

# 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

January 18, 2001

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session from 3:45 to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 18, 2001 in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies) presiding.

### MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor **Burian** welcomed members to the new millennium. First, however, he needed Council approval of two sets of minutes from the old millennium. The Minutes of November 16, 2000 and of November 30, 2000 were **approved** by acclamation as submitted.

In his first announcement, he urged members to participate in the upcoming Council election and if any chads fell out of the envelope, to sweep them up and return them to the chair of the Elections Committee, as Katherine Harris had ruled that no ballots received after February 2 would be counted. He then invited all comers to join ECAC at the grand opening reception of the newly restored and remodeled Faculty Commons immediately following today's meeting. In addition to lunch service with a new menu in the ballroom, the commons now had four small meeting rooms which faculty members and academic departments could reserve without charge for meetings throughout the day and evening. One was equipped with state-of-the-art audio/visual and internet and phone-conferencing capabilities. Catering services would be available in all of these rooms. Thus it would be possible to hold small conferences as well as talks, receptions and other functions of various sizes in the Faculty Commons. Event management would shortly issue information on reserving and using these facilities. He would like to take this opportunity to thank a number of people who have been instrumental in realizing the rethinking this restoration. Provost Peter Lange had provided the indispensable funding and support that made it happen. Executive Vice President Tallman Trask and Joe Pietrantonio, Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Services had played important roles in a process that was initiated with a report by the committee chaired by Professor Michael Munger. In particular, David Majestic, the project manager, Jim Wulforst, the Director of Dining Services, and Chuck Catotti, Director of Event Management, had been crucial to the success of the enterprise. Lastly, wanted to mention his ECAC colleague Tina Williams, who had given freely of her time and good advice throughout the process.

EARNED DEGREES

Diplomas dated December 20, 2000

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences  
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.  
Bachelor of Arts 63  
Bachelor of Science 35

Pratt School of Engineering  
Dean Christina Johnson  
Bachelor of Science in Engineering 17  
Master of Engineering Management 3

School of Nursing  
Dean Mary Champagne  
Master of Science in Nursing 23

Nicholas School of the Environment Dean  
Norman Christensen, Jr.  
Master of Environmental Management 11  
Maser of Forestry 3

Fugua School of Business  
Dean Rex Adams  
Master of Business Administration 85

Divinity School  
Dean Gregory Jones  
Master of Theological Studies 5  
Master of Divinity 18  
Master of Theology 2

School of Law  
Dean Katherine Bartlett  
Juris Doctor 10

School of Medicine  
Executive Dean Ralph Snyderman  
Master of Health Sciences 1  
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical 3  
Doctor of Medicine 1

The Graduate School  
Dean Lewis Siegel  
Master of Public Policy 2  
Master of Arts in Teaching 1  
Master of Science 27  
Master of Arts 41  
Doctor of Philosophy 76  
TOTAL 427

Professor Richard **Schmalbeck** (Law/ECAC) rose to make the usual two motions, namely, one, that the candidates for degrees during the Fall Term, as presented by the deans of the University's schools and colleges, be approved by the faculty and recommended to the Board of Trustees, and, two, that the Provost be authorized to make such adjustments to the approved lists of candidates for degrees as may be necessary to assure that no candidate for a degree will fail to have his or her diploma awarded in a timely fashion, or that no candidate will receive a degree for which he or she is not fully qualified.

Both motions **passed** unanimously by voice vote.

In answer to a question by Prof. **Heitzenrater** (Divinity) as to the correct number of copies of degree lists to be handed to the Faculty Secretary, the **Chair** indicated that the canonical number was four.

#### REMARKS BY UNC-CH CHANCELLOR MOESER

As the fourth item of business, the **Chair** acknowledged the presence of Chancellor James **Moeser** (UNC-Ch) and of Professor Sue **Estroff** (UNC-CH). He explained that when President **Keohane** assumed her office here at Duke she received an invitation from the Faculty Senate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to appear before them and ECAC thought it only fitting to welcome the new chancellor of the University of North Carolina similarly to this assembly to present him to the membership and to ask him to say a few words about the relationship of the two universities. To introduce the Chancellor, it was his privilege to introduce his colleague at UNC, the chair of the faculty there, Professor Sue **Estroff** who is a Professor of Social Medicine and Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and Psychiatry at UNC. She is chair of the faculty from 2000-2003 which gave him his most signal advantage over her in that he gets to stop in 2002. She is the author of numerous books and papers including one with the fascinating title, "Making it Crazy, an Ethnography of Psychiatric Clients in the American Community," published by U. Cal in 1981, new edition in 1985. There was, however, and he held it for the last, a perhaps more signal distinction to mention, i.e. Professor Estroff is a graduate of Duke University. She told him that she helped close down the Women's College in 1972, the year she graduated, and she pointed out that she was actually the second Duke graduate to be chair of the faculty at UNC. The first being another distinguished person trained in anthropology and a friend to many here, Jim **Peacock**. Sue said that she thought this demonstrated both the great judgment of the UNC faculty and excellent education and life preparation that she and Jim had received here at Duke. (Clapping)

