

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

November 18, 1999

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on November 18, 1999 from 3:45 to 5:30 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Robert **Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** asked for a motion and a second to approve the Minutes of the October 14th meeting. They were **approved** as submitted. Under Announcements, the Chair noted that he and the President each had two announcements to make:

The first **is** an update on the recreation fee issue. Rich Burton of the Fuqua School this year is Chair of the Recreation Faculty Advisory Committee. He reports that the committee is hard at work, meeting basically on a weekly basis. Many different perspectives have been presented. I asked Rich to try and bring us a solution to this problem by the December meeting, which is December 2nd. Rich said he would try and so progress is being made, but we aren't at a solution yet. The second item would be to announce the formation of a committee to nominate a new Academic Council chair. My term is coming to the end on July 1. Our sequence is to have nominations in January, and an election in February. The Chair Nominating Committee is being chaired by Emily Klein of Earth and Ocean Sciences. The other members are John Baillie of Medicine, John Board of Engineering, Cynthia Herrup of History with a joint appointment in Law, and Jan Radway of Literature. So those are the members of the nominating committee. They would be eager to have your input and several of them are here today. I would now call on the President for two further announcements.

President **Keohane**: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wanted to announce a search committee and a review committee just for your information so that you can be prepared to help both of them out. First of all, we have pulled together a search committee to look for Myrna Adams' successor as Vice-President for Institutional Equity [OIE]. I think most of you know that when Myrna Adams came to Duke in 1995, she said that she only wished to serve one term; we are pleased that she will remain at Duke. She will not continue to be vice-president after next summer. Her office has been reviewed by a very thoughtful review committee that did its work last year, and basically proposed that the job remain fundamentally the same,

although they recommended a few changes that the search committee will want to take into account. We want to recruit a very strong leader for this unusual but very important post. The committee will be chaired by Dr. Laura Svetkey of the Department of Medicine, it will include Allison Haltom, University Secretary, as Vice-Chair, Dean Greg Jones from Divinity, Professor Kate Bartlett from Law, Dr. Jacqueline Looney who is Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Mindy Romberg from Human Resources, Aida Nichols from the Hospital Human Resources, two students from DSG and GPSC, Jeremy Huff and Elayne Heisler, and one more faculty member with whom I am in conversations, but I wanted to go ahead and announce it because we're getting underway soon. There will also be a review committee beginning its work in mid-December for John Burness as Senior Vice-President for Public Affairs. John is in the fourth year of his second 5 year term at Duke and therefore, according to our usual procedures, it is time we step back and review his work. As you all know, having reviewed Appendix C for this meeting, it is certainly my practice and our expectation that I would ask for the help of the faculty and ECAC in doing this review and I have discussed this. Len Spicer has fortunately agreed to chair the review committee and David Paletz from Political Science has agreed to serve. There will also be three other members from the administration and community who are still being decided. But when the committee begins its work next month and Len Spicer and his colleagues reach out to ask your thoughts about John Burness's work, I hope that you will be prepared to help them out. So, those two committees will be underway with their reports or their recommendations due in the next semester.

Prof. **Mosteller** thanked the President and reviewed the agenda at this point:

Four items. The first two are ultimately action items, but no votes will be taken today. So [items] three and four are action items, and they are the kinds of items that we treat as two-meeting-rule items, so today we're discussing and we'll vote in December on one and on the other, but the Appendix C issue doesn't have to be rushed if we're not ready. Then we're going to flip the order. Item # 6 is going to go in the # 5 slot, and then we will put a report by Provost Peter Lange as the last item. So, at this time I would call forward Bill Schlesinger, Lewis Siegel or whoever is going to start the presentation, and if you would come forward to begin the discussion of the Program in Ecology, I will pass out two items. One is a handout that Bill prepared and the second one is a draft resolution that we think we'll be voting on in December, and this seems to be a proposal that is in order, so it comes with the recommendation of approval from ECAC.

