

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

March 23, 2000

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on March 23, 2000 from 3:50 to 5:10 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Robert **Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

MINUTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 17. They were **approved** by acclamation as submitted.

Prof. **Mosteller**: OK, two announcements today. First, this will be your last Council meeting, at least for a year or so. We will be seating a new Council as of the next meeting. I would like to thank sincerely all of the people who are finishing their term. I said this same basic form a number of times but I repeat it, because it's true, the fact that we have a Council and you come and you read and you pay attention and you ask good questions, makes everything else done by all of the committees count. Without this body that ultimately has the ability to say 'yea or nay' as to policy positions and those other activities would not have any weight. And so I thank you for your diligence in doing this work. For those of you who were up for election, the balloting closes today. We expect a committee will meet on Monday to finalize the results and so the results of the balloting should go out early next week.

I wanted to mention one problem that some of you may have heard about, and the reason I put my e-mail address on the 'Forward' was to solicit from you any reactions you had. I thought we wouldn't spend the time talking about it today [what] ECAC has talked about. The problem is that there is one division, Basic Sciences, and in that division there are different departments, one of which, Pathology, is substantially bigger, almost double all of the others. It turned out this past nominating period, as far as we can tell, the first time it's ever happened, nine out of the ten people who were nominated were from Pathology. If this would occur over and over, we would know we have a problem. But since it's occurred for one time [only], we're not sure whether it's something we ought to remedy. We thought about a change in the Bylaws that would deal with it. Only 16% of the people returned their nominating ballots, so we would

guess [there] would be a higher turnout of people nominating individuals. It worked out that when you came down to a certain level of balloting, and let me give just an arbitrary number of ten, everybody above ten was from Pathology. At ten, where the cutoff happened, there was starting to be a mixture, and at the number right below it, there were ten people from other departments, and so we were very close to having no problem at all, but as it was, we did have a problem. So ECAC has talked about it and we're not sure which way to go, and the election committee will think about it and give us some input, but I just wanted to let you know that we recognize this to be an issue and people [may] want to communicate to me about their view about whether this needs fixing. I think we're quite confident. If this were a repetitive process, it would need fixing. What we talked about was something along these lines. As to a division that has three or more subdivisions, one proposal would be no more than one half of the nominees can come from any one of those subdivisions. We could write something like that in. It complicates the counting process and also has the impact of some people with more votes will not get nominated and some people with fewer votes will. So, I just wanted to let you know we're thinking about it, we haven't come in our minds to a solution we're really sure about, but if anybody wants to give me input, I'll pass it along to Council, that's why my e-mail address is up.

We have three items that we will vote on today. They are items 3, 4 and 5. I just want to kind of preview the agenda. 3,4 and 5 [are] **Faculty Forum Editor** election, **Faculty Secretary** election, and Appendix M. We are at the second meeting on Appendix M, and so we will be voting on that minor proposed change. Number 6, the proposal to create a department of biostatistics and bioinformatics, is the first of the discussions, first of the two meetings on that issue, hence we will not vote until the April meeting. The Faculty Commons report here is for discussion and feedback, but not for formal vote. And then we will have a report from Janet Dickerson on the alcohol problem on campus and that will be a discussion item.

ELECTION OF FACULTY FORUM EDITOR AND FACULTY SECRETARY

The **Chair** now turned to the election of Faculty Forum Editor. He asked if nominations from the floor were to be closed. After receiving a motion and second to that effect, he asked for a motion to elect the nominee, Professor Lawrence **Evans** (Physics) to the post of Faculty Forum editor for a one year term. His election was **approved** unanimously by acclamation. The **Chair** congratulated the Editor elect who received a round of applause. He then reminded members

that in the past there had been discussions on extending this term [beyond] one year, but that Council had never done so. Victor Strandberg [the current editor] thought it would be a very good idea at some point. No one really wanted to force that issue at this point, assuming that Professor Evans would like to see how it was, but in the future it may be a good idea to extend the term, so that [the matter] doesn't have to be revisited each time.

The **Chair** turned to the second item, the Faculty Secretary election. There being no other nominee, he asked for closure on further nominations from the floor and proceeded with the re-election of the nominee, Tilo **Alt**. Professor Alt's election was **approved** unanimously by voice vote. The **Chair** congratulated the Secretary followed by a round of applause.

VOTE ON APPENDIX M

The **Chair** now turned to Appendix M. Before voting on the matter, he reviewed briefly the reason for and history of the proposed changes. The basic thrust of its revision is to deal with a set of cases where the conflict is very clear and where it's going to litigation. Basically, both sides in a [possible] tenure case have looked at it very hard, they think the issues are clear and there's not much room for mediation. It proposes to shorten the process in those situations by allowing a conversation between the ombudsman and the Faculty Hearing Committee, and if the decision is to short-circuit it, it moves to adjudication. This was in part based upon one of the things that Carl Anderson [the current ombudsman] had told ECAC about. There are many cases that he is confronted with in that posture in which there's really not much to do.

Since there was no further discussion concerning the issue, the **Chair** asked for a vote on the changes to Appendix M. The vote was unanimously **in favor** of the changes.

He then turned to item number 6, the proposal to create a Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics. He reminded the assembly to consult the various materials concerning the issue that had gone out with the agenda. He called on Professor Joseph Corless (Vice Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs in the Medical Center) to introduce the proposal.

Joseph **Corless**: Thanks Bob. Today the Medical School would like to propose the formation of the Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics. We have had extensive discussions over several years within the Medical Center concerning the proposal and its coordination with units on campus. I'd like to acknowledge two other colleagues here, Gordon Hammes, former Vice-chancellor of the School of

Medicine and Professor of Biochemistry, and Professor William Wilkinson from the Division of Biometry of Community and Family Medicine, which is the unit which will essentially transform into our new department as well as some additions. Both of these individuals have been essential in developing this proposal and I'd like to ask Bill Wilkinson to come forward and review the main points of the proposal with me. When we last made a proposal, he tripped on a step so no more [of that?] today.

