

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 20, 2 000

[Correction: Minutes, December 2, 1999, p.22, line 6: replace "four" with "forty" to read ". . . in the last forty years . . ."]

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on January 20, 2000 in 139 Social Science Building from 3:45 until 5:11 p.m. with Professor Robert **Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Minutes of November 18 and December 2, 1999 were **approved** by voice vote, subject to a one-word correction in the December 2 Minutes.

The **Chair**: I have a couple of announcements and I'd like for Randy [Prof. Kramer, ECAC] to help me out with this. Because of the weather, attendance was somewhat lower in our last meeting. For anyone who wasn't here, Randy's got a document for you which is a summary of the presentation by the Faculty Compensation Committee. This was handed out at that meeting and if you weren't there or you didn't get it, raise your hand and Randy will pass them out right now. At our December meeting, we had a presentation, a short presentation on the Master Plan. Larry Evans raised the question about why couldn't we have more time with this, and I thought it was a very good suggestion. So what we've done is to set up three sessions, and these are available to everyone, and I'm going to try and get it advertised, but there are three sessions to deal with the master plan. One on West Campus, one on East Campus, and one over at the Business School. They're on February 8th and 9th, they'll run roughly two hours and so we hope there will be time for a relatively full presentation and questions. The Master Plan could take longer. And so those are our three dates, the first of which is in this room and that is what we meant by here. OK, any questions on that? My third announcement. Faculty Forum editor Victor

Strandberg was prevailed upon to continue one additional year, and that's this year. He is not doing it again and if we're going to continue the Faculty Forum, we need a nominee, and so if you would like to be Faculty Forum editor or you know someone who might, please encourage those people to contact the Academic Council. The fourth item as far as announcements is a piece of paper that I hope everybody got. There's a Recreation Fee Recommendation, it's already been passed out. There's a one-page document that talks about the Rec fee. Tallman Trask today issued a letter implementing the recommendations of the committee with one exception, the exception having to do with the summer, and so I didn't see a need to discuss that at this point, but there have been a lot of questions about this going forward and I wanted to make sure everyone got a copy of this. Anything else? OK. We're now ready to do what, I think, is Ken Knoerr's favorite part, and that is our nomination for or approval for earned degrees.

EARNED DEGREES

Diplomas dated December 30, 1999

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	8
Bachelor of Science	5
School of Engineering	
Dean Kristina M. Johnson	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	3
Master of Engineering Management	
	5
School of Nursing	
Dean Mary T. Champagne	
Master of Science in Nursing	21
Nicholas School of the Environment	
Dean Norman L. Christensen	
Master of Environmental Management	8
Master of Forestry	
	2
Fugua School of Business	
Dean Rex D. Adams	
Master of Business Administration	77
Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Theological Studies	1
Master of Divinity	14

Master of Theology	1
School of Law	
Interim Dean Clark C. Havighurst	
Juris Doctor	8
Master of Laws	1
Doctor of Juridical Science	1
School of Medicine	
Dean Edward W. Holmes	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	2
Doctor of Medicine	2
The Graduate School	
Dean Lewis M. Siegel	
Master of Public Policy	4
Master of Science	25
Master of Arts	22
Doctor of Philosophy	76
 TOTAL	 374

Prof. Randall **Kramer** (NSOE/ECAC) was recognized to make the usual two motions: that 1) 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 2) 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.

The **Chair**: I received from Dr. Richey [Divinity] a document [Inclement Weather, dated January 18, 2000] that has gone around to most of you. ["I move that the schools and educational programs with a significant clientele be authorized and empowered to determine their own inclement weather closings and delays, with the proviso that they issue standing and special announcements through the University Registrar who shall make the appropriate releases, e-mailings, and postings."] It's in the form of a motion to the Academic Council. As Chair of Academic Council, my ruling would be that it's inappropriate to deal with as a motion.

Motions that have significance like this are typically in our rules referred first to the Executive Committee for examination and then brought here. The Chair can always be overruled but that's my ruling. We are treating this as though it is a question to the Provost and so we will deal with it as a question today and then I can talk with Dr. Richey about whether we should pursue it further.

Provost **Lange**: Well, the Provost in this University has two powers. One is to make additions to the [earned] degree list and you've just deprived me of that opportunity, and now Professor Richey is proposing to deprive me of another opportunity that I have to exercise my absolute limitless powers to declare when we cancel classes due to severe weather. This is a policy which I inherited, but which I fully support. Now, I'm going to discuss a bit on how we work the policy in a minute, but before I thought of doing that, I thought it would be useful to have Tallman Trask who, in fact, was there at the creation of the policy and knows why we have the policy as it is now to state a little bit about the history of the policy. So Dr. Trask, would you like to?

E.V.P Tallman **Trask**: I would be pleased to. In 1996, we had some snow events and hurricane Fran, and it became very clear to us at that point that we didn't have a well-understood policy on severe weather closings and did not have in place a communication structure that was able to get messages to people about what was going on, and so we spent the better part of the year with a committee arguing back and forth about what the severe weather policy ought to be. [It] took us through all the deans, [we] consulted ECAC about it, and put out a policy which basically says, the real concern here is road conditions. And the only way to find out about road conditions is for us to be in touch with the State Patrol, the city and county EMS, our own facilities people, and that's the way we can tell whether or not we think the roads are passable and safe, and it delegates then [recommendation authority ?] to the police chief, unlike the previous policy which delegated to the personnel director the authority to make a recommendation to me usually at 5:00 in the morning. I then wake up Peter and we try and figure out what to do, and after that there are procedures in place to get the information. So we're trying to notify 20,000 people in less than an hour. Local radio and television, Duke cable TV, e-mail, the Duke Web site, the Duke phone line. We're also trying to get the message out now not only to the campus but to three hospitals. So logistics are fairly complicated. We've never gotten it completely right, but I think it gets out a lot better than it did a couple of years ago.

