

# 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

October 14, 1999

Immediately following the annual University Faculty meeting, the Academic Council met in regular monthly session on October 14, 1999 from 4:20 p.m. to 5:10 p.m. in 139 Soc. Science Bldg. with Prof. Robert **Mosteller** (Law) presiding.

### MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** announced that this meeting was just as open as the last meeting to all group members of the faculty and anyone present. As the first order of business he welcomed everyone back to the first meeting of the fall. He then invited and received a motion and a second to approve the minutes of the last two meetings of April 2 2nd and May 13th which had been passed out before the September meeting. Both sets of minutes were **approved** by voice vote as submitted.

Prof. **Mosteller**: As you all remember, we canceled the September 16 meeting because of the impending hurricane that for this area seemed to turn out to be not a very big event and all of us had a sigh of relief. We learned later that for parts east of here, it was a devastating event. The flooding beyond anything that had been seen in modern history in North Carolina, with tremendous devastation. I wanted to pick up on this point and also on a point that Nan made earlier. The United Way campaign I wanted to push on behalf of the faculty. And what I placed over on the chair are envelopes that allow you to make contributions to the United Way in case you haven't done so and are in a position to do so. The connection with the flooding in the east is that the United Way is helping in that process and your gift can either be for the Durham community, designated here, or it can be designated for aid to the Eastern North Carolina. It's a way for Duke University to connect to this community, and the communities to our east. And so I would like to encourage you to be a participant in the United Way and the envelopes that are over on the chair by the door. We formed two committees in recent weeks. The first is a committee to review the Dean of the Graduate School, Lewis Siegel. His term is coming [to an end] at the end of another year. He's in the fourth year of his five-year term. The chair of that committee is Phil Stewart from Romance Studies, Bruce Corliss from Earth and Ocean Sciences, Linda McGown from Chemistry, Dan Graham from Economics, Jeff Dawson for

Immunology, and Jeffrey Peirce from Civil and Environmental Engineering. So that's the review committee and they will be starting their work during the fall semester. Most of you also heard about the formation of a new advisory committee for recreational facilities. Its first task is to examine the issues surrounding the fees for faculty and staff use of facilities. The committee is being chaired by Richard Burton of the Fuqua School, [other members are ] Clarence Birkhead of the Duke Police Department, Jan Ewald, History, Deborah Kinney, Law School library, Carol Meyers, Department of Religion, Tom Spragens, Sue Wasiolek, Student Affairs, Tomalei Vess, Graduate Student, Patrick Wolf, Biomedical Engineering, and Lisa Zeidner, Student Government. I have learned in this process that people do have opinions on this issue. These, then, are the people that will be on the committee, and I invite you to get in touch with them either by e-mail or letter or personally. I hope we can work this issue out.

As a last announcement, I'd like to welcome Ms. Kristina Johnson, our new Dean of the Engineering School — [interjection by Peter **Lange**: the *Pratt* Engineering School!] to the Academic Council. She was a professor of Electrical Engineering and came to us from the University of Colorado at Boulder. I had a chance to get to know Kristina a little bit through several committees we served on together, and I'm personally delighted that she's here at Duke, and we've been talking to Kristina about the possibility of coming to speak to Council later in the academic year after she's had a little bit more opportunity to get settled. I think our president would now like to say a word or two.

President **Keohane**: Because of the Pratt gift, I thought it would be a good idea with this body to take note and have a chance to celebrate. You've probably already read or heard about the wonderful gift from Ed Pratt, a graduate of the School of Engineering and a very loyal member of the community and former Trustee, someone who served Duke in many ways. So the reason for new excitement in the School of Engineering is not only an exciting new Dean, but also this wonderful gift. I find it delightful that the students have immediately adopted this and are referring to themselves as Pratt '99, and Pratt 2000, or whatever, and we find it pleasing to think about this partnership between someone who cares deeply about Duke and this wonderful school. It's a very generous gift, and a lot of people as you would expect worked with Ed Pratt, including John Piva, Earl Dowell, and several other people in the Engineering School, all of us were partners in this and it is a very rewarding time for us. Ed Pratt tells us that it was also rewarding for him. He speaks of it as something that has

[made] him very happy. If you all have ideas about other people we could make happy [let us know], [laughter]