LeBarr; and he had such an impact on her that being in this auditorium had made it almost impossible for her to speak. It was really a pleasure to be back here. She thought that things were wonderful between the two campuses except when it came to sports. After telling an anecdote in that connection she proceeded to introduce Chancellor **Moesser**. He came to Chapel Hill after they had gone through a very tough couple of years. Many of the faculty were warmed by light and moved by the energy of Michael **Hooker** and mourned his loss. They went through a period of actings and interims and great uncertainty. And she could tell people that from the moment she met him and from the moment the rest of the faculty met him that stopped, and it was clear they had amongst them a man of courage, a man of vision, and if she could be forgiven for the expression, a man of boyish enthusiasm.

Chancellor James **Moesser** began his remarks by pointing out that the computer science department in Chapel Hill was a good example of an area of collaboration between Duke and UNC. When Professor Fred **Brooks** of the Chapel Hill computer science department received a grant of \$100,000 from IBM, he asked IBM to split the \$100K three ways between Carolina, Duke and NC State. In an article he had published concerning the history of computer science at Chapel Hill, he wrote among other things: "It's very clear today, as it was then, that the only way an institution out here in the back woods of North Carolina can achieve excellence on the scale of the Harvards and the MITs was to do it jointly. So building that team together was of crucial importance." He thought this was a remarkable story, because Fred recognized the synergy and strength that would be added to the effort by uniting these three institutions. Similarly, one could say that just as the fierce rivalry in team sports between the two schools had resulted in a higher level of performance with both teams, the academic collaboration was characterized by the setting of benchmarks for each other. He had said and especially to UNC alumni repeatedly they didn't like to hear him say this, but he was convinced the presence of a great private university only eight miles away was one of the reasons that Chapel Hill had reached the level of excellence that it had reached. He would like to think the same was true for Duke. They had each benchmarked and leveraged each other with an eye on the relative quality of the other place. He thought even in that academic atmosphere of competition they were better today because of the co-location and close proximity of two great universities. The first thing he was told when he went to the Triangle that there was not another pair of co-located public and private universities anywhere in this country. The rivalry he thought was healthy and the collaboration wonderful. Together with their third partner at NC State the three universities were truly the cornerstone of the great Research Triangle Park. He pointed to the benefits for North Carolina and indeed for the nation. The power and reputation that it had brought to this southern state: the new jobs, the economic impact, not to mention the benefits to the public welfare that had resulted. As chancellor of Carolina he

wanted everyone to know that making the most of this synergy – the synergy that existed between the campuses and looking for new areas of collaboration would be among his highest priorities. In fact he just said to Peter Lange that they had a new job for their provost, namely to work with their faculty to begin to assemble a catalog, an inventory of the collaboration that already existed which was formidable and impressive and he would hope would be a platform for even greater collaboration. Consider NIH funding for example. Thanks in large part to the two schools of medicine and the scholars in the sciences, the state of North Carolina ranked 7<sup>th</sup> in NIH support in preliminary figures for fiscal 2000. In fiscal 1999 the two schools accounted for nearly 2/3 of the state's NIH funding. Perhaps the second and most notable example of these joint efforts was the new Robertson Scholars program which had been discussed earlier, funded by their friends and benefactors Julian and Josie Robertson. This groundbreaking scholarship program would allow their students to attend classes and seminars on both campuses, participate in special internships and service programs and take part in a semester-long exchange program. One of the concomitant benefits of the Robertson's Scholars Program was that they would have a bus service running back and forth between Chapel Hill and Duke and his guess was that what they would discover was that there were a lot more people than Robertson Scholars that wanted to be on those buses because there were parking problems at both ends of the terminals. This may be another area of co-investment. Another problem that was just introduced to him by a faculty member, a Duke faculty member, was why should it be a long distance call to Chapel Hill? That needed working on. This should be addressed immediately and solved. He thought Robertson would simply be a wonderful visible bridge across which many other folks would travel back and forth in both directions. He felt sure everyone present was familiar with the Title VI joint international centers, the Duke-UNC program in Latin American Studies, the European Union Center of and Duke and the UNC- Duke Center for Slavic, Eurasian, and East European Studies. By bringing together their considerable expertise in these areas they had created a real power, an international power to be reckoned with here in North Carolina. There was also the Duke-UNC Rotary Center for International Peace Studies, one of seven such centers world wide and one of only two in the United States. Along with their friends at NC State, their universities were part of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, an interdisciplinary consortium that promoted communication, cooperation across disciplines and beyond the confines of each to advance research and education concerning national and international security issues. The three campuses also were part of the Triangle Universities Nuclear Laboratory, a federal Department of Energy funded lab with physics faculty and other researchers sharing the lab and equipment. Strong collaboration efforts existed in religious studies and women's studies. They were working closely together in technology. The three Triangle universities were part of the North Carolina