Peter **Lange**: Now, in that context, let me explain to you the decisions, since I've taken grief from the left of me and grief from the right of me about the decisions both on Tuesday and today; the students were mostly complaining about today. I thought, I would just clarify. On Tuesday, I had a wake-up call, literally, from Dr. Trask at 5:30 in the morning, telling me that there was heavy snow, that the state had determined that the roads were hazardous, that there had already been multiple accidents reported. Dr. Trask then, on the recommendation of the Chief of Police, declared that we were in a severe weather emergency, which means that all non-essential employees would not be asked to come to Duke, and non-essential employees is not a casual category, but a sharply defined administrative category. Now, under those conditions, I determined that I did not think it was appropriate to ask our faculty and graduate and professional students, and I want to emphasize that— *the graduate and professional students*— **to put** themselves in danger, as well as putting others in danger by putting themselves on the roads under those conditions. I did, however, recognize that the conditions at 6:00 might change because that's what the weather report was suggesting, so that by noontime it might be possible for people to be out on the road and come to class; and, in fact, at 10:30 we therefore determined we would reconsider the decision with respect to the afternoon, and as you know, we did reconsider the decision both with respect to classes and with respect to the severe weather emergency, and it was lifted. Well, for this morning I can only read you the message I sent to various people that I'm responsible for communicating with about the weather. Snowfall has been light and to use a technical term, fluffy. It appears to have ended, I consulted the Doppler 5000 radar and the blue area, which if you want to consult the Doppler 500 radar is the snow, had passed Durham going east because I got it to do that loop, which is kind of cool right? And the loop had taken it out beyond Durham and to the east. The State of North Carolina had not called for a snow emergency, Duke was not declaring a severe weather emergency, classes should therefore meet as scheduled. Please drive with caution and leave as late as is consistent with your safety and responsibilities. So that gives [you] a history of the policy for the week. I would also note that my predecessor managed to go through several years without any such weather emergency, and I've had three in the first 6 months. At this rate, I'm going to have sleep deprivation because Dr. Trask is constantly calling me early in the morning to ask me what we're going to do. Now, the question that Russell Richey, his query, well his motion, but it really is a query, raises is, why not

decentralize this decision-making? Why not leave it to each of the schools to determine when there is a danger given their different, their differential constituencies and all of that, and I would only answer as follows. We have already got an extremely difficult communication problem with our employees. Tallman read you approximately 7 or 8 different places we try to put one message, well actually two messages. Severe weather emergencies, and the situation with respect to classes. If we began to have to put such a message out about each school, in all of those sites, we would be creating, I believe, a great deal of confusion and, in fact, potential danger to our employees. Now, why do I say the second? First of all, because confused people will be on the road and they'll be thinking about whether they should be on the road or not, just as they hit that ice patch and we could lose some people. Lew [Siegel] went into a ditch the other day, didn't you Lew? Or did he leave? He announced this thing, anyways. But, the other thing, the other reason is that if we decentralize the decision, we are then leaving the decisions about who should be on the road to people with less information about the actual hazards in place, that is, we certainly cannot ask each dean to be in touch with the State Police, to consult the Doppler 5000 radar, etc. etc. Then they would have to communicate to some central source, Russell suggests the Registrar's office; I assure you that the Registrar's office is not the place to communicate with our 10,000 or 20,000 employees in a short period of time, as any of you who have submitted [grades?] well know. The basic response that I would have to this query, posed as a motion, is that while the current policy constantly needs to be tweaked and upgraded— and, in fact, even between Tuesday and today we worked on some communication issues with respect to the policy— I believe that it is the best policy we can have under the circumstances. Thank you.

Prof. Kenneth **Knoerr** (NSOE): Just one minor correction. There was a policy prior to 1996 and that was classes were never cancelled. That goes back to the time when, basically, all the undergraduates and most of the graduate students lived on campus, and it was up to the professor, [if?] the students were supposed to show up in the classroom and if the professor could make it here, they'd have class. If they couldn't make it here, they wouldn't. And there was one February, where we had 4 snow storms, a week apart, that I had to wade through the snow two miles to get here. My point is, I'm not saying we couldn't cancel classes, I'm saying what the policy was. It was up to the faculty to get here, if they could.

Peter **Lange**: In fact, I received three e-mails on Tuesday from more senior colleagues at Duke, each of them reminding me that we never used to cancel classes. So Ken's thing is correct. I didn't know it was a policy or we just didn't do it. I don't know if it was a formal policy, but in any case the kind of constituency that we serve and the number of people driving to campus now is vastly different than it was even when I came which was a while back, certainly.

Bob **Mosteller**: I now call on President Keohane.

President **Keohane**: I think, you all have probably already seen that our colleague Gene McDonald will be stepping down as the president of DUMAC this summer after serving brilliantly for 10 years. I think those of you who have not recently followed DUMAC's returns may not be aware of how important it has been to the University that DUMAC has performed at the very top level of all of our peers in endowment management, so Gene deserves, when the time comes, [that we] give him the [recognition he has earned?]; we look forward to sharing with him a great deal of recognition and thanks for his leadership. So he set a high bar for his successor, but having done this for 10 years he is ready to go on and go back to Ireland and do some other things. So we will have the tough job of finding his successor, and what I wanted to do this afternoon was to share with you the composition of a search committee and ask your thoughts as we look for someone who will be successful in managing our endowment down the line. It's obviously important to all of us that the endowment portfolio continue to do as well as possible, through bad markets and good. The search committee is composed of Bob Steel who is the trustee member who is now the chairman of the DUMAC Board [and] who will chair the search committee, Neil Williams who was former chair of the Board at Duke and had been one of the people who was in on the origin of DUMAC and had served on the DUMAC Board and is now Trustee Emeritus, Joe Grills and Alice Hicks. Joe is a serving present member on the DUMAC Board and Alice is an immediate past member. [Finally, there is] Campbell Harvey of the Fuqua School, [E.V.P] Tallman Trask and Ken Morris of the Health System. That's our committee. Allison Haltom [University Secretary] will be working with the committee and providing the staff support. This committee will be formally charged by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees at a conference call meeting in another 10 days. But I know people are ready to get started on this. We'll probably be working with a search firm, but we certainly need any suggestions that people may have of places we could be looking for a strong investment

manager to succeed Gene McDonald as president of DUMAC. So, I wanted to ask your help and let you know where to turn to give it. Thank you.

