Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, September 22, 2005, 3:35 – 4:41 PM

Announcements

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council) I want to welcome you all to the first meeting of this academic year and the first day of Fall. I realize that I’m not Nancy — I’ve already received complaints — but we’ll do the best we can. The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the May 12th meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Our Second order of business is to tell you that Laurie Shannon from English is the new Vice Chair of the Academic Council. Laurie… Please remember to sign the attendance sheets as they’re passed around in each meeting. This may be the last place at Duke where we still take attendance. That’s because our bylaws require that you be removed after three unexcused absences. I’m always afraid that will be understood as a reward, not a threat, but please call or email the council office if you’re unable to attend a meeting.

There are no questions for the President or Provost today.

One thing I would like to introduce to our procedures is a consent calendar, for items which, in the view of ECAC, are unlikely to generate any need for discussion. What I propose to do is the Friday before the Council meeting, I will send you the consent calendar item, along with any resolution that would go with it, and any supporting documentation. If we do not hear from any of you within 24 hours of the meeting, that item will be deemed approved and as soon as the meeting starts it will be approved. It’s just a way of not clogging up the meeting with things that don’t require discussion. I want to emphasize any member can move something off the consent calendar on to the regular calendar simply by registering an objection. Are there any questions?

Member: Can you clarify what you mean by “within 24 hours”?
Paul Haagen: Excuse me, 24 hours before. You will get it on Friday, you will need to object by 3:30 on Wednesday afternoon.

Are there any objections to that way of proceeding? [There being none, the consent-calendar procedure will be adopted in future.]

The other thing that I’m doing is clearly indicating those items on which we will take action, and those items which are merely for information purposes only. This is, I hope, going to concentrate our efforts ahead of time on those things where you’re going to be expected to vote.

Now, in accordance with the university bylaws, I will call on representatives from the various schools in Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for the various degrees. These lists will be presented to the Secretary of the Council and forwarded by the Provost for approval by the Board of Trustees.

Earned Degrees

The earned degrees are as follows:
Trinity College of Arts and Sciences  
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.  
- Bachelor of Arts: 58  
- Bachelor of Science: 10

Pratt School of Engineering  
Dean Kristina M. Johnson  
- Bachelor of Science in Engineering: 6 
- Master of Engineering Management: 7

School of Nursing  
Dean Catherine L. Gillis  
- Master of Science in Nursing: 33

Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences  
Dean William H. Schlesinger  
- Master of Environmental Management: 3

Fuqua School of Business  
Dean Douglas T. Breeden  
- Master of Business Administration: 85

Divinity School  
Dean L. Gregory Jones  
- Master in Church Ministries: 1 
- Master of Theological Studies: 2 
- Master of Divinity: 6 
- Master of Theology: 1

School of Law  
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett  
- Juris Doctor: 5 
- Master of Laws: 3 
- Doctor of Juridical Science: 1

School of Medicine  
Dean R. Sanders Williams  
- Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research: 6

The Graduate School  
Dean Lewis M. Siegel  
- Master of Public Policy: 1 
- Master of Arts in Teaching: 13 
- Master of Science: 16
Master of Arts  
Doctor of Philosophy  

TOTAL  333

All were moved, seconded and approved by voice vote.

Paul Haagen: I’m gratified that it was the Graduate School and not the Law School [which appeared late].

Faculty Hearing Committee

The next item of business is the Faculty Hearing Committee. I want to thank both the continuing members and those candidates for election at this time for their willingness to serve on this committee. The work load of this committee is highly unpredictable. It depends on the number of cases that are brought forward. We hope for all kinds of reasons, including the well-being of our committee members, that the work load will be light. I want to stress: thanks on behalf of the entire faculty to those who were willing to commit themselves for this service. Professor Bob Mosteller is again going to chair this committee, and I’m going to read the names for the proposed new or reappointed members. Tim Bollerslev in Economics, Catherine Fisk and Christopher Schroeder in Law, and Carol Meyers in Religion.