Networking Initiative. (The most successful networking research effort in the country and a model for other schools and regions). As people could imagine with two powerhouses in the health sciences located so closely, Carolina and Duke had a distinguished tradition of joint efforts in these areas. While they were competitors on the clinical side, they were working together on the academic side and there was a lot more he thought could be done. UNC's School of Public Health for example, the only one in the state and one of the top schools of public health in the nation, was partnering with Duke's School of Medicine in an effort that allowed Duke to send its med students to Chapel Hill to get their Master of Public Health degree while completing medical studies on this campus. In pharmacy Carolina and Duke Centers for Education and Research in Therapeutics worked together in a variety of collaborations including microsystems analysis of health care delivery to improve patient safety and communications to practitioners via a website on current topics in drug therapy. The two libraries also had one of the oldest and most successful cooperative relationships in the nation dating back to the early 1930s in an effort to cooperatively build collections so that together they could buy far more unique materials than either university could purchase alone. Another area of partnership and collaboration in the libraries might be in remote storage which would be of tremendous advantage to both institutions. Recently, a joint purchase of an on-line catalog had been made that allowed their students to search the holdings of all four institutions in the Triangle Research collaboration. A Duke or Carolina student only needed an ID from his or her campus to check out materials at the other university. No special library card was needed.

He could say without a doubt that having the depth of expertise available on these two campuses coupled with a willingness to work together on key projects was looked at very favorable by granting agencies looking for the biggest bang for their buck. To the extent that Duke and Carolina could be put together on a grant proposal, this was an impressive collaboration with all of the major funding agencies and gave them a leveraged advantage over other university centers elsewhere in this country. He concluded by saying expressing his desire to work with President **Keohane**. She had been most gracious in hosting a dinner just this week for Marianne **Fox** and himself on this campus. They were working together. Their provosts were working together and now their Faculty Senate chairs had made contact. He thought that in the way of collaboration even more could be done in the future and he was convinced that Carolina was a better school for having a neighbor like Duke, and likewise that Duke was better for having a neighbor like UNC. Indeed, they both bled blue - there was just a shade of difference. [Laughing and clapping].

#### UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

Professor **Burian** thanked both speakers and since there were no

questions for them, he turned to the last item of the agenda, namely to further discussion of the University's Strategic Plan and an update by Provost **Lange** on what had happened with the plan since the draft that was circulated last time. After that there would be time for discussion of the plan from the floor.

The **Provost** said he wanted to be given credit for supporting the Commons but that if there were complaints about the menu, they should be directed to Professor Tina **Williams**.

At the retreat the Board of Trustees held recently to discuss the strategic plan, members were well pleased with most of the elements in the plan in particular they made strong endorsement of the goals set forth, including the emphasis on science and engineering, its focus on strengthening the faculty and multidisciplinary work, diversity, technology and internationalization. There was also general agreement with the funding level and the funding strategy that he discussed with Council in December. They did however express their feelings that certain aspects of the plan need further development. A sense that the Provost's group also had. In response, several things were being done. Goal 6 with respect to technology was being revised. The same was true of goal 7 which concerned a discussion of Student Life, Student Affairs and so forth. The first part of the plan was being rewritten which was a sort of broad overview and because of the incredible quickness of his office in preparing planning documents immediately subsequent to Chancellor Moeser's presentation, they had introduced a new goal to take a leadership role in building partnerships and collaborations in the Research Triangle, the State and beyond. He would be returning to the Council in February and Council would receive the new draft as it was done at that time. But he wanted to share with them today some of the changes so that Council could know where planning was going. They were in the process of making these.