Bob **Mosteller**: At this time I call on Emily Klein to report on the Chair Nominating Committee.

Prof. Emily **Klein** (NSOE): On behalf of the search committee consisting of John Baillie, John Board, Cynthia Herrup and Janice Radway and myself, we are pleased to recommend to you the names of two faculty members who have agreed to stand for election for chair of the Academic Council. If you'll stand, Dr. Peter Burian, Professor in the Department of Classical Studies and Dr. Helen Ladd, Sunny Ladd, Public Policy Studies and the Department of Economics. It's my understanding that biographical sketches will be provided with the February agenda.

The **Chair**: We announced nominations at this meeting, we'll vote at the next meeting. Nominations can also come from the floor, assuming that the consent of the nominee has been secured. Are there any nominations from the floor? So we'll consider the nominations closed at this point and we will vote at the next meeting. I think at this meeting, I'm officially a lame duck, that is, as soon as they start nominating, you are a lame duck. Maybe it's officially next time, but effectively this time. I'd like to call the meeting into **executive session** at this moment. Anybody who is a Duke faculty member can remain, anyone who is not, needs to leave. This will be very brief, it's an honorary degree matter, so don't go far.

The **Chair** [the meeting having gone back into **open session**]: Back in December, we had a presentation on a new proposed degree, the Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership. The same four individuals who came and talked to us at that time are here today, Mary Champagne of the School of Nursing, Duncan Yaggy, Lloyd Michener and Joe Corless. I'm sure they would be happy to respond to any questions, if there are any. Did you have anything that you wanted to say? The materials were passed out at that time. Are there any further questions? I'll read the bottom line of the 'whereas' clauses in just a second, but [are there any] questions about substantive issues about this degree? I'll skip the resolution to 'be it resolved:' "Be it resolved that the Academic Council endorses the creation of a Master of Health Sciences and Clinical Leadership (MHS-CL) in the Department of Community and Family Medicine." Do I have a motion that that resolution be adopted? Is there a

second? Any further discussion? Anyone want me to read the whole resolution, I'd be happy to. Are we ready to vote? All in favor say aye. All opposed? It's **approved**.

PROPOSED MERGER OF THE BOTANY AND ZOOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

The **Chair:** [Dean] Bill Chafe will be the initial presenter, as well as Peter Lange, Roger Barr from the Biology Task Force, John Simon of Academic Priorities Committee, and Mark Rausher, one of the two chairs of the two departments involved. Those are the people here who will either have some part or be available for questions. We are not voting on this matter today. This is a matter that we will vote on in the February meeting, I hope we can have a full discussion today.

Dean William **Chafe:** Thanks Bob. Let me just review briefly the history of these issues. As you know, the question of the merger of the Botany and Zoology departments has been something that has been up for discussion for a number of years. There was a task force that Jim Siedow chaired in 1996 that dealt with this. The external review, made up of distinguished scientists, came together last year and that was one of the issues that they addressed as well, as the future development of the biological sciences and Arts and Sciences at Duke. Their recommendation, as you know, was strongly supportive of the two departments, primarily for purposes of future development and the relationship to the rest of the biological sciences at Duke. As a result of their review, a series of steps then took place. Peter Lange is going to describe the ways in which the Academic Priorities Committee became involved in that, and then the development of the task force which Roger Barr is going to describe, Mark Rausher • is really here to speak both on behalf of Botany and Zoology. Don Stone [Chair, Botany] chose to ask Mark to speak on behalf of both departments in terms of their response and then John [Simon] to talk about the APC resolution, and then Peter and I will come back and talk about some of the commitments that we are prepared to make for the future of Biology, and then we'll talk about the next steps that will develop after that. So Peter's going to talk about the initial involvement in APC.

Provost **Lange:** Thanks Bill. During the search for the Provost, I had become aware of serious concerns within the Botany and Zoology departments about their standing within the University and the level of support for their programs in teaching and research. I had also become aware that there were other segments of the university

that were concerned about how Biology at Duke would develop overall. I had also been aware of the external review and of much longer standing debates in the departments in the university regarding the potential benefits and possible difficulties with mergers of the department to a single Biology department. I was also aware of the earlier study recommending unification and of the fate of that study in the two departments. Since one of my priorities on becoming Provost was to direct attention to the sciences and to the possible ways we could improve the sciences through a combination of greater synergies between them and the commitment or resources to them, Biology was very rapidly on my agenda, and the external review provided the occasion for further examination. From this examination and the recommendations of the external review, it seemed essential to move ahead as quickly and decisively as possible to address the issues raised in the external review, a sentiment shared by Dean Chafe, and to link any resolution of the issues raised in the review to a reinvigoration of the support for the Biological Sciences in Arts and Sciences as part of a larger effort over a longer period to strengthen the Biological Sciences at Duke overall. APC discussion and the resolution were critical in this regard. There was widespread support in the committee, the review has brought forward to the APC committee through the normal procedures that attend to any external review in the university. There was widespread support in the Academic Priorities Committee after reviewing the external review, hearing from the chairs of Botany and Zoology and from the Deans that we should work towards unification and that we should do so in a way that would extensively involve the departments in the process. In moving towards unification, it was clearly important for scientific reasons to assure that we could create an environment as conducive as possible to the following goals: collaboration within the new department across traditional lines in both teaching and research, further- strengthening of the undergraduate and graduate programs, assuring the best conditions for supporting research at the cutting edges of subdisciplinary areas within Biology, maintaining strength in traditional areas of excellence in Biology at Duke, while assuring that they were able to continue to work at the frontiers of research in those areas, and effective utilization of new resources to support the unified department. I would now like to call on John Simon who chaired the APC committee and who can tell you somewhat more about the actual deliberations of the committee at that first round, when they first addressed these issues this fall.

