

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

September 18, 1997

The Academic Council of Duke University met on September 18, 1997, from 3:45 until 5:05 p.m., with Prof. **Robert Mosteller** (Law) presiding in the absence of the Chair. Prof. **Mosteller** first reported to the Council his own election from ECAC (the Executive Committee of the Academic Council) as Vice Chair, supposedly a "largely ceremonial position," but something more when as in the present instance the Chair is called for jury duty on a current, time-consuming case. "So he is there [dispensing justice] and I am here, and I hope you will bear with me today."

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 17 and May 15 having been pre-circulated to the Council with the meeting agenda and other materials, they were brought up for consideration by the Council. Were there corrections or additions? Both sets of minutes **were approved** by the Council by voice vote, as submitted, without discussion or dissent.

The **Vice Chair** called attention to the rosters being circulated for recording attendance.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

It's customary each year at the first meeting of the Council to remind its members, and hopefully to get the word to others, of the Personal Assistance Service, a part of the Employee Occupational Health Service, which is available to faculty members. An outgrowth of an earlier committee on chemical dependency, started by our late colleague Prof. Robert Dickens, it can help in advising and counseling on a variety of problems. It is useful to have the availability of this program be widely known. There are brochures available on the table up front for those not familiar with the PAS to pick up, and please to share with colleagues. [The brochures are available at the Academic Council Office, 304 West Union Tower, 684-6447.]

The **Vice Chair** recognized the President for a few matters she would like to speak to the Council about. President **Nannerl Keohane** came to the lectern to announce a search for a new Athletic Director to succeed Mr. Thomas Butters, whom we shall have several chances to salute over the course of the year for his extraordinary service in that position. The search committee will be chaired by Executive Vice-President Tallman Trask and will include Profs. Kathleen Smith (BAA) and Thomas Spragens (PS) as faculty representatives. Nominations of candidates and suggestions for framing criteria will be most welcome as this committee begins its work.

President **Keohane** then addressed another topic, encouraged by ECAC to speak to the matter of race relations in the light of the September 10 letter signed by 250 concerned faculty and staff, following up the letters from concerned black faculty last spring after the arrest incident involving a black student. She quoted a passage from a letter signed by twenty black faculty to help frame these thorny issues of racial fairness: "The applicability of the Golden Rule should perhaps render a stronger case for the advocacy of fairness than all of the committee reports and declarations of good intentions. We could conceivably have a campus-wide revival if members of the university community approached each action by honestly answering the question: 'Would I want this done to me or to my children?'" Commenting on the extraordinarily thoughtful conversations she had had over the summer with a number of those black faculty she also wanted to share her response to the September 10 letter: "Dear Colleagues, I appreciate the strong support demonstrated in the letter you have sent me, for efforts to make this University a place where 'all of us are treated with dignity and feel welcome to study, work, and learn.' I agree with you that we as a community must take specific and well considered steps to achieve this goal. It is heartening to know that so many other members of the faculty and staff share this dedication, including both those who signed the letter, and others who have spoken to me about this issue over the past few months. I welcome the commitment you have made in the letter to work with me, members of the Board, the Provost, the Deans, and other members of the administration, faculty, and student body in addressing these crucial issues at Duke. I assure you that I will call upon you for your partnership in these endeavors." She was to meet with the three faculty who had delivered the letter, to discuss what specific actions might be taken, and wanted at this time to make four points.

First, this has to be a collective effort, to make Duke a more inclusive place. Acknowledging her role as leader in these efforts as in others — it comes with the job — she also recognized the need for wide help from the community in exercising that leadership. Already having identified this crucial area of need within her convocation address to the first-year students, she welcomed not only offers of help but also suggestions about ways in which the energy which is now present on the campus can most appropriately be harnessed. She quoted from a column by William Raspberry taking issue, understandably, with any notion that the problem could be solved by interaction among freshmen, which she had not of course intended as her only suggestion. But he went on to add his own view that a good deal more than freshmen being nice to each other is needed, even trying hard to make friends across racial lines. It will take a critical mass of students and faculty who believe an

inclusive community is worth the effort it takes to create, and who will get busy creating it. Pres. **Keohane** saw the notion of the critical mass as very important. And potentially we have that and just have to make it work better.

