

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

December 3, 1998

The Academic Council of Duke University met in regular monthly session on December 3, 1998 from 3:50 p.m. until 5:08 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Prof. **Robert Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** announced that the Minutes of the November 19 meeting would not be available for a vote until the next Council meeting in January due to the short time interval between sessions. He then called on the President to make a brief announcement.

President **Keohane** said that the Chair had suggested that she might make an announcement which won't come as a surprise to anybody, but it's good news. A new football coach is being brought back to Duke: Carl Franks, who was Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in Trinity College in 1983. His mother went to Duke, he went to Duke and 'bleeds' Duke blue and we look forward very much to welcoming him back. Anyone reading the papers, knows that he has been Assistant Football Coach at the University of Florida. But it's also important [to know] that while he was at Duke, he was academic All-ACC in his senior year and he also has been involved in the Duke Alumni Association. There have been five winning seasons in Duke football in the last twenty-five years, Carl Franks has been involved in four of them. Two as a player, two as a coach under Steve Spurrier when he was assistant coach at Duke. She asked that the assembly join her in welcoming Carl and Debra back to his alma-mater.

The **Chair** thanked the speaker and turned to the first item on the agenda which was further discussion of the proposal to approve the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree. This was the second meeting on the issue, it was placed on the floor at the last meeting. There will be further discussion today and a vote. Doctor Hammes, Doctor Richardson, and Doctor Gwyer are here to answer any questions. He referred Council members to the handout containing the resolution dated

either November 19 or December 3. Other than the date they are identical. It starts at the top "Proposal for Replacement Degree Offering the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT)." He now opened the floor to discussion. Because there had been a rather substantial discussion at the last meeting, it may be that all the questions were answered, but if there are further questions, they would be entertained at this session.

Prof. **Robert Wolpert** (NSOE) expressed the fear that this is degree inflation happening. It isn't a specific criticism of this proposal, but it's a fear that there is a flood coming, or we are in the midst of one, and that no one knows whether this is something to swim with or something to oppose. Some reassurances would be welcome.

Vice Chan. **Gordon Hammes** (Med. Ctr.) preferred to respond in general terms. He too feared the same thing. Degree inflation. But he thought this is a little different because this is really a different degree. There are different skill sets that will be required for this degree. It will provide a substantial academic basis for carrying out research that wasn't necessarily inherent in the shorter degree. So he really thought that this is a different type of degree and it is not the same degree in another [guise], which is what he would fear also.

Robert Wolpert: Are we replacing more of a practitioner's degree with a researcher's or academic [degree]?

Gordon Hammes thought that it was more of an academic degree. It is a practical degree too just as an MD is. He thought it's in the spirit of the normal degrees offered in health care. He would say a master's degree is much more of a practitioner's degree than a doctorate.

The **Chair** turned to Dr. Richardson, asking if she wished to say anything more and if there were more questions or comments?

Jan Richardson commented that it was truly a practitioner's degree, a degree that is going forward with the way that the profession is moving. But in addition, one of the major different pieces is the strong scholarship component of research, which was not present and is not present in the majority of the master's programs at the national level. As regards the degree inflation argument, she felt very comfortable in saying that that is not the case and that the original degree had 52 credits, as opposed to 126 that they were moving to and that there's a very strong component in the third year by moving to a full year of residency, which

is a 'hands-on' or practical component in the clinical environment.

Prof. **Richard Palmer** (Chemistry) remarked that he too felt concerned about degree inflation. If what Dr. Hammes said is correct, one would think one was more academic and one was more practical, one would think they would offer both degrees, one for the practitioner and one for academics. But from what he could gather, everyone is moving to get rid of the master's degree, not only here, as a motive to a doctoral degree, which sounds much more like degree inflation. He understood that the ingredients are that more and more is being required, but it's nevertheless raising the level of everybody rather than having two branches as Doctor Hammes was suggesting.

Jan Richardson added that beyond this, as far as the scholastic piece and preparing one for scholarship in an academic environment [are concerned], there are PhD programs in physical therapy at other universities. With regard to that then, the DPT still is a clinical degree with a very strong functional research component in comparison to the scholastic degree of the PhD.

Richard Palmer: Is it correct though that everyone is getting rid of the master's level and moving to the doctoral level? Is that the trend? It's not having both.

Jan Richardson: The profession is moving towards the doctorally prepared practitioner because of the demands of the profession and the requirements in the health care arena. The master's degrees are not being eliminated nationally, but the baccalaureate programs are.

The **Council Chair** interjected that he didn't want to muddy her waters, but was he correct in saying that at least one of the reasons for this move is that the DPT degree would allow the person to be a primary care [provider], [to be] an entry point as opposed to the master's degree, so it may be, that it's somewhat driven by forces outside of us as far as health care industry requirements are concerned. Is that somewhat accurate?

Gordon Hammes thought the overall level of competence that is expected of a physical therapist to do their work was being raised. You must have this academic background as well as the practical background if you want to be a top physical therapist. And he thought that was perfectly appropriate.

Robert Mosteller: Other questions? If anybody would like that he do so, he would read for the record the resolution. He thought that if he asked correctly, everyone has a copy and he could see that it is unnecessary. He asked if Council was ready for a vote at this time? This has been placed on the floor at the previous meeting, it is prepared now for a vote on the issue.

DPT DEGREE RESOLUTION

The resolution to approve the PROPOSAL FOR REPLACEMENT DEGREE OFFERING THE DOCTOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY (DPT) **passed** as written by voice vote without dissent.

