

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@acpub.Duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, September 25, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): Good afternoon. It's 3:30, and I would like to welcome you to the first meeting of the Academic Council for the 2008-9 academic year. ECAC has already had a number of meetings. The current members of ECAC are **Stanley Abe**, of Art & Art History & Visual Studies, **Amy Abernathy**, Medicine-Oncology, **Ana Barros**, Civil Engineering, **Amy Bejsovec**, Biology, **Dona Chikaraishi**, Neurobiology, **Tom Metzloff**, Law, and **John Staddon**, our very erudite Faculty Secretary.

According to our by-laws, ECAC must select from the Executive Committee a member to serve as vice-chair, and I am very pleased to announce that ECAC has selected Professor **Dona Chikaraishi** as this year's vice-chair for Academic Council.

I also have an introduction to make and I do this with a great deal of pleasure welcoming this person, but with a great deal of sadness to let you know that our mainstay of the Academic Council, Linda Lehman, is retiring. She will be leaving the university at the end of December. But we have hired **Sandra Walton** from the President's Office. She has worked for Presidents Brodie, Keohane and Brodhead and we are very happy that she has joined our team. Linda will be overlapping with her, and so by the time that Linda leaves, Sandra will know everything that Linda has learned in her eighteen years with the Academic Council.

Please remember that you need to initial the attendance sheets that will be going around. This may be the very last place at Duke University where attendance is taken. And according to our by-laws you can actually flunk out of class if you miss, 3 consecutive unexcused absences. So please call or email Sandra (sandra.walton@duke.edu), if you are unable to attend. And also if there are any questions or comments coming from the council members today, *please be sure to identify yourself*, as we are taping the session. Sandra will not know everybody, so please make sure that you identify yourself and that you speak up for the record.

The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the May 8th meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated September 1, 2008

Summary By Schools And College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences

Dean George McLendon
Bachelor of Arts 46
Bachelor of Science 12

Pratt School of Engineering

Dean Tom Katsouleas
Bachelor of Science in Engineering 1
Master of Engineering Management 24

School of Nursing

Dean Catherine L. Gilliss
Master of Science in Nursing 29

Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences

Dean William L. Chameides
Master of Environmental Management 7
Master of Forestry 1

Fuqua School of Business

Dean Blair Sheppard
Master of Business Administration 3

Divinity School

Dean L. Gregory Jones
Master of Theological Studies 3
Master of Divinity 3
Master of Theology 4

School of Law

Dean David Levi
Juris Doctor -
Master of Laws -

School of Medicine

Dean Nancy C. Andrews	
Master of Health Sciences	-
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Leadership	-
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	6
Doctor of Physical Therapy	1
Doctor of Medicine	-

The Graduate School

Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Master of Public Policy	2
Master of Arts in Teaching	9
Master of Science	31
Master of Arts	68
Doctor of Philosophy	86
TOTAL	336

We are now going to go into Executive Session.

Executive Session: Honorary Degree

Faculty Hearing Committee

With your agenda, you received the current members of the Faculty Hearing Committee and the proposed new or reappointment members who are: **James Cox** (Law), **Neil McWilliam** (Art, Art History & Visual Studies), **Carol Meyers** (Religion) and **Chris Schroeder** (Law). [There being no further discussion, the motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Graduate School Report

Jo Rae Wright (Dean of the Graduate School): Thank you Paula, and thank all of you for the opportunity to talk with you. It's always a pleasure to have a chance to come before you and to try and update you with what's going on in the Graduate School.

I have four topics to cover today and only about ten minutes, and so I apologize in advance that I will only be touching on them somewhat superficially, but I



want to be sure to leave time at the end to try and answer any specific questions that you have.

So first, I want to talk to you a little bit about my progress my first two years as Dean and update you on admissions this year. I want to talk with you about a new policy that we will be implementing on tuition remission, I want to speak to you about graduate fellowships and endowments that was at the request of ECAC. And I'll explain what I mean about that in a minute. And also just end with my priorities for the coming year.

So, those of you who have heard me speak before, I have tried to divide my goals into three major areas: 1) recruiting, with my goal being to recruit a diverse population of the highest quality students. I want to work with retention, to enhance student life and success in career opportunities, and then finally with respect to training, try to grow interdisciplinarity, to support the strategic plan, to put a global perspective on our graduate education process and also try to prepare our students for teaching and communicating in a flat electronic world.

We had a great year again. These are the statistics, just hot off the press. We had 6300 applications last year, and we made 908 offers of admission. Again, that's about 14%. We had 380 people accept, and come to Duke. Again, a 42% acceptance. Our full enrollment now is a little over 2000 and our GREs and GPAs are steady over the time.

In the five years that I have shown you here, our international student cohort has grown from 33 to 38%. And I think this will be a continuing trend. Our under-represented groups have been steady at about 13%, again this is something that I'd like to be focusing on in the coming year, to improve that percentage. So, this is sort of the short version of what I've worked on in my first two years. (It's always a little depressing when it fits on one slide...[laughter]). But, I worked really hard to try and implement the strategic plan. The plan, which I inherited with enthusiasm and great support, had as a major focus improving financial packages and implementing central coverage of health insurance. We have been successful in this regard, I am pleased to report. This has been met with great enthusiasm from our students. This comes at some cost. It's about a \$15 million debt that I'm looking at, but I'm pleased to report that the deans I've been working with have been supportive in covering this financial obligation. I will be looking for ways that I can reduce this debt myself in the coming years.

Secondarily, I charged a task force, with Larry Moneta, to look at unmet needs, if any, for professional development of graduate students. This task force met over the course of a year, under the guidance of Jackie Looney and Sheila Curran. The report is fantastic, and I'll be presenting what I can of that report to the Board in December. And I'm grateful for that opportunity.

I also charged a task force, again under the able leadership of Jackie Looney, to look at a childbirth,

adoption and accommodation policy. This has been approved by the executive committee of the graduate faculty. We are finalizing a few implementation details on how we can provide support for graduate students who become parents while they are in graduate school. I reported on that briefly last year, but we are just about ready to roll that out.