William Wilkinson: Thank you, it's a real pleasure to be here today. In the way of background, Joe mentioned that the Medical Center has been giving consideration for this department for several years. To be perfectly honest about it, it probably goes back longer than that. Actually, 14 years ago next month. Here, before you, is the proposed creation of a Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics [sentence garbled], I think fairly soon after that was approved by this body and by the Board of Trustees, I started lobbying the Medical Center administration for the appropriate home for the department [?] in the Medical Center. It took about ten years to get their attention. And so, four years ago, in 1996, at a planning retreat of Medical Center chairs and administration, the concept of a department of Biostatistics and something was strongly endorsed. At that time, the faculty of my division came from all over the university. There were other folks in the Medical Center who had appointments in departments that weren't exactly appropriate. We were thinking something like 'Department of Quantitative Health Sciences' which, in fact, was what was recommended by an external review committee, Dr. Gordon Hammes convened in 1998. It turned out, while they strongly endorsed the creation of a new department, the content of that department looked very much like a small school of public health. When Ed Holmes arrived as Dean a year ago and appointed a task force to flesh out a proposal for a new department, that task force fairly quickly came to the conclusion that we did not want to have a small school of public health here at Duke, that there were other things that were more appropriate that we could do, and in the interim, in these last 15 years, it was 15 years ago that Biostatistics and Bioinformatics [were first suggested?]. So, we've very quickly realized that an opportunity that we had was to create a department that merged two disciplines. We looked around the country at what other folks were doing. We looked at the best schools of statistics and biostatistics, those folks who seem to be doing the most in bioinformatics. None of them seemed to be marrying the two together very closely, but it seemed to us that it was a natural thing to do, so that's what we proceeded to do. I might mention that one of the [reluctant?] members on this task force that was chaired by Gordon Hammes, Mike West from

ISDS, was a very influential [force?] [for?] me. I hope all of you have read the letter that Mike has written to Bob, it's very thoughtfully written and it makes the best case I've seen to date for this department.

Very quickly, though, let me run down a few of the essential features of this. Biostatistics is an established discipline with departmental type of status at most major medical centers, something that has been missing here at Duke. My faculty now number about twenty-three. I was involved in recruiting twenty-two of those people. I should say twenty-one besides myself, and another ten who have become involved. One of the problems that we will always face is attracting really good people and having an appropriate home. Community and Family Medicine has been good to us but when you tell people you are in the Department of Community and Family Medicine, the response is 'Why are you there?' We actually are there administratively. None of the efforts of any one of these three individuals is [responding?] to that department. So, clearly, there's a need for an appropriate home for Biostatistics. Bioinformatics, of course, has emerged as a new discipline. I think it's going to be very important in Duke's future. It's already clear with the efforts that have already taken place in terms of the Genomics Institute and some other things university-wide, that there needs to be an appropriate home in the Medical Center for those folks who are involved with that effort as well. The commonality that exists in the disciplines and the methodology issues between the two disciplines are extremely well [established?] which argues for their integration in a single department. The proposed department, then, will focus on marrying the two disciplines of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, and there will be some appointments in other disciplines such as Health Economics and Classical Epidemiology. It will be classified as a clinical department in the Medical Center, but it will have such strong basic medical science features that it will include some prescribed number of tenure track positions. The initial faculty will consist of the twenty-three faculty members that are currently in the Division of Biometry, and that division in the Department of Community and Family Medicine will cease to exist. There are two genetic epidemiologists; that includes two statistical geneticists that are affiliated with the Center for Human Genetics. Two of those people have appointments in Community and Family Medicine, two have appointments in the Department of Medicine. Those folks will be in the new department as well. Then there are two other people with appointments in Community and Family Medicine or in Medicine, a Health Economist and some Epidemiologists who may also be associated with the new department. And then there will be

four new appointments. The Medical Center has designated funds for four new appointments in Bioinformatics and, of course, one is for the chair who will either be a Biostatistician or a Bioinformatician, an expert in one of those areas with an appreciation for the other area.

Academic programs: initially the only degree program in the department will be the Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research which we currently offer. We are not asking at this time for approval of any new degrees. We will continue to offer the Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research. That program is now being video-conferenced through the National Institutes of Health, and we have over seventy degree candidates between here and the National Institutes' selection committee for clinical policy [?] and that has really taken hold since the NIH Director's Panel on Clinical Research strongly recommended the creation of didactic programs to do this. In fact, the Panel's recommendation to the Director is very similar to the wording in my proposal of ten, twelve years ago. Ph.D. programs we anticipate will be created at least primarily in conjunction with other academic units on campus. The first of these will probably be a Ph.D. in Biostatistics or Biomedical Statistics [together with] ISDS. Obviously, we can expect initially Ph.D. programs in Bioinformatics and [in other areas as a result of] collaborative efforts with other academic programs at Duke. Research programs: I think it's fairly obvious. We devote a substantial amount of time now to statistics and collaborative clinical research throughout the Medical Center. We'll continue doing that; eventually, we'll have substantially more effort devoted to methodological research which can only come [through?] the Medical Center, and obviously, in the area of Bioinformatics, we expect to engage in university-wide collaborations that fully take advantage of all the information that is coming out of the various genome efforts. I think with that I will stop. Do you have any comments or questions?

Gordon **Hammes**: I want to say a few things. The clinical departments really were an impetus for putting this department forward and Bill set out a retreat. After a lot of discussion there was surprising agreement among all the chairs that we needed something in the Medical Center that would deal with the burgeoning area of biostatistics and something about informatics; it wasn't clear what it would be at that time. I think we sharpened this thing, we had an external review committee come and tell us their thoughts on this matter and then just before I left office we had put together a proposal which we held onto until Ed Holmes got here. He immediately created another task force to deal with this. I think we've come up with a proposal that really

addresses the cutting edge of what's going on in this important area that is important not only for the medical areas but also for other areas. This department, of course, will concentrate on the medical areas and expect to be closely coordinated with ISDS and the Duke program that is going on with informatics in [?]. I think it has the overwhelming support of the Medical Center.

Bob **Mosteller**: Before we open to questions, I just wanted to note that [Prof.] Jim Berger [ISDS] who is mentioned in the letter from [Prof.] Mike West [ISDS], is here, if any questions are to be directed to ISDS. Jim, is there anything you wanted to say?