The **Chair** then turned to the next item of business, a report from Prof. Ken Spenner, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee. He referred the assembly to the relevant handout regarding this year's agenda of the FCC. This was the third in a series of activities that ECAC tried to do this fall in which chairs from the major committees, PACOR, Academic Priorities, and now Faculty Compensation had come and talked to Council about issues that will be addressed during the year, as opposed to simply reporting at the end of the year items that have been accomplished. There would be no action item coming out of this discussion today.

Prof. **Kenneth Spenner** began by saying that he was going to report briefly the ongoing agenda of the Faculty Compensation Committee this year and to solicit the Council's advice and input for additional agenda items. The committee charge is given both on the handout and on the overhead. It looks brief and concise and to the point, but he stressed that it is labor-intensive. And on that note, he would like to acknowledge and thank the hardworking committee members, Professors Berry, Burton, Cox, Falletta, Hasher, Martin, Plonsey, and Slotkin. Thank you colleagues. [Addressing the items on the overhead projector screen] Our overall agenda can be briefly summarized, at least so far, in terms of the second overhead. In the committee's spring reporting, it will be talking at some length about the overall trends in the compensation system, in particular, increases in medical, tuition related, and non-exempt pension categories. Those seem to be the largest areas of increase. It will also be commenting on an extension of the tuition grant program to the age of 75. Currently, most recently it is at age 65, with some combination of years of service before one is eligible. An upcoming review has been scheduled. Day-care expenditures and the compensation budget are on the agenda. The committee will be hearing from a faculty member or two with their proposals concerning possible additions and extensions of day-care kinds of activity. Also, as a matter of tradition for the committee

at this point, every other year it conducts a comprehensive salary equity survey, working closely with Jim Roberts in the Provost's office. That update will be done this spring, including 98-99 data. They'd also like to work in some salary equity comparisons in clinical sciences into our larger set of comparisons. An attempt will be made this year to look at the liability in terms of salary compression issues. Reliability of years of service and rank for those who stay here compared with salaries for new hires. This is a bit of an experimental venture, and no one can be sure what's going to happen or turn up, but it is going to be attempted. It will be a fuzzy signal in terms of salary equity comparisons, but it's probably one of the leading concerns for faculty: salary compression. There will also be a recommendation to the provost, and members' counsel will be welcomed, in the next couple of months, new variables to be added to the file, that is, to the file or the faculty file that includes salary information, years of service, department, rank and so on, including variables that would capture outside offers and years in rank history and including new hires who had an academic faculty history prior to coming to Duke. It is thought that that would significantly extend our ability to make salary equity judgments on the salary compression issue. Finally, a report will also be filtered in to members comparing compensation data by schools, rank, not only for Duke but for other comparison institutions. The area that is taking most of the committee's time is Duke Managed Care. At the outset, on behalf of the committee, he would like to note with pleasure and gratitude the open response of Clint Davidson and his office and Lois Ann Green in terms of committee counsel concerning the evaluation of Duke Managed Care. It has not always been the case in the past, but it is felt that a good and strong working relationship is developing, so 'thank you.' The evaluation that is underway involves multiple components. There will be multiple surveys in the coming year, one of the major changes compared with last year is the NCQA, the National Committee on Quality Assurance. If members are not familiar with that group, they should consider themselves fortunate, they have exited the scene. They are no longer part of the evaluation effort nor are they driving the design, and Duke wisely has decided to go its own direction. Multiple surveys will be conducted including one comparable [to] last time, at least in size and design, a survey of 1900 randomly selected employees. Unlike last year, the design is considerably expanded in other areas, to conduct special surveys of employees who are active users of personal care providers, to survey employees who are active users of specialists, to conduct a special survey of retired employees who tend to be heavier users of both primary care physicians and

specialists and rather extensive pediatric and specialty surveys in pediatric areas. That was one area that was substantially ignored in the last round of evaluation efforts, and we'd like to take a careful look at it this time. Also, in the spring, later on in the spring, the administration we understand is committed to special surveys of both primary care providers themselves and specialists. The committee argued last year that if we're serious about evaluating quality of managed care, we need to look at all components of the system, and he thought the architecture and design was in place to do that. Just a couple of notes on the larger design: the committee has expended quite a bit of time, energy and effort, and it is felt that its voice has been heard in terms of recommendation on instrumentation, the design, the conduct of the surveys. Meetings have occurred a couple of times with the Mercer group, who is subcontracted on the surveys. Pretesting, unlike last year which didn't happen, has occurred and wise adjustments to the instrumentation have taken place. Schedule-wise, the first largest survey will go out to the sample just after the first of the year. The committee's position was rather than rush the evaluation effort, they'd rather do it right and do it well, even if that means a bit of a delay in terms of reporting the results. But his committee's target at this point is to be able to report back to Council probably late spring, but if it moves into the first meeting of the fall, so be it, so long as the design isn't compromised, but that reporting requirement shouldn't drive the quality of the main areas of the design. We'll be looking also at other evaluation components, not only the survey, but including complaints, complaint patterns, waiting times and the like and other types of statistical information kept by Sanus and Duke Managed Care. One of the major directions in which we're trying to move the survey is to include not only affected information, asking people in detail how satisfied they are with this part of the plan or that part of the plan but additionally, to include more policy indicators or levers. The idea is to conduct surveys, gather information in areas that allow for, if it's problematic in this part of the plan or another part of the plan, suggestions regarding specific changes. The satisfaction questions alone might indicate that something is wrong, but they don't indicate a course of action. Other Duke Managed Care related items to be considered, all of these upcoming will be the possibility of free flu shots, not mandatory, free, the more friendly scheduling of physicals. The software in the system has a time-frame of about 6 months so if someone does annual physicals it's not very friendly in terms of getting on the schedule. The user has to call back and check in again to get the annual physical. Schedule changes, potential schedule changes in