And finally, Provost Lange charged a task force which I chaired on graduate school finances last year. We looked at a number of items, but the main item we looked at is tuition remission. This is a complicated subject. I only have a short period of time, so I'll do my best to bring you up to speed. This is our current system. We do not have tuition-remission policy at Duke University for graduate students. Instead students are charged registration fees and they are charged tuition. Almost all students receive a scholarship for tuition, with a few exceptions – for example, students on training grants where the training grant pays tuition. The fees in the current system are either paid out of pocket or via payroll deduction for research assistance. Or they're paid as a scholarship for TA's or students who are on fellowship. That's the current system.

So, there are some problems that the task force found with this current system. One, there is a potential for inconsistent application of fee scholarships. We can't really monitor this very well. There is a tax liability for our students who are RA's in that all of the salary that they receive is considered reportable or potentially taxable from the IRS's perspective. Third, a problem is that this can lead to inconsistencies in research assistant's RA compensation. And the current methodology is complex and difficult to administer and monitor. So if you think this slide is complex, I assure you this system is even more complex than this slide. And if there's time at the end and you all want to go any deeper, I can give you some examples of how this current system works and how it will change.

But the point is, the committee has recommended – and senior leadership has agreed – that we should move to a tuition-remission policy.

For those of you who don't know about tuition remission, let me try to explain it. It is the share of all graduate student research assistance tuition that is included in the student's total compensation package. And total compensation is the salary, living wage if you will, fringe benefits which will currently cover health insurance with, and this thing called tuition remission. Tuition remission is a federally regulated and defined entity in that it can be charged directly to externally sponsored projects, for example, research grants, and all students have to be treated the same way, that is all students have to be charged this whether or not they're on a grant or not. This tuition remission is charged below the line, which means that it does not draw fringe benefits or doesn't carry F & A, that means it doesn't have what we call indirect cost recovery.

Third, it must reflect reasonable compensation for the work performed. This is an effort reporting / compliance issue, and it's subject to something called the NIH cap, which is set by the year zero post-doc stipend.

So, with all of that background here are the positive and negative aspects of the implementation of this policy. The positive is this is really a good outcome for students and one of the major reasons I have been pushing for this. It results in a reduction of taxable compensation for research associates. This is especially important for our international students who do not have the opportunity to claim a lifetime-learning-credit on their tax return. It standardizes things in a way that we can monitor and be sure that all of the students are being compensated equally and fairly. And it's consistent and it will make it simple to do our accounting and the department's accounting.

There is however a negative impact and that is that it results in a reduction of indirect-cost recovery to the university of about 2 million dollars. This is a maximum loss to the university for the following reason: grants that are currently existing and funded can be rebudgeted so the loss will not be as great as if rebudgeting were not a possibility. And budgets can be put in for tuition remission in future grants, but there will be potential for slightly lower indirect cost recovery.

You can imagine that this has made me a somewhat occasionally unpopular dean that there could be a loss of 2 million dollars of indirect cost recovery to the institution, but I have to say that the senior leadership has really been supportive of doing what I think is the right thing for the students and also not trying to transfer this expense back to the faculty which could have been very difficult in the current funding climate, with NIH and NSF grants being cut. So that's the up and the down side.

The take home message for faculty and students is that this is a good thing, I believe, that the students will have a reduced reportable, potentially taxable compensation. The expense to the faculty will be no greater than if this were not implemented, that is, if it were not implemented there would have been a cost-of-living increase in the fees that you would have seen anyway. And that will be also increased in the tuition remission, but it's no greater, you will not be paying more money than you would have done otherwise if this policy were not implemented. And, finally there's simplicity and accounting in the reporting.

I wanted to describe this to you today. It will be presented to the Board of Trustees in the October meeting, when we anticipate implementation for July 1, 2009. As soon as the Board of Trustees process is complete, we will be issuing a detailed memorandum of understanding to the faculty. I believe, that if the faculty have the opportunity to understand what is being proposed, they will be pleased by the outcome and I look forward to answering any questions they have, or you have, about it.

The third topic – which is now a complete change of subject, and rather abrupt – is to talk about graduate school competitive fellowships. I was asked by ECAC to talk about this because there was a change in policy last year that was implemented very quickly and under circumstances that I didn't have a lot of control over.

Let me explain. The Graduate School awards about 45 competitive fellowships a year. These are funded by our endowments, and the revenue generated from our endowments is recycled back to these competitive fellowships. The need for these fellowships is huge. We receive many applications for these 45 fellowships. Traditionally, these fellowships, once they were awarded were added on to the allocations that the departments receive. So every year they departments negotiate with me and their deans about the number of graduate students that can be afforded and we tell them that you can afford 10 students (say). If in the past, if they received a competitive fellowship, that was added on to their allocation. So last year, the third point, there was a rather late-breaking change in the spending-rate policy for endowments ... but the change was such that we lost revenue from our unrestricted endowments and gained revenue in our restricted endowments. Overall, it was a good thing for the Graduate School in that we get more money, but the way that we spend it was sort of changed mid-stream.

Under the leadership of Cindy Robertson, new associate dean for finances and enrollment services, we are working on a way to manage this. Last year we had no choice but to count those awards as part of the allocation. Because the allocation had been made, we increased Arts & Sciences and inter-departmental allocations by twenty-five and with this change in spending rate policy, we simply could not find a way to redirect the funds on that short notice. We're looking at how we might do that now. It's not my goal to give you less money – I'm trying to give you more students; as many as we can afford. But because of this change in spending-rate policy, we had no choice that we could see.

I should point out that I learned at ECAC that some departments were under the impression that externally awarded fellowships were also counted as part of the department award, like NSF grants. That was not a graduate school policy, that was not implemented by the Graduate School. So, if your department did that, or if you think that your department did that, you need to let me know and we'll look into it, because that was not a graduate school action.

I know this is rather complicated, though I hope the big picture is clear, because ECAC wanted me to be sure and talk about this.

I'll end then with what I'm hoping to focus on in the coming year. My contribution, I hope, to the 15 million dollar problem that we have in funding the strategic plan is to work hard on development and fund-raising. I have gotten a lot of support from the other school deans in working with me to try to raise money for graduate education. The development of-

vice is helping me to prepare a plan, and I'm happy to go out on the road, take the graduate students and faculty with me. I believe in the mission and I believe we can raise some money for graduate education as part of the next campaign, if that is the senior leadership decision. I will be working to implement this tuition remission policy and simplify graduate school student finances, focus on recruiting programs targeted to under-represented groups, continuing planning for the graduate student center, and working on some space issues which affect the Graduate School as a consequence of the new campus, working with schools to implement their strategic plans and also focusing a lot on interdisciplinary graduate student training.