The second point she wanted to make was to acknowledge that there has been action taken in the past, as issues of race have been raised at Duke. Over the summer she had read a lot in some of the past archives about particular periods when race was very prominent on Duke's agenda, learning some things about some actions that were taken that made a real difference, helping us get as far along as we are today. But she also learned about some actions that would have been really good, which failed to take root. Why that was true, and how can we make sure that the changes we now want to make are built into the very fabric of the University? As the Chairman of the Trustees said last spring, "This can't just be a project; it has to be a way of life." We now have precious moments of opportunity to focus our actions and get some significant actions done.

The third point is to report some of the actions that are right now being taken, only a sample, but responding to the need to "walk the walk, not just talk the talk." Here are some things now being done among many others which we hope to share with one another. Ms. C.T. Woods-Powell has been appointed interim Director of the Mary Lou Williams Center and Assistant to the Provost to help with black faculty recruitment and retention, a particularly important post on both counts. Mr. Phillip Shabazz will be artist-in-residence of the Mary Lou Williams Center, giving a sense of rejuvenation in the Center this fall. Chancellor Ralph Snyderman (Health Affairs) has asked Dr. Charles Johnson to serve with him as special advisor on improving the recruitment of black faculty. Under events, many will be aware of a celebration this weekend of the fiftieth anniversary of our colleague Prof. John Hope Franklin's book, "From Slavery to Freedom." There will be many things going on, but one of the most interesting, promising to be most fruitful, is that on the initiative of [University Librarian] David Ferriero and others, the book has been given to all members of the first-year class, and there will be opportunity to discuss the book in depth with Dr. Franklin. There are also a number of events planned by Student Affairs including an African-American women's retreat this November, a year-long series on literary women and men of color, and several films and lecture series to be on the alert for. Also, the Black Student Alliance has a full program scheduled for the Homecoming weekend and the Mary Lou Williams Jazz Festival will be the first week in October, to name only a few.

Next, a number of task forces have worked and are continuing to do so. One last spring on diversity in the curriculum, appointed by Dean William Chafe (Arts & Sciences), has brought forward an interesting report which will be taken into account in the larger curriculum review for Arts & Sciences this fall, and the task force on Residential Policy will be thinking hard about these issues too. There is a proposal being developed for a John Hope Franklin Center, perhaps in renovated Perkins Library space, not only for documentation but also as a gathering space and with perhaps a few offices for visitors. It's very early on the drawing board as yet, but she was quite enthusiastic about its possibilities. Diversity and racial climate were the major topics of the annual retreat of her senior

leadership group and Administrative Council. Partly as a result, a number of working groups have followed up, one on workplace issues which Human Resources [Assoc. V. P.] Clint Davidson has agreed to chair, one on faculty and student issues which the Provost will chair, and one on some monitoring efforts on campus, trying to keep people informed about all the things that are going on. There will also be a brainstorming effort from the Office of the President, chaired by [Special Assistant] Judith White. Diversity and racial climate will also be a major topic at the meeting of the Trustees next week, at their request, for both the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs committees, and also for the full Board for a lengthy discussion in a closed session on Saturday morning. Duke Student Government (DSG) President Lino Marrero has plans for a Coming Together in Community to kick off Homecoming next Friday around noon, which was conceived as an opportunity for sharing and introducing oneself to new people and getting to know each other. A discussion at a DSG luncheon earlier this week brought some very thoughtful suggestions and a clear expression of hope on the part of students that students can weigh in as well as part of this critical mass.

Along these lines, early this afternoon, a statement was brought to her office from the Intercommunity Council of student leaders from several of the classes and major groups on campus. To quote one paragraph, "After meeting last night to discuss race relations on campus we decided that the issue demanded immediate attention and decisive action. Therefore, on Friday September 26, we are declaring Race Day for the entire campus community. We are planning to change the 'Coming Together' — referred to a moment ago — to a frank and confrontational discussion on race relations with an open microphone forum. We are not going to attend classes on this day, and we adamantly urge that you validate your devotion to improving the racial climate at Duke by supporting Race Day with a formal cancellation of all classes. We will encourage the student body to forgo classes, because what we would be learning in class that day is far less important than what this discussion will bring. We hope that we may have your support in these efforts."