[The slate was moved, seconded and approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Paul Haagen: Thank you very much. Congratulations to the Committee, and we wish you a good and uneventful year.

Nasher Art Museum

The next items on our agenda are a welcome for and comments by Kimerly Rorschach, the new Director of the Nasher Art Museum. Kim has already been here for, I guess, a full year. She was a Fulbright Scholar, received her PhD in art history from Yale, BA from Brandeis. Prior to coming to Duke, Kim was Director of the University of Chicago’s David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art. The Nasher Museum will open in October and is going to have a strong focus on modern and contemporary art. As I was thinking about the wonderful things at Duke, I realized that it’s not only this institution itself — we’re also very lucky that the persons willing to contribute to this are appropriately named. (As I already told Kim, my own alma mater had the misfortune that the person who gave the money for the art facility was a Mr. Marshall, meaning that the college now houses the Marshall Arts Center...)

We’re pleased that Kim could spend some time to talk to us about the museum and about her vision for the role of a museum in an academic institution. Thank you.

Kimerly Rorschach (Mary D. B. T. and James H. Semans Director of the Museum): Thank you all, and Paul, for inviting me to address the Council. We are just about one week away from some of our pre-opening events, so we’re sort of in a crisis mode and I’m using the all-purpose power points that I have, which may not be most appropriate to my remarks, but I’ll do my best and leave some time for you all to ask questions. I also don’t have a good sense of how many of you know a lot about the old Duke University Museum of Art and the genesis of the Nasher, whether you know a lot or a little, so I’ll give a little bit of background and introduction and then, as I say, leave time for questions.

As many of you know better than I, the Duke University Museum of Art was founded in 1969, part of East Campus, a former science building that was renovated to provide a museum. The university was offered quite an important collection of European Medieval sculptures, a partial gift/partial service if they would provide a museum to house it. It was decided to do that and so the first museum was born. And I brought this slide — it’s very 1969 — I think that feeling-
groovy student standing outside the door of the museum sort of gives you a sense of the time and place.

It was a fine start, and the beginnings are critical. Everything that we have now is built on that foundation. But it was a modest start. Those of you who visited the old museum know it was a modest facility, it didn’t have good gallery space, it didn’t have proper climate control, lighting, storage, it had no loading dock. If a work of art wouldn’t fit in through the front door, it couldn’t be shown there. In short, it wasn’t a facility that really would allow Duke to do much with its art museum in the way of ambitious programming. It didn’t allow the museum to attract collections of the caliber that I think would have otherwise been possible and that were being attracted to other comparable university art museums at the time, if you want to look at it in that way.

But again as many of you know, there were plans for a long time, even almost from the beginning — people knew this was a start but not really an adequate facility for a university art museum. There was lots of talk and lots of planning about doing something more ambitious for the art museum. The patron who was involved during all this time, again as you know, is Ray Nasher, and I show you a photograph of him here in the Sculpture Garden of the museum that he recently built in Dallas. Ray Nasher, a Duke alumnus, class of 1943, captain of the tennis team, loved his time at Duke, he always says. They had a great time here, a great education, except in one area, which is the arts. He felt that the arts were not well enough developed; there just weren’t enough offerings, weren’t enough opportunities for students in the arts, and he wanted someday, if he could, to be able help make that better. And he had been interested for a very long time in helping Duke to move forward with the art museum project.

I won’t go through the stories of the site and all the debates about that, because you all know them better than I do. But just, if we can go on. Just suffice to say that eventually, the architect Rafael Viñoly was engaged to design the museum, and he produced a design which I think you will agree when you see the museum is very exciting and very successful. I think it’s quite beautiful from the outside, but even if you don’t agree, wait until you see the inside, which is very dramatic and very, very satisfying both as a museum space, I think, and as a kind of new civic and public space for Duke University — I’ll show you more and better slides of it in just a moment.