I realize that I've covered very complex topics, and I have just a limited amount of time, so I'll stop there. I will be happy to drill deeper on anything or answer any questions that you might have and I thank you for your attention.

Questions

Warren Grill (Biomedical Engineering): You use the term "central coverage of health insurance" for graduate students. My understanding was that for students who were being charged to my research grants, I'm paying fringe benefits and those fringe-benefits dollars are being used to support their health insurance. Is that correct?

Wright: Yes, that is correct but the fringe-benefit rate that you are charged does not cover the full health insurance, so the balances of the health-insurance coverage for those students are funded centrally through graduate-school resources. So, all graduate students currently have centrally funded health insurance, which is what the policy is. How it's actually funded varies.

Tso-Pang Yao (Pharmacology and Cancer Biology): Jo Rae, I appreciate very much you're explaining this tuition remission. (But) I have to tell you after explaining everything, I still don't totally understand what it's all about...I just want to get reassurance, I think it's very, very important, because this is a very important issue now for people actually trying to get federal funding to support research, and as some of you probably already know that the compensation with everything added yet together for a graduate student comes close to \$35,000 per year (this is in the life sciences). I just want to totally understand that we



are trying to give a student more compensation, and I'm with you because the fees shouldn't be taxed, but I also want to get reassurance from the Graduate School that, that basically the cost to faculty, the financial cost will be really equivalent, even after you implement a new policy. I want to make sure that is really the case, because from what I see, I don't see why that would be the case.

Wright: So, we had budgeted a 6% increase to these tuition and fees if we did not do a tuition remission. With the tuition remission, there will be still a 6% increase, which is what was budgeted as part of the strategic plan. The cost to the faculty member will not be greater. In fact, in the situation where there are existing grants that can be re-budgeted, the faculty will see more money in their pocket to spend for the re-budgeting time.

Maybe I can just give you a quick example. So, in the current situation the original budget had an RA salary of \$34,000 and fringe benefit of \$2000. These are just made-up numbers, round numbers. In a revised budget, the salary will go down to \$26,000, and you can see then that the tuition remission is \$8500 (down on the bottom right). So, the total direct costs in the original budget were \$46,500, those dropped to \$41,000. The F & A goes down, that indirect cost recovery as I explained, tuition remission now is charged below the line – it doesn't carry indirects. But you get to re-budget the \$3000 that would have been in the F & A for existing grants. So, the cost for you is no different and in fact in this rebudgeting scenario for existing grants, you'll come out ahead.

The advantage to the student is that his taxable income drops from \$34,500 to \$28,000. And, I should say that tuition-remission policy is the standard operating procedure for our peer institutions of which I am aware. Does that help you, Pang?

Yao: Okay, thank you.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): When you said the deans were sort of helping you out, with the deficit, does that mean more TAs, more RAs, or what exactly does that look like in terms of people power?

Wright: What I did last year was look at the graduate school revenue and the number of FTEs that could be supported. I looked at the department requests in all cases, and of course, the departments want more students than I can afford, even if they're expensive or appear to be expensive. I went to the deans and said, this is what the departments are asking, this is what I can afford, can your school contribute to graduate education? Then the deans looked at what they could do, and they, in the case of two of the schools anyway, Arts & Sciences and School of Medicine, which is where there was a need, put in additional money for graduate education. The TA budget in Arts & Sciences is really independently set based on the teaching needs of the department, and even though we make the awards so the departments can either use TA funds or fellowship funds depending on what the students are doing, the amount of the TA budget is set by

the true teaching needs by Arts & Sciences. Does that answer your question?

Baker: Yes, thank you.

Ranjana Khanna (English): This isn't directly related to what you are reporting, but it seems that many



many of our peer institutions are now giving summer money as part of the standard fellowship package, and I know that here is some concern that we won't be as competitive as we have been. I was wondering if you are looking into that?

Wright: I am. I am actually very concerned about that. And to give everyone hopefully the same background: Currently in Arts & Sciences, most of the students only receive only 9 months of guaranteed support. That's guaranteed for five years which is better than some institutions. But our competitive institutions have now gone on to 12 months of support for Arts & Sciences. We looked at how much it would cost to provide that for all 900 Arts & Sciences students and Nicholas School students, and it would be close to 8 million dollars.

I don't have that revenue to contribute, so I've done two things. One is, we just wrote the annual fund letter which is my personal plea to alumni, and I targeted summer fellowships explaining just this. That it's a disadvantage to the students who aren't funded in the summer because they have to get jobs, and that slows down their time to degree, their progress. And our competitors are offering 12 months of funding. So, I'm hoping to raise some money for this particular topic.

The second is, I have tried to increase the number of summer fellowships from our endowment support and I'm hoping that we can even increase it more than I projected based on the change in spending rate, and we're looking at that.

I should take just one minute to address this issue of the cost of a graduate student because I don't want to leave without making sure my thoughts on this are clear. The cost of a student in the Basic Biological Sciences is about \$34,000. And people compare that to the salary of a post-doc which is about \$38,800. But there are a couple of points I want to make. One is, post-doc compensation, that comparison doesn't include fringe which is about 24%. So if you have a

post-doc it's about \$44,000 based on the post-doc policy.

Secondarily, I feel compelled to say that we're an academic institution; I think graduate student education is part of our mission. It's a very important mission, and when I talk to the faculty it's clear that it's a very important mission to them. So I think that it's both our obligation and a great benefit to us to educate graduate students. I have both post-docs and graduate students in my lab, and they bring something very different to my academic experience and to their peers. Even though the cost of graduate students is not as cheap as it was 10 years ago (nothing is) and so I have to use my bully pulpit for that and I thank you for listening.

Garnett Kelsoe (Medical Center): You mentioned that only students in training grants were actually charged tuition, and I know that's limited by the



recovery rate from the funding institutions. What happens to the recovered tuition monies? Do they remain in the Graduate School and how are they disbursed among the various programs?

Wright: Yes, actually, if I can just make an amendment. I think what I said was that one example of students who pay real tuition are those supported on training grants. There are other students who are supported by other kinds of external funds who pay tuition. Most of the tuition that is charged is awarded as scholarship, except for those students who are externally funded. The tuition revenue that the Graduate School takes in, or that the other schools take in – because they also receive some tuition in their accounts – comes to the Graduate School and it is recycled for fellowship support and to support graduate school operations.