Pres. Keohane commended the dedication of student leaders to taking this issue seriously in an attempt to bring about change. Mr. Lino Marrero as one of the signers of the letter she was sure would work with the others to accomplish what he hopes can be done in the framework in the original Coming Together, however it might be altered in light of these new emphases, and she looked forward to hearing about what he and other signatories have in mind. But she wanted also to make clear that she could not support the cancellation of classes. As a Professor, she resisted the notion that the only way to show that something is important is to cancel classes. The topic that we are discussing is of very great importance to our community, but so is the fundamental mission of Duke University, and she did not think that it wise to put these two important purposes in direct conflict with each other. She hoped that the student leaders will work with the faculty to find other ways to provide educational opportunities and draw other students into involvement on this issue.

Finally, and coming back to her conversations with the black faculty, the most instructive and important part of all these discussions over the last few months were those

conversations. She had had the excellent advice to talk with the letter signatories individually, rather than as only a large group. A lesson learned and now shared was that each of us should take more opportunities on our own to reach out individually to people rather than thinking of them in terms of collectives. The insights that our colleagues shared, and the particular problem that African-American faculty and students face on campus — anywhere, but particularly Duke, which is our concern — were very illuminating as were some of their suggestions for steps that we might take. To share a few, and there were many more, one particularly important insight for this body especially was problems with communication. In particular, there is a sense among African-American faculty members and students who feel that they have been unfairly treated, and suspect some racial bias in the classroom or in their interaction, that there are no safe routes for them to take in acting on this feeling. In our system, department chairs have a crucial role, and this is our advice. But to go to department chairs is not necessarily perceived as a route that is likely to be fruitful, because department chairs are perceived, fairly or not, as more likely to be loyal to and protect their faculty colleagues, especially those more senior. She had mentioned this observation at the Dean's Council last Monday, asking them to bring this up with those faculty who are department chairs and division heads for frank discussion about what we can do about that perception.

As a second communication point, the African-American faculty members see problems sometimes in a sense of condescension that comes in the assessment of one's work. People are not willing to be as frank and straight in their assessment of problems, either for faculty or students, to say that they're not performing to standards, by a bending over backwards not to seem to be racist. There's an exaggerated effort to be kind, but our colleagues are quite clear that this is not doing anybody a favor and that straight talk is definitely needed. Now you may say, "But after I do this, suppose somebody does say I have behaved in a racist fashion." Of course, sometimes the race card *can* be played unfairly, and one of the real dilemmas is, how do you know? And here again, our colleagues had given her at least, and others similarly troubled, some very good advice. If there is an instance for worry that the race card has been played unfairly, that someone is seeing discrimination in what doesn't seem to you an instance of discrimination or insensitivity, and you're a member of the white majority, discuss the incident with a black faculty colleague whom you know and whose judgment you respect. You will get a better litmus test than can possibly be provided by those of us who have not directly been subjected to racial discrimination. Ask their opinion and they will tell you, either "Yes, this is racially insensitive even though you may not have intended it to be" or "No, I think this person was using racism as a crutch to avoid dealing with the problem."

In closing, she expressed once again her appreciation for the offers of support and partnership from all parts of the community in tackling the obstacles that lie ahead of us in our desire to become a more fully inclusive community. In thinking how to work towards the goal of being the best university Duke can be, must be, and can only be, she quoted again from the letter from her colleagues this September. Duke must be a place "in which

all can study, work, and teach, knowing that they have the respect and support of our University."

As the President departed the lectern the **Vice Chair** took note of the fact that this was her birthday, offering the appreciative best wishes of the Council on this occasion.

INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTS, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR HUMAN RESOURCES, MR. CLINT DAVIDSON

At this point the **Vice Chair** introduced Mr. Clint Davidson, our new Associate Vice President for Human Resources. Mr. Davidson was Vice President for Human Resources at the University of Pennsylvania. Prior to being at Penn he was Associate Vice-Chancellor for Human Resources at Vanderbilt. Since his coming to Duke he has been spending a lot of time speaking with individuals and groups to learn more about the University and the Medical Center, and we invited him to come here today to introduce himself to us and to talk for a few minutes about issues he sees on the horizon. He also serves on one of our Council committees, the Faculty Compensation Committee, chaired by John Payne. Welcome, Mr. Clint Davidson.