user friendliness of the system [need to be looked at] . It is the committee's understanding that there are some schedule changes that would require one to go to one's home location. That is, if your PCP is on Fayetteville Road, you'd have to go to Fayetteville Road to get blood drawn or whatever for lab work, but that's a substantial additional trip for a number of people, compared with just walking over to Duke south or another one of the facilities in the area. So they are concerned about that, there will be questions asked about that, and it will be monitored, and other smaller things that seem trivial, but like adding history numbers to ID cards. Right now, they are two separate documents. The history number is probably in your home file, and the ID card is in the billfold in your wallet, and one is always asked, first question in contact with the system, what one's history number is. He didn't know his. We're concentrating our energy on some of the larger evaluation efforts and surveys, trying to establish a solid baseline from which to evaluate the system not only this year, but in the out years. And while it won't be perfect, he was confident that people will see a design that is much stronger than the one that had to be contended with last spring. If he could hear questions or receive suggestions as to additional agenda items the committee should face.

Prof. **Ken Knoerr** wished to make one comment on sampling those who are most frequent recipients. He has heard comments from people who are not making much use of the system, partly because they don't know how to do it. Those who are making frequent use have figured out how to use the system to their satisfaction to some extent. So he didn't know how he gets at the others, but if he used those who use it most frequently, he was in a sense biasing himself on the side of those who may be most satisfied.

Ken Spenner believed this to be a good point. It's not clear that those who use the system are frequently the most satisfied, this remained to be seen. The committee's concern, and one of the reasons so much energy is being put in going after the frequent users is to capture the world of people with chronic conditions, particularly in the retirement groups and audiences where the prescription drugs may not be covered by any kind of insurance plan. The out-of-pocket outlay for someone on 6, 8, 10, 12 prescriptions might be 30, 40, 50 percent of discretionary income and the like. So that is why he desired to go into those things in detail in the heavy users survey. In the general users survey, it was attempted to beef up a little bit the questioning, [i.e.] not only satisfaction with the system, but knowledge of the system and specific components of the system, so the group referred to can be measured better,

[i.e.] folks who don't know how to use the system and may not be using the system for lack of knowledge, understanding and so on. That was a problem last year as best we could detect it.

Prof. **John Baillie** (ECAC/Med.Ctr.) spoke to congratulate Prof. Spenner on the job he has done. Being on the executive committee, ECAC is fortunate to hear all of this in a little more detail and it's clear that he and his committee really thought about these issues and polled the faculty and really listened to those things that mattered and ECAC really appreciates that.

Ken Spenner thanked the speaker and added that credit goes to the committee members. Substantial. He asked if there were other items that members would like to see in the agenda? Assuming that everyone was overworked and underpaid?

Prof. **Philip Stewart** (Romance Studies) asked what Duke was doing in terms of inter-institutional comparisons with faculty compensation.

Kenneth Spenner thought average to better than average. But what average is depends on the other institutions in the AAUP list[?]

Phil Stewart continued by asking how Duke's relative placing in that list had moved in the last three or four years?

Ken Spenner couldn't say that it's moved a lot. This is his first year as chair so he didn't know the numbers much. He would get him some general comparisons this spring in terms of both where Duke stands and where it's been. He termed it a good question.

Provost **John Strohbehn** wished to add something established in the question. Each year, two studies on the AAUP data are done for all the universities. The first one is just looking at how much data there are to compare with the schools that Duke considers its peer group. Try and see whether any rank, whether it's full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, changed much from the year before. Secondly, a weighted study is done which doesn't change much for Duke, but when one constantly looks at the AAUP data, there are lots of different universities with different mixes. So if you have, for example, a huge business school, then you're going to see higher salaries on average. Taking the weighting of the schools, one only gets rough averages, it cannot be done well, because one just can't get the data really well to see whether or not Duke is

out of line in view of that extra weighting. Other schools change more in that comparison than Duke does and we seem to be reasonably average when one looks at the University schools that Duke compares itself with.

Prof. **Julie Edell** (Fuqua School) asked if he could give members more of a sense of what he is looking at in terms of the tuition grant program and the rule of 75 he made reference to (65 now) and what the issues are.

Ken Spenner replied that there's a proposal that came from the staff fringe benefits committee to extend the tuition benefit to employees up to age 75 given the dropping of the mandatory retirement ages in recent years. And without assuming or commenting on the pro-natalist stance, the committee felt that, in general, it was a good idea. And one thing it wanted to be sure of, historically if you look at it, the tuition benefit has been both an incentive to attract faculty, and an incentive to retain faculty. The only concern they had was that there might [be double dipping], especially if you look at the instances [thereof], i.e. if someone would reach eligibility for the tuition benefit at Duke, decide it's time to retire, get to another fine part of the country, pick up another job, perhaps have eligibility there for tuition benefit for offspring and they'd kind of be double-dipping in a sense. So we ask that some traditional certification and regulation [sentence garbled] Probably isn't a lot of people.

Prof. **Richard Palmer** was glad to hear that FCC had dropped the NCQA certification. Last year members were told that it was absolutely essential that Duke be part of that and that it couldn't possibly get out of it. So, whoever had the courage and integrity to get us out of it, thank you.

Ken Spenner thought that a lot goes to that man [who?]. Fortunately they're history.

The **Chair** thanked the speaker and reminded members that they had a list of the committee members and that Ken Spenner was known to everybody and hence to keep in touch on issues. One thing that Roy Weintraub (Chair of PACOR) wanted us to do is to get Academic Council and PACOR into the budget process as far as the obtaining of information earlier in the process was concerned. So, today is the start of an experiment. Tallman Trask is going to give Council some information on the forecast budget. The budget that is being put together. It will be brief and tentative, but he wanted to provide information to the Academic Council before the event happened as opposed to after the fact.

