn't do everything that some of the people would have liked, we have done [what is possible?]. So this has already been a set of choices. The second point I would make is that even though they have not yet, as Professor Bell made clear, come up with a very detailed description of exactly how students will deploy themselves or will live in these new spaces, one of Duke's major goals is to make these spaces flexible for the future. It is not known exactly what students will desire to do or what their leadership will think they will perhaps be best served by in terms of living arrangements, in terms of exactly who lives with whom in 30 or 40 or 70 years. But we want these spaces to last that long. So we don't just want a plan for current students' preferences even though we take student advice very seriously, and that's why we don't feel they need a fully worked out plan of residential programs before this choice

is made. We hope, however, that it will allow for an element that we have not had at Duke for a long time, which is that students will move in their sophomore year and will want to stay where they are, will like their choices, will like their living companion, and will stay on campus. That has not happened at Duke for quite sometime. People move, they trade around, they make choices which don't conduce to a stability of residential experience. They will still be able to make those choices. Students will still be able to live off campus after their first year, but they will also have the possibility of stability that we think is desirable as an element to shoot for."

Prof. **Mosteller** announced that he would now like to talk with members about what is in the package as far as materials to read and then they can talk about questions or where we want to go from here. The cover sheet of the materials that were in the manila envelope that everyone received today talks about the new materials members have which are a proposed resolution from Academic Council coming by way of ECAC in support of the various conditions. The PACOR materials about funding and the restrictions on that funding plan. The APC materials, the document that David Bell was talking about and the letter from John Strohbehn endorsing the project. So those are the succinct statements of position. Then there is the president's two-page statement, she was talking about as item number two, Tallman Trask goes through for five or six pages and talks about all the issues involved in funding. Bill Chafe and John Strohbehn are talking about academic priorities in residential life. Jim Roberts authors a memo that has a few pages from David Ferriero from the library. Basically why the library [needs funding]. And again what the proposal is [for] a 400 bed addition to West Campus. 200 [spaces] found within existing space by reconfiguring and taking advantage of, for instance, trunk storage in what is incredibly valuable real estate on lower levels that have windows and that is one of the things about this proposal to be kept in mind which is the quality of the thinking of the architect. By reconfiguring the space, we can get 200 beds within the footprint without giving up size of rooms and in fact reconfigure the beds, the facilities so that they will be more efficient. 200 more beds will cost an additional \$17 million roughly, which takes us up to \$75 million. So \$75 million to construct 400 new beds, \$65 million of those available from resources that are already identified in the housing budget. That leaves a \$10 million shortfall there. Trying to assure that we get \$33 million out of this 0.5% taken across the endowment. \$10 million of that going to finish up the residential life program, \$15 million committed to phase 1 and 2 of the library program, and a total of \$8 million to make [into] useable academic space the two buildings, Trent Hall and Hanes Annex. So that's the basic proposal. The Chair invited some questions now. One of the things that is listed on the bottom of the sheet is Judith White's e-mail address and one of the things that might be helpful, is that people

could direct questions to her so that in her discussions next time, she'll answer some of them, but what was really intended was for people to tell her what it is about this package that is an entire mystery. There will be a vote on it at the next meeting. It's clear to him that Council will want to start somewhat earlier so that there will be plenty of time so as not to rush it. He invited questions at this point, keeping in mind, however, that people would like to get over to the reception.

Prof. Shaughnessy (Engineering) began by stating that he has been on the Committee of Facilities and Environment for perhaps 10 years so he's been on all the major building projects here and this particular one came quite late to the committee, in fact this week and it will come back so it has quite a head of steam. He thinks there is a good deal of expertise on this committee when it comes to things like this, so the committee will examine this project in some detail. But one of the things that he thought came up just in that first meeting, and maybe the president can address this, is the following. He knows the committee always anticipated that renovations would include air conditioning as just one element, but for the simple fact that it's inconceivable four years from now to think that we might [not?] have air conditioned dorms. The second thing is because of the constraints on financing, we're going to fall short on the 600 beds needed. He is concerned that the resolution calling for a hard dollar figure may end up in fact kind of causing us not to choose what we hope for. For example, Edens Quad will become the next Trent drive. But for the present he might say what are the possibilities of finding a donor to give us really a new dorm with a name on it that might get us there?

