Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday January 19, 2012

Susan Lozier (Chair, Academic Council/Nicholas School of the Environment): Good afternoon, everyone. If I can have your attention, I will start our meeting. First I would like to welcome you all to the first meeting of the new year – I trust everyone had a lovely holiday season and has had a smooth start so far to the spring semester. In the spirit of the new year and in the spirit of this year’s theme for Duke’s Martin Luther King commemoration, Act to Honor, I offer you this thought from the 17th century French playwright, Molière:

“it is not only what we do, but also what we do not do for which we are accountable.”

Surprisingly, the theme of what we do not do provides a perfect and convenient segue to my reminder to all of you who have not opted in for election to this Council. For those members whose terms are expiring this spring, I encourage you to re-enlist, opt-in and please stand for election. To all continuing members, and in fact, to everyone in this room, I would please ask you to encourage your faculty colleagues to stand for election. This Council is fueled by the willingness of faculty members to invest some small amount of time, some energy and some ideas to our broader university community.

Continuing my welcomes, I would like to welcome back those members who were on sabbatical last semester and I would like to welcome Professor Keith Whitfield, from Psychology & Neuroscience to this Council in particular. Though Keith has been at Duke for about five years, he just recently assumed the role of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, a position in which he will work quite closely with this governing body. Keith, could you please stand so we can welcome you? (applause) Congratulations on your new position and I look forward to working with you.

On this campus we are used to the ebb and flow of welcomes and farewells, but at times we are sadly confronted with ultimate farewells. And so it was last week when we said goodbye to Jo Rae Wright, Professor of Cell Biology, Pediatrics and Medicine and the former Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. By all accounts the Duke community lost, in the words of Provost Lange, “an outstanding researcher, an excellent teacher and mentor, a wise, patient, determined and resourceful leader.” Though I had known Jo Rae for just over a year before her untimely death, I understood completely the sentiment expressed by Sally Kornbluth, Vice Dean for Basic Sciences, when she wrote in her remembrance of Jo Rae: “Although her incisive intellect and administrative savvy distinguished her as a top administrator and scientist, it was really her gracious personality, warmth and ability to find humor in even the most pres-
sured situations that made her such a wonderful colleague and friend.”

And so, on behalf of the Duke faculty, I pause to honor Jo Rae Wright’s commitment to scholarship; to Duke students; and to this institution as a whole. And, in recognition of her steadfast devotion to her students and colleagues, I also offer in her honor the words of Pericles that resonate through the millennia:

“What you leave behind is not what is engraved in stone monuments, but what is woven into the lives of others.”

Two final notes:

First, the University has established the Jo Rae Wright Fellowship for Outstanding Women in Science. This fellowship will annually recognize one Ph.D. student in the biomedical sciences and one in the natural sciences whose research shows particular creativity and promise. This is a fitting tribute to Jo Rae.

Second, a celebration of life will be held in honor of Jo Rae in February at a date to be determined.

Turning our attention now to the comfort of ritual, I would like to call for your approval of our December meeting minutes. Are there any corrections?

[approved by voice vote with no dissent]

Before I move to the first item on our agenda, I have a few remarks to make regarding a recent campus controversy.

In response to a study that focused on an analysis of data gathered from Duke’s Campus Life and Learning project, black students on this campus have clearly conveyed through their actions and through their words that they feel disrespected.

In yesterday’s Chronicle, senior academic officers for the University, Arts and Sciences, and the Pratt School responded to the Duke community on this issue. I urge you to read their informative letter.

After talking to some of these students, listening to several faculty colleagues, and consulting with members of ECAC, as the chair of this Council I offer this response:

• The faculty of Duke are deeply committed to the pursuit of free inquiry and the freedom of advocacy for all faculty, and for all students.

• The faculty of Duke do not differentiate students in our classrooms or in our labs by their race, their gender, their major, or their GPA. In our eyes, our classrooms are simply filled with Duke students who are there to learn.

