

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

May 10, 2001

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session from 3:45 -4:45 p.m. on Thursday, May 10, 2001 in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Humanities) presiding.

The **Chair** welcomed members to the final meeting of the academic year. He thought it had been an extraordinary year, a year to remember. 2000-2001 had seen the expansion of the Campaign for Duke to an unprecedented two billion dollars and brought a number of extraordinary gifts that would support major initiatives in research, teaching, and learning, such as the Fitzgerald Center for Advanced Photonics and Communications Systems. The women's basketball team had reached the Sweet Sixteen, the men's team won a national championship (in case members hadn't heard) and Duke students had won a national championship in mathematics. Duke had adopted an ambitious and exciting University-wide strategic plan, witnessed the opening of the John Hope Franklin Center and, most recently, celebrated the appointment of three of its distinguished faculty colleagues to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Since two of them actually happened to be in attendance (John Aldrich and Bill Chafe), he offered them his congratulations followed by a round of applause. The third honoree was Ariel Dorfman.

MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

He then turned to the approval of the Minutes of March 22. He reminded members that the May meeting followed quite closely on the heels of the April meeting, so it hadn't been possible to distribute the April minutes for approval as well. They would be submitted for approval in September, but they would be available for reading in the Faculty Forum which was distributed with the Duke Dialogue. He then asked for a vote of approval of the Minutes of March 22. They were **approved** by acclamation as submitted.

Professor **Burian** said he only had a couple of announcements. The October meeting of the Council, originally scheduled for the 18th

had been moved to October 25th in order to align its date with that of the annual meeting of the faculty. Members would be receiving an updated Council calendar, and the correct date would appear on its web site.

Secondly, William King, whom he thought was known to many of the membership, had announced his plans to retire. Bill was Duke's founding archivist and had served with great distinction in that capacity for many years, so replacing him would not be an easy task. He was announcing the formation of a search committee. President Keohane had asked Vice-Provost Judith Ruderman to serve as chair, and she had agreed. Faculty appointments, however, were not complete at this time. Anyone with comments or suggestions concerning the Archives and the Archivist position should contact Dr. Ruderman.

EARNED DEGREES Diplomas
dated May 13. 2001

Trinity College of Arts and Science Dean		
Robert Thompson, Jr.		
Bachelor of Arts		816
Bachelor of Science		441
Pratt School of Engineering		
Dean Kristina M. Johnson		
Bachelor of science in Engineering		180
Master of Engineering Management		14
School of Nursing		
Dean Mary T. Champagne		
Master of Science in Nursing		46
Nicholas School of the Environment		
Dean Norman L. Christensen, Jr.		
Master of Environmental Management		93
Master of Forestry		2
Fuqua School of Business		
Dean Rex D. Adams		
Master of Business Administration		331
Divinity School		
Dean L. Gregory Jones		
Master in Church Ministries		3
Master of Theological Studies		14
Master of Divinity		93
Master of Theology		15
School of Law		

Dean Katharine T. Bartlett	
Juris Doctor	200
Master of Laws	71
School of Medicine	
Executive Dean Ralph Snyderman	
Master of Health Sciences	63
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	12
Doctor of Medicine	82
The Graduate School	
Dean Lewis M. Siegel	
Master of Public Policy	19
Master of Arts in Teaching	1
Master of Science	28
Master of Arts	77
Doctor of Philosophy	116
TOTAL	2717

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

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

REELECTION OF THE FACULTY SECRETARY

The **Chair** now turned to the next item on the agenda, namely the annual election of the Faculty Secretary whose primary responsibility was to provide the minutes of the Council meetings. The Secretary was also a member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. Professor Tilo Alt who had served faithfully for three years had kindly agreed to be a candidate to succeed himself for one more year. In the absence of any nominations from the floor, he asked Council to ratify the reelection of Arthur Tilo **Alt** as Faculty Secretary for the coming academic year. The motion having been made and seconded **passed** unanimously by voice vote followed by applause.

A.P.C REPORT

Next, Professor **Burian** introduced Professor John Simon, current and ongoing chair of the Academic Priorities Committee to report on the activities and functions of that committee at the present time.