Prof. James **Berger**: I think Mike's [West] letter said it all, but I guess as a faculty member, I can just affirm that we're all just really excited about this. I think we would be excited if it were a department of Biostatistics, we'd be excited about the department of Bioinformatics, but this idea of combining the two is just wonderful. This semester, when we've been interviewing faculty members and graduate students in ISDS. We tell them about this development and they are really excited that they can come here and do ISDS and be associated with this [development?].

The **Chair** now opened the floor to questions, asking speakers to identify themselves for the record.

John **Board** (Engineering): The Biostatistics part makes complete sense to me, it has natural [constituents?] of what it's done years ago. I need some more convincing on the bioinformatics part. The term is extremely broad and poorly defined at this point, I think nationally, it's not clear if you were to create a Bioinformatics department without any constraint to what pieces you would put in it; but I think my expectation is that you can put a lot more pieces in a bioinformatics department that are going to be there on Day One here, but on a university level, we could have expected a proposal for a bioinformatics department to come out of any of three, four or five potential groups on campus. There are people in Computer Science who think they are doing bioinformatics, [in the] Economics Initiative and Engineering and, of course, ISDS and the Medical Center. I'm worried a bit about 'truth in advertising' to really have a bioinformatics department from Day One, or are we sort of claiming an Internet domain and reserving it for one group in advance before the other groups have really gotten their act together? How convincing is this that it's really going to bring in people in Computer Science and other parts of the university that also think they're doing bioinformatics but may have a slightly different definition of it?

Bill **Wilkinson**: Well, I do know, I can't answer your question fully, but I do know that Ed Holmes has talked to [your dean?], the chair of Computer Science, with the chair of Mathematics, for collaboration with those groups. We did have trouble [with] everything that we looked at [that] is going on in other universities; we found conflicting definitions of what bioinformatics was. Even at Stanford where there were sort of two proposals to put things together. They defined it in totally different ways. We have sort of loosely defined it as computational biology, including specifically genetic epidemiology and genetics. Those are the people who initially will be part of the department's genetics section[?]. What that part of the department is going to look like specifically is going to be to a great extent determined by the four people who Ed Holmes recruits as new people in this department.

Joseph **Corless**: I would just add that it's very clear that this unit would have very close ties with the Bioinformatics Center Jim Siedow is heading. The new Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics would bring together under a single administrative [umbrella?] individuals within the Medical Center who are now located in separate areas related to Genetics. There are other areas of bioinformatics developing, e.g. neuroinformatics, which will probably see a separate initiative. Bioinformatics is a very broad area, with many different definitions. The main focus has been on the understanding and manipulation of genome information. The Medical Center plans to expend about \$ 10 M for the new Department, and anticipates the hiring of four bioinformaticians (five if the Chair of the new Department is also in this discipline) . It may be that some cost sharing can be achieved in the area of computation, and Dr. Holmes has been in preliminary discussions with the Department of Computer Science to explore such possibilities.

Provost **Lange**: Let me just say a couple of things about this. First of all, I think the metaphor of the Web domain is probably less apt than the metaphor of the tent peg. This is going to be one of the pegs that goes into the tent that's going to cover a whole lot of different parts of the university in this area, so I think that what they are doing is really putting one peg in the ground related to their corner of the university, but it's going to get tied up to other corners of the university as this whole area develops. And on the second point you raised, we have two appointments right now that might happen (not will happen) , both of which find the fact that Duke is willing to put any of these pegs in the ground now to be an attraction for them coming in to another place in the university and thinking of themselves as someone to help pound another of these pegs into the

ground . . .

Gordon Hammes: I don't think we should be too nervous about this. The intent is really to create one group that's going to deal with Bioinformatics that is going to link with a lot of other groups on campus doing the same thing. This is true in so many areas of science and engineering, statistics for example. Statistics is represented in how many different places at the university? But I don't think anyone is nervous about having ISDS exist. And I think Biochemistry is another example. They all exist in multiple departments, but as far as the Medical Center is concerned, of course, this is going to have a medical focus. It's going to focus on genetic information, either in terms of DNA sequences or of genetic epidemiology. So I think we have a clear idea of the type of people we need, but I think the methodology that they use is going to cut across multiple departments and I sincerely hope that many departments [that] engage in this activity come forth. Certainly Biology, Engineering, ISDS would be appropriate places for people doing Bioinformatics, so I don't think one should [think] that this is an exclusive club. It's just part of the overall network that's available, and certainly is no sham or Web site. It costs more than a few dollars to set this up, creating the space and the appointments. There are at least four appointments in Bioinformatics and there may be a fifth, we'll have to see who we can get for the chair. It could be in Biostatistics, it could be in Bioinformatics, we're not going to be restrictive. I think this is just an exciting way to begin the game. I fully expect the game to develop.

Joanne **Wilson** (Medicine) asked for the reason why the new department will be a clinical department and the source of its funding.

Bill **Wilkinson**: Yes, it will be a clinical department in the sense that it distinguishes between clinical and basic science departments. One of the reasons for this initially is the fact that only the basic science departments are part of the Graduate School and offer degrees in the Graduate School. We're not doing that this year. Much of our effort will be in collaboration with the other clinical departments so, consequently, we don't offer a new degree[?]. We will have a lot of research traffic throughout the Medical Center and partly with Basic Science departments [?] as well. Most of the new funding that is coming in will be devoted to new things that are being added to this [budget?] for new appointments and the chair. 37 people on this list are currently with the clinical departments and will continue to be funded as they are now, which, for the most part, is by the Medical Center. My division for example with 23 faculty

members, at least 80% of their effort is on grants [. . . ?].

Prof. Gregory **Lawler** (Natural Sciences): I have been hearing things for a while, I find all of these things exciting, but I still don't know what Bioinformatics means, and it really worries me a little bit. I know what Biostatistics means and Bioinformatics could be very inclusive, meaning all uses of topics in computer science and mathematics and quantitative methods in medicine, or this proposal seems to be very much towards the genetic applications in mind. Is that what you mean by bioinformatics and why isn't a term like computational biology used?