The **Chair**: Thank you, Nan. You received in the materials that came out in connection with the meeting, the minutes of action taken by the Executive Committee on September 28th. We approved the degrees on behalf of this body that were to be awarded in September. The one item of business that we need to accomplish today is the election of the Faculty Hearing Committee members, four new members. There was a sheet that went out before proposing new members. They are Carol Eckerman, Psychology-Experimental, Jan Ewald, History, Carol Meyers, Religion, and Chris Schroeder, Law. Those are the proposed four new members that ECAC brings to you. Last year we created three year terms, and so the reason we're only [voting] in [four]— (back two years ago we would have been voting on all 12)— [is that] we thought that was entirely too many at a time, and now it's three year terms with the rotation; and so, [since] it comes to you from the Academic Council Executive Committee, it does not need a second. Is there any discussion or any other nominations? All in favor of these four individuals to be elected for a three-year term to the Faculty Hearing Committee, please say aye. All opposed, no. [The four new members were **approved** by voice vote without dissent]. Thank you for handling that business quickly. Our next item is to invite Peter Lange to come forward and to talk to us about the university-wide strategic planning process that is just beginning. The Academic Council has business to do and has the opportunity to discuss ideas, and today we are here to discuss ideas, and I know that Peter wants to talk with you and have a conversation.

Provost Peter **Lange**: Thank you Bob. Well, I'm here to talk about planning, and as a result, as I am a professor, I went to look for some sources first, that would allow me to think about planning and this process for the future. And so I went out and I got on a few germane quotations, which I thought would be useful for me. [Pointing to an overhead transparency:] Now here's the first one. It's called "Looking into the Future" by Neils Bohr ["It's risky to make a prediction, especially if it's about the future"], which I thought was particularly germane to a planning exercise, but he's a physicist and we probably need at least a second opinion; so I looked for some more and I want to share with you the second one. Now, the question is who is the profound philosopher, who coined this guide for planning? ["You got to be very careful if you don't know where you're going, because you might not get there."] Yogi Berra is correct, and I think that was Ken Knoerr who said that. Now, having said that, we're about to depart on what I think is an exciting intellectual adventure.

We're going to be thinking about and planning for our institutional future. We're going to be doing that as a faculty, as an administration, and as an administrative cadre of the University. It is a propitious time for planning. Shaping Our Future is five years old, and as many of you know, "Shaping Our Future" was in many ways as much a declaration of central principles to the University and what it represented, as a plan about priorities and choices. This time we're going to be reaffirming, and we are reaffirming many of those principles that were in "Shaping Our Future," but we're intending to produce a plan which will be more concrete, more about priorities, more about choices for our future.

Now, it's also a propitious time for planning, because we have new resources. We have the successes of the Campaign, which are producing more resources in the schools, which are producing more resources to support the identification and implementation of university-wide priorities, and there will be funds available to support those priorities when they come forward. It's also a propitious time for planning, I think for some of the reasons that Bob alluded to. There's a real sense, or I at least have this sense, maybe as I'm just starting this job, but anyway maybe it's a sense that there is a willingness among our faculty and between the faculty and the administration to work together around the future of the the university. There's more of a spirit of cooperation between the schools and between departments within the schools and between the administration and the faculty than I've seen in a number of years at Duke. There are reasons for that I will not go into, but I think we're at the right time to grab that opportunity to go forward with planning. So what I want to talk to you about today is how we're going to do that.

Now you were circulated some documents which you may or may not have read, so I'm going to give you a rather brief overview of the planning, and then towards the end of what I have to say I'm going to pose some questions that we're raising in the planning exercise, that I think are incredibly interesting questions for us as a university to contemplate. They are questions that we have to address in a real plan, but they are not easy questions and they are questions that could be contentious. Now let me just start with what kind of plan we're going to be doing. Basically, we're trying to develop a plan which will talk about priorities and choices over the next five-year period, but will view those in the context of some goals which are over more of a ten or longer time horizon, and then, in some areas as you'll hear later, the issues which will really determine a long-term vision of what the university should look like, or might look like, or what we might like it to

look like over an even longer period of time. So, it's a concrete plan in the present, in the context of some sense of where we want to go in the future.