Inevitably, in a diverse and intellectually vigorous environment, tensions will arise. Yet, where else but on a university campus can we find the value in that tension? Where else but on a university campus does that tension afford us an opportunity to teach students that a community of open ideas and free inquiry is a community that will inevitably challenge them to formulate and affirm their own beliefs? Where else but on a university campus can we find value in those different beliefs?

That value, however, is only discoverable if, in addition to the inevitable tensions on a campus, there is an enduring commitment to mutual respect for all members of the university community. With that, I have one closing remark:

• The faculty of Duke are committed to an environment of mutual respect in this marketplace of ideas, in this gathering place for students and faculty of all colors, backgrounds and beliefs.

I urge faculty who have an interest in discussing this issue further to please contact me or any member of ECAC. We are open to your concerns and to your ideas.

By-law Revision

And now we turn to the comfort of by-laws (laughter) – something we all mutually respect and abhor at the same time (laughter). Be that as it may, ECAC has two changes it is proposing to this Council. The bylaws with the proposed changes were posted with your agenda. Let me just pull these up now (slides).

The first by-law change is highlighted here in blue. For those of you who were here in December, you will recall that ECAC received a request to conduct the vote for the approval of the DKU-Fuqua MMS degree by written ballot. And since our by-laws are silent on voting procedures, ECAC, doing what ECAC does best, extemporized and allowed for the written ballot on its own authority. ECAC is now proposing to amend our by-laws to make the voting procedure explicit. The proposed change is that we simply add to our by-laws the text here that is in blue:

Voting shall ordinarily proceed by voice but upon petition of a member of the Council or on its own authority the Executive Committee of the Council may provide for voting by secret ballot.

Does anyone have any questions about that change? We will vote on these changes at our February meeting.
so we are proposing them now. Let’s move to the next change. I will just briefly note that I wanted to thank Peter Burian and Phil Costanzo for helping out with these changes.

Currently, the Faculty Secretary is nominated by the Executive Committee and annually elected by the Council at the April meeting. The Faculty Secretary then serves as an ex officio member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, without vote. ECAC would like to restructure the Faculty Secretary position, such that, like the Vice Chair of ECAC, the Faculty Secretary would be selected from among the elected members of ECAC.

Currently, once members to ECAC are elected by the Council as a whole, the Council chair, in consultation with other ECAC members, selects the Vice Chair for ECAC. ECAC is proposing that the Faculty Secretary be chosen in the same manner.

Why this change?

This change allows us to increase the number of representatives to ECAC by one. While the number of Schools and faculty has grown through the years – currently there are twelve Divisions and Schools that have representation on this Council – the number of elected ECAC members has stayed steady at seven, with the seventh being the chair. With this change, we can increase the representation around the table without changing the total number of people around the table. Essentially, we are converting an ex officio position to a full ECAC position.

Does anybody have any questions about these changes? The changes are further down. What would be deleted from the by-laws is the explanation about how the faculty secretary is currently elected and that the faculty secretary is an ex officio member. What we are proposing to do is that the Council elects seven members to ECAC rather than the six, and if you look down further, what we have proposed is that each year after the election of new members, the Executive Committee shall choose from its members a Vice Chair and a Faculty Secretary for the Academic Council.

Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering): My question is not about what you have up but the first one.

Lozier: Changes to voting?

Wolf: As I read that, it looks like any member of the Council can request, but the Executive Committee is the one that grants it. Is that correct?

Lozier: That is what we intend. And the reason is we don’t want it to be something used when there are trivial matters. We just don’t want it to be abused. I think in this situation that we talked about in December, ECAC looked it up and thought there was absolute reasonable grounds for us to proceed with the written ballot. Any other questions about the by-law changes? Again, we will vote on these changes at the February meeting and if there are questions in the interim, you can write to acouncil@duke.edu or contact me.

Sara Beale (School of Law): What does the Faculty Secretary actually do? So I notice that we have a staff member on here, and we have a transcription going on. I wonder why we need a separate person designated as a secretary? We need a Vice Chair in case the Chair is unavailable or incapacitated, do we actually need a designated member of ECAC as a secretary?