Professor John **Simon** began by referring the audience to the exhibit included in the agenda for the day's meeting. The membership of APC included faculty from all the professional schools at Duke (Medicine, Law, Business, Engineering, Environment) and the different intellectual divisions of A&S (Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences). The "Provost's Office" comprised a group of ex officio members, and Peter Burian, as Chair of the Academic Council, also served in an ex officio capacity. The members of APC were appointed by the Provost in consultation with ECAC. Having served on the committee for three years, he was personally impressed by how much the members of APC cared about the University, and the time they were willing to devote to University service. (Although they could work more efficiently if they had crumb cake back on the APC breakfast menu.) Meetings were also attended by the Dean or Deans that had a stake in the issue being discussed. The agenda of the meeting was generally set by the Provost, but he had found Provost Lange to be receptive to input from the committee as far as agenda items were concerned. The purpose of the committee was quite simple: as a faculty body, their mission was to advise the Provost on academic programs. He thought that if one were to ask the committee members what the purpose of APC was, the response would be that they were there to keep the Provost honest. The underlying theme of their work was a hope that they were contributing to make Duke a better place. Among the issues they were dealing with, were undergraduate and graduate education, the details and infrastructure associated with faculty, department and school development, the establishment of new intellectual programs, and long-range strategic planning. Their charge was really to advise the Provost on intellectual development at Duke.

One of their more important tasks was to consider external reviews of departments and programs. He thought it would be insightful to hear what their purpose was in this particular area. In general, two representatives of APC were designated as committee representatives to an external review of a department or program. These members met with administration of the graduate school, examined the self-study documents that the department prepared for the external committee. They then meet with the review team during their visit to discuss various issues. Once the external report and departmental response were filed with the administration, those documents also came to APC and their representatives prepared written materials for the committee that helped shape their discussions. As an entire committee, they then met with the department chairs and the appropriate deans to discuss the major issues that they had identified from these documents in their discussions. This would ultimately result in a written resolution to the Provost which contained their advice on the development of that department. Their resolutions could and had addressed curricular issues, faculty development plans, space and infrastructure support, and leadership issues within the academic enterprise. Their efforts in this area were one piece of this

program review that ultimately led to the allocation of resources and the shaping of the academic community. He would stress that these resolutions were not wasted pieces of paper. As chair of Chemistry he could speak about what it was like to be at the receiving end of some of these documents. Moreover, as chair of a recently reviewed department, he now knew that he was about to begin a negotiation with Dean Chafe, Dean Siegel, and ultimately Provost Lange to develop something akin to a written contract between the department and administration that linked resources to their redress of concerns raised by both the review, the APC resolution, and the resolution from the executive committee of the graduate faculty. So he thought this was an effort in what he'd like to call "mutual" accountability.

When Peter Burian invited him to come and talk, he asked that he address "the tension between the need to examine so many reviews, and my own desires as Chair to look more strategically and globally at academic priorities." After giving the question of how to do that in a concise manner a lot of thought, he would say the following: he had the pleasure as chair of this committee to work with Provost Lange for two years and under his guidance he could honestly say that this committee was evolving from a "Provost's Advisory Committee" in his first year to what was really an "Academic Priorities Committee". In addition, there was more accountability between the administration and the faculty through APC. The biggest driver was the strategic planning process for most of the 1999-2000 academic year, and in the end he believed that they played an important role in contributing to the University planning process and the plan itself.

In a normal year, there may be 8 to 10 external reviews that went on on campus, which represented about 50% of the meeting time and the inherent danger was to lose sight of broader issues affecting the university enterprise as a whole. He was not suggesting that the solution to this problem was going back to the weekly meetings that he mistakenly agreed to with Provost Lange when they were in the midst of the planning process. However, through the study of departments, he thought there were a set of issues that were important in academic priorities that were beginning to emerge, and by way of some examples (and these were just some that he saw after having now read probably 25 external reviews and listening to discussions) he would name instructional technology, implementation and staffing of Curriculum 2000, staff support issues in general, library support, status of buildings, and administrative barriers between schools that often probably hindered intellectual efforts. Most of those were complex issues and making progress required faculty involvement. As they moved forward into the next academic year (and his last as Chair of APC) , he hoped to work with ECAC and Provost Lange to try and balance his committee's efforts between the jobs they had to do and discussions of these broader issues. He thought that this was an important role for APC now and in the future which drove it more to becoming an academic priorities

committee. He would welcome any suggestions at any time from the faculty concerning the academic priorities of the campus that the faculty think should be discussed. Having concluded his report, he invited questions and comments as well as faculty input generally and asked that that be done by e-mail at any time: ids@chem.duke.edu

Professor Kenneth **Knoerr** (NSEES) inquired whether he had ever said 'no' to the Provost or would do so.