The planning has a number of purposes.- It will be a vehicle for ongoing discussions with the full Board of Trustees, with annual reviews. And what you have to understand is that it is really the President, with the strong support of the Board, which is pushing forward the demand for planning. In fact, there was a survey done among Board members this year, by the Board itself, in which one of the most strong opinions coming out of that survey was that the University needed to do a better job in planning. It's also to be a guide to the Provost as chief academic officer about what we as a university are trying to accomplish, and therefore what the Provost as chief academic officer needs to seek to promote through the resources he has available, both through persuasion and occasionally money, I want to stress that. It is therefore also a template as to the expenditure of Provost funds on academic programs and for that not to be an act of whimsy on my part, we need to have a plan on how to spend those funds,-and the- absence of that, is really a discretionary decision on the Provost's part and I suspect knowing that Ken [Knoerr] is in the room, among others, that you would prefer to have a planned set of decisions on how to spend our money than discretionary ones in which the Provost acts on whim. It's a tool that is a source of principles for establishing the balance between the schools and the Provost's office, or between the schools and the center.

As you know, we've gone through a long period of evolution about this. We used to be a centralized University, then I think many would say we became an overly decentralized university, and we've been kind of eating back ground to achieving a better balance over the last few years. We are now at a very good time to think about that balance in a strategic way and talk about what's the best way to accomplish what we're trying to do academically with a budget system that is well matched to that, and therefore reflects this balance. It will be a tool for the Deans, the chairs of the departments, and the faculty both in setting priorities, and trying to steer what happens to [all] kind[s] of work in conjunction with those priorities. It will be a tool for guiding administrative planning and action. Now let me stop here for a moment to talk about that.

One thing we've done and that Nan and I discussed at the beginning was, in fact, what should be the relationship between academic planning and administration? And what I and she agreed on, was that academic planning had to come first,

and so we had begun academic planning this fall. Administrative planning will only begin in the winter, and there's a clear purpose to that. The purpose is to insure that when we begin administrative planning it is geared to what we are trying to accomplish academically. I can give you a very small example from when I was Vice-Provost for International Affairs about what happens when you don't do that. We have a commitment in shaping our future to internationalization and we named a Vice Provost to do internationalization. When the Vice Provost came into office, he discovered that neither the payroll office nor the personnel office nor the visa office, all of those support services had a clue about what we really meant by internationalization, nor about how they should organize their offices in order to facilitate what was an academic priority. This time, what we're hoping to do is identify those academic priorities, and then steer administrative planning in support of them. Finally, the planning needs to be a guide for the University in setting development goals and monitoring our progress towards our priorities at an annual basis. I'll just put this up here, there is a steering committee for the planning exercise that is in a place you can read it; one person I want to point out is John Harer, who is sitting up here, who is a coordinator for planning, a former chairman of Math, John is the one to complain to about planning, whatever you think is going well, just call me. [Laughter] Planning is an iterative exercise, it will be a long exercise. I'll come to the schedule in a minute, but in order for planning to work, we need interaction and iterations of the plan. We're going to bring forward documents, we're going to listen, we're going to filter them through the various committees, faculty committees, administrative committees, and then we're going to take them back and rework them. And it's going to be very much an iterative process over a lengthy period of time.

Alright, planning will go on at two levels. It will go on at the schools. All schools are being asked to develop their own plans, and all of you I hope as faculty are beginning to hear from your Deans that planning is coming, that you need to be prepared. The Deans are organizing the schools in order to do planning and the schools are going to be asked to identify where their strengths and weaknesses are, where the areas of investment in existing programs should occur and where, dare I say the word, disinvestments in existing programs might occur, and also what are the targets for strategic new investments. So a plan needs to be built around those, and the choices, those statements about targets and plans and plan priorities will be backed by financial statements that the schools have to develop about how they're going to pay for the priorities they have