Lozier: So part of this, which I didn’t mention, is that the Faculty Secretary, I think since 1974, has been elected by the Council. Clearly the advance in technology has drastically changed the duties of the Faculty Secretary in such that many of these duties have been reduced, etc. Is there still a role? The Faculty Secretary is ultimately the one who finalizes the minutes for approval by the Council. I think there is still a need for the Faculty Secretary and I think that an ECAC member can easily assume those duties.

John Staddon (Psychology and Neuroscience, Faculty Secretary): The Faculty Secretary also does the rudimentary minutes for every meeting of ECAC, so that is once a week.

Lozier: Yes. Thank you, John.

Terri Young (Ophthalmology): So with this change, we would have eight (ECAC) members who could vote among yourselves? So what if we have some impasse in terms of some approval in a process?

Lozier: That is a very good point. For those of you who have been on ECAC and are currently on ECAC, in fact, I have served on ECAC before, I don’t know that we have ever had a vote. But you are absolutely right. Normally a Chair doesn’t have a vote so there would be seven members and there wouldn’t be a tie and I wouldn’t have to be a tie-breaker (laughter). Sandra brought this to my attention as well, and I don’t foresee that as a problem but I do see your point. Any other questions about this?

Staddon: This will have an impact on the unemployment rate for emeriti (laughter).

Lozier: Yes, we err in the business of job destruction I guess. I did want to thank John though, as he has been helpful in advising on the input, not only on the role of the Faculty Secretary, but also in crafting these changes. Any other questions? We will come back to this in February.
Update on Duke Libraries

Next, I’d like to welcome University Librarian and Vice Provost Deborah Jakubs who will present an update on the Duke Libraries. Before I turn things over to Deborah, I would like to note that Duke ranks 5th in the 2012 Princeton Review ranking of Best College Libraries. It is important to note that this ranking is based on students’ answers to the survey question: "How do you rate your school’s library facilities?" I am sure that Deborah and her colleagues across Duke Libraries necessarily take pride in that ranking! Deborah?

Deborah Jakubs (University Librarian and Vice Provost): Good afternoon. It is a pleasure to be here giving you an update. I could update you on many different things regarding the libraries but after sitting down with ECAC we decided to limit it to four topics: Open Access, the Digital Futures Task Force, Research Commons Planning, and the Rubenstein Gift and Library renovation.

Before we get into those updates, I thought I would provide you with a snapshot of recent news and some basic information about the libraries (slides). Also I would like to remind you that this is about the main University Libraries, which are Perkins, Bostock, Lilly, Music, and the Duke Marine Lab. The professional school libraries report separately and have separate budgets but we collaborate quite a bit and we share a technology infrastructure.

The snapshot here, just to give you an idea of how busy the libraries are, I have to add that after we opened the Bostock library and renovated the Perkins libraries, we were second in the Princeton review. The students noticed the difference and they voted for us. Five is not bad though (laughter). We have a visitor every 11 seconds. This is a huge increase. In fact, at exam time, we have quite a bit of traffic. We rented some extra tables and chairs this year which were of great assistance to the students who all congregate in the libraries around then.

You can read these facts for yourselves but I think this conveys that we are a very busy place and there is a lot going on. The final bullet is to give you a sense of what we will be doing in the next year in preparation for the renovation of the Rubenstein. If you haven’t heard, we have a wonderful new partnership with Duke Athletics. This was cooked up by Kevin White [VP, Athletics] after he and I had a conversation about how the libraries might partner with athletics. As you can see here, one dollar for every ticket for every home sport will be coming to the libraries and this will be discretionary funds for the libraries to be used for areas of need. As such, it will support the campus very broadly, teaching and research and students and strategic initiatives.

Open Access: you all might remember that the open-access policy was approved here in 2010. We have created DukeSpace, the Open Access repository. We have been harvesting faculty members’ work. We have recently contacted about 800 faculty at Duke and asked them to be sure that they were who they seem to be and then harvested articles. We got very positive feedback on that process. We were offered additional articles, and that is what we want, we want to continue to harvest from other sources, particularly as this connects with the scholars at Duke Initiative.