Assoc. V. Pres. **Clint Davidson** (Human Resources) appreciated his grant of ten minutes to tell the Council a little about his view of what his job is, what he has been doing these first three and a half months since coming to Duke, and what he sees himself doing for the coming year. He hoped not to gloss over too many things while giving a quick capsule of each of those areas. He had thought a lot about this initial issue of seeing what his job is, and had even sought some expert counsel on that matter. Late last evening he had asked his wife what she thought his job was, and all she could tell him was that not having seen him for the past three and a half months she wasn't sure *what* his job was. Reflecting on that perception he had come to see his job description as that of an investment manager. That may not be a term typically associated with Human Resources, but from his vantage point is likely the most important thing he was involved with.

As for what kind of investments, the President has just spoken in part to that. A major part of his role, and that of his colleagues in Human Resources, is helping provide leadership and support in the development of relationships across the University community, relationships with and between colleagues and faculty, with coworkers, with patients, students, alumni ~ lots of different constituencies that we are here to serve and support and develop effective, productive, and valued relationships with. It's a particularly important and challenging responsibility because of all of the differences we represent. We are multicultural, multigenerational, multiracial, and because of all of those differences, a good deal of investment is needed toward developing those relationships. It's a worthy investment if we intend to use those differences as part of our strengths, rather than to reflect on where we are not included. In a quick sense, that was his view philosophically of what his job is.

What had he been doing these first three and a half months? To touch on four or five things describing the areas he was involved with, he was first trying to appreciate what a large and complex university this is, by any standards, trying to acquaint himself with the University and its Medical Center and the Hospital. That initial acquaintance certainly requires long days and many meetings. Within that effort he was trying to understand the different Human Resources practices and the basis for them, to understand the different organizations and the cultures that those organizations represent. Trying to better understand what works well in terms of Human Resources practices and why, and what needs to be improved and how, [is an initial aim]. It is important to understand the vision for each of those organizations in going forward.

He had spent considerable time, unexpectedly, when interviewing here in learning about the partnership between Duke Hospital and the Durham County Hospital Corporation. As Council members probably know, both boards have approved the terms for moving forward [toward merging efforts] in the near future. Those terms will be going to the County Commissioners for review and hopefully for approval. He had been working very closely with Human Resources colleagues and hospital administrators at the various institutions involved regarding how to integrate our policies, our benefit programs, and our Human Resources practices.

A third area he was becoming more involved in, and one he knew the Council was especially interested in, is the Duke Managed Care member satisfaction survey. He had just received a very large report from Foster-Higgins [a consulting firm on health care] and was scheduled for a two-hour briefing the next day. In the near future, he could meet again with the Council to share the results of that survey and invite dialogue about different views and perspectives we have of our managed care program here. Those are the kinds of activities occupying many of his hours over these last three and a half months.

Next, where are we going, for the near term at least? An important issue facing the entire University community, certainly in terms of managers and supervisors, is selecting and implementing an enterprise-wide Human Resources information system. With the 17,000+ faculty and staff we have here, one of the things that is important in our Human Resources programs is all the data attached thereto. From his vantage it is very difficult to get accurate data and information both for planning and decision-making purposes. We hope sometime in the next few months to make that decision and begin working to acquire and implement that new information system. He also appreciated the help he had had from faculty in understanding how many so-called "non-value added" activities we have in our Human Resources processes at the University. He was trying to understand those activities and work with colleagues in designing ways to diminish them, or at the very best to eliminate them.

There's a need for streamlining processes and capitalizing on efficiencies offered through specific technologies. As a couple of examples, the employment process at Duke University on the staff side is gargantuan. Last year, we hired 4,000 staff employees. He was told by many faculty and others that that is not a very smoothly operating process. We

are in consequence completely redesigning the employment function, attempting to redesign it into a recruitment function, so that we can compete in the very competitive labor market locally, attracting top-notch candidates for the staff positions we have at Duke. We need to be offering high quality applicant screening and providing other support services for those who want assistance in their recruitment and placement activities. It was his hope that by July of next year we will see a dramatic improvement in both the quality and responsiveness of our recruitment services.