identified. We're also going to be doing a considerable amount of planning at the university level, but one of the things I want to highlight is the cross-school planning working groups. We have three areas at least where we think there are major possibilities for cross-school initiatives, and when we need to bring people in a, I hate to use this, but in a sort of matrix fashion, in order to intersect what the schools are doing around things that really span the schools. One of those is information technology where there is an enormous amount of innovation, and we need to think very carefully about how we're going to use information technology and how we're not going to use information technology. We need to think about science and engineering across the university, and those of you that were here in the spring will recall that I said that we need to take some initiatives in science and engineering, but we need to do these in ways that create centers of excellence not just within departments but especially spanning departments and even schools, and we're going to be looking at how to work more intensely in social sciences, law and business. Now, those of you in the humanities I suspect are already saying what happened to us?- We had a long discussion about that and basically the expectation is that humanities planning will primarily go on within Arts and Sciences, because it's such a high concentration of the humanities within arts and sciences. But we will be paying very close attention to that area as well. Now these are some of the issues that we expect to pay special attention to, the role of technology in research, teaching and training. I have been to several meetings of late discussing the changes in technology that are going on and I can assure you that not only are they very exciting, but they can be potentially very expensive. We need, therefore, to tailor what we are going to think about doing in technology to what kind of University [we] want to be. We can't do everything in technology, and there would be little reason to do certain things in technology unless we had an academic mission that [it] was trying to support. That is again why the academic mission needs to guide in this case the mission regarding how we are going to develop technology. There is no question, however, that we need to develop technology in teaching, technology in research, technology in infrastructure.

Second of all, interdisciplinary research and teaching: here is really one of those areas where we need to make the reality match our reputation. We are not as interdisciplinary as we'd like to say. We have a lot of obstacles to real interdisciplinary research. There are budgetary obstacles, there are institutional obstacles, there are space obstacles, there are cultural obstacles. One of the goals has to be to push our interdisciplinarity to the next level, and to do that, we need to think about

those obstacles and ways of working through them. Internationalization, I won't say anything more about any of these others for the moment just so I can move ahead.

The timetable: briefly, we have just had a meeting of the Board to discuss planning, in February we will be presenting an elaborated outline based on the initial school and Provost-level planning, and kicking off administrative planning. That is the sequencing I was talking about before. In May, all through the spring, we will be carrying on a discussion, in October we hope to bring forward the draft planning document to the Board and the final document to the Board of Trustees for review in December. To do that, we need to go through all those iterative stages several times that I discussed earlier. Now let me bring forward, at the end of this discussion a few issues that really we need to think about as a University; and I find this the most interesting part, all the rest of this is boiler plate, but this is where the rubber hits the road.

Let me go through a number of these issues. The first one is programmatic development. We need to really assess in each of the schools, in each of our departments where intellectual developments are going and where they intersect with what Duke can do well. And what are the areas in which we expect to intellectually prosper, I don't mean financially prosper? Where we expect to intellectually prosper over the next five to ten years, and that will require real assessment on the part of the departments and schools about their strengths and weaknesses, about the areas that are worthy of putting new funds into, areas that we are going to have to withdraw from, and more generally, how we are going to shape the intellectual environment within our departments and schools over the next decade. Now, there is an important point to this, we cannot—remember those two folks in the beginning? [Neils Bohr and Yogi Berra]— expect to create straightjackets. The idea here is not to create straight jackets, but we do need to make some bets. We do need to think carefully through those issues.

Second, a related issue is faculty quality in recruitment, promotion and retention. Now personally, I think that this is probably one of the most critical areas for two reasons. When you look at our salary data, Duke isn't paying badly. Duke is really paying pretty well, you know, you can debate about the cost of living, the adjustment up or down, but we are somewhere up there in the top 10 universities in the country in terms of average pay, and it's pretty consistent across our schools, you know. But, are we investing sufficiently in the things that make it possible for faculty to accomplish what they are capable of accomplishing, and



what is the trade-off, for instance, between investing in a deeper way in slots that we already have, and investing in more slots? When we talk about faculty development at Duke, we generally talk about new slots. We have been growing and we have been investing in new slots, but there is also an issue of deepening [commitment to fields], of providing to our best faculty the kinds of resources that will allow them, their students, and their colleagues to do the kind of work that they are really capable of, and we need to have a very careful discussion of those trade-offs, and how we build the best faculty over time.

Obviously, another area that this comes in is how we use the APT process. That's ultimately my responsibility, and I will be reporting back to the Council this Fall, I think in November or at the latest at the December meeting, because I realize that you as a Council have had no reports on what has been going on in the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee I think. We looked back and we couldn't find any for two years, it may even be for three years. We need to talk about Appointments, Promotion and Tenure and how that intersects with what we're trying to accomplish in our academic mission.