I just want to remind you that the institutional repository is not only Duke faculty scholarship articles that we are harvesting but it is also a key collection. It began actually with electronic theses and dissertations so we have all student publications and student work in there as well.

Related to this is the COAPE (the Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity) fund and we have established a fund to help with author fees for publications and open access journals to encourage faculty to do more of this. You can see here that there’s been increased interest. The funds available have increased and the number of publications submitted in this way has also increased. So, this is definitely a way to disseminate the scholarship that is produced at Duke much more broadly and seems to be a national trend as well. The Digital Futures Taskforce was responsible for creating the Open Access Policy. Its membership is drawn from across the campus. Once the Open Access Policy was put into place and the institutional repository has been underway the new focus for it last year was on research data. There’s obviously a well-understood need to manage and share data produced by Duke faculty and graduate students in some cases. The Digital Futures Task Force has prepared a report and recommendations and is now working on implementation of this.

Research Commons Planning: what we’re seeing in the libraries, this goes back to trends that we’re seeing, is that there are many fewer general reference questions at the desk. A lot less one on one kind of questions and much more extended kinds of consultations with our sub-
ject and area specialists. We have 35 folks who are quite specialized. We think that the ability to do a lot more chat and online reference has keep people away from the desk. We often have students who are sitting as far away or as close as Margaret Riley there in the back and texting the librarian at the desk (laughter). They just don’t want to get up and walk over I guess but they’re getting what they need.

We’ve also seen an increased need for many more complicated services, for help with digitization, visualization and Data-GIS. We have a Data-GIS department in the libraries. To prepare the research commons we are considering expanding the Data-GIS department. So along with this goes the changes at Duke which you all are well familiar with, so this combination of changes in libraries and changes at Duke in general led us to what we are considering as our response which is to create what you think of as a research commons. If you think of the first floor of Perkins and Bostock as an information commons which is just a kind of general place where you can study and get work done, the research commons would be aimed at faculty, advanced undergrads and graduate students, giving them much more complex support for their work.

We already have librarians embedded in the Franklin Humanities Institute Labs. We have a number of librarians who are doing office hours in departments, who are available and spend a good part of their time in academic departments. The plug for the overhead scanners is just because there has been a lot of interest in that. And, we recently hired some new folks with very special expertise that can be a real asset to the campus as a whole: Head of Digital Scholarship and Production services, a Data Visualization Coordinator who will start in June, and the digital Humanities Technology Consultant who is being funded through the Mellon Humanities Writ Large Grant. I think he started last week.

Now, the Rubenstein Library. I’m sure you all know about this spectacular gift we’ve received of $13.6 million from David Rubenstein, a trustee, who was also a student worker during his time at Duke. He graduated in 1970. In fact he worked in the very part of the library that will become the Rubenstein Library that will be renovated. That was back when it was the only library. There was no Perkins 1968 edition which is what we think of as Perkins today, so that was the name of the library. We have told our staff to treat their student workers very well (laughter) because you just never know. But seriously we are delighted that David wanted to give back to Duke in this way. His gift enabled us to reach our overall goal for the Perkins Project which is entering its second decade. I think it started in 2000 and the first phase of that was the construction of Bostock and the von der Heyden Pavilion. The scope of the renovation is the original 1928 building and 1948 addition.

So, what will happen? During the next year we will be carrying out a number of what we call enabling projects, moving the special collections library used to be called the Rare Book Manuscripts and Special Collections Library – we like Rubenstein Library much better – moving them to Perkins third floor. The old stacks, which were really probably quite state of the art in 1948, but they’re not now. In fact not only are they not but in the case of a fire, they would serve as a chimney because there’s space between the floors to enable air to circulate so the books would not get dusty. We will have fire suppression and environmental controls.

If any of you have used our research room for special collections, it’s a very skinny room, I have a picture here in a second, and it’s just not what Duke deserves so there will a new research and reading room. The Gothic Reading Room and Rare Book Room will receive attention in terms of HVAC and several other things but they will essentially be still recognizable as the iconic spaces they are. The Carpenter Boardroom – some of you may remember that we used to have a Carpenter Boardroom and it went away – it will be restored. The Breedlove Room which is hard to find, will be relocated. There will be a new main entrance. I have a couple of photos here. Again, it will be a library worthy of our special collections.