The second example having technology-support implications is redesigning the administration of benefits. By the next open-enrollment period [for health-care benefits], he hoped that [faculty and others] would be able to make benefit selections and changes via telephone and computer, and that many of the administrative processes would be automated, freeing benefit staff to really work with you on information and counseling matters. A third area that we will get into shortly, after both of those, is the complete redesign of our compensation program to ensure that we are competitive in the markets that we have to compete in, while providing appropriate flexibility.

The last item that he was becoming increasingly involved in is building a service attitude and a service capability consistent with the expectations and needs of a premier university and medical center. This effort requires understanding the expectations of those being served, and developing the core competencies and the capabilities to meet those expectations. That can sound like a lot of glad-handing and backslapping, but in his view it's certainly not charm school but really presenting a set of services and the professionals who will respond to the range of needs in accessing the Human Resources program. That effort needs to have very high priority and he hoped that faculty will start to see some of the benefits and advantages of that work this coming year.

So that's what he'd been involved in, and he was delighted to be at Duke and developing lots of relationships, welcoming input and counsel and direction as we go forward on many of these issues.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES EARNED DURING THE SUMMER

Thanking Mr. Davidson, the **Vice Chair** moved on to the matter of approving degrees earned during the summer. In exercise of a responsibility delegated to the Academic Council by the University Faculty, he recognized the Deans or their representatives from the College and the eight Schools, in turn, for presentation of approved candidates. These lists are to be forwarded by the Provost, after Council action, for final approval by the Board of Trustees. The numbers of the various degree nominees were as follows:

Trinity College of Arts & Sciences, Dean William Chafe	
Bachelor of Arts	36
Bachelor of Science	10
School of Engineering, Dean Earl H. Dowell	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	10
School of Nursing, Dean Mary T. Champagne	
Master of Science in Nursing	12
Nicholas School of the Environment, Dean Norman L. Christensen, Jr.	
Master of Environmental Management	4
Fuqua School of Business, Dean Rex Adams	
Master of Business Administration	99
Divinity School, Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master of Theological Studies	7
Master of Divinity	4
Master of Theology	1
School of Law, Dean Pamela B. Gann	
Juris Doctor	2
Master of Legal Studies	1
School of Medicine, Dean Dan G. Blazer II	
Master of Health Sciences in Biometry	1
The Graduate School, Dean Lewis M. Siegel	
Master of Arts	23
Master of Science	10
Master of Arts in Teaching	10
Master of Public Policy	2
Doctor of Philosophy	62

Prof. **Peter Burian** (Humanities, ECAC) was recognized for the usual motions: 1) that the candidates for degrees during the spring term, as presented by the deans of the University's schools and college, be approved by the faculty and recommended to the Board of Trustees, and 2) that the Provost be authorized to make such adjustments to the approved lists of candidates for degrees as may be necessary to assure that no candidate for a degree will fail to have his or her diploma awarded in a timely fashion, or that no candidate will receive a degree for which he or she is not fully qualified.

These motions, in turn, were seconded and offered for discussion, and **were approved** by voice vote, without discussion or dissent.

ELECTION OF THE FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE

The **Vice Chair** reminded the Council that at the September meeting the Council is charged with electing, each year, a Faculty Hearing Committee, which represents the faculty as described in Appendix M of the Faculty Handbook. The term of election is for one year. A list of nominees from ECAC was included in the pre-circulated material, and will be read into nomination:

Prof. Craig Casey (Electrical and Computer Engineering),
Prof. John Falletta (Pediatrics),
Prof. Robert Gleckner (English),
Prof. Joel Huber (Fuqua),
Prof. Thomas Metzloff (Law), to be chair, spring semester,
Prof. Ellen Mickiewicz (Public Policy),
Prof. Herve* Moulin (Economics),
Prof. David Pisetsky (Rheumatology/Immunology),
Prof. Kenneth Reckhow (Nicholas School of the Environment),
Prof. Wendell Rosse (Hematology/Oncology),
Prof. Thomas Rowe (Law), to be chair, fall semester, and
Prof. Laura Underkuffler (Law).

It was moved and seconded that this list of nominees be accepted, and that motion was passed by the Council, without any additional nominees, any discussion, or any dissent.