Prof. John **Simon** [APC]: Thanks Peter, I'll try and give you some insight into our discussions and what led us to the conclusions that we made. We met on September 29th to consider the external reviews of the two departments and the responses that the departments made to those reviews. After a short executive discussion, the committee saw interest from Mark Rausher and Don Stone. And after these discussions we came to the conclusion that it would be best for Duke to unify the two departments into a single Biology department. The reasoning behind our recommendation and thinking was as follows. First, as a committee, we felt that the current organization of the biological sciences departments by organism did not provide a flexible and forward looking structure. Instead, we thought it would, in fact, impede the development of biological sciences at Duke. Second, while a single BA and BS degree is currently being offered on this campus, it became clear to us that unification would facilitate the implementation of a more cohesive undergraduate curriculum. This actually was an important point to us, given the importance of this major for undergraduate students. It was also the case that we felt that if the faculty were working together in a single department towards a common goal, the graduate program would benefit from an increase in the scope of its offerings, as well as reducing the isolation that was being felt by some of the subdisciplines currently present in these departments. Finally, it was our perception that a unified biology department would facilitate better integration of the biological sciences across the university. I would say this was a unanimous feeling among the committee, the question was one of 'how do you do it?' This was something the committee wasn't sure about, but we felt that unification needed to be accomplished in a manner that would build upon the current intellectual strengths of the individual units. And so we advised the Provost to form a task force that involved also APC representation and the job of that task force was to actually meet with individuals in the department, meet with the current leadership and come back to us with a blueprint for how the unification process should proceed. We requested a detailed plan that would enable the diverse set of intellectual pursuits present in Botany and Zoology to work synergistically within a single department, and, at the same time, provide the type of flexibility necessary so the department could develop when new areas of the discipline come to the forefront in the future. At that point, the Provost appointed the task force and Roger Barr, I think, is now going to tell us about the task force process and the recommendation.

Prof. Roger **Barr** [Biology Task Force]: The Biology Task Force was established on October 6th, with the understanding that it would work intensively but under a short calendar period and report on December 1st, and the goal was to take the point of view that a merger would proceed and take the point of view that an external chair would be appointed, within this broad framework, to identify the issues that would be involved in the merger and to suggest which of these issues were addressed. Perhaps the most significant thing I can do in a few minutes is tell you how the committee, the Task Force proceeded, about half of whose members were from the effected departments. Generally, in the meetings that we had, we would discuss a set of issues, we would identify points that needed some development. The members from the departments that were in the Task Force meeting often explained these in considerably more detail than I would have been aware of without that explanation. They then discussed these after our meetings among themselves quite extensively with other members of the departments and then, as a result of that, there were also meetings that were in the [?] of our task force meetings that took place with groups of faculty within the departments. Through this mechanism and through quite a large amount of e-mail that went back and forth, the members of the department gave us very effective and detailed guidance as to the issues that were there and considerable suggestions as to how they might be addressed. These were not just some superficial comments, but I think reflected the fact that this seems to have been under consideration for several years. As a result, in the Task Force report, we tried to enumerate 14 different issues that were of substantial importance to the faculty as a whole, or to individual groups of the faculty, and to suggest in a general way why these were important, how they might be addressed.

These are necessarily general guidelines that will have to evolve as the faculty involved work on them further themselves and how the structure changes and as the new chair is identified, when that comes to pass. On the other hand, I believe that these are substantial and this is a good list of items, every one important and I hope that you have a copy of the report, so you can see that. And I believe that they are given attention, that the process will have the support of a substantial number of faculty. I would like, just in closing, to express my particular appreciation as Task Force chair to our Task Force committee members but also to the chairs of the departments, both Dr. Stone and Dr. Rausher who extensively modified their own schedules in ways that they hadn't anticipated so as to work cooperatively with

us, and of course, the whole faculty that were involved who did the same. They really came through and did a wonderful job for [the cause?]

Prof. Mark **Rausher**: I'm Mark Rausher, I'm chair of the Zoology Department. Merger is a thorny issue, because there are going to be advantages and disadvantages associated with it. I think, historically, the departments tended to recognize primarily disciplinary [disadvantages?] over the last year and a half, I think the two departments and their respective faculty have come to recognize that there are going to be substantially more advantages associated with merging than disadvantages. And having come to that [conclusion?] the faculty of both departments, not unanimously, but by a large majority, support the merger. In the context of the entire external review that the departments merge, really [amounted to] only some dozen or so recommendations by the external committee. I think our faculty feel that if a majority of those recommendations are carried out, that will make the merger a successful one and we're looking forward to proceeding.

John **Simon**: So, that brings us to December 8th when APC reconvened to discuss this, and I think I can honestly say that I was one nervous chair of a committee that day, thinking that this could go many ways, but actually it turned out to be one of the simplest APC meetings we've had this year. It began with a discussion that the APC members who served on the Task Force brought us up to date, and we had advised the whole Task Force to join us in the meeting after that. And Roger [Barr] showed up to give us a presentation with all the recommendations being made by the Task Force, and Rick [?] from Zoology and Jim [?] from Botany, hopefully both from Biology soon, showed up and voiced their support for the report. And after the plan was presented, we discussed some of the details with Bill Chafe and Berndt Mueller, and I would say that this was an extremely proactive meeting. It was clear to the membership of APC that the faculty of the departments, the Task Force and the administration were all in agreement as to the basic procedural issues for unification. So it was just sort of a dream come true [for me] as a chairman of this committee and based on the agreement and the importance of biological sciences to this university. The APC unanimously advised the Provost to work on Dean Chafe to unify the two departments using the Task Force report as the guide.