So, badly needed updates: these are the current stacks in the 1948 building. This is the 1928 elevator which is still in use for carrying materials up and down. This is the reading room in Special Collections. 40% of our users are undergraduates, this is for Special Collections. There are many courses in which students are assigned primary research and they crowd into our research room and get assistance and read the materials that they need. This will go away. If you think of the portico, the kind of area you go under and then you turn right and then you go into the lobby, the doors will be flush with that now open space and so you will walk into a much grander lobby. Here is what I was just discussing. This is now open and it will be closed. The gallery will move down here. The Rare Book Room will remain in place. The elevator will disappear. There will be new restrooms and the current hallway that serves as a gallery for documentary photography will expand to 20 feet wide which will be an actual destination kind of gallery. The area where the administrative offices are now will include a new assembly room.

There are many events that take place in the Rare Book Room that should not take place in there. They should be in a room with technology. They should be in a room that doesn’t have precious collections. This room, which is actually the Holsti-Anderson Room, is named for Professor Holsti’s family with a generous donation from them. It will serve as the university function room so it is solely a library room but it is available to everyone. This will be a classroom for using Special Collections Materials and a brand-new research room, once
we take out the stacks, this space becomes available for users. It’s going to be much more a sort of main street of special collections user space. Just quickly, the second floor, the Gothic Reading Room remains in the same place. The Carpenter Boardroom will now be at the top of the stairs. The Gothic Lounge, this area is being expanded to be a study area by day or library use area and then when there are dinners or other events in the Gothic it can serve as a pre-function area.

On the third floor, we have a number of collaborative – they’re called digital humanities spaces in the original plan which we have changed that to just be collaboration spaces for faculty, students to use and equipped with technology. The Breedlove Room will be over there, right above the Carpenter. Again these are both rooms that can be scheduled for meetings of any groups on campus. The timeline quickly between now and December of this year we are relocating all of us and all of our however many miles of collections, six miles, I think. Political Science will relocate in 2013. Then the renovation, the hazardous materials work and all the renovation work will take place and by fall 2015, we’ll have the grand reopening of the Rubenstein Library and I should say the completion of the Perkins Project which began in 2000. We are very pleased and I’m happy to answer any questions about these topics or anything else.

Questions

Emily Klein (NSOE): Are the Breedlove and Carpenter Rooms about the same size as the current Breedlove Room?

Klein: I’m also just curious historically. Did the three porticos used to enter straight in at one time in the past?

Jakubs: No, although it’s really curious because it looks like there were doors there but there weren’t and if you go on inside, there’s just a book drop there.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): About the Open Access part, I was just curious how your committee group has decided to interface with those of us in the Medical School who either want to do Open Access ourselves, which a lot of us do, or also have to do it for NIH grant purposes so is that going to be coordinated so they can move from one to the other?

Jakubs: It already is. In fact 56% of the articles in the institutional repository are from medical school faculty so they’re already being put into this institutional repository.

Richardson: Will that happen automatically?

Jakubs: Yes – well, you will be able to do it later on. Right now they’re being harvested. Jim Tuttle is here who is the Digital Repository Director and Jim do you want to make a comment about that?

Jim Tuttle (Digital Repository Director): The idea is that we don’t want to burden the faculty further and we know that many people already have mandates on the medical side to deposit for NIH requirements so we’ll be harvesting some places that allow us to do that. So you’ll deposit once and we’ll harvest from there. Unfortunately we can’t deposit for your NIH requirements on your behalf but we would do what we need to do to deal with it.

Lozier: Any further questions then? Thank you, Deborah. The next item on our agenda is to have an update on the plans for the West Union Building. So Executive Vice President Tallman Trask and Vice President for Student Affairs Larry Moneta are here to give us that update.