Bill **Wilkinson**: More appropriate? [**Lawler**: "yes"]; Well, I think in some of the documents I have read, they have used the terms interchangeably but then in other places in those documents, they will include computational biology within bioinformatics, so I think it's really a question of choice of words. I personally like bioinformatics better than computational biology, even though that's clearer because to me it includes specifically a lot of the methodological things that I think are [not comparable?] to computational biology. I don't know, other people, Gordon [Hammes] may want to comment on the Task Force.

Gordon **Hammes**: I think Greg has brought up a good question. The Task Force spent a lot of time discussing this and we never could agree on a definition, so you'll find the definition lacking in that fashion, but it's not because we didn't think of trying to come up with one, and if you look nationally, there really isn't a clear one. We just felt that computational biology was not an accurate description of what we wanted to do and bioinformatics was better because the idea was the information of the biological information, such as epidemiology and kinetics, so it's fair question in. It does not have a national definition.

Bill **Wilkinson**: But I think to some extent it's going to be defined by some of the people who are close to it. I guess, as an analog, I might say that well, the Department of Statistics and Decision Sciences doesn't imply to me that that's the base of the department, but it is for the most part; and it is, because that's, for the most part, the people who are there. By the same token, I think that the bioinformatics component of this department is going to be defined by the people who are close to it.

Gordon **Hammes**: I think the Task Force felt that in the long run, bioinformatics would serve us better because that seems to be the arrow to the future. Whatever that is. We have a clear idea of the type of people we want to recruit.

Prof. Barbara **Shaw** (Natural Sciences): Could you be more specific as to what financial commitments are being made by the Medical School for this new department and what financial commitments are made by the Provost and Trinity College designating space, specific funds or faculty positions that the Medical School and Provost are committing?

The Provost interjects 'no' and the speaker adds "just the Medical School."

Bill **Wilkinson**: As I indicated earlier, most of the commitments being made by the Medical School are for the things that are yet to happen, not for the things that have already happened. With one exception, there is some support, a small amount of support for tenure track faculty, even those that are currently here, but most of this ten million dollars is for new faculty, for the chair, and for computing.

Barbara **Shaw**: I did hear that you share expenses with the Computer Science Department for contributing, did I not?

Joseph **Corless**: It's one of the areas that's being explored, but we don't know yet to what extent that is a viable possibility [?]. The range for estimates of the cost of the computing hardware [is quite variable?], so we're hoping for [considerably less than the total of \$ 10 M] to [generate] some savings there. I think we're capable of [putting together an accurate estimate that is asked of us].

Provost **Lange**: The other side of that is with their shared equipment, because, according to Berndt Mueller, I [forsee] no problems with shared costs.

Dean Lew **Siegel** (Graduate School) : You proposed to set aside four lines for 'track 3' type faculty, tenure track faculty, and those will go through the normal basic science process, I presume, to hire by the normal standard process. What is the tenure commitment to this 'track 3' faculty just to have us understand? Is it like our normal commitment to the Basic Science Department?

Joseph **Corless**: The intention is that it is a clinical department and we will have the same commitment to 'track 1, 2, and 3' faculty from this department as we do to other ones, which is not very large. \$20,000 for Associate Professor and \$30,000 for [full].

Prof. Edward **Shaughnessy** (Engineering) : I wonder if someone can tell me exactly what APC was trying to tell us in the third and last part of their resolution. APC encourages the

proposal to assure that the Dean of the Medical School provides financial resources, so the faculty and the student body can apply for partial and temporary salary support, thereby enabling a greater focus on engaged research. Is that hinting at the fact that the faculty in this department is really responsible in essence for their own support through a great deal of research that maybe doesn't have the kind of groundbreaking base, but is more applied? If that's what APC is hinting at, I just wondered what assurances have been reached on this.

Gordon Hammes: I think your interpretation is correct. It's probably what they meant. I think you should have an understanding of what all tenure track research faculty in clinical departments are like. Typically, they are set up like any basic science person and their salaries are covered, actually guaranteed typically for a three year period. After that, they are expected to obtain a substantial amount of their salary from grants, and that's pretty much the way it is with this kind of work. I put aside some money so that we can buy some time for people to do some basic research, and I expect there will be a pot of money that these people will compete for, where their salary will be covered by this. So this is pretty straight forward and it's the way research is done in clinical departments, and as you know, much of that research is very basic, indistinguishable from the basic sciences.

Peter **Lange**: I would just say that actually Gordon's use of his funds with respect to this is well cited and is accurate in that sentence of the resolution and Gordon describes it as really nothing but the fact that APC was referring to that.

Gordon **Hammes**: I certainly would hope that would continue because, I really think that was necessary and why we did it to begin with, because there's so much important clinical collaborative research – I don't know if I'd call it applied research, it's collaborative research and probably not devoted to methodology– that there has to be a mechanism to set aside some time for people to work on methodology and there certainly is the intention to add such programs.

Peter **Lange**: That's exactly what APC is saying.

The **Chair** thanked the presenters and said that the issue will be revisited at the next meeting, April 27th. He then called on Prof. Michael Munger, Chair, Faculty Commons Committee, to come forward to report on proposed changes in the commons and that part of West Union Building. ECAC started with the proposition that the Faculty Commons was

not close to what it could or should be. While we think changing the tablecloths would be a good idea, we thought something far more than that was an appropriate level of analysis, and we put together what I think is a really excellent committee. Mike chairing it, Emily Klein, Roger Barr, Dick Stubbing. Michael presents the committee report today and what we were thinking about in ECAC is that we want feedback. We want to move to another level, there's somewhat more information to gather, you can find it in different ways, and there needs to be a committee of another form that comes together that starts giving these concrete proposals, and so Mike is here today to discuss the thinking of his committee and to get feedback.

Mike **Munger**: [pointing to the floor plan of the second floor of West Union on the overhead projector] One of the reasons to do this is not as many of you may know the location of the Commons. Let me say this is the second floor of West Union to orient you, this out here is the Chapel, this corner looks out over the quad, here is the Commons, there's a long lounge here. The Taylor-Cole meeting room is here and this is the Oak Room, so you can get some idea of what the space looks like. There's quite a lot of potentially usable space right here. It's above a roof, but it can be fairly easily closed. There's a mechanical room here which needs a lot of things that fairly easily can be put on the roof, I mean it's not my money. Ongoing through a tour of this, I was astonished at the amount of space because a lot of it feels very small, although the Faculty Commons space feels fairly open, because there's usually quite a few empty tables in it.