The response was .that indeed he would. He would say there had certainly been meetings where Peter [Lange] and he didn't see things eye to eye. He had no problem saying no to the Provost and he thought the committee didn't either, and he also thought the Provost would have no problem not taking their advice if he thought it was best not to take their advice. So if the questioner was wondering if that tension could ever exist, the answer was that it could.

Professor Len **Spicer** (Basic Sciences-Medicine) asked about Professor Simon's role as Chair of the Chemistry Department in regard to a sort of a contract of mutual satisfaction following review. For a long time one of the questions in Academic Priorities with respect to reviews was 'how do you implement or feedback information that shows positive response to all the effort people put into it. Is that a normal procedure now or becoming a normal procedure?'

The reply was that it was indeed becoming a normal procedure, and when Len Spicer added that that represented a very strong advancement in the whole process, Professor **Simon** continued that it was needed, otherwise everybody's time was wasted. If there was no accountability and no feedback and if these reviews and documents that are generated didn't end up in some mutual discussion about how they were to actually advance or improve then it was a wasted effort. He thought that Lew [Siegel], Peter [Lange] and Bill [Chafe] should really be acknowledged for pushing this, and as a department chair he would do his part.

Since there were no further questions for the APC Chair, Professor **Burian** turned to the next item on the agenda, Dean Chafe's report on Residential Life proposals.

RESIDENTIAL LIFE PROPOSALS

Dean William **Chafe** (Arts & Sciences) thanked the Council Chair for the opportunity to talk to Council about residential life proposals, but wanted to emphasize that from his office's perspective residential life should not be seen in a vacuum. It was part of the overall effort to enhance undergraduate education. They saw it really as part of a framework of operating within a series of principles to develop the best opportunities for their

students to have a mature intellectual and social life. Their guiding principles were really to have a world in which academic and social life could be integrated, in which all students could have equitable access to the best of both residential and intellectual life in which a climate could be created which was respectful for and supportive of diversity, but also respectful of and consistent with Duke's history. Therefore, they had been really involved in the last six years in trying to create a new academic community for undergraduates. This began with the creation of the first year campus in 1995-96 moved on to the Curriculum and now in stage 3 with this proposal which he was bringing to Council today which would be brought to the Trustees tomorrow and Saturday for their consideration. First year campus was a very important step in this entire process because it was a remarkable success in bringing together students across racial, ethnic regional lines to have a common living experience, develop a sense of relationship with each other, have a common experience over dining, over cultural affairs, over things like an extended focus program in the first year. One of the things he found most notable was the way in which that first year bonding experience had become a critical factor in the students' lives. At a senior reception at the Fleishman Commons he would circulate among small groups of students and ask where they had come to know each other. The universal answer was that they met each other in the first year. In other words their fundamental bond came from living together on first year campus. Many of them no longer live together and yet that was the basis on which they had a relationship with each other. That first year experience had been an incredibly important model for Duke. In order to improve the academic experience, at least of Arts and Sciences students, Curriculum 2000 represented a rather bold and far reaching curriculum reform that began this past year. When he became dean there were 49% of all students graduating from Trinity College who failed to take one of the following 3 kinds of courses: a math course, a foreign language course, or a science course. That did not seem to be appropriate for training students to be literate citizens of the 21st century. And so they basically engaged in a very far reaching reform which resulted in the kind of requirements that Duke now had: three writing-intensive courses, two research-intensive courses and an emphasis on cross cultural inquiry on ethical inquiry and an exposure to a whole variety of modes in inquiry that were thought would produce well rounded and well trained students. At this point, they were moving into dealing with some of the issues and the implications of these two major innovations in terms of the upper class experience, i.e building on that first year experience, focusing on issues such as diversity, using the opportunity for major residence hall renovations to provide opportunities to reconfigure and rethink residential living. All of this had to do with the new dormitory they were going to be building, the West-Edens link. This was essentially the core of the new residential life experience. It

was a project that was being supervised by Judith White who was doing a terrific job in working on it. It was going to be a model residence hall. It would have 350 beds and would provide the kind of core between Main West and the Edens Quad which would make it possible to have a much more integrated and seamless kind of campus. This was part of an ongoing plan which would result in having all sophomores on West Campus using reconfiguration and renovation of the West Campus residence halls to create a different kind of pattern of the way in which students live on West and also an opportunity to expand multi cultural and social space for the students. "So what are our goals and what do they consist of?"