Plans for the West Union Building

Tallman Trask (EVP): Susan asked us to give you a brief update as to where we are in terms of where we are in thinking about West Union. We’ll do that and then Larry’s going to talk about some of the program details in the building and then we’ll be happy to answer any questions you have. As you well know, we’re at work on Baldwin Auditorium at East Campus currently. All of this is enabled by an $80 million dollar gift from the Duke Endowment which was announced last year, trying to pay greater attention to three of the iconic buildings on the campus.
In the case of West Union, it is the primary gathering space for students on West Campus. It is 82 years old and while it has been the victim of a series of uncoordinated renovations over the years, it has never had a comprehensive attempt to clean and fix it up. And the reality is, after eighty years the entire infrastructure of the building – mechanical, electrical, air conditioning and so forth – is shot and in its current configuration it is not ADA-accessible as it has no elevators. Actually it has some elevators in the back but it has no public elevators. So we have been working for eighteen months now trying to think through what a renovation in the West Union might do.

We are interviewing architects on the 14th of February. Four firms are coming to compete for the work. After they are chosen, then we’ll go into detailed drawings. Our expectation is that no work will actually begin until the summer of 2013, so we have a lot of details to work out between now and then. In terms of the plan, West Union is building number one and we’ve really tried to spend a lot of time thinking not only about the building but the neighborhood in which it is exists.

Many of you will remember that area pre-plaza when you were deposited from the Main Quad into the Bryan Center through a cement cattle-chute (laughter) that had no place to stop and no place to do much of anything. The plaza has really transformed that. So we want to think about all of these as a series of buildings around the plaza that take advantage of both inside and outside spaces because outside spaces in North Carolina are actually quite valuable and quite inexpensive. The work now is on West Union, talking about increasing the dining capacity and we’ll show you a little bit of early planning and I want to emphasize that it is really early. We’ve had a planning firm involved but we haven’t even hired the architectural designer yet to do this work. Our expectation is that this project will be somewhere around 50 million dollars which comes from the Duke Endowment but until we get into detailed plans I don’t want to commit to a precise number.

And so currently our thinking is that we might be able to actually put another floor in the building. As you may know, there is no connector. Where the Faculty Commons is there is no connector across that part of the building and for dining there we are also looking for places to expand for student use. As you may know, part of the concrete cattle chute remains, the space under it is essentially dead, and for not a whole lot of money you can probably convert that into some kind of program space which is shown in these two possibilities here. It is a very interesting building – someday if you want to I will take you on a tour of the basements of West Campus (laughter).

What happened is the campus was built on the high point of the ridge. Under the ridge is a lot of rock and for those of you who want to know why there was never a building before we were foolish enough to put Bostock where it was, is because there was a vein of very heavy rock which in 1928 would have been nearly impossible to get out. Fortunately, now we were able to get the rock out although the occupants of the Languages building will remember the complaints about the dynamite that went off periodically (laughter). The same thing is true of West Union, although in the case of West Union, when they ran into rock in the basement, they just quit (laughter). So, about a third of the basement of West Union is in fact not useable. It would be possible now to expedite that rock out of the basement in West Union, but it would probably consume the entire budget of the project to do so, so we will leave it as is. Larry, if you want to talk about programming?

Larry Moneta (Vice President, Student Affairs): As Dr. Trask mentioned, the building is extraordinarily complicated, I think I was told sixteen separate mechanical systems over the last eighty years have been installed and co-mingled. As complicated as the physical infrastructure is, it is equally complicated by its variety of users and planning for both temporary and permanent relocation of all that is in West Union and paralleling the
conceptual planning and architectural planning. West Union feeds 6,000 meals a day and based on our estimates, it is inadequate for the capacity we will need to feed five years and ten years from now. One of the key needs is to ensure that when we reopen West Union that it has the capacity to accommodate the number of meals that will be served out of that building. There are currently about 600 seats of dining throughout all of the venues within West Union. We’re projecting 900 to 1000 seats will be needed when we complete this phase. As you can see, our intent is to dramatically increase the capacity. You also are aware if you have been in there, if you have a sense of where the front door is and the back door is, if you’d let us know, we’d appreciate it (laughter). It is beyond the realm of comprehension to know how to navigate the building so a lot of our planning includes trying to rationalize the variety of ways that one would come into the building.