I have spoken to the Academic Council about how we run the Graduate School and I'd be happy to come back and do that in more detail. But the bottom line is that our administration operations we estimate to be about 6% and the rest of the money that comes in – and for that you get the 6000 applications that we process, the handling applications, the offers, and the student tracking and the graduate student affairs English as a second language, etc. – the rest of that money is recycled as stipend support for students.

Ana Barros (ECAC/Engineering): In this plan of tuition remission, are we talking about 9 months of tuition or 12 months tuition fees for the externally funded NSF, NAFDA, etc?

Wright: It depends on the program, and for what the student enrolls. So, if they're currently enrolled for 9 months it would be for 2 semesters or if it's a program where they routinely enroll for 3 semesters, it would be the summer semester too.

Barros: So, they don't have to actually enroll for the summer because they are not taking classes, they are just doing research on their funded project, do they have to pay fees and tuition?

Wright: Yes, if they are in the Graduate School, even if they are just doing research, they would still have to pay tuition remission just like they have to pay fees now. The overall tuition charge, and this is getting pretty detailed, will drop after years 3 because the general cost in years 1 through 3 is thought to be higher than in the out years when they are just doing research. Yes, they will still be charged tuition remission for the summer semester if they are enrolled in graduate school. And that's not a change now, it will be equivalent to the fees they were charged before.

Barros: They have to be enrolled?

Wright: If they are in a program where they're in school in the summer. Some of the Arts & Sciences students do not enroll in school in the summer, so those are the exceptions. And in Pratt, I believe, most do. I'd be happy to come and talk to your individual schools. I realize this is a topic of greater interest for the Basic Scientists in some regard, so if you would like me to come and talk to your schools, department chairs, I'd be happy to do that. And I thank you for your time.

Faculty Scholars

McClain: Professor Ward is now out of class, and I'd like to call him to come forward to introduce the Faculty Scholars. If you are interested in learning more about the Academic Council Faculty Scholars Program, the information and the list of previous winners is posted on the Academic Council website. And we do have a new website, by the way, so please do visit it.

Ben Ward (Philosophy): Thank you very much, Paula...First of all, I want to thank the Academic Council for the privilege of serving on the committee and chairing it for a number of years. I can think of few committees that have afforded me such unalloyed pleasure as this one has. One of the reasons I think that it's so special to all of us is that we have the chance to read about and interact with a number of students who are in other departments, other divisions than the ones where we hold forth. And this is a privilege that any right-thinking faculty member would kill to have, so you have afforded us that wonderful opportunity. You have the report so you know the number of nominations that we received, and the number of people that we interviewed and so forth.



I also want to thank the directors of undergraduate studies who organized the nominations under great time pressure, although we had a little bit more time this year than last year. We really couldn't do this without your hard and conscientious work in bringing us outstanding candidates for this award. I would like for the other two students, and Aaron, where are you? to come forward.

We have come up with the names of three people we'd like to put forward for designation as Faculty Scholars for 2008-09. And they are **Paula Long**, Department of English, **Aaron Pollack**, Mathematics & Physics, and **Daniel Roberts**, who's in Electrical & Computer Engineering and Physics. I think they all deserve a warm round of applause from us. (clapping)



I must say speaking, I think for Erica, as well as myself, we certainly put them through their paces when they came for interviews last Friday. I don't mean to suggest that these are the only ones left standing, but they certainly acquitted themselves with distinction and honor, and we can present them with great pride to you as Faculty Scholars. When you learn more about them, as I hope you will, you'll have no doubt as to why these three students were chosen. Thank you very much.

McClain: Thank you. Although we don't have to vote on this, I do need you to ratify the selections of the committee, so all those in favor please say aye? Thank you.

Ben is right that these are truly those wonderful kinds of experiences when in fact you get to acknowledge the students that you teach for kinds of things that they have done.

University Priorities Committee Report

Each year the University Priorities Committee is charged to give Academic Council a preview early in the fall semester of the agenda for the year, again in May to come back to tell us what they have done. So, I'd like to call up Professor Warren Grill who is the chair of UPC, and Warren will tell us about UPC's agenda for the year.

Warren Grill (BME): Thank you Paula. I'd also like to thank the Council for the opportunity that I've had to continue as Chair of this committee. This will be my third year on the committee. And just so you are all aware, I also as Chair meet with the Executive Committee of the Academic Council prior to this meeting to have a discussion with them, both about what our intended priorities are for the coming academic year, as well as to solicit their input to items they think we should be considering.

You can read the charge up here for yourself [slides], but I think what we try to do is best captured by a phrase that Peter Lange came up with, which is "funding our aspirations." ... And so what we try to do is to look at this very long list and put the things that are most important at the top of that list and the things that might be less important, further down the list and figure out how to make the best use of the limited funds over here. So the group that does this includes faculty – I believe from all of the schools – and these are three year appointments.

We have a few new members this year as well as some continuing members. Members of the administration over here, and in particular, **Hof Milam**, from Tallman Trask's office, and **Jim Roberts**, from Provost Lange's office, are my primary interface to the administration. And I must say that they have been extremely forthcoming with information, very responsive to requests to the committee, and I feel like the relationship that we have with the administration via this committee is really quite good.

We also have student representatives on the committee and I understand that Jordan, since he did not get the resources that he requested with their vote last week, would like to add that to our list of potential priorities. So, Jo Rae, the key to make it look like you did a lot is just use really small font (laughter).

So, this is what we did last year, and I'd just like to point out a couple of things that I think were important. One was a review of this proposed revision of the patent-royalty distribution policy. My understanding is this will likely come before the Council this year.

As well, we reviewed extensively a proposed faculty pooled-equity plan which was discussed last week at ECAC. This is a tool that's been proposed to mitigate financial conflict of interest by faculty who have financial interests in companies, and are also con-

conducting research in their labs. The outcome of this, is this program will be piloted in the Medical School. It will then be reviewed by the faculties individually in Arts & Sciences, Engineering, and in any other schools. And then, I would guess in the spring, may come before this board.