First of all they wanted to have all sophomores on West by 2006. The West-Edens link would open in the fall of 2002 and the 350 students would move into that dormitory at that point. At that time also they would begin the renovation of the Main West residence halls which had not been renovated for 70 years. So they would be doing one major area at a time. At the same time they were proposing some major changes in the way in which students would interact with each other. For example, right now there was no link between East Campus residence halls and West Campus residence halls. They were going to create team linkages so that Southgate might be connected to one of the wings of the West-Edens link. Every dormitory on East would have a potential relationship with a residence hall on West. Students in those East Campus dormitories would have the option of deciding to choose to live together in that West Campus hall which was linked to their East Campus hall. That was choice number 1. Choice number 2 would be that they could continue to seek to become members of fraternities or selective houses. They could pledge a fraternity or selective housing. Choice number 3 was that they could decide to block with other independents who are living in other East Campus residence halls and come together in West Campus residence halls which were going to be all independents. That was a significant number of choices and provided some degree of equity. Pointing to the next slide, he commented that this was one of the major changes they were proposing - a residence configuration of Main West (all sophomores on West by 2006) that actually was going to begin in 2002. They were essentially proposing to create two new kinds of corridors on West Campus which would be all independents and all linked houses. The idea here was to put independents and linked houses in the position of having prime real estate, to make West Campus reflective of the diversity racially and ethnically of the entire campus so that in effect walking down main West from the bus stop toward Cameron one would, in effect, be in a part of the community which represented all of the community in terms of the demographic diversity. In addition to that they had created some mixed quads which were very similar to Card quads in which fraternities and selectives and independents would live together. The fraternities were no longer going to be on Main West, but would actually be behind Main West. The quid pro quo for that was that they had more social space which they felt very good about, but

they would no longer dominate West Campus in the way in which they had in the past. They would be mixed in quads with other independents and other selective groups. Their goal in all of this was to create a residential climate which would be very supportive of the principles they were seeking, namely to facilitate the combination of academic, intellectual and social life and where there was the opportunity to develop those kinds of ongoing friendships and to create a campus climate which was both respectful for and facilitative of interaction between people of diverse racial and ethnic groups.

During the renovation period, they were proposing to use Trent as swing space. Trent had up to now been a dormitory for all sophomore independents. What had happened in the past was that students who wanted to pledge a fraternity or a selective house at the end of their first year would do so and the independents basically got left at the bottom of the barrel and got all assigned to Trent which they perceive as second-class housing even though in fact it was very nice housing, but it was distant from campus and it was perceived to be not the same kind of prime real estate as Main West. What they were proposing for the swing space period was that Trent still be used for sophomores, but proportionally allocated so that 50% of those occupying Trent beds would be fraternities and selectives and 50% would be independents, and would therefore be equitable. And they found that they had got an endorsement for those concepts from a lot of student groups on campus and they felt as though that was the most viable way in which to proceed. These were the changes they hoped to get approval of. They represented some fairly dramatic changes and were really designed to help to make it possible for Duke to avoid some of the residential segregation that had existed under past residential plans, in which a disproportionate number of minorities lived either on Central or on Trent and West became a disproportionately white campus. This way, it was felt they had an opportunity to bring to the residential system a kind of vitality and representativeness which was consistent with what was done on East Campus with the first year campus, and with the kinds of things they were attempting to do with Curriculum 2000. He wanted to stop there and give his audience an opportunity to ask questions or raise issues.

Professor Tom **Spragens** (Social Sciences) asked about the fate of Trent Hall at the end of the swing period in the Fall of 2006. Dean **Chafe** replied that in 2006 Trent would cease to be a dormitory of any kind and basically then would become academic space, something they had been trying to do for a long time.

Another questioner wanted to know if the role of Central Campus would be changing. The answer was that Central Campus would continue to be a place where juniors and seniors and graduate students would live at their discretion. There had been some talk of doing some more construction on Central Campus of upscale

apartment living in the out years, but those proposals had not been anything more than talk at this point and they would potentially be at least be 3-4 years down the road.