Bill **Chafe**: As these various reports have indicated, we were exceptionally happy with the degree to which there

was consensus and cooperation throughout this process and thinking through the Task Force recommendations and external review's response to the situation with Biological sciences. We had been talking about a number of ways in which we can work with the departments toward improving and providing for the future development of the biological sciences, and in the context of the report, we wanted especially to respond to a number of the issues that had been raised by the external review. It's important to note that the charge to the Task Force that Peter and I designed, specifically stated our commitment to retaining a strong commitment to the plant sciences, since that is one of the major concerns of the people in the Botany Department. We also wanted to be responsive to the concerns of the external review about issues of facilities and space situations in Bio-Sci, and we met with the combined departments, Peter and I in December, and made a series of commitments that I want to go over today with you and then Peter is going to talk a little bit more about the faculty issues and our hopes for the future of Biological Sciences at Duke. First of all, we have committed with the central administration and Arts and Sciences to commit 3 million dollars over the next 18 months to a renovation of existing teaching and lab facilities within Bio-Sci. Second of all, we have committed to an additional three graduate fellowships and will be supportive of the program within the Biological sciences. And third, we are committed to working toward choosing an interim chair as soon as possible, and a transition team that will be put in place to work towards defining some of the long range concerns of the department as it approaches its future, presuming support for the merger of the department. We are confident that with these commitments in place, that the Biological Sciences can remain a pivotal presence in the future development of the sciences at Duke, and indeed are a major part of the Long Range Plan for Arts and Sciences that will be developed in the next few weeks and presented to the Board of Trustees in February. So we believe that these are a strong indication of our commitment [END OF SIDE 1]

...little show here. So the other bookend, or both bookends.

Peter Lange: I just want to say that the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's office have been working very closely throughout this process to assure that we could deliver on the resources and commitments that were being made in order to promote the biological sciences in the context of this unification issue. And that support will be ongoing. I think that we are convinced that the

proposals that have been put forward regarding faculty size, regarding space and facilities, regarding graduate support and regarding the building and further development of the undergraduate and graduate programs are essential to promoting the biological sciences at Duke both in Arts and Sciences and more broadly in the university over the next 5 and 10 years. Now, there is one specific issue which lands directly on the Provost's lap which has to do with assuring the untenured faculty in the two separate departments that their interests and expectations regarding the tenure process will be fully met. The Task Force, as you know, proposed a particular procedure. When Bill and I met with the two departments in December, one of the senior members of the department and then some of the junior members spoke to the fact that they weren't quite sure that that exact procedure was the one that they would prefer, although they were entirely in sympathy with the basic thrust of that. They have subsequently brought a proposal forward to me and to Bill regarding how their tenure would be handled, so it would leave them some flexibility to determine whether they wanted their tenure to be handled by their former set of limited colleagues or, instead, by the new Biology program as a whole or department as a whole, and I am entirely supportive of that procedure and Bill and I have discussed and we will carry forward on that specific issue, which is one issue of great concern, obviously, to those younger faculty on whom a great deal of the future of both of these departments also rests. In conclusion, I just want to say that we think that the unification of the two departments is a major, but also only a first step in moving forward in the life sciences and the biological sciences at Duke over the next decade. While we obviously are still in the midst of our planning process, I can tell you that simply from what has already emerged in the planning around the sciences, that the life sciences and the biological sciences, and this will not come to a surprise to anyone who reads even the inner pages of the News and Observer on any particular Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, maybe on the weekend as well, that the life sciences and the biological sciences are going to be an extremely important part of how we reinvigorate and strengthen the sciences at Duke. And we think that this step in Arts and Sciences is absolutely crucial to moving that whole larger process forward and we would encourage you all to support the proposal to unify the departments when you have the opportunity to vote thereon.

Bob **Mosteller**: Just to make sure that everyone has the materials. You should have received today a set of documents that has letters from the Provost, from Bill

Chafe, and from John Simon plus Roger Barr's committee report. The proposal, as far as the resolution [is concerned], ends: "Be it resolved that Academic Council endorses the recommendation that the Departments of Botany and Zoology be merged into the single Department of Biology and forward the approval to the Provost and University Secretary for consideration by the Board of Trustees." That's what we'll vote on next meeting. I'd like to now throw the meeting open to questions and I'm quite sure that questions can be posed to any or all of our speakers.

Prof. Helen **Ladd** (Soc. Sciences) : I just have a couple of mechanical questions. How big are the two departments now? I didn't see that. So what size a merged department are we talking about in terms of faculty and in terms of, say, undergraduate majors? And then the second question is, was there ever a time in Duke's history when these two departments were merged or have they always been that way?

Dean **Chafe**: The number of faculty slots at this point is approximately 40 in these two departments.

Prof. Richard **White** (Natural Sciences): I'm the historian, but I don't know whether they [were ever merged?]. Biology began here as biology. And then in the 30's, Professor Bloomquist was established as the first Professor of Botany and the two departments developed from that beginning, so that in the beginning it was Biology, and we've come full circle.

The **Chair**: Did both parts of your question get answered?

Helen **Ladd**: Majors? Number of majors?

Prof. **White**: We have approximately 700 majors in the undergraduate consolidated major.

Helen **Ladd**: Are most of those pre-med?

Prof. **White**: I hesitate to say yes, but the answer is yes. [laughter]

Prof. John **Board** (Engineering): Will a formal vote be taken by the faculty in the two departments and will Council know the outcome of that vote prior to our vote in February?

Prof. Mark **Rausher** (Chair, Zoology): A formal vote has been taken, and is the result of that known or not known?

I don't see that there's anything confidential [about it?].

Dean **Chafe**: We had a 27-0 vote in the combined meeting of the faculty, 27-0 on the Task Force Report.

Prof. **Rausher**: At a combined meeting of the two faculties? So, this obviously doesn't represent people who weren't there.

Prof. Steven **Vogel** (Natural Sciences): As a point of clarification on that, was that a vote on the Task Force Report or the mechanics of implementation, or a vote per se on the issue of whether the two departments could be combined? Has there been a vote by each department, which is a departmental unit, clearly endorsing the merger?

Mark **Rausher**: I can only speak for Zoology; there's been a vote in the Zoology department.