In the coming year, we've already talked about in our first meeting some changes to non-endowment investment pay-outs. How we can pay for community goods – this includes Athletics, the Chapel, the Gardens, Duke Forest. There's a new formula that distributes these costs more broadly across the institution. And what we're going to be talking about in the coming year are the continuing process of Public Policy becoming a school, continuing the discussions about graduate school finances – we'll see if we can more in the right category there, Jo Rae.

The current planned capital budget, as I said, has many more aspirations than dollars. There's a lot of work to figure out how best we want to spend these dollars. A lot of them are going to be going here, New Campus, which we are going to hear about next. And this spring, we are finally going to embark, I understand, on parking.

So, I'm going to be happy to come back later in the spring and tell you about how we do with parking. And, I'm happy to entertain questions that people have, or suggestions for items that you would like to see on our agenda. You can bring them up now, you can corner me at the end of the meeting or feel free to contact me afterwards.

New Campus Update

McClain: Our last item, but it's a very important item, is an update as to what's happening regarding the New Campus. Tallman Trask and Peter Lange last reported on New Campus at our meeting last December. So, today we are going to hear the next steps of the plan from Peter and Tallman.

Provost Lange: Thank you all very much. Speaking of funding our aspirations – actually, this is a discussion of how we go about not funding quite all of



our aspirations, as you'll see. I think the last time that Tallman and I came, and we usually do this where Tallman kibitzes on what I say, and I think we're going

to do it the same way this time. The last time we came to you we discussed with you the shift of this project from the former satellite location on northern Anderson Street down to Campus Drive.

What we want to talk with you about today is the phasing of this project, a phasing which really is driven by two things. One, the full realization that to do everything at once would have cost an amount that we did not want to spend at one time on this project, given the other priorities that we have. And, to some extent, also the financial climate, although that has arisen more recently. And, second of all, that it would not be possible to construct the whole project at one time without creating such massive disruption to the campus and to all other potential construction projects that it seemed wiser to phase this.

As you'll see as I go through the slides, we are maintaining all of the principles that governed the original understanding and conceptualization of the project, but at a somewhat lower scale for the first phase.

So, this you may recognize. This is West Campus and in particular the West Campus dormitories as seen from the tower of the Allen Building, I am told by Tallman. I only bring this slide forward to remind you that in the old plan, the Central Campus project as we called it then, was really an entirely independent separate entity that would have been located at the northern end of Anderson Street, more or less at the corner of Anderson and Yearby.

The new project, as you will see, really provides a bridge to West Campus extending towards East Campus. So, in a sense it begins more or less where you are standing if you take this picture, and it extends to the Nasher Museum, creating a real linkage between



the West Campus and the Nasher Museum. Now, you may recall that with the old campus, the old Central Campus project, had a sort of slightly disjointed understanding. We talked a lot about how it was going to be the Arts Campus, but in fact it was rather removed from the Nasher Museum. And in fact as that project went forward and there were discussions about it, it became increasingly clear that it was not going to be wise to create that detachment. And when we brought Pelli Clark Pelli in, all of this stuff that we discussed

with you in the spring, they recommended really bringing the project down, we changed the name to New Campus, it is a project that will own Campus Drive, and it does really represent linking West Campus to the Nasher and of course beginning to extend West Campus toward East Campus along Campus Drive.

This slide really shows you what we're talking about. So, here's West. Here's Chapel Drive – we were standing right here when we took that picture of the Chapel. Here's the Nasher over here, here's Campus Drive extending along this way, here's Anderson Street. The old Central Campus project was basically up here. The new project is in this stretch of Campus Drive.

Now there are couple other things worth noting. One of the things that Pelli C. Pelli discovered as part of their traffic survey, was that a far larger portion of the campus population actually arrives from the East than had been true ten or fifteen years ago. And, of course, we now also have 2000 employees, more or less (is that right Tallman?) at American Tobacco. So, we've actually shifted the axis of the campus and the population that serves the campus in terms of employees, faculty and students. [It] lives considerably more to the east of campus than used to be the case.

There's some merit also in thinking about Duke University Road as a major access to the campus, and as you'll see it ties in somewhere into the project as it is along here. And, it will also relate to some parking issues that we'll talk about.

Now in the old program that we first brought up with respect to Central Campus and we re-introduced with New Campus, there were two key principles. The first of these was that it would be in part a residential campus. And as you'll see here, this says primarily senior and it's crossed out. The reason it's crossed out, is that in the New Campus project as it's currently configured has come to integrate well with the findings we had coming out of the Campus Culture Initiative and all the work that I and my colleagues did subsequent to that, and that Steve Nowicki is now carrying on as Dean of Undergraduate Education.

One of the key findings in that work was that our undergraduates actually greatly value multi-class housing. And so, they like the fact they can spend time as sophomores with seniors. That there is a positive mentoring effect, there may also be some other mentoring effects.....but there is a positive mentoring effect in that relationship and the students really seek it. So, creating a campus that would have uniquely had seniors turned out not to be wise, hence the red-lining of that, and the New Campus project will have a mixed set of student housing, in fact the housing itself will reflect that. There will be some dormitory space, some suite-like space and some apartment-like space in the new campus construction.

The second thing was that we did not want to create a uniquely residential campus. When we had central campus up there and it was really out there, we actually said well, we weren't going to create a suburb

where people would sort of put on their backpacks in the morning and go into school and reappear at night – that we always wanted to create an integrative campus. And if you think of it, of course, that's one of the distinctive things about our campus is that both West and East are integrative. They have residential space, pretty close to academic space, pretty well integrated with academic space, and with campus services all in one mix of things. And that we were going to be sure to preserve that, that basic conceptualization as we built, this first Central, and now, New Campus.

Those principles will be very much evident as I take you through what we are actually proposing for phase one. This is basically what we showed you in the spring. Just to orient you again, here's the traffic circle, here is Chapel Drive, the Chapel is up here, here's Campus Drive, here's Anderson Street. What we showed you in the spring, which would be the full built-out New Campus, included a significant construction in the area to the left of the entrance to the campus at Campus Drive. So there was to be an alumni center, shared meeting space, some dormitory spaces down here, there were more residential spaces here. There were to be residential spaces here, there was to be an arts library on this corner, there were to be the arts complex here, including both performing and visual arts, there were to be the languages and literature and other academic spaces along here.