These are some of Viñoly’s original sketches, the idea of these buildings around a central courtyard, which I believe was for a minute or two thought of as an open courtyard for sculpture, but it very quickly became apparent that it would be much more efficient to cover it over with glass, so that what we have is more of a kind of piazza-like space, a gathering space, that again is very exciting and that you will see in a moment. Can I have the next please? Another just early sketch again as you know, it evolved to five pavilions around a central space, if we could go on again. Here’s the model, just showing it in 3-D. I’m going to go through these quickly, I’m not really going to talk about the architecture in this talk. We want to talk about other issues. Next again. There is Viñoly peering in to the model, figuring out the spaces just to give you a glimpse of the architect. Next again. And then here is the plan as it turned out. The three white boxes of course are the three gallery pavilions, one for the permanent collection, two for frequently changing temporary exhibitions. Together they have 15,000 square feet of exhibition space, whereas the old museum had less than 5,000 square feet of exhibition space, so it’s a big jump there.

The Lecture Hall pavilion has 173 seats: museum programs, Duke classes will also be taught in this very beautiful lecture hall. And then the Education Pavilion, as we call it, which has two smaller classrooms, one University classroom and one community classroom. It houses the Museum Shop, the café, administrative offices on the top floor, and loading dock storage and art handling below on the ground floor.

The location: I just want to say one thing about it. I think strategically this ended up being a great choice of location. As you know, it’s at the corner of Duke University Road and Anderson Street, the kind of southern-central edge of the campus. It’s in the center of the campus, albeit a center where there may not be all that much going on just yet, but as you know central campus
planning is starting, and we will certainly be a part of that, a kind of anchor for that. There’s talk about really developing the arts activities in that central campus area, and we’re excited about those possibilities and ready to be a kind of flagship partner in that. We’re on the Campus Drive bus route, so we are at least right between the two campuses. The students do need to pass by. But we’re also very visible to the broader public. People driving by the campus can easily see where we are, they don’t have to meander their way into the heart of East Campus and be worried about whether they’re even welcome on Duke’s campus or not. We’re very visible; we’re right there on the edge.

We have a public parking lot with a hundred spaces. You will have to pay a small fee to park there so that there will always be short term parking available, but we’ve got parking so that anybody can come and visit the museum so that we will be visible and accessible to town as well as gown. And I think I can say more about this in a few minutes. I think we’re going to all be surprised at how much interest there is in the broader community in this museum. I mean we’ve felt just a tremendous press of curiosity, interest, wanting to be part of this, wanting to benefit from it. Durham, of course, does not have an art museum of any broad significance; now we’re going to.

The Triangle, as you know so well, is a growing community. Lots of educated and sophisticated people are moving here: businesses, people with means, people who are used to participating in culture and supporting it, and really wanting to be part of this. Yes, indeed there are some other museums here, and although we won’t be the biggest museum in the area when we open, we will be a major, major, major addition to the broader cultural scene. And while Duke students and faculty are our first concern, no question about it, we can’t really stop at that. We have to focus there, but also look out to these broader audiences and communities. And that’s going to be, I think, one of the biggest challenges. How do we do that effectively, give everybody what they’re looking for, and keep everybody appropriately engaged, and, you know, continue to be very, very well alive with Duke’s fundamental educational mission. That’s the challenge, and I think it’s nicely symbolized by the strategic aspects of our location.

I’m just going to go rather quickly through some slides during construction. This is the Great Hall, the central area with the five massive themes going into place, covered with this beautiful little coating of snow as they went in one winter. Next please. The roof struts going up, the iron that supports the glass at the central skylight. Next please. A view of that from the top as they were putting the glass in, you can see the more shadowed areas where the glass is in. The glass lets in a tremendous amount of light, but it screens out quite a lot of heat, so that it’s very comfortable to be in that area although one feels almost as if one is outdoors. Next please. Here’s an aerial view — this is the real museum that you’re looking at, not a model.