You see a sketch of the second floor. Most of you who have been in there will recognize the Faculty Commons portion of that building, but you will see there is actually more floor there now in this conception than what currently exists. So the infrastructure that Dr. Trask referenced will provide us with not only a far more viable and expanded great room and Marché servery on the ground floor but would extend to the second floor with the capacity for house dinners and the kinds of communal dining that we aspire to be the heart of the building.

We are guided by a couple of visions. Those of you who are New Yorkers in spirit or in body who may have been up at Eataly in the City will know that block-size of Marché restaurants that Mario Batali runs and looking at that as sort of one example. I had the opportunity to be in Austin last week and visited the Whole Foods mother-ship which I am still in awe of and I actually think the Marché I saw there was better than at the Mario Batali. We aspire to be really one of the best dining experiences that can be imagined, not only one that would encourage students to sit and stay and actually engage in communal conversation to support the house model that we’ll launch next year, but a place that faculty and students, either casually or in classes or in groups, would find very comfortable and very convenient to engage in conversation.

We have many other very important occupants of West Union, ranging between the Mary Lou Williams Center for Black Culture and the barbershop, I don’t mean to pick the two as two ends of the spectrum, but the MLW and LGBT centers are of high priority for us. We have two groups of students, faculty, and staff, that are engaged in using this opportunity to think about the future centers and their roles and their functions and the kind of spaces that they will need and are in the process of determining potential alternative locations and will be working with both communities to explore any number of choices that may emerge. The same is true for a lot of the administrative offices although our intent and the requirements of food alone will take up so much of the building that it really limits space beyond the food spaces to a very small percentage of the overall building. If all goes well, the event pavilion that Dr. Trask mentioned will go into construction this summer and will take us a year. It will become a temporary dining facility for the year and a half to two years that it will take to do the renovations to West Union and when completed we’ll end up not only with this beautiful new community dining and gathering facility but also a new ballroom gathering event kind of space that the Von Canons never quite served adequate purposes for.

There will be modest and some needed changes in the Bryan Center as well, and as we’ve determined the locations for the centers and the other facilities in West Union, there will be quite a bit of movement that will occur over the same time. With the Plaza project at about the same time as the library renovation we’re scheduled to complete this about 2015. If it says anything about the parallel nature of our primary community spaces at Duke, then we are pretty much running on a parallel path. I think we are happy to answer any questions?

Questions

Berndt Mueller (Physics): Just about the program. One of the things that I thought was very good about the Focus program was to have the conjunction of dinner and discussions with all kinds of programmatic activities in the evening but that is on East campus. If we want to do something similar for senior capstone seminars we need a place on West. How many spaces of that kind would you foresee in that new design of the buildings?

Trask: We haven’t gotten that far yet in detail. This shows three. There could be more, they could be on different floors. But it’s clearly an attempt to have that kind of space which we currently don’t have.
Mueller: Would it be possible to find out how much interest there is in the faculty before you go into the details?

Trask: Part of the issue here is that we know we need space for group dinners whether they are class dinners or house dinners, so there will be spaces in there. I think the trick is to make sure we don’t build too many or too few given the demand.

Lozier: Is there a way for the faculty to give you further information about programming? Do they have ways they can contact one or both of you?

Trask: There are faculty on the program committees and faculty involved in the architect selections.

Moneta: We do have a website up now.

Lozier: Thank you both. So, I’m wondering how many Council members have noticed the peculiar absence of three letters that I haven’t said once this meeting (laughter). An acronym – anybody? Really? DKU. Ok, for those of you who are disappointed that I haven’t said that once, actually I just did, don’t be forlorn because at our meeting in February we are returning to the DKU Initiative and at that time ECAC will be presenting a proposal resolution for action on that venture. Now I will call our meeting to a close. Before I do, I want to say to anybody who needs a New Year’s resolution, I just have two words for you, and that is “opt in!” (laughter). Thank you all for your attention, and it’s before 4:30, I want everyone to note that. I hope you enjoy the rest of your month.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon

Faculty Secretary, February 3, 2012