Dean **Siegel**: Thank you very much Bob. I'm basically just going to introduce Bill Schlesinger to you. What is in front of you is the proposal to authorize the ability to grant a PhD in the University Program in Ecology so that you understand the University Program in

Ecology exists. It was approved last spring by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty as an interdisciplinary program that has the authority to admit graduate students. The Graduate School has that authority in its own right and there are quite a large number of interdisciplinary programs. But it is rare for such a program to have the authority to grant a PhD and it is that degree granting ability that must seek the advice of the Academic Council. Before Bill talks specifically about this program, I just wanted to put up one overhead that will just orient you specifically. This will be the third degree granting interdisciplinary program, PhD granting interdisciplinary program in the Graduate School, all having been created in the last decade, that is, programs that really do not fundamentally have a departmental home, but work as a truly interdisciplinary entity, so it is not a unique approach and it has been tested before. The other point that I want to make to you again just for background and emphasis is that this is the way the Graduate School has been moving for the entire decade of the 1990's. Only one program that the Graduate School has created in the entire decade is associated with a department. That is the Immunology PhD that, in fact, is simply a splitting of the Microbiology and Immunology degree. So the fact is that this is sort of in-line with what we've been doing. Most of these university programs do not have the authority to grant a degree, but Ecology is proposed to do so. The background of the Ecology program is a long period of deliberation by faculty to find the best vehicle for admitting students into an area of biology that clearly spans Arts and Sciences, the School of the Environment, and actually a few faculty outside of those units, and to find the best vehicle to put a good case forward for admission of students in an area of great strength at Duke. By general agreement of the faculty, this is the best vehicle to do that and if so, we put that in front of you. The director of the existing university program in Ecology, Bill Schlesinger, now will present the program to you in more detail.

Prof. **Schlesinger:** Thanks Lew. As Lew said, this comes from a long set of deliberations that began, I think, most formally with a Task Force in Biology in the Fall of '96. A number of us on the campus had become concerned that while Ecology was growing on this campus in many places, that there was very little coordination between those efforts, particularly between Arts and Sciences and the School of the Environment. That, I think, graduate applications were falling between the cracks, somebody applying to a unit that appeared appropriate but might not have exactly the right advisor for them, while another unit sat, unable to see that particular application. So, a number of us got together and began to brainstorm how to deal with this, and, of course, we looked at the university program in Genetics and the development of cellular and molecular biology programs as our models, and came up with the University Graduate Program in Ecology. You have a proposal in the packet that came out with this meeting that goes into some length about the structure of the program and we just passed out slightly

more updated but perhaps not quite as deep in content information from the web site that we have prepared for graduate applicants. That's what a student would see logging onto the web site at Duke. The idea is that we will have a single home for applications, graduate applications that come to Duke, for students interested in ecology in its broadest sense. We have a faculty that has expressed interest from a number of different units on the campus. Obviously primarily Arts and Sciences and the School of the Environment. But we welcomed those from various places that have expressed an interest. We have still welcoming arms open in case we've overlooked an appropriate group that would look at and admit these applicants, that would provide interdisciplinary training with a couple of core courses that will cover the breadth of important issues in ecology today as well as the depth that is appropriate for a graduate student and then a curriculum for each student designed by their committee that would flesh out the rest of their graduate program. We've garnered through cooperative agreements with departments and through some funding from the Provost's common fund some funding to get this program off the ground. I'm working, hopefully successfully, but with great enthusiasm and hope, with the Development Office to garner some long term support in terms of fellowship and endowed fellowships that would support this over the longer periods. As Lewis said, we're before you both today and I guess at your next meeting with the requirement that, as a degree granting unit, [we need] approval by this body of the University Program in Ecology. And I think I will stop there in terms of my formal remarks and take questions that might come up from any of you on this program.