Let me go through first the executive summary of our report and then I'm going to talk very quickly about a lot of the problems and it is for your feedback that this session has been scheduled, so there's no reason for me to talk. First, there's really only two action items that this report is making and they are fairly simple. First, a survey should be conducted of departments and other units that might use dining and meeting facilities. It seems to us that the meeting facilities especially are not organized in a way that's very useful. The space is just not set up in a way that it's easy to use and the dining facilities also need some significant work. The goal would be to obtain information about the form of the renovation that will be most useful. That is we're taking it for granted that some form of renovation is going to be required. The question is not how much do you use it now, 'why not?', it really doesn't matter. The question is what sort of meeting facility and what sort of dining facilities would be most useful to you. Second, the working group comprised of university personnel with specific expertise in dining

services, convention services, finance and physical plan should work on that with faculty representation also. In spite of making those recommendations, we did feel like having thought about this a lot, you'd like to see some starting recommendations with the recognition that we will have no control over what happens once it starts. Those two recommendations are that the existing Commons should be closed, that space, in addition to the lounge, and the Taylor-Cole Room should be converted to meeting and auditorium space. The space should be elegant and attractive and have technical capabilities that would make it useful. The faculty should be guaranteed free use of those facilities at all times with an easy to use and reliable reservation system. Right now it's possible but it's not that easy. It should be available either on the phone or online. And other uses, private parties, receptions, whatever are possible, but only if faculty have gotten first priority. So in some ways the model that we're thinking of is something like the Searle Center. That is used quite a bit for private parties and receptions, it's a good way for covering the costs of the renovation and to be able to cover the cost of providing food services, but a lot of those would be at times when the faculty wouldn't be using it anyways, so it's a nice way of cutting those costs. Second, the existing Oak Room and the kitchen should be extensively remodeled. Our recommendation is that it should take advantage of what now is basically unused space. There is a large lobby hallway, enormous restrooms. The function of the Oak Room should be divided into two parts, the new Oak Room [and] there should be a new Faculty Commons with reserved seating space.

Let me just set out briefly what it seems like some of the current problems are and then I'll be quiet. This isn't very big, but you've got it in your report. This is the bottom of the first page of the report. There are four main problems, as we saw it. First is that gross revenues have fallen about ten percent over the past 5 years. Second, food and labor costs have risen about 9% over the same period. The facilities are operating at quite a significant loss, even if you don't include the opportunity cost of the space, and the space itself is really valuable, some of the most valuable space on all of West Campus, right in the center of West Campus and it's used for next to nothing. Third, the facility itself regardless of that is badly in need or renovation. The Taylor-Cole Room basically doesn't have any HVAC, it's unusable for a significant part of the year, although [core?] Economics does usually try and use it in spite of that, the sweat, the way in there. The significant parts of the kitchen on that floor have no electricity. There's one whole wall, and it's so important for cooking to have electricity. Then last, as I said, the

space is not being used with anything like an intensity that reflects its opportunity cost. In the report we talk a bit about the Hollingsworth Report and some of the conclusions it draws from what really you might think of being a pattern of interaction among faculty from diverse backgrounds that are intense and frequent that tend, according to the Hollingsworth Report, to characterize universities for significant advances in that. For their report, that was the biomedical sciences. I'm not sure about the extent to which we can say there is a causal relationship between having those kinds of facilities and having significant research advantages. I offer that for what it's worth, but the two main points then to be made are that there are some reasons to believe that it's not going to hurt that the way to get significant interactions among the faculty is just to have a horrible dining facility. Probably it would make some sense that if the environment is conducive to discussion, if we are likely to use it, we're likely to bring guests, we're not going to take guests out, we can say 'Look, we can go right there, it's something that we're kind of proud of, and there's meeting spaces that are available that we know are going to be useful for meetings, that they're going to provide a good space for meetings we can reserve far enough in advance to be sure that they are going to be available, that this space will be very, very intensively used, we'll all be better off as a result. The university offers not inconsiderable subsidies, they are not enormous, but they are not an inconsiderable subsidy for this space, and at present, as far as I can tell, just from an informal survey, generally, we get something like 50-70 people using it a day drawn from a pool of something like 150 total. That's a relatively small group of the faculty. I eat there two or three times a week, so I'm one of them, thank you very much. The claim is that it may not be the best use of the **explicit** subsidies, and we firmly believe that it's not the best use of the **implicit** subsidy for the use of this space for something other than [full recovery?] of its opportunity cost.

Prof. Eric **Meyers** (Humanities): I was wondering, Mike, [about] the intent of sort of merging or putting the Oak Room and the Faculty Commons adjacent to one another— whether this is to encourage student-faculty interaction or just to broaden the square footage?

Mike **Munger**: Alright, I guess the reason for my perspective is that I think what is now the Commons would be used a lot more as an auditorium space. There's quite a bit of space in the Oak Room in that adjacent room. I don't know if the right way to do it is to have everything in one room or completely separate. There's plenty of space up there for both. The reason to have what is now the Commons be an

auditorium is that is what it was, it was a ballroom. Underneath it is a really first quality hardwood floor. They have beautiful chandeliers that go in those spaces. I think it would be very easy and cheap to set it back up as an auditorium space that I think would be very heavily used. The question of where the new Commons should be: I think, in the Report we say there needs to be a reserved space for a faculty commons. I'm not sure precisely what it should be. But it should not be in what is now the Faculty Commons, because it's just perfect for an auditorium. That's how it was designed and that's how it should function.

Eric **Meyers**: You mean like a ballroom—

Mike **Munger**: It is a ballroom.

Eric **Meyers**: Ballroom, not a lecture room.

Mike **Munger**: In hotels, the advantage of having meeting space like that is that it could be used for anything. It is possible that it could be used for dances. It would probably be used on the weekends for receptions. You could have a wedding in the Chapel and go there, and this is a way for us to recover the cost.

Randy **Kramer** (ECAC) : Mike, I want to commend your committee for all the hard work and the creative solution to improve eating space for faculty and this possible new meeting space for all kinds of meetings. I realize that this wasn't part of your charge, but do you have a sense of what the renovation costs [will amount to]?