This was a full built-out project, would have 1100 beds, would have had the academic units that you see, and would have had this other, what you might call, service units of various sorts as well down here and scattered around the rest of the project. That was a very, very ambitious project, an 800 million dollar project, and would have been massive, you can see the scale of construction here.

You also would have to do a lot of road work – everything in orange here would have been construction, including the re-doing of Anderson Street. (We have an agreement with the city that enables us to re-do Anderson Street within certain constraints because it will remain a city thoroughfare.) And redoing a lot of work along Campus Drive as well. There was also parking here, just to be sure, that since this is going to be a topic that we discuss in the spring, I thought I should at least point it out. There's a parking garage here, which actually had very much in mind that East-West connection that I talked about along Duke University Road. There's a parking garage up here, these lots that are now gravel lots across from Alumni Affairs and Chapel Drive will be developed, and there was another parking complex along Towerview, and there was also...some of you may remember that Keohane Quad, which is not a quad, a triad, I guess you would call it, and so we have an opportunity to build spaces by completing that quadrangle.

So that was the original plan. It's very ambitious as I said. It would have been about an 800 million dollar project. We are not deferring from that plan, but

we are not going to do it all at once and the phasing is what I am going to talk to you about now.

So, as we discarded the discussed phasing, we decided to work on what were the various principles we should employ as we moved towards a phasing of the project, given those broad principles I showed you earlier.

Well, the first was that the project has to reach toward the Nasher. We did not want to give up the principle that we would really extend toward the Nasher museum, thereby integrating the Nasher much more into the rest of the campus. The second one is that we want to address the Garden interface. I just want to come to that for a second. This dotted line reflects the interface between the Duke Gardens, and the area below the Duke Gardens – right now, there's a parking lot here, a long straight parking lot basically. It's very important that we address this interface in the sense that we protect the Gardens, there will be no thoroughfare into the Gardens from here, because this is probably the part of the Gardens that is most delicate – this is the Blomquist Garden, some of you may have been in there.

And, more generally, we don't want to damage the Gardens. Actually, if you remember in the original design for New Campus, there were two bars along here. The residential bar, like this, and another residential bar, like this. What you see here is a design intended to diminish the impact on that interface by creating only these smaller fronts along here rather than a full bar residence.

The third principle was that we wanted to do as much of the roadwork right away as we can. So, even though this is phase one, the roadwork and the utilities work for the project will be done for the whole project. And the principle, I think, to be evident to everyone, which is you don't want to have phase one up and then have to go in and re-do the roads and the tremendous amount of disruption that would create.

And, finally, as I've said earlier, we want to include both residential and academic spaces for the kind of connectivity and integration across student and faculty activities that we're seeing.

What are we proposing? Here are the program elements for phase one: it will have rather than the 1100 students, it will have about 500 students. And I think that the important thing about that is 500 students is certainly a critical mass. If you talk to our student affairs people, what they'll say is, you know, with 500 students you can generate enough residential activity, you can create enough units of a governable size, governable by the students who live in them, governable by student affairs. There's enough activity in 500 students – there might not be if you said, oh let's 250, okay? But you don't need more than 500 to create that.

Second of all, as you'll see, the academic facilities are there for the arts, languages and literatures, and for the John Hope Franklin Institute. There are some activities from the full plan out that won't be there, but

these will all be maintained. And there's plenty of room for dining recreation and services to meet the needs of this campus region. And when I say that I mean not just for the residents on this campus, but for the residents, all of them, who are in the academic buildings, etc., so that the services are designed to serve not just the students who live in those dorms, that housing, but to serve the entire part of the campus all through the day.

If you think about it, languages and literatures and cultures is a high-traffic set of departments because of the fact that we have a language requirement. Many students will come to this part of the campus and there will of course be faculty associated with the various units that will be on this campus.

So, here is the current broad planning for phase one. What you'll basically note is here again are the residential part, now for about 500 students in this part. What we delay is the residential complex down here and some of the buildings over here. You have the academic buildings here, again, I'll come to this in a minute. You have the visual arts here, you have the arts library here, that building will probably also include a major eatery and classroom spaces. You have the John Hope Franklin Institute at this prominent point on the corner of Anderson and Campus Drive, this southwest corner associated with the languages, literatures and, cultures department. These two lighter pink things are – well, this one here is not a very large building and it really is sort on the edge of the project. In this sense, that if we can afford it, we'd like to build it, but if we can't afford it we can get along without it. This is the performance part, including a new theater of about 300 – 350 seats. And to be honest with you, this is a development opportunity. You know, there's no single building on New Campus that will be more attractive to a donor than to build a performing arts facility.

So, this is on the edge of the project and hoping that we find a donor willing to put in the money to pay for that so that we can build the entire arts complex at one time. Or obviously if we were to find the money to extend the project right from the beginning, we could build this.

The streets, there's no real change, as I said we want to do that upfront. As you can see, it integrates the residential with the academic, with the services and with library space. I should say, that arts library here really means a library to serve the local population with a concentration in terms of the collections in that library space, to the extent there are non-digital collections, that will be related to the arts because we have the arts departments here led by the Art, Art History and Visual Studies department which is the largest of them and which of course makes a very good connection to the Nasher.

I should say something about the roads. Aside from the utilities, there has been very extensive planning for bicycle and pedestrian traffic and to create an integrated environment in which bicycles and pedestri-

ans and automobiles are not in what you might call physical conflict – as is somewhat the case on Campus Drive now, and is definitely the case on Anderson. We had somebody who rides a bicycle to campus, and they said you know Anderson is the most dangerous street we have in the vicinity and as we've increased the bike traffic, people are more aware of that.

In terms of parking, the most likely parking garage will be this one in the first phase and that is included in our 400 million dollar estimate for what this will cost. I should say that the Center for Documentary Studies is not on this because it's not within the budgetary envelope that we are talking about, but they are raising money independently and will likely either be at this site or at a site right over here. You know, there's a sort of nice, open area if you come down the hill and you go past the Nasher and you look to the right, there's a nice open area there that goes between Alexander Street and Oregon Street. And that's the alternative site. I might stop here for a minute, and ask if there are any questions before I go to the last couple of slides.

Questions

Tom Metzloff (Law/ECAC): I've had the pleasure of being on a couple of committees that review it and I just wanted to share with faculty the sense that this does seem to be a very appropriate phasing in that



it has mass, it also has constructability in that those are areas that can be constructed at once. I think you've got the right subdivisions.