Again just another look at the museum through the screen of trees, one of the very beautiful views that one can get on the site. Next please. Let’s just go on quickly and I don’t really want to talk about the architecture. There it is. There it is at night, through the skylight. Next again. Next again. Next again, that’s the café actually, that’s the main entrance.

There’s the loading dock, which we’re so proud of. It’s very large and we can get big trucks in there and big crates, and large works of art. So we’re really no longer constrained by our lack of a loading dock. Museum directors get very excited about loading docks, and we’ve got a good one now! And there it is down there. Next please. This is the terrace, the south terrace, sort of overlooking that, go ahead, go on. This is the University classroom, which again has a beautiful view of the woods and the site. I’ll show you another view looking out in a minute. That’s it again. Let’s go on. That’s actually the main entrance, up the hill. Next again. Next again. Then coming inside now, looking out through the skylight to the sky, this sort of irregular, very beautiful patterns of the beams that one sees. Next again.

And here’s I think a good view of that central space. It really is I think a very exciting space. Some of you have seen it already, others I hope will see it soon. And I hope it will become really a kind of civic space, a gathering space, for Duke and the broader community. It’s not really
a gallery as such, although there will be works of sculpture displayed there. I think of it almost
more as a piazza: you can sit, you can look at art, you can get a coffee, or something to eat, you
can people watch, and yet it’s all climate controlled. I hope it will be, a very important space for
all of Duke, and while we are an art museum, we want to do a variety of programs that will really
bring our Duke community and our broader community together in this space.

And then of course when one wants to see a great exhibition, one goes in to one of those
gallery pavilions. Let’s go on. There’s just another view actually of the lecture hall entrance, en-
trance to one of the galleries. Here’s on of the galleries itself. I just don’t have slides with art in-
stalled; we’re just finishing that up now. These are very beautiful, serene spaces. These really are
what you need to display art: flexible, white cube, very adjustable light. We do have natural light
even in these galleries, but it can be screened as needed. So, great spaces for showing art. Next
again.

A more of a night time view, go on. Here’s the lecture hall, in a sort of an incomplete
space. A very warm, different feeling, very warm, no natural light of course, good acoustics, good
AV. We’re hoping to also to have 16-mm film projection capacity, which will allow us to work
with full frame and other collaborators that we hope to bring in. So a very nice auditorium room
that will benefit a lot of different audiences. Next again.

Here’s another view of that University classroom. Duke classes will be scheduled in both
these rooms through the University Registrar, through hours that we will release with preference
given to those who need to use the museum’s collections. But we’re very pleased that Duke
classes will regularly be able to be taught in the museum. Next again.

Just again very quickly the two opening exhibitions. As Paul said, yes there will indeed be
an emphasis on modern and contemporary art, certainly an increased emphasis compared to the old
museum. But it won’t be an exclusive emphasis. We have collections in other areas, some very
important teaching collections in other areas and we will continue to use and display those. But
you will see quite a lot of programming in the modern and contemporary field. That’s where the
best opportunities lie, that’s the niche, I think, in the broader community that isn’t so well served
in many ways. So there will be a strong emphasis there but not an exclusive one. But of course we
want to open the museum with an exhibition of works from the Nasher Collection.

Ray Nasher, in addition to all his other accomplishments, has formed what is probably the
world’s greatest collection of modern and contemporary sculpture, American and European. It
lives in the museum that he built in Dallas to house it, but he has very generously lent us an in-
credible selection of works for this opening exhibition called the evolution of the Nasher Collec-
tion. Here’s a wonderful work by Matisse, a beautiful sculpture here. Next one please. Picasso’s
“Pregnant Woman”. I’m not sure what I have here, just a very few. Giacometti’s “Spoon
Woman”. So great works by the quintessential 20th century European and American artists. Next
again.