Mike **Munger**: I know that Jim Wulforst has prepared some figures for parts of the renovations, that was from two years ago and I'm reluctant to quote him on it. [It was] less than I had expected. Several hundred thousand dollars would be a good start, but the point is I don't know, we've gone way past our charge here about the Faculty Commons. When I went on the tour and looked at what was required for the kitchen and the fact that fairly often they'll have circuit breakers go if someone downstairs turns on a coffee maker. It's hard to know just what parts of this we should attribute. So if you think I'm ducking your question, it's absolutely true, but a few hundred thousand dollars would completely accomplish the renovations that I'm talking about for the ballroom part, at least to make that back and the Taylor-Cole Room. The question is what is going to be done for HVAC, to remake the kitchen and enclosing the space that could be a great deal more.

Greg **Lawler**: When the Faculty Commons was first created, I don't know, about 15 years ago, I don't know exactly when it

was, eating options on West Campus were significantly worse than they are now. One of the reasons for the decline, I think, - is just basically that the options are much better. I'm wondering, has your committee looked at how many faculty really want a regular place, as opposed to a nice place, to take someone occasionally, but how many people need a regular place?

Mike **Munger**: There was some sentiment that we don't need a regular place at all, that a nice place was possible and food services on campus had been in that sense a victim of its own success, there really has been a tremendous increase in the quality and number of food service facilities. And it seems as if younger faculty especially just might not prefer the setting and cuisine and anything like the current system which I actually rather like, but this is why we think we need to start with a survey. Basically, you look at the two action items, we're committing to nothing. We want to know what would people do and the answer is that they wouldn't use it, we don't need a Commons, and if the answer is this is how the meeting space should work, then that's how it should be configured. The very first thing to do is to start out. I don't know the answer to your question. The first thing that we would want to do is to find out the answer to your question.

Prof. James **Rolleston** (Humanities): I'm wondering about the very fact that this is such a central place, and doesn't it raise a question or two about the desirability of renting out for parties, dances, such a very central spot. Wouldn't it be a slightly perverse irony if after all the grumbling about the noise on West Campus that we heard from students seriously doing their homework at 1 am complaining about elegant [dances?].

Mike **Munger**: It would be a delicious irony.

Anne Marie **Rasmussen** (Humanities): I'd like to concur with Greg's point about eating options having been increased, although it's not so long and far away that all of us can remember waiting in line to eat at the Faculty Commons. I'd like to point out that what most faculty really want, as Greg said, is just a good meal and that the quality of the food in the Faculty Commons has declined precipitously in the last five years, it could be that we haven't fully had a test case yet in which the food in the Faculty Commons is of the same quality of, say, the food choices in the Great Hall now, and therefore the test case of whether or not faculty will choose to come and have a place to congregate or to meet faculty from other departments informally, that those conditions have not yet fully been met.

Mike **Munger**: Not even close, really, so that there has been no relative decline and absolute decline in quality, because better alternatives and this facility itself have gone downhill. I am agnostic about that. It seems to me quite likely that if we designed the facility correctly it would be intensely used. But I don't know that, it's a very good question.

Prof. Russell **Richey** (Divinity): I've heard of the ballroom, it's really quite elegant and I think that's a wonderful plan, but given the other plans we've heard this year, it would be nice to put a chopper pad on the top, so people could actually get to the quad and get there.

The **Chair**: Other comments? Does Peter or Tallman want to weigh in on anything? I think that there are, at least when we talked about it, there are lots of different ideas floating around with different people and it seemed to me that one of things we wanted to do was to bring these ideas forward, get some response, and then we have to move forward. And the moving forward isn't really clear. We've got to operationalize these ideas, we've got to figure out how the money and various other things come together, and at least my view about it is that we will be coming back to you before we move forward with anything concrete, and so what we wanted to do is to get some feedback at this point about what people's reactions to the general ideas [are], so I wanted to make sure we had heard from everybody who wanted to comment.

Mike **Munger**: My e-mail is on the report, feel free to contact me or Bob if you figure something out.

Bob **Mosteller**: And I really would like to thank Mike and his committee for working very hard. They put in a lot of effort.

Mike **Munger**: We ate a lot of food.

Bob Mosteller: Thank you. Let me call Janet Dickerson forward at this point. Janet is going to talk to us about response to alcohol problems and I know a number of you have seen the items in the news, and we thought on the [Executive Committee] of the Academic Council to ask Janet [to talk to us] [because] it was a serious problem and it ought to be addressed in some way by the faculty.

Vice President Janet **Dickerson**: Maybe in my next life at Duke I would be on the committees that talk about Faculty Commons and ballroom dancing. Now, that conversation has relevance for what I'm going to say here about the student culture. But I made some prepared remarks which I will go

through very quickly and hopefully there will be time for some questions. We do have several members of our committee present to respond to anything you might want to ask. I would start by saying thank you for allowing us to speak today about an issue that as I understand hasn't been discussed in this august academic setting. As I did at the February Trustees Student Affairs Committee meeting, my remarks are intended to be forthright, my own opinion, for the most part, but they reflect the concern that I and my colleagues in Student Affairs and some others have about heavy binge drinking, which is a very compelling public health concern both here and nationwide. Until now in our planning and discussions about campus life, we have mostly been involved in adjusting the physical architecture of the community. Now, we are attempting to attend to a more social and psychological architecture of residential living. Our life in this Gothic Wonderland in some ways has made us overconfident, because we know that most things that can happen here end up turning out well. The most recent Harvard School of Public Health longitudinal alcohol study, a copy of which (the press release) you received in advance, indicates that more than one in four students are engaging in heavy drinking on campuses, and more students, nearly one in five, are reporting abstention from any drinking activities. So what we recognize, Henry Wechsler has referred to this [as] abstainers' discomfort with "secondary effects" of binge drinking. As we are seeing more diversity in the lifestyles of students, universities are also feeling greater tensions between those students whose excessive behavior has had a deleterious impact on the life and environments of the others, the abstainers. You also, I believe, received a copy of a March 9th letter to parents, so I won't repeat all that I say there, especially about the complicating effects of drugs and other things, but you've heard and understand, I believe, the nature, extent, and consequences of our students' abusive use of alcohol and other drugs, and I should say **some** of our students, because many of our students don't drink at all. We're receiving a tremendous response from parents, and parental advice ranges from 'just ban all alcohol products from being sold on campus or being consumed in any dorm or residence hall,' to reminding us of our legal obligations to set standards and limits and to police and enforce them, to confessing that their own students are very heavy drinkers and expressing their fears and concerns about their safety, to encouraging us to continue our efforts to look at the underlying causes of these behaviors. Most of the letters and e-mails and faxes and phone calls have been very constructive and have not been too dualistic or prescriptive in their recommendations.