Professor Richard **White** (Natural Sciences) asked if with this shift upperclass students still had the opportunity to live on campus their entire four years? Dean **Chafe** responded that during this swing period the four year guarantee would be waived because it may not be possible given the situation, on the other hand we didn't see a demand right now for that. This was consistent with the patterns of choice that had existed. For example, at this moment in time 70% of seniors did not live on West Campus. They choose to live off campus. There was kind of a developmental progression that took place. One of the things they were trying to recognize was that the first year was a very important year. The second year by having all sophomores have the opportunity to live in the prime real estate on campus - that was a very important statement, especially since it would be a much more representative and they hoped supportive environment. In their Junior year 40% of Duke's students went abroad and in their Senior year they were more likely to move off campus and have apartments of their own and get ready to be off on their own as independent people.

To Professor Kathleen **Smith's** (Natural Sciences) question if the three year residency requirement was new, the Dean replied that it was not but they wanted to try and enforce it. Professor Thomas **Spragens** (Social Sciences) asked if Juniors would be guaranteed space on West and Dean **Chafe** said that basically they were guaranteeing juniors a place on campus, but not necessarily on West after 2006. They thought that they would be able to live on West. They were talking about a crunch of possibly 100 beds overall. Those students would go on Central. It was thought that there would be enough choice there - that there would be room for an adequate number of upperclass students to live on West as well as sophomores. Obviously, they were making it a policy of choice here to give priority in terms of the overall development to the sophomores, which was primarily a way to make sure that they had a West Campus experience and that a major step was taken toward eliminating some of the structural inducements to segregation, or to put it another way, create the structural foundations for a much more effective and diverse campus community.

Concerning more substance-free living space, Dr. Judith **White** said that there would be for the first time space on West in addition to the number of substance-free spaces existing on East. Dean **Chafe** cautioned that while this could make a significant difference it was not a panacea. It was not a solution for anything, but it put in place the structural foundations for building a very different kind of campus community. In answer to a question about a definition of substance-free, he said that as he understood it, substance-free meant that neither alcohol nor drug use would be acceptable in a substance-free house. Right now they had 200 beds

on East, i.e. one section of a residence hall defined as substance-free. The interesting thing was that there were a lot of students who opted for that, who actually asked for it. There was a greater demand for it than there was supply right now.

Professor **Knoerr** (NSEES) commented that he was chuckling about the terminology, because in a sense they were condoning the use of the stuff wherever substance-free space was not made explicit. Bill **Chafe** had to admit that that was true.

Peter **Burian** wanted to ask about students studying abroad, and the contradiction between trying to encourage international experience and the fact that students in the past had found it difficult to get integrated back into housing when they came back from their period of time abroad. Did the new policy strive to make a difference in this respect in any way? The dean replied that they had not tried to define policies in that area right now because what they were doing here was setting out principles which were going to be very complicated to implement, but that was a task they hoped to start this summer and going through next year, but before the major change took place. They had basically been devoting this year toward articulating and developing support for these sets of initiatives. Knowing that the President was coming, Dean **Chafe** offered to filibuster to kill time until she arrived.

The **Chair** then explained that President Keohane wanted to talk to Council about recent developments regarding questions of race, ethnicity and the campus climate. She was engaged in another meeting but would spring herself loose for 15 minutes and would be here at 4:30. While they were waiting, he took the opportunity to remind people to indicate their own willingness and the willingness of others they knew to serve on University and Academic Council committees. Over the years those of them who had been involved in faculty governance got to know well people who had been willing and served well and ECAC kept asking them again and again to serve. So The circle of those willing to serve needed to be widened.

[Enter President **Keohane**]: "I hear you were filibustering."

Peter **Burian**: "Now with relief and pleasure I introduce President Nan Keohane."

UPDATE ON 'STUDENT MOVEMENT'