Goal 6 on technology: Unlike the previous draft of the plan, they had now organized their technology strategy over the next 5 years and he wanted to stress this as a longer term strategy and in fact they needed to take great care as technology was introduced more pervasively on this campus around 3 key components. The first was something that his group was calling CITIE (Computer Information Technology Intensive Environment) at Duke. Something that they believed described their strategy for supporting the use of internet information technology through academics on campus. The second component is ISIS (the Information Science and Information Studies certificate program) and it was a proposed certificate program for undergraduates. Third, a proposal to create an Institute for Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Technology was being contemplated. Starting with CITIE, the goal was to begin in the Fall of 2002 to create a campus environment where all students and faculty were connected to each other and to the resources they needed when and where they needed them. Among their specific goals

was that in the Fall 2002 all undergraduates own computers and that entering freshmen own portables. All undergraduates would be expected to own portables, i.e. whatever baseline portable computing devices were best and most efficient by the fall 2005 because of the rapidly changing technology. In graduate and professional programs they would focus on capabilities and decide with the deans which technologies to employ. The second major initiative under CITIE was to develop wireless capabilities campus-wide. First, however, they needed to respect the time limitations of faculty and students to learn the new uses of technology. Second, they would be aware that the uses of technology were discipline specific at all levels, from introductory freshmen courses to research centers. Third, they were seeking as much as possible to focus on acquiring capabilities and not machines. They would provide training that was tailored to particular needs, carefully incorporating the use of two new technologies and hardware such as laptops into the curriculum to meet the expectations of students. One reason for instance that Duke had not gone the way that some other schools had was simply immediately move to the requirement that all students have laptop computers was because that immediately created an expectation that here was faculty that would immediately be using these laptops in their classrooms. Theirs was a gradualist introduction of new technology as they sought to bring the campus as a whole to the level that those technologies required. They would be investing substantially more in support personnel. There was a line in the budget regarding the expenditures for technology, a lot of that was people. At the moment they tended to have two extremes, i.e. either committees populated by people highly invested in and very knowledgeable about technology or committees that were entirely generalist committees that passed on issues about which they knew relatively little and would need to do a great deal to tee up. What needed to be done was to create a middle level of structures where feedback from faculty and from students could be gotten, i.e. from people who were knowledgeable and who were users, but not necessarily high end users and not necessarily intensely familiar with the technology. A certificate program to study 'new technologies' was being developed. A task force was developing a recommendation. The idea was to help fill the gap between the current academic training and the needs of an actual work world that required a wider understanding of commercial, legal, social, philosophical, computational and aesthetic issues surrounding new technologies. The third major initiative around which they were working was the university-wide initiative in Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Technology. They were developing a proposal. It was to be a university-wide initiative with strong involvement in all activities not only by Arts and Sciences and the Pratt School and their undergraduate programs, but also the graduate and professional schools. There would be a curriculum shared across schools. They would seek to foster research on innovation and entrepreneurship - areas which were in fact research-weak while they were very dynamic in their social development. They would

expect to provide training that would be particularly for professional students expecting to be interacting with or participating in entrepreneurial or technological activities or initiatives. Goal 7 - academic community - was the matter on which the Board felt the plan, as Council saw it in November, was the least well developed and the least satisfactory from their point of view. The focus was on strengthening the academic community at the university - of creating and assuring that the university community be strengthened that nourishes personal, civil and intellectual leadership for its undergraduates, graduate and professional students. It was to bridge areas that were often thought as operating separately. These bridges included bridges between students and faculty, classroom and dorm room, and also the renovations to the library, undergraduate and graduate students, curricular and co-curricular activities, academic affairs, and student affairs, and the campus and the city. They would also be addressing the issues raised in the November 1999 GPSC report. In each of these areas they would be seeking to foster community, foster a higher level of interaction, create more opportunities for the kind of synergies which a good campus and the campus of the kind they were going to create should foster.