Prof. **Knoerr** (NSOE): My one question is for you or for Lew, but I'm trying to figure out where the records for these students will reside, graduate records. Will they be in a place that is basically the home for the Program of Ecology, [or] will they be in the affiliated academic units?

Lewis **Siegel**: Well, obviously there's always a record that is in the Graduate School itself, but in analogy with other programs, if the student first is admitted into those programs, the records will be in that program. If the student transfers to a department to get their degree and in the Genetics Program, the majority of students admitted to the program end up getting their degree from departments. Those records are then transferred to the departments. It is wherever the student is at the time that we're considering is where the records are kept, and that has worked very well.

Ken **Knoerr**: So in this case, they could be either in the Program in Ecology or Botany, or Zoology or the School of Environment.

Lewis **Siegel**: That's right. There will likely be obviously some skeleton body of records that are kept there.

Prof. Mary **Boatwright** (Classical Studies): I probably missed this, but can you tell me a little bit more about the funding? How many graduate students are you foreseeing to be admitted per year and what impact will this have on the third year [of?] graduate funding for the individual departments?

Bill **Schlesinger**: We envision admitting 6 per year roughly to get us a steady state of 12 in the two-year period, [i.e.] the first 2 years in the program. We have an agreement with participating departments that a student admitted in the Program will be acceptable in a participating department. So, a student transferring to, let's say the Botany Department, to use my own example, would then become the responsibility of the Graduate Board's budget in Botany.

Mary **Boatwright**: So does that mean that the Botany Department therefore has to keep a slot open? I mean, what happens in the third year [of funding]?

Bill **Schlesinger**: Typically, this is run more smoothly than you might believe with Genetics and DCMB doing the same kind of thing. There's enough fluidity in that process that we can anticipate a student coming off Genetics Program's support say after two years and transferring to Botany support because they've selected a botany professor as their major professor. And I would anticipate the same kind of relationship and procedure will work for this program as well.

Lewis **Siegel**: The idea is that the responsibility for the funding of the student, after the period of guaranteed support by the Provost [is over?], reside in the place of primary appointment, the faculty member will be supervising. The department is aware that it will be taking on some number of students. It will know who is in the pipeline and it will have to think about that, but as Bill said, right now, Botany and Zoology, some of the two of them average between 4 and 5 students that transfer from the Genetics and CMB Programs into those departmental programs after a period of [provostial?] support every year. So they're used to that.

Bill **Schlesinger**: We're also hopeful, of course, that many of these transfers will be onto RA's as research grants and not impact anybody's budget. That's never a guarantee.

Ken **Knoerr**: This goes back to my first question: if someone then goes back to the department for support, then are the records sent to those departments?

Lewis **Siegel**: The departments will certainly have those records if they need it; certainly all the records that they need in order to keep up with those students. I'm not sure what you mean.

Ken **Knoerr**: Well, I'm thinking of the long-term archiving of

records of the faculty affiliated with the various academic units. What I'm trying to do is maintain the [records of the] School of the Environment. It's a historical record [of] faculty [who] participated in this, but we have a lot more [?] and there will be support available [?] What I'm trying to figure out is how I'm going to maintain those records after [a student has left?]

Bill Schlesinger: I don't think there's anything we need to be particularly possessive about. We could duplicate and have your office have a copy of them from the very beginning if that would be desirable.

Lewis Siegel: The fundamental issue is that there will be some students who don't know which department they will want to go to.

Ken Knoerr: I understand.