A REPORT FROM ECAC ON THE *FACULTY FORUM*

The **Vice Chair** noted that the ECAC report on the *Faculty Forum* had been included with the pre-circulated agenda material. This matter comes forward to us from the May meeting, where a motion had been made that ECAC bring forward to the Council a report on the full cost and benefits of the *FF* and the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission. The Council has that report, which he would summarize and characterize, and then offer for open floor discussion. The report contains a detailed breakout of the cost figures, dealing with that part of the motion in a very straightforward fashion. The total cost is \$10,100 per year. The issue about what the goals are and the degree to which these are being met, and the mission of the *FF* being fulfilled, is more complex. As ECAC has decided in discussion, and set out in this report, there are two ways generically to describe these potential goals. One goal would be to provide a totally independent voice for faculty discussion and debate, with the *FF* as an organ available at such time as it might be needed to for discussing issues of importance within the faculty, an organ totally independent of any control other than faculty control. So that's one broad goal that one could talk about here.

The other role that ECAC discussed was to provide a regular channel for intellectual exchange within the faculty. Various different people and different groups might have different views on the relative importance between those two goals, and how that second goal especially is being satisfied or not satisfied. We chose in ECAC, rather than to come to closure immediately after the summer break with a recommendation about either continuing the *FF* for an indefinite future or a recognition that could lead to its elimination, to take what we thought was a better approach. After a discussion with the Editor and with the [members of the Advisory Board], we offered some suggestions of what we saw as ways to improve the function with the respect to the second goal, that of a more robust venue for discussion of issues within the faculty. What our proposal is today, and we feel that it needs no formal action if it is the sense of the Council that this is the proper direction to head in, is that basically we will come back to this issue at the end of the academic year, after a period in which the Editor, taking into account our advice and acting upon it as he and the [Advisory Board] feel proper — after they've had a chance to do what it is that they can with the *FF* for the course of the year. That is our recommendation at this point, that we take another look at the end of this academic year, and during that time we may ~ and we haven't decided how - make some efforts to do a sampling of what the readership is and how people believe the direction it is heading in [is working out]. It has not been decided whether to do that, or how to do it if we try. With that, the report on the *FF* is open for discussion.

Prof. **John Staddon** (NS&M) came to the lectern with a prepared statement. How did all this come about? Why is that ECAC rushed into summer deliberations about a matter that is clearly not an emergency? The reason is apparently embarrassment. Prof. Roy Weintraub (ECO), ex-Dean of the Faculty [of A&S] and ex-Chair of Academic Council, is so embarrassed by the *FF*, as he told the *Durham Herald-Sun* in June, that at the last meeting of this Council, in a stealth motion not listed in the agenda or announced to Council members in advance, he moved to suspend publication pending review. That's a curious view of justice, first we hang them, then we try them.

This is a serious business, and we must take Prof. Weintraub's discomfort seriously because he is not easily embarrassed. Here are some things about Duke University that evidently do not embarrass him. He is not embarrassed that a distinguished Professor of Literature at Duke has twice won the International Bad Writing Award, or that Duke's journal *Social Text* has shown itself to be an intellectual fraud by publishing without review in its "Science Wars" issue (but not in the book that followed), the most notorious intellectual hoax of the last decade. He is not embarrassed that the Executive Director of the Duke Press reacted to the hoax not with an apology, but with a defense (in the *New York Times*). He is not embarrassed that the Duke Press itself — tiptoeing between scholarship, sex education, and psychopathology - publishes books like "Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment" a faux-tabloid self-justification by a bisexual feminist who defends sexual activity with her students and thesis advisers as a contribution to teaching. A sensitivity robust enough to be unfazed by these events, but embarrassed by the *FF*, suggests that its crimes must be severe.

What has really upset our colleague? Printing of [*FF* Editor] Strandberg's book chapter, said to have been rejected for reprinting five years ago during a peer review, was mentioned in the *Herald-Sun* interview with Prof. Weintraub. If lack of peer review was what was upsetting, *FF* is after all a newspaper; its policy is open publication, not peer review, although the Editor might well draw the line at an article justifying sex with students. But Prof. Weintraub is not embarrassed that *Social Text*, an academic journal, seems not to peer review anything.