A third major area of examination is what I would call here 'balance.' Duke has been working for the last ten years and more with the basic principle that if a school could pay for it, a school could do it. Now if you think about that, it's effectively a system that says if you can get the resources, which in turn means you have access to the availability of resources, we're going to allow you to use those resources in the way that you decide to do so. Now that may be fine over a limited period of time, but over a longer period of time, we at least need to address the issue of whether that's an appropriate way to run a university. Do we want to let schools grow at their own pace, or are there other principles? And I don't actually have an answer to this to be honest with you, I certainly don't know what the principles are, or are there other principles [by which] we should determine the relative balance and size of the schools, and if there are other principles, how do we reconcile the resource issue with the balance issue? That is a very difficult problem. If we are talking about 5 years, 10 years, even 25 years, we can't simply market-effectively determine our internal balance and the implications that has with the kinds of faculty the university has, the number of students it has, the kind of students it has, and so on.

Another issue is the future role of the departments, centers, programs and institutes. I think we are all sort of nervously aware of this issue, some of us more than

others depending on which part of the University we are in. But we know that there has been a growth in recent years of types of institutions in the University that cut across the departments. They represent alternative sites for research, sometimes for teaching, sometimes for graduate students. We have some of these that began in one way and ended up in another, so they start as programs, they go to sections, you know we created all these titles, we created this set of titles to allow us to accommodate this type of adaptation to start out as a program, then you became a section, then you become a department. We need to be aware of what the relative roles of these kinds of institutions within our University are going to be, and what the implications are for teaching; for instance, we have the growth of a research faculty independent of the teaching faculty. Do we have the role, or conversely, the growth of the teaching faculty independent of a research faculty? Do we have the growth of the faculty which spends a lot of time teaching students at a distance, in executive education programs in our different schools. I am asking schools to examine the issues of where the markets are, where the student constituencies are, or do we want to curtail ..that, because we think it. somehow, will damage our research mission? These are issues which we must contend with in this period because we are being challenged from the outside constantly about whether or how we are going to do that. If we don't address them they will run us down or we will adapt to them in a willy nilly fashion.

I have already said something about budgeting, and I won't say much more about that, basically we have this whole issue of how we adapt the budgeting system and this addresses a number of these questions, the balance question, the departments, centers, programs, and institute question, the faculty slot vs. faculty weakening question. Each of those has implications for how we budget and the extent to which we adapt our budgeting practices again to our academic priorities. So, to conclude, what I really want to stress is that this is really an academic plan about academic priorities which are seen as a way both of thinking and about controlling our future in a way that is propitious to us, and at the same time, for assuring that we adapt our other administrative and budgetary practices to allow our academic mission to grow. – The agenda described this as a conversation, so let's converse. John [Staddon], who has heard this before.

Prof. John **Staddon** (Psychology/Exp.): Well, it's very good. I just want to underline what you said about AP&T and that whole process. I can remember several years ago, Philip Griffiths asked me, I had to say I declined, but he asked me to chair a committee which was to simplify this process. Well, it has not become simplified, it is now really very

very bureaucratic and time-consuming. It's sort of tenure by weight, you know, you've got this huge thing that people have to assemble. So I agree that some examination of that process is long overdue, and the second point is this business of accretion of faculty. I had never quite understood why there is this kind of academic drive to always acquire more faculty rather than getting the existing faculty a little bit more to work with.

Provost **Lange**: That shows why you're a psychologist rather than a political scientist. And you can go home and think about that.

John **Staddon**: Well, I wouldn't want it to interfere with my other work.

Peter **Lange**: On AP&T, we are going to look at that. I actually was not stressing so much the bureaucratization of AP&T as the selectivity, the kinds of criteria we use and whether we are properly balancing the role of the departments, the deans and the committee. To be honest with you, and I'll be [brief?], the chairs know this at least, because they've been to meetings with their deans; one of the things that I think is [problematic is] that the process is bloating up too much. The process of selection has bloated up the system too much. And there isn't enough selection going on at the department level and on the dean level. And if you think about it, the departments and the deans know more about any case than at the AP&T level. But if the assignment of making selections [bloats up?], then the AP&T committee has to do it and the Provost has to do it. So, there is a real issue and this is what I will talk about when I come back. There is a real issue of whether we have a whole process, again I will use the word balance, or whether we have to balance properly to assure that we do the best job we can of constantly using that process to improve the faculty which is what it is all about.