Exec. Vice-President Tallman Trask stressed that his remarks were almost entirely informational. He, Bob [Mosteller] and Roy [Weintraub] agreed that it might be useful that the Academic Council heard early on in the process sort of what the budget looks like for fiscal 1999-2000. PACOR is in this loop and had several conversations about it but he thought it a useful idea if there's a wider understanding of where Duke seems to be headed. At this early stage, the process is iterative. It eventually will end up at the Board of Trustees in May of 99. So all of this is currently quite preliminary. So, he was giving members maybe 10 or so observations about where things seem to be flowing out for next year. It looks to him in general that next year's budget can be balanced, not without effort, but probably without great pain. The place is financially in pretty good shape. There are a number of issues on the margin to deal with, but by and large, it looks like Duke's income and expenses for next year are in fairly close alignment. He also expects that they are going to be looking at reasonably low tuition increases across the board ranging perhaps in some units as little as 0, and some other units perhaps 3 or 4 percent. The trustees have asked that the cost of attending Duke be kept to an increase of less than tuition plus two percent. The inflation issue depends on who you ask. It's in the one to two percent range, so only fairly modest cost increases are expected. Unfortunately, along with that, there will be rather modest goals for salary adjustments as most of Duke's salary increases are taken out of tuition, which is the largest part of the general university budget income. Given the fact that that will be the third year of rather low increases in salary and the compaction factor that [it] leads to in salary structures across the campus, he expected that his group will offer somewhat more local freedom to make ad-hoc adjustments to salary, especially on the staff side. That's been a little bit possible on the faculty side in previous years, but it's probably time to open up the non-faculty staff side as well. The fringe benefits account in general seems to be balanced. There may be some pressure on health care costs that will have to be negotiated out over the next year. Most of Duke's peer institutions are seeing in their contract negotiations health care proposals that are higher than he hoped Duke was going to see. Duke was in the somewhat advantageous and disadvantageous position of being its own customer as an institution and it has not yet managed to completely resolve the discussion, so health care may be an issue. It has been agreed this year for the third year in a row to hold the growth of administrative budgets to a rate below the growth of academic budgets. He has committed to do that until he's sure he can't do that anymore, and he was pretty sure he can do it another year. There are a number

of PACOR members here, who will recall that there used to be a device called a base budget adjustment, which as far as he can tell was jargon for the administrative announcement of whatever costs the administration wanted to be taken off the top and called [that] the base budget adjustment, and after that, the rest of the budget would be allocated. This year, for the third year in a row, there won't be any base budget. There are no special allocations. At the same time, he should say that it looks like there will not be any large amounts of new funding available for new initiatives until the often said growth by substitution was upon us. A number of administrators are concerned about increasing pressure on undergraduate financial aid. It bears watching as this year goes forward. As members may be aware, a number of institutions that students often consider as well as Duke have announced increases in their financial aid budgets and programs. In particular Princeton, Johns Hopkins and Harvard have all done that. How Duke is going to respond to that is an interesting difficulty Duke is going to try and work out over the year and he thought he and the Provost are agreed to the extent to which money is available; that's going to be a fairly important place to put it. Duke's aid packages, at least as we understand what some of the new programs may be, will certainly be less competitive as they have been in the past. In general, he would say all schools are in relatively good financial shape. There has been over the years a sort of endemic problem in Arts and Sciences that the administration has worked on quite diligently and he thought, in general, had solved. That is not to say Arts and Sciences is now rich, but at least the structural deficit seems to have been eliminated. The only place that he is particularly concerned about now is the impact that the Marine Lab has on the Nicholas School budget, and that's an issue that members may know is complicated by hurricane damage. One of the dormitories didn't make it through the hurricane and we're trying to deal with the insurance company to see if matters can be straightened out. The only other issue that is at least being thought about in terms of budget increases, is deferred maintenance. There was a program to increase deferred maintenance. The last couple of years they've backed off on it. He thought they may try and make an allocation for it, only as he has reminded his colleagues, Duke University owns more 70 year old roofs than any other university in the world. Given the fact that this place was all built at once 69 years ago, there is a risk of a rather large failure all at once. They might want to get a look at that with maintenance; and John [Strohbehn], you may want to add a little more, but the budget working group, he thought has worked pretty well this year and things look good, but not wonderful.

The **Chair** invited questions.

John Strohbehn: One comment he would make is that the library's budget will go up a little bit more than the others.

Richard Palmer asked if the budget was public information? Is there published numbers that go with this?

Tallman Trask replied that he wished to distinguish between available and public. It is not published as a public document. It is certainly available through the consultation process with PACOR and he'd be happy to share it with any interested faculty, but it is not a public document.

Bob Mosteller thanked him for this presentation and asked him to wait up here because he had the next item also, namely a discussion of the upperclass residential life update. He was not entirely sure what was coming, but at least from what he has heard, the issue is substantially different than one might have expected earlier in the fall. His anticipation was about this time Council would be discussing in somewhat concrete terms the building of a new residential facility, and the planning process has become more interesting and taken a different turn. What members will hear today as he understood it, is a process that gets to more bed spaces on west campus without necessarily building as much new space and it's very interesting. This presentation is informational. It's the same presentation that the trustees will hear tomorrow. It's background information for later discussions when more concrete proposals will come forward.