Steven **Vogel**: Has there been a vote, does anyone know, does Botany clearly support a merger?

Richard **White**: Based on my recent discussions with Don Stone, I don't believe it's ever come up as a specific 'we move that we support the merger' and then vote on it. I don't believe that has actually happened.

Steven **Vogel**: I was going to make just that point, that in all of these whereases and all of these supporting things, there are no statements that the two departments each separately has voted to endorse merger, and I think that thing has to be read in that context, because as a matter of procedure, the department has gone, I think, a long way, because we have to live with the consequences, to making this process as smooth as we possibly can in designing instruments that will enable us to do the things that we have to do, [that] is that we can do them. But I am a little bit troubled that we are not actually moving on something which has been separately supported by each of the departments which are not inconsiderable departments or departments with bad reputations or departments in very serious trouble. They have not actually come out and endorsed this.

Richard **White**: All I can say is based upon a conversation which I don't think is confidential, Berndt Mueller did, indeed, ask Don Stone [Botany Dept. Chair] if it would be possible and if he thought it was a good idea to bring this forward as a formal recommendation to the Department of Botany to vote upon, and after some discussion between

them, I think Don expressed the fact that he didn't think it was really necessary, that there had been considerable discussion, that there was not any aggressive 'anti' this position based upon the Task Force Report and the support [of] the Task Force Report by the Botanists that attended, so that the general sense was the opportunity had been given, but the chair of that department declined that opportunity.

Prof. John **Staddon** (Natural Sciences) : I just want to support what has been said by Steve [Vogel]. I think, it will be much easier for us all to vote if we felt that this had been voted on [separately by each department?] If indeed there is no objection in either of the departments such as Botany, then I see no reason why a vote should not be taken. What's the problem?

Dean **Chafe**: We will be happy to talk further with the department chair as we have already done once and we will remember to do that. It was our understanding that the joint meeting did represent essentially almost all of the people who were part of this and I'm not saying it represented all because 27 is not 40, but, in fact, that's a fairly significant turnout and so our view was [that] this was a fairly significant response; however, we will go back to Don Stone and have the Department of Botany do that.

Prof. Barbara **Shaw** (Nat. Sciences) : I have two concerns. One is I have looked for a report [in my mail?]. I haven't received yet this report. It would be very helpful for an issue of this importance for the faculty to have a little bit more time to review this material and be better informed. I guess, my suggestion is that if this comes up in the future that we do have the documentation ahead of time.

Bob **Mosteller**: I'm assuming that your packet didn't get to you; it should have gotten to you roughly a week ahead.

Barbara **Shaw**: I've been looking for the last week.

Bob **Mosteller**: Did other people receive their's?

Barbara **Shaw**: Other people received it today.

Bob **Mosteller**: I'm very sorry about that. We try to get things in the mail about 8 days in advance of this meeting, and sometimes, in many units, they are there the next day or at least in some, in other units they aren't. I apologize for that.

Prof. John **Aldrich** (Soc. Sciences) : Will this have any implication for placement? I thought particularly of graduate students getting a degree now, I presume. Does this have any implications for the placement of graduate students?

Prof. **Rausher**: I doubt it.

Prof. Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies): I just would like to probe a little bit further about other things that are connected, if this happens. They have been mentioned and there's this interesting paragraph in the document, which states particularly explicitly that the merger is a worthwhile thing not so much in itself as for the opportunity that it offers and that there needs to be incentives, that is, other things have to happen for the value of this to be realized. The committee, with proper circumspection, says it's not in a position to make commitments and I don't know that anybody here now is. Peter [Lange] has said that this is a very high priority for us, but what, I guess, I'm wondering is do the members of the departments and the administration have a clear idea of what has to happen, when what sorts of things can and should be done more or less immediately and how long it will take to do the kinds of things that will, in fact, by the account of the external review committee and of this Task Force Report make it for the people [?] involved in the merger worthwhile and for the departments and for Duke?

Bill **Chafe**: Well, I think that our reputation as an institution [?] already made is designed to sort of suggest the degree to which we are strongly invested in making this work. It is my hope that this is going to succeed. Having an interim chair in place and a transition team will enable the department to think through its long-range planning and work with us in developing plans for where it chooses to focus additional new resources; and as we proceed with the recruitment of an external chair, clearly, how those resources will be allocated in terms of program funds and faculty funds will be a major ingredient of those negotiations. So, *that*, in effect, is the second stage of a process that we have already begun in terms of monies for renovations, graduate fellowships and the like.

Richard **White**: I just want to follow up a little bit on Peter [Lange], but not exactly. I was wondering, given the fact that today we've had a presentation that gave six major goals by the Provost for what he saw happening here, a couple from APC and 16 or so items from the Task Force, is it possible to build into this process a retrospective review on whether or not, indeed, these

goals have been met and that the merger has, indeed, made the changes that we anticipate that it will make. There's a long history which many of us know with these kinds of mergers with great expectations; many of them don't work out that way. And I don't know of any example, and we might be unique in this, of a situation in which a merger is undertaken with such willingness and participation and collaboration and cooperation. This is a surprise actually relative to the way things have been done at other institutions. So in that sort of same positive spirit, could we look at something either in the resolution or a follow-up to the resolution to come back and visit these goals in five years from now and see where we are in making it to these goals in an effort to show relatively good faith about the merger in the first place, but some sense that, indeed, it was worth it and that we are actually a better [department] five years down the road, doing better things the way we'd like to see them done than we are currently.

Peter **Lange**: Let me say two things about that. One is that there are two aspects to your question. And one seems to be whether the administration and I think this is fair, whether the administration delivers on its promise.

Richard **White**: I meant to be a little more subtle than that, but you're right, [laughter]

Peter **Lange**: And that's a well-known difference between you and me. The other one is whether the merger succeeds from an intellectual standpoint. And we have a natural process of doing that which is the external reviews. And this external review, as you know, raised some questions about the longer term, not the short term, but the longer term intellectual growth of the department and how it would be best structured and, in fact, we're following that very much in the Task Force recommendation and the way we're proceeding. So, I would assume that the appropriate point for evaluating the *intellectual* accomplishment of the merger would be the next external review which will happen, I believe, . . . what's the cycle Lewis?