I would like to question what I heard about the Garden. I've been to several of these meetings and I've never heard anybody talk about that sort of fenced area blocking off the Gardens. I think you have the right word, interactive, but what you just described is not interactive. I think it's absolutely essential that there is a great deal of permeability through the Gardens. What this picture does not have is where they're going to classes in the Allen Building, which is right about where it says phase one, I hope that you've thought very seriously about access and permeability.

Vice-President Tallman Trask: There will be a lot of access in here, there will be a lot of access in here.

Metzloff: Through a parking lot?

Trask: No. A pathway that's going to be built. What we don't want to do is to have people running out of here, into the gullies of the Blomquist.

Metzloff: But that's a very good pass there.

Trask: Well, there are no passages here – they have to be built.

Lange: What we're really talking about is right in here, Tallman. That's the area that needs protection.

Metzloff: On even there, I'm wondering if there can't be an entrance in some ways, because that's nice part to get into the Gardens.

Trask: Potentially. The Gardens just wants assurance that there won't constantly be thousands of people.

Lange: They don't want it to be a major thoroughfare, basically.

Member: Are there plans to have an underpass or overpass at the intersection there of Anderson and Campus?

Lange: Here? No.

Trask: Well, what the city has agreed to, we're going to dramatically slow Anderson Street. We're going to underground utilities, we're going to put bicycle and pedestrian paths outside the street right of way. We're going to narrow the street, we're going to take parking off of it. It will become entirely different.

Lange: And traffic calming bumps.

Trask: Yes, traffic bumps. And John has agreed to personally approve the signage.

Lange: Oh, there's a comfort!

Prasad Kasibhatla: What's the potential impact of the performing arts center that the City of Durham is undertaking?

Lange: Let's talk about performing arts centers on campus. We've actually thought about this pretty carefully. This one will have 300-350 seats, okay? We have a number of facilities in the 100 – 150 range on East and on West, things like Schaefer and Branson. We have a facility, Baldwin, which is in the overall capital plan, which has around 600 – 800 seats. We have Page, which is also in the renovation plan, which will be, after it's renovated, around 1000 or 1100 seats. The downtown facility is around 2700 fully built, utilized, or what's the smaller configuration?

Trask: If you don't use the balcony, about 1200.

Lange: About 1200 without the balcony. So, basically, a facility of around 300 – 350 actually fills a niche, okay? Current plan is that this would be a presidium space, so we could have theater, dance and musical performances in there. Of course, if Baldwin becomes a much better musical performance space than it is now, we expect that to be used quite heavily. Because the basic problem with Baldwin is the acoustics. And we shouldn't forget the Nelson Music Room which is also around 150 seats. So, I think the notion is that this actually fills a niche. It isn't a competitive space with anything. Reynolds is about 600 seats.

Trask: And for those who have not been there, the new theater, believe it or not, developed by the City of Durham, is unbelievable.

Member: in a good way?

Trask: Oh, it's unbelievable. You know, when we got engaged in it, we had great fears wondering where it was going to end up. It is remarkable.

Lange: Jeff?

Jeff Glass (Engineering): Could you comment on what needs to be torn down to go through this plan, and any discussions on the architectural value, what needs to go?

Lange: Well, I can tell you what needs to be torn down and he can tell you the architectural value.

Trask: Well, we have been through all of them, as you'll see. All of the stone houses remain.

Lange: So, the blue are the stone houses. This is Admissions, University Development, Public Affairs and the Alumni House.

Trask: Although it's quite possible that many of them have some really kludgy additions that have been put on, so we'd sort of like to get rid of those as part of



this. We have been through all of the other houses that line Campus Drive with some care. We know who designed them, when they were built, who's lived in them over the last 75 years. I think from an architectural standpoint you can say the Trumbauer firm touched most of them in one way or another. But very few of them are actually Trumbauer homes. International House is a Trumbauer house. There's a very mixed listing of who lived in them over time, there was lot of house trading going on, so we've gone through the whole thing.

I think, our view is that some of them are worth saving for historic reasons, but they need to get out of this office use – the code violations are just massive. So, we have been looking is whether there is a place where we might move them and create a neighborhood. The more I think about, it looks more and more like the street where Desperate Housewives live. And so I think what we're going to do is actually make them available, subsidize their movement by individuals to other places if they agree to then make them back into private residences.

Dona Chikaraishi (ECAC/Neurobiology): the beds, the 500 beds, are they going to be all undergraduates or are you going to put some professional or graduate students in there?

Lange: They will, almost, be exclusively undergraduates. There may be a few graduate and professional students, but it would be more in the RA or C role than as real full housing. And, we're hoping also to put some faculty apartments.

I could have mentioned that in this plan, after you've accounted for the 500 beds, you have about 50,000 square feet of remaining space. That is way more than we need for campus services. So, there are opportunities to use that space for things like faculty apartments, for visiting faculty – the arts especially are very interested in having visiting faculty. So, we have some opportunity to do some things, there's a little flexibility. We could also raise the bed count a little, but there are various things we can do there.

Trask: We're also thinking, not here, about the extent to which Duke needs to get back into the graduate student housing business. There are three or four interesting opportunities to do that, that we are working on, but that don't fall into here.

Lange: Warren, you had your hand up...

Warren Grill (BME): Where do those 500 students sleep now and what will become of that space?

Lange: That's a good question. We're hoping that most of them are sleeping in K-ville, no, just kidding. We're hoping that most of them are living off campus. There will be some who will be moved out of the current Central Campus, either because we will destroy some of the worse housing on Central Campus or because we will move students, the undergraduates from there so that we can increase the amount of graduate housing on Central Campus – some combination of the two. But a significant number, we're going to try and attract them from off campus.

Susan Lozier (Nicholas School): You know, when Science Drive was cut off, I think many people couldn't imagine that it would be cut off, but it really created a campus there, I'm just wondering if anyone has thought about not having Campus Drive, or closing Campus Drive, that section from Anderson over?

Trask: We're having long debates about whether we should close this or close that. You can't do both, and I think it may be closed, but to what? So, it may be that only pedestrians, bicycles, and some kind of university transit are allowed in there. The biggest problem then is the people who come here and then go up here, and how to re-route them.