H. L. Mencken has aptly written that "all successful newspapers are ceaselessly querulous and bellicose," a thought that raises another possibility. Perhaps Prof. Weintraub finds *FF* upsetting because it publishes opinions with which he disagrees. But surely he is not a fan of failed prophets like Sigmund Freud, or the post-modern Yale professor — and Nazi collaborator — Paul de Man, both of whom have figured in the Editor's "Crackpots on Parade" column. On the other hand, *FF* has published a couple of articles critical of the vibrant new discipline of Science Studies, of which Prof. Weintraub has recently become a devotee. He is Director of the new Center for Social and Historical Studies of Science, which has invited at least one person criticized in the pages of the *FF* to speak at Duke. But that's not certain because Prof. Weintraub has not published a Forum article on this or any other topic. If there is one good outcome from this unfortunate motion it is that we should not entertain objections to the *FF* from anyone unwilling to contribute to it. "If you don't like what you read, then by God write something better (or keep quiet!)"

Parenthetically, the ECAC report refers to fears that "the publication is somehow being unduly 'captured' by a small minority." If it has been captured, it is only because the defenders have fled! The opposition has not been heard from. Since these folk are rarely silent on other occasions, we may think of this situation as a sort of "Silence of the hams." In any event, no contributor has ever been denied publications by any Editor, as far as he was aware.

Although not sure what embarrasses Prof. Weintraub he *could* say what embarrasses *him*, the spectacle of a senior faculty member attempting to choke off a unique vehicle for public debate under the guise of fiscal responsibility. The *FF*, and its earlier incarnation the *Faculty Newsletter*, has seen in its pages vigorous debates on topics like administrative bloat (remember the "VP Count"), political correctness, race and affirmative action, grading policy, biology and women's studies, speech codes, the organization of the curriculum, tenure policy, and many others. Some of these topics cannot even be discussed at many of our major universities, so great is the self-censorship of the high-horse professoriat. It is disgraceful, yes, and embarrassing, that an eminent colleague should seek to impose a similar censorship on Duke University.

No matter how querulous the *FF* may be, Prof. Weintraub's motion was disingenuous and did not deserve to succeed. That it passed is a testimony only to our openness to the idea of reviewing any activity of this Council and our collective willingness to trust a distinguished colleague. The trust was misplaced. We should not continue along the path

opened up by this unfortunate motion. "I therefore move that we accept ECAC's review." If there is need for action next spring, perhaps some well-intentioned and constructive proposal will be placed before this Council — a proposal that may improve communication and debate at Duke University, rather than attempt to abort it.

[Note: during this speech the tape record was broken off, so that the report of the rest of the meeting relies only upon notes.]

Prof. Lawrence Evans (NS&M) asked about the "two attractive possibilities" in the ECAC report ~ reduction to four issues this year and guest editors for one or two of these. Who proposed these, the Editor? Perhaps he [Prof. Victor Strandberg was present] could respond. The Vice Chair said that ECAC thought the fewer issues might improve quality. Evans: would they be larger issues? No, maybe smaller.

Prof. Seymour Mauskopf (HST) asked about the previous paragraph questioning whether the *FF* had been captured by a small minority; in the May minutes, page 12, Prof. Weintraub had not given that reason. What does ECAC mean? The Vice Chair explained that an aggressive style and content was seen to make the *FF* not congenial. It's not censorship, but discomfort. Mauskopf asked if that would be looked at during the year or only at the end, and the Vice Chair thought it would be by a report coming forward at the March meeting for vote in the April meeting, or in April for vote in May.

Prof. Sydney Nathans (HST) expressed the view that those who read the *FF* find it not much of a forum. There are not many contributors, it's not diverse, and the successive Editors have not succeeded in getting there. He didn't think it was that the defenders had fled the scene, but over the years the *FF* was too much dominated by the voice of its editors, a monologue. Prof. Strandberg notes 40-50 hours per month, trying to get wide expression of views, but it emerges as the eccentricities and natural extension of the Editor. There is grumbling about the effect on tone and balance of the contributions. Ferret and Possum and such filler should be cut; there's a lot that's better for filler. Too much satiric wit and hyperbole prompts one to ask, is that where I want to be? It's too much *ad hominem*. But the ECAC experiment is worthwhile to do and he'd support Staddon's motion of that approach. The Vice Chair made the procedural point that no motion was needed to accomplish that outcome of the discussion.