Dean Lewis **Siegel**: 6 or 7 years.

Peter **Lange**: I would be reluctant to do it too soon, because I don't think fields evolve at a pace, but that would be the proper cycle and I believe that this review, and our intellectual goals with respect to this review is articulated in the documents we have, and would be an appropriate starting point for that external review when

it happens. And I think external reviews probably did [satisfied] the first part of your question, and will probably be a better way of understanding the accomplishments than some kind of internal review.

Prof. Gregory **Lawler** (Nat. Sciences): This is a procedural question as well. Dealing with the merger of two Arts and Sciences departments: this was chosen not to go through the Arts and Sciences Council at all, but directly to this committee; can you comment on why the Arts and Sciences Council hasn't been in on the discussion?

Bill **Chafe**: That's an important question, and I think it's one of the issues that we've been talking about in the Executive Committee of the Council; it actually goes back to what the history has been of the way in which these kinds of structured things have occurred. I would think that one of the things that we should do in the future is to make sure that that process involves them. Even though this [Academic Council] is a legislative body which clearly has the authority to recommend to the trustees, there should be an advisory role played by the Arts and Sciences Council, particularly ECASC. I would support that in the future and I regret that [wasn't done]. But you have some representation on the issue of considering the situation of the Drama Program. This external review preceded this.

Prof. John **Baillie** (Medicine): I wanted to make a point, an issue keeps coming up and its quite [tangential?]. In the years I've been with the Academic Council, whenever the issue [comes up] that so many students come and take Biology here are doing it to meet pre-med requirements, there's a sort of feeling this is some kind of necessary evil and somehow not quite right for them to be using the facilities here as a springboard to a different role in graduate education in Biology, and I think the way it should be viewed is as a great compliment to the quality of the education given to many students who choose to do it and many go on to medical schools. However, is that a problem or is it a compliment to this system? It's kind of snidely brought up in the way that people always say 'are they going to do medicine or what are they going to do?' It shouldn't be an issue, surely. Is anybody prepared to take that on? [laughter]

Richard **White**: Well, I'm the Director of Undergraduate Studies in Biology only for the last three years, and I know that most of us in the biological sciences would like to say little people like ourselves, not all of us, but I don't think we're really negative about this,

because some of our brightest students are pre-medical students. Students who graduate with distinction are predominantly those students, and they wouldn't be here if they weren't really good, and some of our faculty scholars who are nominated each year and awarded the faculty scholarship are pre-medical students. So, I don't think there's any antagonism among the Biological Sciences faculty. Individuals have different feelings about the dominance of it perhaps, and we're working now to revise a biological sciences major that perhaps less emphasizes it, which will be looked at by the new Curriculum Committee of the joint proposed department so I have a feeling that it isn't as bad as you make it sound and it isn't snide, and I don't think you really downgrade it because, obviously, one can look at it totally pragmatically and say if it weren't for all of those pre-medical students, we wouldn't have 40 faculty, we wouldn't have 700 undergraduate majors, and we wouldn't have the resources that are being provided by the administration in order to support that program. So I think that we see it as better than you might think. We appreciate the fact that the students are interested in coming to Duke and taking biology as a major.

Prof. Rhett **George** (Engineering): Are there similar movements in other private institutions? I noticed only one reference in the quick reading of the document and that was to Berkeley. Are most schools equipped only with one Biology department or with several, Botany as well as Zoology?

Mark **Rausher**: We are behind the times in that regard. That statement not meaning to imply that being one of the choices.

Richard **White**: There's no other way of phrasing it. We're one of the last of those that have seen this as the way to go. [laughter]

Steven **Vogel**: I think it should be pointed out, though, that the diversity of arrangements, departmental arrangements in Biological classes in various universities is very very wide. And while separation into Botany and Zoology represents only a small minority of institutions, a unified Biology department with as many faculty as we will have is not probably the majority set-up either. There is no consensus organization for Biological sciences in American universities anymore.

Lewis **Siegel**: I just would like to alert the Council for the record [about something?] My understanding is that there is a committee that is working towards a unified

Ph.D. program, presumably in Biology, perhaps there's some sort of field distribution. And that may well appropriately come to ECAC and be an addendum to the resolution. This is a task that goes to the board, otherwise it will simply go through the usual process and you should be aware that that process simply hasn't been finished in the departments and must go through the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty for approval.

Mark **Rausher**: I'll confirm that. We should have our recommendation by [?]. I should also say that the two departments have set up a series of committees to deal with many of the issues that will arise in the two departments combined such as how to deal with the graduate program, and various faculty issues . . .

Prof. Barbara **Shaw** (Nat.Sciences): I would feel better about this if I heard from some of the departments themselves, I mean, I know that [the discussion] gave a very brief statement. And it's not clear to me at all why you take two good departments and turn them into one big department. Is this big department going to have more strength? Essentially, as far as I can tell, there's 3 million dollars and an 18 month commitment over renovation over teaching and laboratories, which should be done anyways. Pre-graduate fellowships I guess you cannot split down the middle and have one and a half people in each department but you can certainly give that to two individual departments and an interim chair. Maybe there is a lot more to this than I understand. I would like to have some sense of what are the true advantages of combining these departments into a 40 person department when there already are two smaller departments and what are the disadvantages of doing this. And certainly the universities have a lot of smaller departments, smaller than 20 person departments and why should the Biology at this time be combined to have Zoology and Botany combined.