So, with the endorsement and encouragement of the senior

administration and the Trustees, we've established a task force that's intended to take a comprehensive approach to alcohol problem prevention. We don't intend to talk about taking away drinking or closing down all the alcohol products that are distributed or sold on campus, but we do want to talk about problem prevention. There is much national information and wisdom in this area, and actually, a Duke alumnus, Dr. David Anderson of George Mason University, has been a leader in suggesting a multiconstituent, multifaceted approach, so our task force will focus initially on three key areas, cultural assessment, education and prevention, and treatment. We have faculty, students, administrators, health professionals, alumni, representatives from the police, athletics and other stake holding groups who are participating in this conversation, and several members are here today. We've begun our discussion with a conversation about our vision for campus culture, which would not be so reliant on alcohol. We know that we need to move beyond just talking about enforcement and regulation. That we have to help our students define the culture themselves and to buy into any ideas if these ideas are going to take, will be sustainable. We also know that any of the strategies that we are thinking about will take time to change. We know that we're going to need more space or opportunities for students to do things other than go to parties where alcohol is a feature. Our plan right now is to have these subcommittees working simultaneously, each identifying a few short-term pilot strategies as well as longer term interventions and cultural changes. We intend to make a progress report to the trustees at our May meeting and can provide that report for you as well. At the Student Affairs Committee meeting, I called mostly for an institutional will to change. For the faculty, we know that this may mean rethinking the academic schedule and providing more Friday classes, or seeking to find additional ways to infuse more alcohol education into the curriculum as Scott Swartswelder and other faculty have done with their course; to working with us to strengthen orientation activities for first year students; to supporting our efforts to give consistent messages. It may also mean that we need to do even more to model behavior to help our students learn something about moderation and decorum in their behavior. When challenged, Duke has stepped up and demonstrated its will to lead, as we did recently with the ADA disability issues. I believe that if we make significant efforts here, Duke can become a national model for leadership in dealing with issues of alcohol abuse. No one knows the answers. I did say to the trustees in response to comments that we have missed a teachable moment following the death of Raheem Bath, that teaching is not something that happens in only one moment, that learning is a continuous process, and in this case, I

think, we may need to be informed by and learn from our students who have much to tell us about the pressures of youth culture and their reasons for needing to drink to escape so many of those pressures that they feel. I wanted to conclude by just reading a couple of lines from a letter that Rainer Maria Rilke wrote to a young poet from his book of the same name. He wrote

Have patience with everything unresolved in your heart and try to love the questions themselves as if they were locked rooms or books written in a very foreign language. Don't search for the answers, which could not be given to you now because you would not be able to live them. And the point is to live everything. Live the questions now. Perhaps then, someday far in the future, you will gradually without even noticing it, live your way into the answer.

While we are not young poets, I think the question of what we need to do, what we can do about alcohol or substance abuse on campuses is a societal problem, these questions are not easy. There are no magic bullets. There is no Neosporin solution. This is something that's going to require more attention, more effort, no easy quick fixes. We can't just deal with symptoms and in some ways, the alcohol issue at Duke is a symptom of something much greater, much deeper, as one of the members of the Trustee committee pointed out, is connected to sexuality and a variety of other things. So I hope that as we move forward with our working with you, we can ask the right questions, we can engage in a real cultural analysis of this Wonderland that we live in, and that we can live our own way into the answers.

Greg **Lawler**: Just a question, in terms of general amount of drinking on campus, I don't think there's been an increase in that, but has there really been an increase in excessive binge drinking?

Janet **Dickerson**: Janine Atkinson is here and probably could speak even more directly to this than I can. She's our substance abuse specialist on campus.

Janine **Atkinson**: Please excuse my voice, but it's always interesting when the question is brought up about 'has binge drinking really increased on campus' because even myself, I do this day in and day out who come to see me with binge drinking issues, my perception is skewed, because what I'm seeing are people with alcohol and other problems. If you look at the ER admissions for alcohol overdose and alcohol related accidents, there seems to have been a rise over the last two years, but what I try and point out is that in the

last two years, we've started including numbers of students who were released. They were evaluated by the Duke EMS services and were actually released. Two years ago, I didn't know that that was happening, and so when I heard about that, I said wait a minute, I need to see this figure too. We need to process what factors came together that night that led to these people to be evaluated by EMS and then released. So if you notice the numbers in the Chronicle about a month ago now, the last two years those numbers have gone up rapidly, rather high, the last year was fifty-two, I believe. That looks really bad. We also have been doing a core survey which comes out of the [Clinical?] Institute of the University of Southern Illinois. Every two years we are doing this survey, and the national average of this survey is 41% of college students binge drink. That is 5 standard drinks or more on one occasion in the last 2 weeks. Our data from 98 said we were right on the average, I was going to say we were right on the target. We were right on the average of 41%. Back in 96, we were 45%, so even though 4 percentage points is not a significant decrease, at least in the survey, it's at least showing we're going in the right direction. Some of the other negative consequences from drinking too much, from binge drinking, have also been showed to decrease, but again it's not significant. We plan to do a core survey again this fall and I think that will be very helpful in comparing '96 and '98 to 2000. There are times when the national media starts covering this area and we know that we never [?], it's a horrifying experience to think that that could have been prevented; it was just a senseless death, and so, even though data is important, I do value the individual student that has a drinking problem. We need to do more to help them by looking at the factors in our environment and culture that need to be changed to help reduce their need to get drunk on Thursday.