Bob Mosteller: Any other questions? We will have time for questions if there aren't any further ones at the next meeting. The resolution is passed out and it will be in your packet again next time so we will vote in December. I assume that Bill would be happy to field questions if anybody has any in the interim. So please feel free to contact him. OK, the second item again, this is for discussion only, not for vote, is Appendix C, and let me give a little bit of background. First of all a kind of deep background. It seems to me that there are sort of three documents at this university that are fundamental to academic governance. First of all, the Christy Rule, those set of documents that were established in 1972. A second is what has become Appendix C, which was established in 1982, and it seems to me Appendix M which has to do with the grievance process. So we're dealing with Appendix C which is quite fundamental, established in 1982 out of a history of the conflict over the reappointment of President Sanford. As I read the history, there wasn't much question that he would be reappointed, it was what kind of review there would be and it was in the aftermath of the Nixon library and the Academic Council was not consulted at all after a promise that it would be — quite a flashpoint. And then in the wake of that, the Academic Council officials and President Sanford worked out an agreement that became Appendix C, and it had two parts. The appointment of administrators, senior administrators and review of senior administrators; one of the things I found in reviewing this is those two parts seem to have been written by two different people, because they didn't seem to mesh perfectly and I couldn't find any rational reason. Just for instance, in the first part they use "shall," and in the second part they use "will" in exactly the same situation, and sometimes the officers wouldn't be covered between the two in the same one. So that is Appendix C. It gets revamped in minor ways in the years in between. Last spring, we talked about two changes, and those two changes were made, because there were events coming up this summer or fall that we wanted to basically decide about so that we wouldn't do something

inadvertent. One of those , as the [old] Appendix had been written, we would have been starting a review of the President this past summer, which seemed to make no sense in terms of the sequencing of the terms now to review in the sixth year and the reason for that was that the review sequence was every three years, which would make sense for the first term, but not for the second and not for the third. So we passed a change that moved that review about 18 months later roughly to the midpoint of each term. A second point was whether a dean who was up for a third or fourth term [was reappointed] automatically or whether there had to be some preliminary judgment by the provost that [there] was a possibility for reappointment, [i.e.] whether you went ahead and did a review as a matter of right at every term, or whether it was only a review as a matter of right in the first term and after that it was a call by the provost before you started the review; and we made that change in part to implement what had been the faculty judgment that ordinarily, deans should serve two terms. So those were the two changes we made in May, and before you, you have three documents. One is Appendix C, it's labeled "Appendix C with Changes approved in May." So what you have there is the existing document after the changes we made in May. And the first of two changes made in May you will find on page two. .They're not highlighted in any way, I just want to tell you where you can find it. Page two, III.A.2. So III.A.2 at the bottom of page two and moving over into page three. That was the change having to do with the deans, and then on page three, part C having to do with the president. Those are the two items that we changed in May. Then you have two other items before you. One would be the proposed draft of a full revision of Appendix C. What I said in May, in April/May was that we didn't have time at that point to do a full review. Linda Lehman is a wonderful staff member and helped me in the first part of the beginning of this, and just circled a number of things that we ought to start looking at, and it's clear to me that if we tried to do that in April and May, we would never get it done in a rational fashion that quickly. So we put it over, and starting in late July, I sent my first memo to the President and the Provost and we engaged in a series of memos, I think I counted nine not including e-mails, back and forth, or sorry, nine coming from the administrative side alone, and [then] a series of back and forth [memos], working out all sorts of details about changes, and what you have before you is a document that has been negotiated through the major officers of the university and ECAC, and there are a number of trade-offs in it.

On the whole, we're quite happy with it at ECAC in the sense of having worked out a number of give and take points and we think it preserves the basic principles that we care about, and that's involvement in these key decision points. So what we have right now before us is a document that if we approve, stands on exactly the same footing as Appendix C did in the past in that it was an agreement between the President and the Academic Council. I think it's probably the case that we will, after we finish this up, go