Goal 9 was to take a leadership role in building partnerships and collaborations in the Research Triangle, the State and beyond. The Board was very strong on this point. Examples of successful collaborative programs were the Kenan Ethics Program, the Triangle Research Libraries Network, TUNL, the Title VI centers, individual faculty collaborations which were numerous and about which more was discovered each time they dig around a little bit. There were enormous new opportunities with UNC and State. There were enormous potential collaborations in Genomics some of which were already moving ahead and in which there were great complementarities between these universities, ways in which for instance State did things in areas of bioinformatics that Duke did not do and did not expect to be able to do, whereas Duke had people working in bioinformatics in a very different way, and they had access to clinical data which State would obviously like to be working with for some of their bioinformatics. In marine sciences one would find going down to Beaufort and Morehead City that North Carolina, State, Duke University and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill had marine science facilities within five miles of each other and that they were not taking advantage to any extent of the great potential to build programs down there that would draw on the resources of those three marine science facilities. Obviously, an area which they had been pushing on for a long time was the less commonly taught languages where Duke could create depth by working across campuses and where distance technologies could be used, complemented with movement, in order to create greater opportunities and greater depth and build the student bodies Duke needed. Other areas of collaboration include: the Franklin Center, joint or complementary hiring initiatives, joint degree and non-degree programs, shared equipment and distance learning. Eventually

they would be starting to talk about real joint degree programs -where a student would be able to get the degree from either school. There were obviously new opportunities in the Research Triangle Park and in the State such as initiatives at the Microelectronics Center of North Carolina both in the area of super-computing and in the area of networking. There was a Genomics consortium which was currently being put together under the auspices of the Biotechnology Center of North Carolina in which the two universities were collaborating and Duke expected to stand out in future in photonics.

As to Part I, Provost **Lange** noted one other significant change from the original draft, namely a lengthy introductory essay intended to put their planning effort into a very broad context and would serve as an introduction to the plan as a whole. One challenge put before them by the Board was to be more specific about what they meant by excellence in their endeavors - how it could be recognized and what larger social or humanitarian purposes it served. Competition for excellence among peers needed to be balanced with any substantive reasons for it and with what goals in mind for those that benefited from our excellence was all of that done -students, faculty and society. We were also asked to think about the characteristics of Duke that made it special and unique and to be attentive to preserving and deepening those values. Finally we were asked to think about the threats to Duke's tradition and values and stature posed by the new educational marketplace as well as to the attendant opportunities posed by that marketplace. These issues were addressed under several broad headings. First, under the heading of private research universities in American higher education we talked about the special leadership role that private research universities play in American higher education. In discussing Duke's mission, ambition, and responsibility, they were talking about Duke's history and trajectory as well as the meaning and purposes of excellence and the social ends Duke ultimately sought to serve and should ultimately be judged by. In the third section they talked about the character and importance of community and the rights and obligations of citizenship in pursuing their mission and leadership ambitions. A university was in many ways a privileged community, and faculty, staff, students and administrators had to strive to meet the expectations associated with those privileges. In the final section on competition, differentiation and threats to private research universities several interrelated themes were discussed. But all of them also knew that programs could be replicated and that what really created a unique institutional signature was the way their academic community worked together as a whole. This final section also considered the threats and opportunities posed by distance education and more particularly by for profit education. As long as they adapted in reasonable ways while preserving key values like community and educating the whole person there was no reason to think the role of private research universities in general and of Duke in particular would be undermined by these new developments in

the educational marketplace. He acknowledged receiving two e-mails from members of the Council subsequent to the last meeting and those issues were to some extent being addressed in the revisions as well.

Having concluded with his presentation, the **Provost** answered some questions from the audience the first of which concerned the inclusion of NCCU in any collaborative efforts. He said that it was in the document he just hadn't mentioned it. Professor Helen **Ladd** (ECAC/Public Policy) wondered about a statement under 'goal 1' which said that with every decision to grant tenure Duke would seek to improve the average quality of the faculty in the unit of the faculty member. Newly tenured faculty members had to be substantially better or provide strong evidence that they were likely to be better than well over half of their already tenured departmental colleagues. She had a problem with that language because it suggested that quality could be measured in some single dimensional scale. It seemed to her the goal should be to enhance a particular department or to develop synergies of various forms. She thought this language suggested something a bit more mechanical than something along the lines of enhancement. The **Provost** answered that firstly the language was no different from the practices that had been pursued in the APT committee for a long time. Anybody who had been a chair here knew that that question in one form or another had been asked for a lengthy period of time. Second, the notion that it was unidimensional was not appropriate because quality included service, teaching and research. In evaluating those they were obviously evaluated in some loose weighting but it would not be correct to say that it was unidimensional. Still, the questioner replied that the sense was one could combine those three things into something that could be measured somehow so that one could say that 'you're higher quality' or one faculty member was higher quality than another faculty member.