Mark di Suvero: this is installed on the hill outside the museum. If you drive by you can
see it, a wonderful steel piece, looks just terrific there, also from the Nasher Collection.

The second exhibition is an exhibition of contemporary art, works by 30 artists from all
over the world. By contemporary I mean art of the last decade or so. It’s called “The Forest:
Politics, Poetics, and Practice.” It’s a great theme to allow us to bring together some really terri-
fic work by wonderful artists who in some way or other have been interested in or engaged with
the theme of the forest. They may be interested in global ecological issues, issues of the effects of
colonialism on natural environments; some are more interested in historical and political aspects.
But it’s a really terrific show, and just to show you, and very interdisciplinary in its underpinning
and in its implications and possibilities. The Nicholas School is cosponsoring the exhibition with
us and we thought it would be a good way of sort of starting out by showing, you know, possibili-
ties for engaging other disciplines within the work done in an art museum. This is a great piece by
a New York based artist named Petah Coyne. It starts with a garden statue of the virgin Mary and
fixes all kind of artificial flowers and dead leaves to it….a very, very beautiful and dramatic peace. Next please.

This is a photograph by Rosemary Lang, an Australian artist, and it’s the forest of course. And that’s not a carpet of autumn weeds, but it’s a carpet of Victorian carpet that she has laid down and carefully cut around the trees and the rocks and photographed there. And she wants to get at, you know, how natural is the natural environment, how touched or untouched by the hand of man is it, issues of colonialism in Australia and on and on. A great work as well. Next please.

This also relates to some programming that we’re doing around the forest. I think I just won’t talk about that, just keep it brief. Let’s go on again. The permanent collection, as I said, will be displayed. The core of the collection is really four very strong teaching collections in Classical Antiquities, African art, pre-Columbian, and the Bramer collection of European Medieval sculpture that I mentioned before. We’re displaying the collection thematically, cross-culturally, according to some broad themes that we’ve come up with in consultation with faculty members who have worked with the museum over the years. We think it’s the best way to show the best pieces in the collection, which is rather disparate in its composition, and also get at it some of these really big issues that the faculty members are interested in for their students, but that we also think will be, perhaps, very engaging for broader audiences as well.

So that’s how we’re going to deploy those collections. We have some great study storage areas so that classes can have access to objects that aren’t on view. We can do that much better than we did in the past. So we will very much continue to use those collections and we think we’ll have a lot of new and exciting opportunities to build on that with a new and ambitious facility. Next please. Again, let’s just skip on here.

Very quickly, upcoming exhibitions in the spring. We’ll be showing Grant Hill’s collection of African American art. He’s a great basketball player, but he’s also an art collector and Duke alumnus of course, and there was an opportunity to show his collection so we’re pleased to be able to do that. Along with it, next please, we will mount a show of works by Romare Bearden, on the “conjur woman” theme that our colleague Professor Rick Powell in Art History is organizing for us with a group of his students. The museum has a long tradition of students curating exhibitions in the museum, and we will continue that. We’ll also have students working with us as interns in all of the different departments. We’ve always had a few, but we’ll have many, many more, which in itself is an important part of our teaching role and our relationship to Duke’s academic mission. And many of these students will go on to work in other museums, and we’ll just be able to provide many more opportunities there. Next please.

And then finally, as a just kind of finale teaser, in the Fall of 2006 will be presenting a wonderful show of contemporary Chinese photography and video that I organized for the Smart Museum of Art in the International Center for Photography. Last year it traveled to New York, Chicago, Seattle, it’s now just opened in London in the Victoria and Albert Museum. It’s going to Berlin and then having its final venue next Fall at the Nasher Museum (it would be even better if it had been organized by the Nasher Museum in collaboration with a Duke faculty member but we’ll do that next time). These things take a long time to incubate and prepare and schedule, but in the mean time we will have a very significant show of work that’s coming out of China today. Whether or not you’re interested in contemporary art, if you have any interest in China and the incredible changes that are just going on there like crazy, this exhibition will be of great interest to you. We’ll do things with the Asian Pacific Center and Ralph Litzinger and his colleagues I know, and again, like the Forest show, these will offer many rich opportunities for interdisciplinary debate and collaboration…So I’ll stop there and just to kind of give you sort of a sense of what I’m thinking and what we’re aiming for and I’d be pleased to take any questions. Thank you very much.