Lange: So, actually Pelli C. Pelli has very sophisticated traffic engineers as part of their thing, and we've had some discussions with them and we're going to have some more. It's really a question of when you close off one piece where does the traffic go and are you then creating a problem somewhere else.

Trask: the reason Science Drive worked is because we rebuilt Circuit Drive. The problem is this doesn't work as well as an alternative unless the City

will give us traffic signals which they currently won't do. We're pushing back. I agree with you, it would be very nice if both of these were pedestrian oriented through which occasional vehicles traveled.

Lozier: But they could really turn that into a campus.

Lange: My preferred one would be to shut this one off.

Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas): The notion of bringing these 500 students, most of them off campus, seems to run counter to this issue that we'd like to get our students more involved with Durham. We keep talking about students not interacting with Durham, just remaining on campus, we seem to be going....

Lange: I don't know, Prasad. Have you been to the Belmont? And would you consider that a community that really integrates with the rest of Durham? I think our goal of the integration of students with Durham does not extend to dense undergraduate senior living places where most people in Durham would not venture, at least not at night. I don't think that's a major issue.

If we were drawing students from, integrated housing within the rest of the community, that would be one thing. Drawing students from these apartment complexes that are essentially, senior ghettos, which is what they really are, I don't think is really an issue.

Trask: And the other issue this is not really moving people, but offering people who are now maybe freshman, maybe not even here yet, the choice three years from now to go to this attractive place rather than somewhere else. Our theory is they've gone to those places because our only alternative was Central.

John York (Pharmacology): So, have you thought about given the weather – heat, wet – have you thought about arcades or porticos? One of my favorite cities is Bologna Italy, you can walk essentially from one end to the other without getting wet. It just seems like a very long distance to be integrated with the rest of the campus.

Lange: So, it's not really that long of a distance first of all.

York: What is the distance?

Lange: It's about a ¼ mile.

York: But then up to East Campus?

Lange: Oh, well up to East, that's longer. That's about 1½ miles. This is a road repair, this is essentially the road to nowhere, if I can use a certain current...actually you can only see Russia from the end. (laughter) I don't really think it's an issue right now. We are not pushing East in that sense.

Trask: And East-West buses in some form, I'm hoping, in a more environmentally appropriate form, will continue.

Lange: Alright, I have a couple more slides so unless, Peter?

Peter Burian (Classics): I had just one comment about the residential aspect, and that would be to simply say that a lot of students might like it if the university were to encourage different ways of providing

social space and formation of groups in residences than just the ones that we have. You mentioned different types of room space, but has any thought been given to ways of encouraging communities to form somewhat differently. Maybe for example, a facility that has a college style dining option within it?

Lange: Yes, I can say two things about that. First of all, you'll remember in the report I gave following up on the Campus Culture Initiative Report that theme houses were a significant piece of that, and also Steve Nowicki and Larry Moneta have been working very hard on this whole issue of residential types. Steve would need to be here to talk at great length about what they've been doing, but they've been thinking a lot about that question as part of this, as well as part of West.

Trask: One of the reasons for cutting this up is to make it clear that they don't need to be the same, in fact different pieces could be different things themselves.

Lange: But, I don't think we've thought about doing a single residential college because I think that that has a lot of cascading effects which you know might not be...

Trask: Eventually there will be a group of students who live in a facility that attaches to an eating facility. But it will be not theirs exclusively.

Lange: Okay, so there are three architectural commissions associated with this. Basically, this is the basic plan: one, here. The thing I would say is that each of these has a building of potential high architectural value than other buildings of a more practical architectural value. If you think about it, it's really the corner building here, the performance theater here, possibly this corner building here, and possibly this corner building. This is Tallman's favorite little jewel, as he calls it, which he wants to give to some frou-frou architect. It's just a small building, and it has no designated functionality [laughter]. You know, but we're all very attached to it. We could put the Academic Council Offices there? We can have the Board Room there too.

The other thing I want to say – remember these drawings are just blocks. These don't represent any architectural vision of any sort. And, one of the things that they distort, they sort of pinch this corner, if you think about it. But, actually we've had a lot of discussion about that corner not being pinched, having a more open, plaza feel across that intersection. The other thing about the architecture: so, there's been very preliminary discussion about the architecture. But I think that the one thing, is that Pelli C. Pelli has developed architectural guidelines for the project as a whole. And they will be the master overseer of the architectural work, even though they will not necessarily have any of the architectural commissions.

The thing that you might think about is that both West Campus and East Campus, in different ways, have an architectural style which really divides the inside from the outside, right? So, if you're outside the

building you don't really know what's going on inside. And if you're inside the building, you don't really know what's going on outside, because there are very heavy walls, basically punched out windows, and not a lot of glass. The underlying principles for the architectural guidelines are to have a much more transparent campus, much more glass, much more ability for people to see activities going on in the building from the outside, and to bring the outside in. Of course, if you think about that part of the campus, that makes a lot of sense.

So, what are the next steps? Architect selection, program verification. I'll talk about program verification and leave these last two to Tallman. In terms of program verification, we have talked to the departments and the units that are going to be on New Campus, but we have not drilled down with them on adjacencies, on how to mix classrooms and offices, how to try and create a real interdisciplinary environment while maintaining the integrity of the departments. So, that's going to be the major task in the next few months as we work with those departments.

We have not changed the program at all. The Program that was in the old Central Campus Plan in terms of square footage, and in the New Campus Plan is the same. And for the academic units, it's the exact same. Obviously, the residential is smaller. But for the academic units, it's the same. We haven't gone through that much more detailed planning which has to happen in interaction with the architect.

Trask: As to the architect selection, we began with a list of well over one hundred architectural firms world-wide. Now that we're down to the situation where there really is a residential piece, arts piece and an academic piece. We've been working with Cesar's office to try and identify people who are particular good in those kinds of facilities. So, we're going to give to the trustees at their October meeting, a list of potentially six architects for each commission. At this point, I have no idea whether they will accept it or reject it or tell us to start over. It includes some pretty big names. Whether in fact people who are now working on 800 billion dollar projects in Dubai will be interested in coming to work on 50 million dollar projects in Durham, remains to be seen. But, we've got, on every list, we've got a couple of people who I am confident will be interested and are very, very good and who I think would be interested.

Lange: So, that's our presentation. If there are any more questions, we'll be happy to take them, otherwise thank you very much.

McClain: That is the end of our agenda, we are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, October 16, 2008