The **Provost** replied that judgments like that were made every day. After all the APT committee only made their judgment after the department had made a judgment and the dean had made that judgment. We all knew that judgment of quality along many dimensions was what was both central to the way that knowledge was advanced in the university and to the anxieties and insecurities that we all took home at night and when we go to big meetings and stand around saying 'where do I really stand.' With regard to appointments to tenure or appointments to full professor of faculty who were already here, issues of strategy, issues of the collective good that the faculty member might contribute to or not were not permissible by Duke's rules - by the rules of the faculty of the university. The strategy question was out of order because this in an internal promotion. Hence, the issue of strategic enhancement and collaboration only really could come up (and always did) for external appointments, i.e. what contribution would this faculty member make to the synergies within the department, beyond the

department, potential collaborations and to the strategy that the department and dean were seeking to develop.

Prof. Leonard **Spicer** (Medical Center) thought that there was one area where one might enhance the language, namely along the lines of interdisciplinary activities whereby the whole interaction between say departments or programs might be enhanced. The **Provost** said that he thought they could that. It was more generally an operational problem than a conceptual problem. The fact that Duke's plan put a good deal of emphasis on interdisciplinarity needed to be addressed. The question was whether departments and deans paid sufficient attention to the interdisciplinary character of the work that a faculty member did and then assure that the department in the creation of its review committee put people on the review committee who were able to provide real expert advice about the quality of that interdisciplinary work. But he thought that was an ongoing process. He didn't want to suggest that that was something they had to solve.

Prof. **Heitzenrater** (Divinity) posed a question he thought could be expressed in a more statistical way. For instance, in an area that had, say, seven full professors and three associates and an assistant coming up for tenure, the document was saying that that assistant had to supersede all of the stars who didn't get promoted to full professor unless they were absolute stars in their field and this assistant had to be better than two of those stars.

Peter **Lange** cautioned the questioner never to underestimate the capability of a department chair to provide information to the committee about the quality of assistant professors that took into account the distortions that he had just illustrated. For instance, they recently had a case in which the chair came and said based on where this person was right now they didn't meet the criterion. Two chaired professors in his department had records when they came up for tenure that couldn't hold a candle to that young person up for tenure who had a better record and a better looking trajectory than the two chaired professors had at the same point in their careers, so there were lots of ways to skin this cat. And the chairs did that.

Prof. **Heitzenrater** responded that he would agree with that potential and some rephrasing that would allow for that potential. But the second way of looking at it, say, when the chair came into APT the second time and forgot that he or she said that the previous person would be the 3<sup>rd</sup> best and all of a sudden this person was the very best it would be interesting if this would fly, if the chairs or the deans were required to provide a listing of 1-10 that the faculty could agree upon that would specify that this person coming up for tenure did in fact fall [within that range?]

One of the things they did (to for stall that a chair might 'beat

the system'), the **Provost** replied, was to require the chairs to indicate who in the department not by rank order, but who in the department they would rank as a group above the candidate and whom they would rank below. So they could refer back to that when the next case came.

another questioner wanted to know if there was any room for diversity of intellectual contributions, i.e. the different contributions that different people in different fields within a department made that could not be measured. Peter **Lange** answered that that was clearly an important factor for external appointments and it related back to the strategy. Right now what they were trying to prevent was that a faculty member arriving at Duke got on the tenure track, was hired to do a certain thing and then in year 7, the department said 'you know, we really decided that it was a mistake to do that thing and despite the fact that we told you you were on a tenure track and we wanted you here then to do what you are doing, now that you've got to be where you're supposed to be and although you are good, we don't want to do that.'

Professor John **Staddon** complimented the Provost on what he was doing and the latter expressed his appreciation for that.

President **Keohane** wanted to convey The Board of Trustees' positive sentiments regarding the process by which the plan had been created and that they also were quite supportive of the substance of it. They asked some very thoughtful questions and made good recommendations. In addition, she wished to pass along their commendation to this faculty, faculty working groups, the discussions the Provost group had in various schools, the planning committee and the many ways in which many faculty had been involved. She was sure they would also want her to pass along their thanks as well to the Provost, John Harer, Jim Roberts and to others who worked so hard on this plan for 18 months to bring the university to where they were. They still had the formal approval to go, but the Board was very pleased with what had been done.

With that, the **Chair** invited and received a motion to adjourn.

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