through some kind of approval process through the Trustees, and it will be more firmly entrenched as far as a basic document in the university [is concerned]. And so the document labeled "Draft November 8th" is the document we present to you from ECAC with the recommendation that it be approved. Now, that doesn't mean we can't change things, it's just that we have to work things back through, and I want people to understand and feel comfortable with what's been done. And then the third document is kind of a narrative of what was changed, and that is a document to Academic Council from me, dated November 8th and an explanation. We'll march through a few of those and then we'll start questions. One of the first issues was whether the search and review should cover the same officers, and somewhat remarkably, there wasn't exactly the same listing between the two, and I couldn't tell if it was inadvertent or purposeful, but it made sense to us in principle that searches and reviews ought to apply to the same officer; and then the question would be, which officers? And you will see that over time, things changed, sometimes willy-nilly, sometimes it seems purposeful. For instance, in the first listing there was a vice-chancellor for computing. So that was one of the officers that was listed that got moved out at one point. And what we came down to, what we suggest as a listing, and it's in indented language, are the senior officers and the deans, the President, the Provost, the Chancellor for Health Affairs, Executive Vice-President, then the deans of the Graduate School and the deans of the faculty of Arts and Sciences, then the deans of the Schools of Business, Divinity, Engineering, Environment, Law, Medicine and Nursing. And then we went on through and tried to define what was the principle about these officers being covered, because you'll see that some aren't covered, and for instance John Burness' position isn't covered here. It isn't a suggestion that that's not important; or at least we tried to think of what was a rationale of what would stick over time and make sense over time, and we also decided to put that into the document, so that as new offices were created in the future, they would be automatically or presumptively included and so that simply a nomenclature change would not get rid of the review. This won't be iron-clad, but it seemed that we set out a principle, a set of principles and we said the offices listed below are examples of these principles so that in the future, you can use both the principle and examples to decide whether or not this fits or not, and so the language of the principle is the indented language at the very bottom of page two and I will read it:

"The faculty is to be involved in searches for and reviews of the most senior officers of the university with authority over issues with major programmatic or budgetary impact on the faculty," —so that's one group—(and then:) "and deans who report directly to the provost or chancellor for health affairs. The offices listed below fit this definition, and if positions of equivalent rank are created in the future, they are to be covered by this appendix as

well." So, that is built in too, and you will find that in the preamble, when you look at the revised draft, the November 8th draft, you will find that in the preamble on the first page. It's the very bottom of that first major paragraph. So that's which offices would be covered and the rationale for it, and then the changes and the makeup of the search committee, and with respect to the president and provost, they are substantially unchanged.

The provision with respect to the executive vice-president is made more specific. When you look at the old language it just said there would be a review, and this sets out a review with a minimum number of faculty members. When you get to the chancellor, there is somewhat more flexibility. There are fewer faculty members as a matter of necessity, because of the change in the nature of the chancellor's position as many more business and other far-flung duties are taken into account. There is a designation of areas that need to be covered with respect to the four faculty members, two inside the Medical School, two outside the Medical School, and the two inside designated as between two different areas. It can go more than four, it can't go less than four within the total. For the rest of the deans, there's no changes made of any substance, other than .to recognize a role of the Chancellor of Health Affairs with respect to the two deans that are related to medicine - the nurse, the nursing dean and dean of the school of Medicine. It made sense, it just wasn't included in the prior language and that's carried all the way through, and there's also a recognition of the Provost's responsibility in the same deans'[review process]. The Chancellor is included officially, and the Provost's role is also recognized in various forms throughout the document. [There are] changes in the review position, that is point 3 on page 3, point 5 on page 3, changes in the review committee revision for the deans. Two changes are made in part B of the review document, and at this point, it's page 3 of the document with November 8 on the front. And instead of four items as part of the review committee is concerned, there are two separate, two additional paragraphs added. One is item number 2, the review committee is supposed to develop a description of the position, responsibilities and the basis for evaluation. That's been a point that the Trustees have been concerned about. When you evaluate a senior officer, it's against what you are evaluating [them]? So it's just sensible to have a job description as part of that evaluation and that in fact was in the initial document way back in '82, somehow it didn't make it's way to the final draft. And then [there is] part number 6, saying the reviews of the process should develop information about the judgment. That's not new as far as the document is concerned, it's just pulled out of the preamble part 3 and moved down to an item, which seemed to be a more sensible place for it to be. [In] item number 6 of my review document, this is on page 4 of the new draft, there's somewhat more specificity and differentiation made with respect to the review of the Provost, Chancellor for Health Affairs, and

Executive Vice-President, recognizing in this review that the committees for two of those, the Executive Vice-President and the Chancellor are going to look different than the committee for the Provost. The committee for the Provost will be much more substantially filled with faculty members than will the other two. But faculty members will be represented. So I went through it very quickly, and I hope it was something that could be followed at least generally. I'd be happy to open to any questions that people have.