Tallman Trask said that this is informational. He thought members knew that a number of groups have been working over the last year or more on questions related to undergraduate residential life. There have been some limited discussions in PACOR and the APC but given the range of issues that these discussions potentially touch, it was thought important that they at least explain to the Academic Council where they think we are and where they think we're headed. This is what the trustees will hear on Friday. It is for their information as well. They are not asking for any trustee action and won't until into the next calendar year. But as Bob said, he is pleased in some ways, although surprised to report that we are headed in a somewhat different direction than we might have though three or four months ago. One of the things they have learned in the conversations is that this is an extremely complex and complicated set of discussions in which there are multiple

and intertwined constituencies. Different people with different agendas have different desires and it seems clear to him that if we are going to have any chance to conclude this conversation in a timely manner, it is necessary to get one person to sort of take responsibility for that and to make sure that various constituencies would stay together and keep the conversation going. And so he was pleased to be able to entice Judith White to join the effort. She is going to take on the role of Assistant Vice President, and director of the residential program review, he couldn't get her entirely away from Nan [Keohane], so he doesn't have her completely full time, but they are arguing whether it's 85 or 90 percent. And he would like Judith to come down and say a bit about where we are and introduce our guest who's going to show members his work to date which is then what is going to be shown to the trustees.

Bob Mosteller announced that when Steve Kieran (consulting architect) begins his presentation, he prefers the questions be at the end of the presentation rather than interspersed throughout. He thought there will be time for questions.

V-P **Judith White** said that 'these folks' have really stolen her thunder. She was supposed to tell members that there is a new plan, a new proposition. But she would start by just recommending that members take a look at the materials provided as background so everyone can get a sense of what was done over the summer and what her group has been working on in the fall. What they were trying to provide today is a first report from the architectural consultants. Steve Kieran is here who is a partner in Kieran, Timber lake and Harris Architects and Planners from Pennsylvania, from Philadelphia who have been working with residential buildings both at Yale and Princeton over the last couple of years so they have a lot of experience with buildings that are reaching their 70th years and older, and buildings that mean a lot to the constituencies involved and that's certainly the case here. She also wanted to introduce Steve's colleague Karen Moustafellos. Some members may get a chance to talk to Karen during the winter. Karen is a Penn graduate and did her architectural work at Princeton. She also wanted to acknowledge the work of their colleague, Kris Surichamorn who is an intern with their office, a Princeton BA in Architecture and Engineering and some here present may have, perhaps not in this group, but some students got the chance to see Kris going around in their attic making close analysis. Let me tell members that she and her group are in fact looking now at a proposition that they think is exciting, that is instead of talking about simply renovating and fixing the wiring in these buildings and then going off and building something entirely new, Steve has convinced all

them that the existing buildings are much more flexible than previously imagined, and that they may in fact be part of the solution to offering more housing on West Campus and may lead us to some new thinking about size and siting of what we will still need to build in time with construction. As members have been told, the Board of Trustees will get this presentation tomorrow, and we will be talking to DSG in a presentation next week. They want people to know early the direction they are thinking about because unless they get no signals, stop signals at this point, they are excited and they want to keep going, because they think it's important to make these proposals concrete by mid-winter and get them back for discussion. So, she wished to introduce Steve Kieran. In the last six weeks, they have become very close colleagues, and let me turn the mike over to Steve at this point.

[The following is a slide presentation with the architect's comments]

Steve Kieran This formula [bench, plus grass, plus quad], as he indicated, was amongst the nearly 800 pages of material that were provided to them to start this project. And it actually summarizes the evidently near Homeric journey of Amy Meyers [sp.?], as chronicled appropriately in the Chronicle on March 1st, of 1995. She said, "We finally get a bench, and grass, and a real quad." That's interesting that Amy was only moving from the appropriately named Eden's quad, at that time, to the real Garden of Eden at Duke which is the upper main west campus. Her formula really defines, at least in the minds of some students here, many students apparently, the idea of a good location at Duke. Basically, bench+grass+quad. There shouldn't be any great surprise in this. The placement of West Campus itself, in his opinion is almost a form of divine intervention, fairly close to the parting of the waters in a way, but the way in which the tower literally parts the Duke forest is one of the more sublime moments he thought any of us have seen on any American campus anywhere. So really, it is no great surprise that more of Duke's students wish to live on Main West than there is in fact space for. In fact Main West is marketed as the images on the left show, as one of the first things that a Duke student will experience here. It's certainly one of the first things they all see. The question, considering the challenges faced by all trying to solve this really high class problem, in his opinion have to do with how many students need to be housed. We don't know the precise answer to that; but if you take into account the Trent residence hall, the central campus sophomores, the ongoing over-density within student rooms on upper main west, there are some issues of flexibility. The student

student life folks really need to manage these buildings properly. It's something on the order of 600 total beds would be the best guess at this point in time. The next question really is about the role that your historic campus can play solving this problem. Underlying the question is certainly more than a belief he thought, it's really a value structure that this campus has about these historic structures. It's a value structure that suggests that really the first thing to look at here, to make certain is that Duke is using as efficiently as possible and as effectively as possible what it already owns; that you at least have a plan for the conservation and care of what you own, and using it efficiently and effectively before you go and build new buildings. New buildings are both like and unlike children. Once you bring them into the world, you have to take care of them. The only difference is children grow up and eventually hopefully take care of you. Buildings never grow up, they just get older. So you bring them into the world with extreme caution and try to bring in the minimum amount possible so you take care of it forever. There are necessary renovations that are obvious to all walking around these buildings. There are roofs that are 70 year old roofs as Tallman noted. There are windows that are 70 year old windows, many of which have had air conditioners tucked into them. There are over 80 air conditioners that have been authorized on Main West Campus for health reasons. Lots of sick people I guess need air conditioning live there. They are problematic, they are damaging the buildings, they are certainly not sightly, they require removal of historic windows. Next, there is the infrastructure of the buildings, the plumbing infrastructure. While much of the piping, at least on the supply side has been replaced, the fixtures have aged, the drainage systems in them and the sanitary systems are aging. And lastly, the near ascetic? existence of these two undergraduates in the late 1950's [pointing to one of his transparencies] seemed to really remind me of a monastic [existence?] has been really dramatically transformed into a highly material [world?] much he thought [like that] of our present students today, and with that existence really comes an exponential increase for the demands on infrastructure within these residence halls. There is no comparison to what they are asked to sustain today, and what they were built for. Now, it would seem, given the circumstances of these buildings, and the 70 year old infrastructure that it would behoove everyone at Duke to look at the opportunities it has to optimize the organizations of spaces for individuals and groups within the buildings. So, that is the opportunity that we are really putting before this body today. The question really is, what objectives could the existing buildings fulfill that aren't being fulfilled