Prof. Eric **Meyers** (Religion): I wanted to ask a two-part question. First, on Curriculum 2000 [which] has already greatly influenced the strategic plan especially in terms of implementing such things as language requirements and so on, how that's going to be rolled into your planning process, and I'd like a little clarification about your thinking about putting the humanities over in the Arts and Sciences rather than over here, I'm not quite certain that would be the appropriate move.

Peter **Lange**: On Curriculum 2000, that's really an Arts and Sciences issue which they are going to have to work through in their school, adapting their school plan to the demands of Curriculum 2000 in the context of the questions we've

posed.

Prof. Karla **Holloway** (Dean of the Humanities): Peter, can I just [interject], there is going to be a letter coming, it just hasn't gotten to you, on how we place Humanities.

Peter **Lange**: OK, so obviously, I didn't know. You'll notice I was very defensive about it. It's only out of my good grace that I didn't tell you why we're doing it this way, let me put it that way. It wasn't my idea.

Prof. Richard **Burton** (Fuqua): [referring to a transparency] Peter, on the list of all the participants, starting with the President, you had a slide and you went through Deans and department chairs, PACOR, and the Academic Council, and at the bottom of that, fortunately it is an 8.5 by 11 sheet, but the faculty was on the bottom. Could you tell us a bit more about the process by which those of us on the faculty end up on the bottom?

Peter **Lange**: With respect to the faculty, the Academic Council is a regular forum. ECAC is a regular forum. Academic Council and those working groups I talk with are two critical areas. Also, I'm expecting to meet at least once with the faculty in each of the schools. I mean it's not a good opportunity to go to the schools anyways with[in?] the context of those meetings with the faculty in each of the schools. I have already been to the Law School, I'll be meeting with the Arts and Sciences faculty, I know I'm already meeting with the Fuqua faculty and so forth. So, there are lots of opportunities. It can't be the same kind of ongoing, obviously, engaged thing that will be true at those other levels, but we're hoping there will also be feedback from these committees back to their departments and remember, the faculty will also be involved at the school level. This is where our level gets involved and the planning and steering committee gets involved, but there's also going to be whatever the dean is organizing in the school. I think really, the biggest problem is not in schools like Fuqua or Law, it's in Arts and Sciences, because Arts and Sciences has over 400 tenure track faculty, and over 500 regular rank faculty. And so that's where that problem of losing some of the faculty in the process probably comes into this.

Prof. Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies): I have another question along the same lines, and that is the way in which faculty participation can be organized and the search to increase our understanding and attention to interdisciplinary questions. At least traditionally, the way these things have been organized, faculty in the rank and file hear of this from their chair, who has heard about

this from the deans and so on, and we are invited to think about the needs of our departments and so on. It's much more difficult to see the kind of initiatives that will commit faculty to think seriously about their relationships both outside departments as well as inside. I think that there needs to be a way, I don't know, maybe you have some ideas about this already that you haven't had a chance to go into in detail with us, but I think some thought has to be given to it.

Peter **Lange**: I thought about that. We don't have a solution or an approach we're clearly comfortable with. We're not comfortable with just leaving it. There used to be more of these working groups, that was our original solution. Some of the deans felt uncomfortable with the notion that there would be so much intersecting activity, so we cut them back to some very big issues where we think there is clear need to have this interdisciplination across school and across departmental boundaries; but, that doesn't really solve your problem; just today John [Harer] and I were discussing one approach to some of this, but I don't think we have this worked out yet. I think, we need to—think —about—how we're going to do that, I don't think we have that fully worked out.