Ken **Knoerr**: Has the faculty ever participated in the review of administrators on the business side of the university or always the academic officers?

Bob **Mosteller**: Specifically, who would you be thinking of?

Ken **Knoerr**: Well, there are people who have responsible positions on business items, and their actions impact the faculty and students. It just occurs to me that I don't know whether they basically serve at the pleasure of the Executive Vice-President or whether they are reviewed on a periodic basis.

Bob **Mosteller**: I'll let Nan [Keohane] answer in just a minute, but one of the principles that we went to in this listing is that we wanted to list out as a matter of necessity and right the most senior officers and put down our stake at that point. And it was part of an argument that George Christy has made to me about governance in general, that if one gets into all the minutia, you tie yourself down so much that you aren't involved in faculty governance. Look at the big pictures, review those, put your important emphasis there. So we didn't go down any further than these senior officers. With respect to other officers, there's a provision in here that says the President can ask for our help, for instance with respect to, we just have an example of what was announced today, John Burness' review. If it is an important officer and the president wants to have faculty input in an official way, we are open to providing that but we do not fight our way into that process or insist upon it if for some reason it needed to be done quickly or needed to be done otherwise, but I think it's 'at the pleasure.' President, would you like to respond?

Nan **Keohane**: The way we do it [is, when there are] officers who directly report to the president, I have asked the help of faculty in reviewing those officers. On the business side, the way we run things, there are a number of people who report to the Executive Vice-President, but there are seven or eight of them at the same level. It would be difficult to involve people as part of our more routine [process]. It's also true that the president of DUMAC [is not reviewed] but that, as you know, is a quasi-independent corporation and that officer reports to the DUMAC Board.

Bob **Mosteller**: Another question?

Prof. Helen **Ladd** ((Social Science): My question is before the November 8 document, one of the new sections that was put in was point 6 on your [document], and it just says that the review process should develop information and not judgments. Can you clarify what that means?

Bob **Mosteller**: It's in the area of what has this person done right and wrong about substance as opposed to should this person be renewed. As far as I understand it, it is not that it is supposed to develop the data from which the senior officer can make the decision, but it is not the job of the review committee to say up or down, and so it's pushing in the direction of more data rather than judgment, and the emphasis [is to provide] the basis for the officer to make the decision. I know you didn't ask this, but it was contained in the prior document, it was in the preamble, part 3, exactly [as] the language was in the old version if you look on page 2 under III, the first sentence is "The review process is a reasonable and useful method for ensuring institutional health." That sentence is moved up to the preamble of the old document. And then the next sentence [is] "The process .should develop information, not judgments." So that was moved down to an item as opposed to [a section?]

After some discussion concerning item 6 of the November 8 Draft document ["The review process should develop information, not judgments"], Prof. John **Staddon** remarked:

As it's written here, it sounds like a [routine?] job, when, in fact, what we're saying is [that] the aim of the committee is to see to what extent this individual has met the goals that were set.

The **Chair**: We'll go back and work on it. One of the things we tried to do was not change anything we didn't have to, but this is a good point.

Prof. **Shaughnessy** (Engineering): The issue on page 2 talks about the search committee, [certain] individuals and faculty representatives. These individuals [are from inside and outside the university]. I like the way I read that, which is it will all be faculty members, but I wonder if it means these faculty [members?].