them he would identify here. First, he believed they can accommodate more upperclass students. Diverse housing types on West Campus can be provided that don't exist there today. Flexible boundaries can be provided that allow the buildings to flex year by year with the shifting size and demographics of groups and living groups in blocks on this campus. Because the buildings are in fact we believe as Judith has said, more flexible than the people that occupy them. Lastly, we can provide high quality flexible student amenities and group space that just doesn't exist in those buildings. Using Craven Quad as a case study, which will be tracked throughout the remainder of this talk, it can be seen here that Craven represents about 25% of the total student rooms in all of upper Main West. So if one multiplies the numbers that will be presented times 4, some idea of the order of magnitude of some of the alterations to be considered will come into view. One objective set out first and foremost is optimizing spaces for individuals, and that means a number of things. It certainly means an increase in the number of beds on upper Main West, because lots of Duke students want to live there, but at the same time it very importantly means decreasing density and increasing diversity. Now within the apparent contradiction of these objectives, lies what the mathematical prospect of at least a partial resolution of this problem, i.e. the prospect of unlocking the West Campus structures as we work through this. Simply put, as he will show momentarily, diversity can give rise to less density in certain circumstances, and seemingly contradictorily fewer students can be [accommodated in?] individual living spaces, and it does sound too good to be true, but it's in fact true of nearly all of the buildings in this area that we've had the opportunity to work and look at. What is the existing housing stock at Duke? Predominantly it's doubles. It can be seen here that the vast majority of your stock are double rooms. The next largest category are singles, then there are these more troubling categories of expandable singles which really flex into doubles regularly, and expandable doubles, that flex into triples regularly, and a couple of designed triples. There are only 19 designed triples. That's all there is by way of upperclass housing stock on upper Main West at this particular point in time as we begin this process. Now the problem he wished to focus on briefly here is really the triple problem. Like most hackneyed expressions, three is a crowd has a basis in fact. Put too many people into a room and there will be some behavioral problems. He could recall 25 years ago as an undergraduate, he didn't know if there were any 'psych' professors here, but he remembered wondering what those deer crowding studies he did in psych would ever mean to him in his life. They were studies basically about the behavior of deer when you

basically about the behavior of deer when you put too many of them in too small an area. Working on residence halls, residence life issues, he now knew the meaning of those studies. You put too many students in too small an area you have behavioral problems, and they are, in fact, documentable. About 75% of the students that go into those triples don't know each other before they go in. They're going in to get to a particular location. Of that group, about 25% of them wind up requiring some form of intervention on the part of student life staff during the course of the year. There is no great shock in that, but it certainly suggests that lowering density, particularly in triples should be central. One way this can be done is basically converting some of those expandable doubles and triples to singles. A circumstance is shown here in which you take 47 existing beds in Craven by altering configurations like this, to configurations like this [pointing to a transparency], going from a pair of expandable doubles with four students in it, to three singles, you can only lose a net three bed spaces. Projected over all of Main West, if you were to undertake a program like that opportunistically where you could, you're going to get some loss of beds, maybe on the order of about 50 beds approximately, but you're addressing some of the density issues. So that's the down side of the thought. Here's a potential upside. If you convert in certain circumstances, not everywhere, some collections of bedrooms to suites, you can actually, believe it or not in some circumstances, get more students in the same space, in better quality space and in an alternative form of housing. This is a collection of space that houses 10 students at this point in time. One can see the arrangements of singles and doubles. If it were made into a block suite for, in this particular case, 12 students, it could have a shared living room as well. So there are a number of circumstances where you could actually by changing to a suite configuration from a dormitory configuration, get a net gain, in this particular instance of two. Now across Craven Quad, we found on this one floor, the possibility of about 5 beds. That would total over four floors about 20 beds in Craven, times 4 again might generate 80 additional beds by converting certain dorm rooms to suites across the breadth of Main West. Next, consider apartment conversions. There are a lot of reasons why Duke might want to include apartments in here. It adds a lot of meaningful diversity to the mix. It's a type of living arrangement that certainly older students very much favor. There are lots of reasons why Duke would want to look at that. There are some cases where the cost to you in the actual rooms of those conversions is not substantial. There are other cases where it is. In total, if you did it everywhere, it would be huge.