Prof. Dale Martin (Humanities) felt that the *FF* does not draw people in. It invites but we don't have time. We read the *Duke Chronicle* instead, or the *Duke Review* "if we want that view." That it's not easy to find an Editor is good evidence that it's not a forum and that we don't need it. Staddon noted that Prof. Weintraub had offered himself as a target, and that all the Editors have been willing to back off. Prof. Greg Lawler (NS&M), as a recent member of ECAC noted that earlier issues had been reviewed, and there were a lot of contributions, but we seem to have fallen behind more recently. Prof. Peter Burian (Humanities, ECAC) as current ECAC member and former *FF* contributor said that fewer pages over the year might help avoid ideology, a criterion for success over the year. An

increase in contributions reversing the downward trend noted would be the best indicator of success, so that we can wait and print them as we get them. Having an occasional guest editor around a particular theme could make the *FF* more organized, and get former contributors back again.

Prof. **Nathans** gave his view that the motion in May had not been a surprise, not a stealth motion in Staddon's term. It had led to a debate here in open forum and he appreciated the ECAC work over the summer, which should not be seen in the pejorative terms perhaps hinted at in some of the discussion.

FINAL REPORT OF THE SACS SELF STUDY

With that, the Council moved on to the final report of the SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) Self Study. With Profs. Greg Lawler (MTH, also the graduate section of the report) and Michael Gillespie (PS) (for its consideration by the Academic Priorities Committee, APC) present also, Prof. **Stephen Nowicki** (ZOO, and representing the undergraduate section of the report) came forward as spokesman. What has changed since the draft report last spring? What are the major themes? What has been done over the summer, and where do we go from here? It has been edited for style and for general organization, mostly by Prof. Philip Stewart (ROM, and Director of the Self Study) and V. Prov. Judith Ruderman (Academic Services), with comments from Lawler and himself. There are three major themes: 1) urging continued focus on the liberal arts, not as in a liberal arts institution, but with special attention to writing, 2) focus on graduate students as an exceptional resource, playing a key role as bridge mentors, and 3) how to use our faculty resources, which are finite, assisted by better information about what faculty *do* -other than being here and "writing for the *FF*." The report is the opinion of the committee, with the re-accreditation visiting committee as its target. For them it's a guide, and they may make whatever recommendations they see fit. It goes to the administration as the next step. And with that he invited questions.

The **Vice Chair** asked Prof. Gillespie first to report on the role of the APC and its consideration of the report. Prof. **Michael Gillespie** (PS, APC) had four quick points from the APC consideration of the SACS report at its last meeting. In terms of substance they saw emphasis on quality over quantity but felt that the tenure/promotion concerns were already adequately in hand. They strongly favored what the report had to say about the undergraduate writing requirement. They saw as a real priority that all six Areas of Knowledge should be required of undergraduates, a concern primarily affecting Quantitative Reasoning and Foreign Language. We should be more rigorous in pursuit of the liberal arts in undergraduate education, including research opportunities with that emphasis. And finally, the SACS report should be published in hard copy for the entire faculty; publication on the web is not adequate (the **Vice Chair** had earlier informed the Council that the full report in its currently final form had been put on the web by the Faculty Secretary). [Note: a version of the report dated September 18, 1997, was just that afternoon put on the

Academic Council web site, reached from the Duke Home Page by searching under "Administrative Services" or by extending the Duke Home Page URL by /web/acouncil.]

Discussion of the SACS Report

Prof. James Rolleston (Humanities) asked what timetable was expected for the distribution of the writing requirement among the departments and **Gillespie** pointed out that a curriculum review would be necessary through the ASC (Arts & Sciences Council), but the problems really are quite urgent, calling for not just slight improvement. We must move on from the current reliance on graduate student teaching of writing, which leads to exceeding the legal limits in time required and prompts graduate students to take any other job to avoid it. Two models of the needed evolution are the writing components of the FOCUS program and the ethics program. Students need to write about something specific. **Staddon** asked where input should go in reference to the writing requirement, and **Gillespie** said that "our committee's" work is done [perhaps referring to the Self Study committee, of which he was also a member, although perhaps to the APC as well]. The external reviewers will then make recommendations which will come back to the ASC and Engineering.

After inviting any further discussion, the **Vice Chair** presided over the adjournment of the Council, at 5:05 p.m.

Prepared for consideration by the Academic Council,

Donald J. Fluke, Faculty Secretary of the Academic Council.