Mark **Rausher**: That is the issue that both departments have grappled with for a long time, for at least ten to fifteen years. I think it's fair to say that a lot of the initial resistance by both departments to the notion of combination was that each department has its own culture, and those cultures are not by any sense identical, but neither is necessarily inferior to the other, that they both seem to work. Both departments have been exceedingly successful in most endeavors with respect to their own operation? And there's a lot of concern what a disruption of those cultures by merging will accomplish. One of the intangibles that tends to be left out of this discussion is 'a productive faculty is a

happy faculty.' If we have a culture where there are a lot of bad interactions between people, that's going to hurt productivity. So that's been a major concern in terms of merging. And I think it wasn't until the external review that [merger became an issue?] I think it's also fair to say that with the recommendations of the external reviews, it seemed to the faculty that the handwriting was on the wall, and that, therefore, we needed to rethink this whole issue. Now I think it's fair to say, and I can't speak for Botany but I can pretty much summarize [their position?], is that it's going to be worth it if it's a procedure that will also bring the resources that we needed for merger in terms of [?] to the science of Biology, and that's why I briefly alluded to the fact that I think the faculty really tends to support that the issue of merger be considered not by itself but in the context of the other recommendations that have been made by the external review, which essentially dealt with resources for dilapidated facilities, resources for graduate student fellowships and other things. So I think our faculty see this in very practical terms as an opportunity for development in Biology which would not otherwise be possible, and that's the primary reason for deciding to endorse this idea. Now, subsequently I would say our experience with each other, the two departments' experience with each other in the initial phases of working out the transition have been very good. And I think many, though not necessarily all of the worries about the combining of the two different cultures have been to some extent alleviated because of [this?] Given that we see it as a fait accompli, we're all trying to work as best as possible towards making this successful. So, does that help?

Barbara **Shaw**: Well, that helps, although it still isn't clear to me why you need to do this in terms of one big department rather than share the resources.

Peter **Lange**: I'm going to speak obviously as a non-Biologist, but we're dealing here with at least two reports. One that was done within the department in '96 and the external review, both of which were arguing that while both of the departments are very good now, that the current structure might not be as conducive as a more unified structure which would allow more movement in, you might say, a more horizontal direction between these two vertical units. I don't want to say that it would be more conducive to innovation over a long period of time. This is not an attack on the quality of the current department, and it was not a suggestion that the current departments cannot continue to be good. But in a very dynamic disciplinary area, Biology, Biological Science,

however we want to define it, the argument was, which was ultimately accepted by me as Provost, as a layperson, but with consultation with a number of other scientists and with some other people I talked to, and I think with Bill as well and by others in the university, that as a long-term prospect in a highly dynamic and innovative field breaking down some of the barriers and, in fact, we have people who work across those barriers now, but breaking them down further would create a market for [?] one of them, that breaking down those barriers and building a larger unified department that would realign itself in some horizontal directions along yet some other lines while some of the original positions would create a stronger, if you want, cultural context and structural context, more conducive to the long-term development of Biology within Arts and Sciences and its ability to establish linkages to the Biological Sciences in other parts of the university as well as to other departments within Arts and Sciences. That is the perspective that is promoted by the external review and that is the perspective that was promoted earlier by the internal report that recommended unification in '96, which was then accepted by Zoology but not accepted by Botany at that point in time going forward at the internal level. So that is the argument, now Dick [White] raised earlier [the question of] how do you know? And, of course, we don't know. It's a bet. We're going to be making lots of bets in the context of the planning process of all kinds, because this is a bet about what is to be the most likely structure conducive to innovative intellectual development in a highly dynamic area of the sciences? That's the argument.

Prof. Robert **Hochmuth** (Engineering): As long as we're breaking barriers and making bets, we can raise the ante. There's another department of biology, it happens to be called Cell Biology and I know a number of people in Cell Biology and there's actually a fair amount of overlap between people who are in DCMB, the Cell Biology group which already exists. Maybe we ought to go to the next step.

Peter **Lange**: One step at a time, if it takes us as long to do the next step as it has taken us to do this one.

Bob **Hochmuth**: It will take twice as long. Actually, to add to that comment, many many years ago when I was at Washington University in St. Louis, maybe two decades ago, they actually took that step. They created a larger structure between some of the Biological Sciences and the Medical School down at Barnes Hospital at the other side of Forest Park, and the Biological Sciences on campus.

It's quite an extraordinary step. I can't speak to the success of it, but they actually took that step.

Helen **Ladd**: I just want to follow up on that a little bit. Peter, I believe it was you who said that this is the first of several initiatives that will take place in the area of the sciences. Is there the beginnings of a broader plan into which this fits?

Peter **Lange**: Beginnings of a broader plan is probably overstating it. We have lots of very good ideas. It's a start towards it, but we're sort of putting our feet into those things [starting blocks?] that you do in track. We're not ready for the start gun yet on the plan.

Helen **Ladd**: But you're officially confident that this will be a step that will be consistent with those ideas should they emerge as [recommended?]

Peter **Lange**: That I agree with.

Bob **Mosteller**: other comments?

Barbara **Shaw**: I still have not heard the disadvantages of this. Am I to assume that disadvantages are somewhat less likely to occur?

Mark **Rausher**: If I may take that one, I think, that, again, and I tried to outline this briefly, there are disadvantages or potential disadvantages. I think the disruption of the two cultures is not something that we can put an economic price tag on easily, is one that has to be taken seriously. Sure, there are going to be procedural difficulties in terms of the faculty, of forty people, that are not going to be as easy on us and amicable as [?]

The **Chair**: Other comments or questions? One final point, I was remiss earlier on, I would like to thank everybody who presented today, but I particularly erred in failing to thank Emily Klein and the rest of the members of the Chair Nominating Committee. I'm sorry, Emily isn't here anymore, but John Baillie, John Board, Cynthia Herrup and Jan Radway were on that committee also. They worked real hard coming up with two candidates and the two candidates are spectacular. I'm really very pleased and I wanted to thank that committee in particular for their hard work. Are there any other comments before we adjourn? I would like for anyone who received mail late to either e-mail me or come up and write your name up here and we'll see whether there's a pattern in it and I'll apologize for that. The final point, if anybody didn't get the FCC

summary of what they said on Tuesday, it's up here. Is there a motion we adjourn? OK, we are adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt,
Faculty Secretary