But if you take it on opportunistically, instance by instance, you can get some apartments in the existing facilities. [Pointing to another slide]: This is two areas, there is a double, a single and a bathroom here, and a single and two doubles here. They could be converted to two apartments. You can see the upper apartment over here that takes over the bathroom which you wouldn't need if you converted the whole area to apartments and that could become an apartment for four students with a living room, kitchenette, and bathroom in it. You've only got three in that area plus the bathroom now. Down here though you lose. You've got 5 now. You could get a living room in here, a double bedroom and a single bedroom so it drops to three. But there are certainly opportunities throughout upper west to really convert to apartments in a number of circumstances. [Pointing at another slide]: Attic loft suites. On the upper floors of Main [West], you typically have double student rooms up there. Sometimes singles. If we really took the level of those rooms, which this for instance now is a bedroom, and made it into a living room, then lofted up with a small internal staircase into the peak of the attic, you could develop an attic living loft up there, and this one is depicted with three bed spaces up into it and a view opening down into the living room below, again, probably the type of the space that most students love, because they love to loft. It would be an extremely popular type across West. What would be gained? Well, for Craven quad in total you could gain about 24 beds so that might project out to approximately 100 beds across all of upper Main West by lofting up into those attics. Now, there are a series of other questions. Those are really alteration strategies, they're changes to what there is. There are a series of other questions that arise when we come in from the outside and look at how the space is being used now; and within your residence halls, you have all of these types of non-residential space. There are commons rooms, forty-four of them, studies, forty-five of them, RA suites, that's a form of residential space but not for[?], we're not really counting them in this particular scenario, kitchens, thirteen of them, laundries ten, administrative space, twenty-seven different rooms that are occupied by administrative space and storage space one can see here in the end. A lot of these would make wonderful student rooms. The laundry you see here is on the first floor, it's got great windows. It would be a better bedroom than it is in fact a laundry room. He thought that opening up the question of all of these alternative uses is indeed the responsible thing to look at at this time. All of these room types really represent 70 years of ad hoc response to requests by students. And not surprisingly, much of it has come literally request by request. Each seen year by year

seems insignificant, but 70 years is a long time. It builds up. And you've got a huge amount of space locked up in good habitable space within the building. So again, reconfiguration and renovations bring the possibility of reconsideration of the locations and quantities of these. A true master plan as opposed to an ad hoc year by year habit. Why is this important? Why should we think about this? Through Karen and Judith some comparative work was done on these between Duke and two other COFHE institutions, to which Duke regularly compares itself. The first chart shows the percentage of bed space versus total space here at Duke as compared to these other institutions. This is Duke here and three different quads. And one can see the statistics Joe gave me, 51%, these are a little bit higher based on the statistics we poll, but the average is about 53-54%, somewhere in there, across your quads for percentage of total space that is occupied by beds. COFHE institution A on average, and this is an average for the whole institution, it's a little higher, it's about 55%. COFHE institution B is a lot higher, 67%. In the case of COFHE institution B, they're getting a good 15 percentage points higher in terms of the percentage of their total space they're using for beds than Duke. COFHE institution A is just a little bit higher, but you have to take into account that that institution is based on a residential college model so included in this total space is a dining hall, athletic facilities, a college library, a master's house, faculty housing, all kinds of things that are not included in Duke's [setup?] Now if you look at it differently over here, these ask the question, what percentage of group and support space exists here at Duke versus total space as compared to these COFHE institutions. You can see where at least some of this difference is. Here, again across three quads, you've got more than 12, actually more than 13% in Craven Quad dedicated to group and support space. COFHE institution B, you can see the big questions there are why is it over 6%. It seems like a lot for a residence hall or a dormitory. COFHE institution A is a residential college that is supposed to have group and shared support space but the model is fundamentally based on that and that's all they have. They don't have a campus center and other comparable facilities. It can be seen that they are still well above COFHE institution B, well below Duke. So just some of the statistical information, suggests we ought to go and take a look at this. What would happen if Duke went back to the original traditional patterns in these buildings. It should be pointed out that originally, all of upper Main West with the exception of Few Quad which was built eight years later had student rooms throughout the buildings. This is the original plan. Bill King again supplied us briefly with a lot of statistical information. Next, selective living

back (bed by bed) to create common rooms. And again, incrementally, those have changed and expanded dramatically over the years. Somewhat later it was converted into a square footage calculation, now it's just given away. It's part of the residential life package here. What's tied up in it? 190 first floor beds on upper Main West are now tied up in commons rooms. Everything on this chart that isn't blue or green is non-residential space on the first floor of upper Main West. So, one can get an idea just by looking at the colorations of this. Anything that is not blue or green is not residential. There is a lot of non-residential space being occupied on upper Main West. All told, if you start looking at all of these tactics assembled together, you're going to have gains and losses. If you took all of the conversions that might be possible here and said look we're going to take all of the commons space out of the building, which no one would ever do, it doesn't make any sense whatsoever, but for talking purposes today, if you were to do that, you'd gain all of this, approximately 319 beds are tied up in those spaces all told. Commons rooms, studies, kitchens, laundries, and office space. Then if you looked at the alteration prospects, to add space, mainly the conversion of bedrooms to loft units, about 96 spaces [would be gained]. Conversions of bedrooms to suites [yield] about 80. You get a net gain there of 176. So all told, you're closing in on potentially 500 bed spaces in upper Main West between those two tactics. Now at the same time, you don't want to take all of those. You wouldn't have a good residential environment here, so you're going to have some losses. You're certainly going to want to get rid of some of the expandable doubles that are working as triples now. That's going to cost you beds. You certainly want to look at conversion, if you're going to take some group space out move it to the lower level of the building, you certainly then want to take lower level space out to the tune of at least 80 beds to provide that new quality space, and then the whole apartment question looms large. So, we don't know where this is going to go. These two together alone are 128 spaces. That's an optimization formula that you, and we, and everybody at the university are going to hopefully be working on. We don't know where it will come out, but suffice it to say that you could have a significant gain of space for students within the confines of the [blue?] footprints you already own. Equally critical here is that we have to optimize space for groups, provide flexible living spaces, student service centers, and improved social spaces. This is an absolutely critical point in the game. Flexibility, he wished to point out is a Duke tradition and you can see it here. These doors once existed. They would have allowed you to combine rooms if they were still in existence here in ways that would give you some flexibility