President **Keohane** said she was responding to the Council Chair's request to provide an update on the responses the administration had given to the various objectives and requests from the Duke Student Movement this spring because members had probably read some articles about this, but she thought it might be helpful to provide a look at the administration's responses as a whole. Just to make sure that everyone was aware, the Duke Student Movement was the name which was chosen by an informal group of students that

convened in response to the publication of the Horowitz reparations ad in the Chronicle right after the spring vacation. The original set of demands shortly after the protest that followed after that ad, sent to them on March 22 , included a request among other things that the administration provide an account of actions that had been taken over the years in response to earlier protests in 1969, 1975, 1979, 1989 and 1997. This was an interesting and she thought very appropriate challenge for them to look back and see, what had the requests been, what had actually been done and what remained to be done. So we took this as a very important opportunity to review the record that Duke had sustained over the years in addressing student concerns around issues of treatment of minority students especially. Due to the herculean efforts of a number of people in this room coordinated by Judith Ruderman and Paul Baerman in my office, one week after they received this request, they were able to provide a 16 page response with seven pages of appendices - a lot of data about what had happened over the years. A number of the same issues came up in the protests over these decades. The most important recurring issues included appointing and retaining Black Faculty and administrators, recruiting and retaining Black students in every school, support and appropriate gathering spaces for Black students on campus and an improvement of the climate generally for their education, support for the African-American Studies Program, as well as a couple of issues that came up less often recently financial aid issues, and claims of discriminatory practices in certain parts of the institution. About the same time they provided this historic narrative, the Duke Student Movement had six more requests, as listed in the handout included in member's mailing. As people could see, one of the requests was to the Chronicle. The other five were directed at the administration, and people had a copy of their response, which was addressed to the three students identified as leaders of the Duke Student Movement.

She simply wanted to spend a moment or two telling everyone a little about a couple of these sections of their response and some things that we had been doing since. The administration's first commitment was to establish a task force to address continuing issues about the treatment of minority students at Duke; this would be convened in the fall after the new VP for Student Affairs had joined them to co-chair it. We had been giving a good deal of thought to this recurring issue of the climate for minority students on campus; this had been a major agenda topic for the President's Council on Black Affairs over the past two years and they have had some support from the Mellon Foundation for a pilot study addressing possible diagnosis and interventions. She had also found it very helpful to read the end-of-year seminar papers in several courses including most recently those of Professor William Raspberry in the Sanford Institute. Prof. Raspberry asked his students, working in groups, to come up with some concrete ideas for how the climate on campus for all students could be made more supportive and inclusive. There was a good deal of

convergence among the papers; there were recommendations about curriculum and several other issues, but all the papers agree that many of the major obstacles to an improved campus climate lay in Duke's present residential system after the freshman year. In light of this she was particularly glad that they would be bringing to the Board of Trustees this weekend the plans that Dean Chafe had shared with members for creating a new set of residential opportunities on West Campus, and requiring all sophomores to live on West. I was convinced, as were her colleagues, that this would make a significant difference in the climate for all students in the years ahead. It wouldn't solve all the problems, by any means; but unless they tackled this issue, she did not believe they had any realistic chance of making a difference overall. The response she should note also reported on progress made on the Black Faculty Strategic Initiative, and committed them to finding strategies that would help them improve their record in finding senior-level minority administrators. Tallman Trask had agreed to chair a task force to tackle this issue with the vice-chairmanship of University Secretary Allison Haltom; the members would be chosen and invited soon; it would begin its work this summer and report by November 15; they would then need to make significant commitments to implementing their recommendations. Judith White's committee had now reported with recommendations for the future of the Mary Lou Williams Center, and Tallman and she would be looking right away at the feasibility of their recommendation of expanded and improved space in a renovated West Union, in terms of architectural placement and financing. They would keep the members of the committee informed over the summer and report back on their findings in the fall. The same committee made some valuable recommendations on providing more space for multi-cultural groups and activities in a 're-imagined' Bryan Center, and they would be taking next steps in planning this renovation during the summer. She was also reporting on the steady progress Duke had made in building a very strong African and African-American Studies program, and committed herself and her administration to recommendations from another task force, headed by VP Sally Dickson, which addressed the frustrating issues of dispersed and inadequate funding for cultural activities organized by students at Duke. She would take questions at this point.

Professor John **Staddon** (Natural Sciences) expressed surprise at the reaction of students to the ad. He felt that Duke must be failing in its educational mission if students cannot distinguish hate speech from a polemical statement. The **President** responded that it was her understanding that students were most upset that so few non-blacks on campus seemed to be offended by the ad or even to understand why they were offended. She saw the response to the Horowitz ad as showing a need to work even harder for inclusivity, and as an opportunity for further education. [Additional discussion of the effect of the ad on the community was unfortunately not captured on tape.]

With that the **Chair** observed that the President had to return to her previous meeting and, wishing everyone a pleasant summer, declared the meeting adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt,
Faculty Secretary