Janet **Dicker son**: I would just say too, thanks Janine, with Duke EMT which is a student volunteer group, there's much more immediate response. And students trust the EMT's, and they are getting more calls and we're collecting better data. Jim, do you have any response to that?

Dr. Jim **Clack** (Counseling Services): [We are] describing alcohol as a sexual lubricant, a social lubricant. Every incidence of date rape and assault we've had on campus over the past five years, at least, has always had an alcohol connection. 89% of all vandalism on campus is alcohol related. The story just kind of goes on and on. One of the things that is noted in the first year experience is that the students come from all over the country, they may come from 2000 miles away and the first thing they want to do is to make friends. Self-esteem is a very important thing, you

want to be a part of the place. Unfortunately, one of the first avenues, and perhaps the easiest avenues for Duke to make friends and to become part of Duke is via alcohol. And it seems like initiation into alcohol rituals is early on and quite frequent. I think that in many ways, we've been fortunate to only have one alcohol related death of a Duke student in recent times. I came here from the University of Virginia, and the last year I was there, we had four that particular year. They have now taken measures where parents are notified when alcohol abuse occurs and so forth. You're getting all different kinds of reactions all over the country. But I agree with Janet that there is no quick fix, it's a cultural phenomenon that has been there for a long time, it's going to be very difficult to deal with. I've read the letters that have come into Janet from parents, and they go all the way from stop drinking immediately, it's against the law, put your foot down, to 'that isn't the way that Duke is, I remember the good old days when kegs were everywhere and you could drink on both campuses' and so forth. There isn't clear support.

Janet **Dickerson**: I know that we're out of time. Scott and others are helping us work with students to have them understand the scientific consequences or the biological consequences of heavy drinking or mixing drugs and alcohol, and I think that's the kind of information that many students really need to know so that they aren't taking any undue risks.

Prof. Rhett **George** (Engineering): I'd just like to find out from the students if they weren't drinking, what would they be doing? I don't know if you asked that question.

Janet Dickerson: Sure. And you know I informed students about this meeting but I think they are in class so they're not here, but here's a student.

Michelle **Klosterman**: What else is there to do on campus besides drinking? I mean, there's all sorts of opportunities. There are bands that come on [campus?], a friend of mine did Freewater films, she got really involved with communities on campus. There are all sorts of plays going on, there are sports clubs which [meet?] on weekends. There's been a big push [by many?] undergraduates who have asked for the gym to be opened late at night, so we could go play sports on weekend nights instead of having it close at 10 pm so that we have to go to frat parties or something like that, but I think there is a lot of social programming.

Prof. Joanne **Wilson** (Medicine): I think [there is] one additional way to look at it. I mean, I have two children who are students at the undergraduate level, one is a

freshman at Duke and the other is a junior at Carolina, and because of my interaction with them, I have some knowledge about college students. The concept for a lot of the students is that in order to have a good time at a party you have to drink. And that's one of the really big problems that a lot of students have. A lot of the kids have that same concept starting way back when they are in high school. Both of my kids talk about students coming to college. This isn't the first time they've been drinking and that's the bottom line, that many of those students who come here have already been binge drinking and the statistics will support that. And so that's one of the problems that one of the parents, I think, said. You know, I knew this was a problem, but I just didn't want to face it, I didn't know what to do. So I think that one of the things maybe if we're sending out information to students coming in that we talk about that before they get here because the same problems that they had in high school are going to escalate [when they are coming here]. There are so many things to do in this area, it's just fantastic, and all those students find that don't drink and you have to remember that the response that Duke got to the substance free dorm was incredible. My son wanted to be in the dorm but he didn't get in that there were a lot of kids that wanted to be in places where people had vowed that they would not be abusing substances. So I [heard] there's 25% of the students in the incoming freshman class who requested it; it was way more than could be accommodated. So, I think that it's a continuum from high school.

Eric Meyers: I wanted to say that one of my most delightful recollections of when I first came to Duke years ago, some of the old timers will remember this, we used to have these wonderful cocktail receptions in fraternities and in living areas on weekends, on Friday afternoon. They provided babysitters for us and we wore nametags, everyone wore coat and tie, and there was no binge drinking, it was a very adult and very lovely and the faculty were delighted to go and every place on campus did that. So I think there is a tradition of responsible drinking on campus and we had some nice years there, I don't know why.

Janet Dicker son: I'd love to see that ballroom used for faculty student interactions, swing dancing, and all that is really very popular at the same time.

Prof. Kenneth Knoerr: I'm of the personal impression that the raising of the age of acceptable drinking has sort of pushed it to a problem. I grew up in a state, Wisconsin, where you could drink beer at 16. The Student Union at Wisconsin has a Rathskeller which it still does and I grew up social drinking starting from age 16 with a meal. By

basically postponing it to much later after the time you get drafted for military service but you still can't get a glass of beer legally, I think that's just part of the problem.

Janet **Dicker son**: We agree with that. I recognize that we are probably in the right moment here to lobby to change the national laws and the national drinking age, so while that could be a very interesting strategy at some future time, I think we have to deal with the campus.

Prof. Susan **Denman-Vitale** (Nursing): I've worked in college health and students in the dorms they will [come with problems with their friends who usually were very scared and were not sure how to handle the situation that's out of control, and the ones that we found that sort of stumbled in on their own. Maybe we can look at how students on campus can take a more active role and have a little more background about how to help their friends and proceed a little more appropriately. They just haven't a better idea of what to do. Terrible things happen that can end in death with binge drinking. I think it's time to [pursue this].

Prof. Peter **Burian** (Humanities): I'd just like to add that I think we need to understand and perhaps the information is already pretty well there for us to know to what degree we have a problem in a solitary world and solitary drinking in the dorm rooms, to what degree where social situations can seem to encourage binge drinking. I understand that there have been social engagements where multiple people were brought in to Emergency Rooms, but I have no idea to what extent we know that break-down; it seems as though we have missed a piece of our understanding of the problem, and different kinds of actions would be suggested for different situations of this kind. Certainly, I think a lot of faculty will feel that social life at Duke that encourages binge drinking by multiple individuals has to be brought under control.

Bob **Mosteller**: Well, Janet I would like to thank you and thanks for coming to talk to us about it and we appreciate it. Is there any further business? We stand adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt Faculty
Secretary