for accommodation of groups. There are further levels to which this can be taken. This is an example at another institution of a flexible housing scenario that basically borrows from the doors that you were once using. A hotel idea basically of locked pass-through doors, locked and alarmed that could be opened and shut and changed configurations of suites year by year. You can see here in this area there are ten students, a group of eight in a block here and two and a living room and a pair of single bedrooms here. By basically simply unlocking this door here, you can make this into a suite for four students and turn that into a block for six students, or, alternatively you can lock that door back up, lock this door up, make a single there, and have a suite for six, a single for one and another suite for two. Those could give you some flexibility. You could flex the suites from one entryway into the next. Secondly, the buildings are inherently flexible horizontally. It's a virtue Duke has and is not really using effectively yet. These colorations show architectural barriers basically between blocks of space. Those can be opened up, particularly in the course of renovations when you sprinkler the whole building, you could expand fire separations. You can make these buildings more flexible horizontally than they in fact are at this particular point in time. Now, if you move all of these spaces and student amenities and improvements, where are you going to move them? One suggestion is to move them to the lower level. When you get to the lower level, the next question is what might they displace there? Well, one of the things that they would displace is trunk rooms. The [basement is used] by Duke students for storage. Joe Pietrantonio has a lot of ways that this could be better accomplished than it is now. But again you've got over 12000 square feet of space in prime real estate tied up in 51 different trunk rooms. If you were to convert those into 400 square foot commons rooms, they alone would give you 30 commons rooms. If you converted them into 150 square foot kitchens, they would give you 80 of those. 200 square foot study rooms would give you 60 of those and so on, so there's a lot tied up in those particular spaces. Now what concept might be substituted for the present ad hoc service and shared space in the basements? He believed it important here that a whole be sought, a concept here that is greater than the sum of all these individual parts, than the sum of all these individual spaces and look at the idea of a combined activity and service center. You can integrate and collect social or at least potentially social space together at the lower levels of the building. You can put a laundry in between a student kitchen in between an exercise room, a multipurpose room, a commons room a games room. Those can all be collected in ways that enhance and reinforce

all be collected in ways that enhance and reinforce communities. You can put nearby study [rooms] and seminar rooms in the basement; this is a plan of one such space we've developed shown on the left and development based on Craven quad into that idea shown on the right. These spaces can be wonderful. In your case, they are lower levels. You've got windows on one side of them. That's an opportunity that is rarely afforded in these circumstances. You can make really wonderful social spaces, cafes and informal group gathering study spaces. Multipurpose rooms, that can be used for student drama and music, for lectures, for film, in this particular case; these panels even fold over and they're used for dance and aerobics and there's even a basketball hoop that comes down. There are lots of wonderful things that could be created in the basements, [or] rather lower levels of these buildings. You do need based on all the information we've gotten from the students, flexible group meeting space on the order of size to accommodate 200 students. First of all, all the yellow space represents here spaces of that type that already exist. Some of it is coming on line, like the new rec center, where there are four, three such multipurpose rooms coming online that people don't even know about. There's a lot of that space coming online. If it isn't enough, you can add more of that space as suggested in the red blocks around upper Main West for those large parties, gatherings and events. What could Main West give you? Just to close and summarize here. Duke, he thought, can really get an increase in quality, an increase in quantity of usable space, and certainly and most importantly an increase in the diversity of opportunity for everyone across all of upper Main West. Now what are the next steps? We believe that this all has to be reviewed beginning today with the Duke community. These strategies will have to be tested across all of the buildings, not just Craven Quad but everyone and everywhere throughout Craven to see if the numbers hold up. There's obviously going to have to be some new construction to accommodate the total program. Developing site selection strategies and testing the sites is important. Developing cost estimates for each component. If it turns out loft units are more expensive per bed than are new units, that might drive you in a different direction. Developing a phasing timeline and selecting an optimal approach. All of these really have to be vetted most by the Duke community. Strategies we believe that support multiple objectives will be more favorable in the end. There's not enough time and money to solve all of the problems one at a time, so you want to look for strategies that solve multiple problems at minimal cost. One example is obviously the life cycle renovations that also give you the opportunity to get less density in the student rooms and more diversity and more

and activity spaces provide more high quality bed space on the first level, better quality and more flexible group space, and greater potential for positive social interaction amongst your students through those collective activity centers, and lastly a location for activities in the first level of the building.

Judith White thanked the presenter and invited questions although she realized the hour was late.

Prof. **Steven Baldwin** (Chemistry) asked if this would take place over 5 years, 6 years, 7 years "as you sort of displace students into Quonset huts or wherever they're going to be."

Steve Kieran replied that they really haven't gotten into the implementation phases, so he couldn't say what a time line for this might be at this point in time, and he asked if Tallman [Trask] might want to comment on that.

Tallman Trask replied that it clearly is multiple years. He would hope it's less than ten, though one of the problems existing right now is that because of the high density, it's very difficult to get people out, so we tend to renovate in very short periods of time which makes them very expensive. So his guess is, although things haven't progressed that far, that probably an early move might be a little bit of new construction to give you a staging area, then move around behind.

Philip Stewart asked Judith White about her memorandum which stated that some interesting things were being discussed for Trent. He didn't hear any mention of Trent. Could she tell members something about that?

Judith White answered that they are actually not ready to make a report on that. There are two things that are being worked on that will be coming back to the Council. One is implementation of the recommendations about financial aid and the other is about some ideas about Trent. When the Provost is ready, there will be several projects that people are talking about.

There being no further business before the Council, the **Chair**, invited and accepted its adjournment.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,
A. Tilo Alt, Faculty Secretary