Bob **Mosteller**: OK, thank you. I'll take care of that. I don't see any other questions. I'd like to move forward. We can take this up at the end and we will take it up in December. An e-mail address is listed, so if anybody goes back and sees something and has an idea, please send it to us. We will try to respond to that, but I'd like to move to Cathy Davidson or whoever, Bruce or Karla to make a short presentation update on where we stand with respect to the John Hope Franklin seminars. And I'd like to note, that in

all likelihood, we're going to run somewhat over. I believe Peter Lange's presentation will be interesting and will run probably longer than half an hour, so we'll try to keep this short, but I just want to warn you that we will probably run beyond the 5:00 hour.

Vice-Provost Cathy **Davidson**: I definitely have the idea I'm supposed to keep it short, so I'll do that. I'm speaking not just for myself, but on behalf of Karla Holloway and Bruce Kuniholm today to update you on what is happening on the John Hope Franklin seminars. I believe, you've all received the program statement and a cover sheet about the most recent development with the Franklin seminars, which happened very late last year when the university voted and this body voted on a 98 million dollar package for residential changes that included 8 million dollars set aside for academic renovation of Hanes Annex and Trent Hall. Trent Hall, as you know, is a dormitory, Hanes Annex has had many incarnations, but for the last 5, 6 or 7 years it has been quite empty and is in a state of enough disrepair that when you walk through the building, you're instructed to not go into certain rooms because there is no floor. I'm not sure how much background to go into with the Franklin seminars, since you have the materials. There is also a much lengthier description of the seminar itself, which is a kind of virtual center. It did not have any space until the resolution last May. In the Faculty Forum of April of 1999, there's a full description of the first four years of the Franklin seminars. Highlights are that it's jointly funded by the Office of the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. It allows for faculty in the humanities and with outreaches to social sciences for the first three years, and to the sciences in the fourth year. After that, the whole process will be reevaluated. But in those years, there will be some time for release time for faculty to spend intellectual time in discussion with other faculties from the humanities or the allied disciplines talking about a specific topic. But the first four years, however broadly defined, there will be some race focus in the discussion. This year's topic is race and nation building in the Americas. Next year's topic takes a much wider historical and geographical view, going all the way back, at least as far as ancient Greece to talk about the configurations of race, religion and globalization. The whole process of spreading through the globe and especially in terms of Christianity, reading a taxonomy of non-western peoples of the world, but even going back farther than with encounters along the [Mediterranean?] or North-Africa. The third year's topic has something to do with gender. That's unspecified. It will be up perhaps to the new director of Women's Studies. The fourth year's topic will have some interaction with the Medical School and with sciences around campus, possibly ideas of the mind, possibly something about creativity, possibly someone in place with the Department of Neuroscience-initiative. The exciting new development since I last talked of this in several other bodies last year is

that we now have not just a virtual space, but an actual one. One floor, one wing of Hanes Annex will be the John Hope Franklin Center of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities. Also housed in the building will be a variety of very exciting international programs in very interesting configurations. So, for example, for the first time, this Center for South Asian Studies and the Center for European Studies are literally going to be contiguous and I think those conversations are going to be fascinating. Also in the building are various programs that pay tribute to the monumental impact that John Hope Franklin has had on this whole university: a changing gallery of exhibits and documents from John Hope Franklin's collection, art, that's African and African-American art or other documents and art related to John Hope Franklin; an Academy of Arts and Letters, and an honorary society named after John Hope Franklin. What am I leaving out? Karla and Bruce will also answer any questions.

There being no questions, the **Chair** explained that this report was intended as an update and since bricks and mortar were in play now, there would be a Center that was real and operative and hence it was becoming much more a reality than just an idea.

He then turned to the last item on the agenda, namely the Provost's report on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure process. In order to accommodate the Provost's request to limit the audience to faculty members only, he announced that the meeting would go into **executive session**.

At the conclusion of the report's discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt, Faculty Secretary