Dean Berndt **Mueller**: I am Dean of Natural Sciences for those who have not met me yet. I think it's very important that at least in my area I'm writing to all the chairmen of the departments to make sure that this happens. I think it's very important for the fact that if they have ideas about interdisciplinary [initiatives], they should come forth. This is not a process in which faculty should wait to be asked. The starting shot has been fired, and I think it's very important for faculty to bring the ideas to their deans, and especially to John Harer who is charged with leading that process at the Provost level. We are very open to that. And I think anything that comes from any of the faculty within the schools will be pursued as far as possible.

Peter **Lange**: I think the issue of how to find that balance and how to let the interdisciplinary initiatives go forward is unresolved; that's why I said we can't let the plan be a straightjacket, and one of the ways of avoiding that is by letting that kind of initiative come forward. Berndt [Mueller] is right, we're looking for that.

Assoc. Provost John **Harer**: Peter, let me point out that in 1993 and in 1994, there was a Task Force of Science and Engineering. And what that group did was organize and call for self-assembling and other means of assembling other groups to present ideas of interdisciplinary things, agenda

items that could be pushed forward in the sciences and engineering. They came up with some lovely ideas, many of those are implemented at various levels and some haven't been really moved too much at all. But that is really our model for how these working groups are supposed to develop their agendas and to create an environment where different faculty can come and propose ideas that are cross-school and cross-department.

Prof. Joshua **Socolar** (Physics): There is another issue which I see in some ways as similar to this interdisciplinary issue in that the University wants to pay a lot of attention to it, but I'm not sure it's ever discussed explicitly and fully in the way it needs to be, and that is the relationship between the educational mission of the University and the research mission. In your list of people to consult, one contingent that was noticeably absent, is the students, graduate or undergraduate students. Obviously, there are limitations on how much weight you want to put on student input. They don't have a long history here and so forth. I wonder if with this issue of devoting resources to educational programs versus research will be an explicit part of the planning, and whether there might be some ways in which students could become involved.

Peter **Lange**: That is a good question. First, we need to separate out, I think, that the graduate communities will probably get involved with what happens to departments. How to work with the undergraduate schools is probably primarily within the schools. That would be like Bob Thompson from Trinity College, the Dean of Trinity College, might figure out an exercise of getting them involved. But the broader question we're raising should be there in my last list. Leaving aside the administrative implementation, you're saying how do we think about, if I'm hearing correctly, how do we think about the relationship between teaching, training, and research. I didn't put it up here, but I think the mission statement of the university kind of says we do need all these things. We're strong in teaching and we're all familiar with that and it's embodied in things like the Bass professorships, its principles of how we do things. But it might be a good point that we reinsert that even as a direct theme and think about it in an explicit way through either a working group or some other, and it's worth thinking about further.

Joshua **Socolar**: Well, the schools are obviously highly constrained by the resources that are made available to them, and in planning for how they're going to be allocated, it seems that that should be a consideration.

Peter **Lange**: Well, truth be told, the central administration

is constrained in the resources and effectively central administration is more concerned with the schools in terms of resources, because so much of the budget still rests with the schools. Now, as I said, it shifted somewhat and deciding where to put those central resources in what would enhance our priorities we think as a university [they] should be, should [be] one of those central questions, and there's a significant amount of money [at stake?].

The **Chair**: Thank you Peter. I know this is an ongoing process, and I think it's going to be exciting and I'm pleased that you came to talk with us today. We wanted to spend just about two minutes on the last item listed. It was to follow up on a question that was raised in connection with the Faculty Scholar Award Report made to the Council in September concerning the issue of more science than non-science majors receiving Faculty Scholar Awards. We didn't know if this was a long term trend at that time or not, but we looked back and it was a long term trend in terms of the number of majors within the university. A disproportionate number of winners of Faculty Scholar Awards were from natural sciences. We have a lot- of hypotheses on why that is the case. One of those that we couldn't refute, and it seemed to be the most likely, is, that the awards tend to go along with the nominations; so, at least for greater spread, it's to encourage more schools. You can take the message back to the directors of undergraduate studies in your departments, to be sure that the best students in your department that should be nominated for the scholar award are nominated for the faculty scholar award. And if you have any questions about how this process is to be undertaken, Ben Ward has been working with this program for a number of years, and he's excellent, so direct your questions to him. But we'd like to encourage more nominations and get the very best students. —

In the absence of any other matters being brought before the assembly, the **Chair** declared the meeting adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt, Faculty Secretary