Pres. Keohane said she'll answer his question as quickly as she can and she'll answer more fully next time. As far as air conditioning specifically is concerned, this is something we would like very much to do, but it is a choice that was deliberately made, because it is a clearly expensive commitment, and although it would be lovely to have the air conditioning, it is one of the things that we set aside to make this financially feasible. It may well be that some large portion of the new dormitory space that they're recommending will come through gifts because it will possibly be a very appealing source of funds, but she can't tell him yet that there is somebody out there ready to do it and they also want to be very sure that we don't go to people who might be equally likely to give to other academic priorities and ask them prematurely to support this package. They want to look at people who are really going to be turned on by this and so she would conclude by saying that Duke would like very much to be able to do 600 beds. We see that as something that may be feasible down the line, they are in no way foreclosing it by doing this. They would keep in mind ways in which the footprints of space would be compatible with later additions, but they don't think that it's prudent to make that commitment now.

Prof. **Richard White** wanted to follow up a question on the air conditioning, because he is historically connected to the now old Biology building which almost got air conditioned and it was by a sort of magic manipulation of administrators at the time that it was air conditioned and if it were un-air conditioned at the present time this institution would be considerably behind the eight ball relative to all our competition and he thinks new and renovated dormitories that are not air conditioned will have the same situation in the future. So he is wondering what the differences in costs were, he hasn't read it yet, what the differences in costs were and who made the decision that air conditioning was not feasible given the kinds of priorities that have to be made.

Prof. **Mosteller**: "Is it 10 million?"

Judith **White** replied that it is more than 10 million. Actually, what is in the plan at the moment is that all new space would be air conditioned, but that it is not planned to air condition all four of the existing quads. They have asked for estimates of what it would take to go ahead and do all the [airconditioning] and then budget an amount for [this] eventually but we basically got just about the capacity to do the new additions and not any further without a new plan. So the cost of it is just about the cost of adding 200 beds. So it's quite an extensive thing.

Prof. **White** interjected that if he understood her question we'll be geared in terms of reconstruction for the possibility of future air conditioning but we're not doing it at present.

Judith **White** agreed.

Prof. **Mosteller** observed that questions of this sort might be suitable for e-mail correspondence, because it would be helpful for her to know which issues a given audience is struck by.

Prof. **Staddon** just wanted to add that this will maintain Duke's reputation as a hot school. [This was greeted with laughter]

John **Strohbehn** wanted to come back to the issue of air conditioning. This was an issue that was actually brought up in the Board of Trustee meetings and Student Affairs. The group actually there said that there was no reason to air condition [the dorms]. So that students don't look at it as a major problem and if you think about it, there are only a few weeks from August until air conditioning isn't an issue. So if you're doing air conditioning it's actually for the summer program.

The **Chair** now turned to the Appendix C proposal before closing up the meeting. If the matter can't be finished, he thought it would be just as good to talk about it at the next meeting. There are

two proposals that ECAC is asking members' approval in principle on. ECAC is asking approval in principle on at least one of those; unless Council's approval is obtained, we'll be called upon to do something this summer that probably doesn't make sense. As it is set up right now, reviews of the president are supposed to be done at three year intervals. Looking at the history, that seems to have been done at a time when there was no set term for the president. Hence the president was reappointed from time to time. A review schedule was set up that places the reviews at the end of the third year, the sixth year, and the ninth year. In the present configuration, this is the sixth year of the president's term. A review at this point doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to us, and a review at the end of the ninth year, which occurs during the tenth year, makes no sense at all. ECAC's proposal is to set up something that's roughly halfway through a term on the basis of the president having a five year term. Since the Trustees may change terms, the proposal states that reviews will be no more than five years apart and may be as little as three years apart. Generally, the review would be assumed to be at the midpoint of a five-year term. So, ECAC would like to have Council's permission with respect to that proposal so that a review process does not have to be started this summer that would be relatively needless. The second point would be with respect to reappointment of deans. There's language that you can interpret in various ways. The sense of the faculty at the time that these resolutions were put in in 1982 was that deans' terms would be roughly if not exactly more than two terms and it was a reviewed process. Thus the question is, it looks like the review process is supposed to start at the beginning of the fourth year, regardless of whether this is the 3rd term coming up, 4th term or 5th term, and regardless of whether the senior administrator would ever even contemplate this additional term and so it would seem to ECAC that there ought to be some signaling before a review was done, the first one would be presumptive, so at the end of the first term there would be a review, and that the only person one would ask would be the candidate. There would be no review unless the candidate would think it would make sense but in second and in succeeding terms there would be some inquiry with respect to the senior officers whether reappointment is being contemplated at that point; so the proposal is intended to clarify the language and he hopes it's written out relatively clearly. Those, then, are the two issues that are before Council for a vote in May. He was sorry for the meeting to have lasted longer than intended, but he thought the ball had been put in play on a number of important issues. He concluded by saying: "there's a reception across the way, drinks food, come join us. We're adjourned."

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt, Faculty Secretary