Kim Rorschach: If we have time for any questions?
Member: What is the opening date?
Kim Rorschach: I’m sorry, thank you, I forgot to say that. the museum opens to the public on Sunday October 2nd, but next Tuesday, September 27th, downtown at the Carolina Theater, we have a sort of preview lecture open to the public. Rafael Viñoly, the architect, will be speaking. Ray Nasher will be speaking about his collection, and it’s open to the public. It’ll be great. Anyone whose interested please join us there. We wanted to do something again for the whole community in the pre-opening phase. Then Thursday, September 29th, 11 AM to 4 PM is a kind of open house peek preview for all Duke faculty staff, students, and museum members. Please join us anytime on that day if you want to stop in, see the museum, see the exhibitions, the shop and café will be open, so there’s that as well. Then it opens to the public on Sunday October 2nd, 11 AM. It will be open straight through until 9PM, with an opening day ceremony featuring again Ray Nasher, President Brodhead, and the mayor of Durham at 1 PM. So thank you for asking that question and please do join us at any of these events.

Member: What are the regular hours?

Kim Rorschach: The regular hours: closed on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, 10 AM to 5 PM, Thursday 10 AM to 9 PM, and Saturday 10 AM to 5 PM, and then Sunday noon until 5 PM. I need a more succinct way of saying that, but open everyday but Monday, and open late on Thursday nights. And we will charge admission, but of course it will always be free to Duke students, faculty, and staff, and to residents of Durham.

Berndt Mueller (Physics): You mentioned that you want this not only to be a museum for academics but also a museum for the broader community, and of course that opens up a number of questions like, how well do you think you understand what expectations that there are from the community, and how involved was the community in the evolution of the museum? Did you have a strategy for that that you could share with us?

Kim Rorschach: Yes, and again, you know, it’s not monolithic. I mean, there are many, many people who make up the community. You know, even the old museum had a group of very involved members from the broader community. It didn’t represent, perhaps, a very wide constituency, but it was a constituency. We had about 200 members when I arrived here. We now, I think, have over 1000, and we haven’t even opened yet. And these are people who may have a Duke community connection, or may not, but are members of the broader community. You know, yes it’s true, that they tend, like all art museum member demographics, to be, to have high income, to be well educated, more white than black. They don’t necessarily tend to be elderly; we have a lot of younger people involved, but we’re hearing from a lot of people who have tremendous interest. We’re doing a lot of advertising in the broader community. We’ll do surveying and marketing research, but not yet. We just can’t get to it yet. We know that families have a potential interest. We know that there are a lot of people, as I said before, who are interested in culture, who visit museums regularly and would like to do more of that here in the place where they live. So we know there’s a lot of potential there. There are issues no question, but it couldn’t be a museum that was just for an internal community, and I don’t think any of us would want that. I mean, Duke wants to reach out more broadly, and we will be an important part of what they do in the community. So that’s kind of a vague answer, but maybe it’s a start. Thank you all, again.

Paul Haagen: Thank you Kim. Kim used the word exciting several times. I think among those exciting elements is that list of Chicago, San Francisco, London, Berlin, and Durham. It has a nice feel.

Faculty Scholars

The next item on the agenda is the report on the Faculty Scholar Committee. If you did not already pick up a copy of the report it’s available on the front on the chair. If you’re interested in learning more about the award, the information and a list of previous winners is posted on the Academic Council website. Now I’d like to welcome Professor Benjamin Ward, the Chair of the Committee.
Benjamin Ward (Philosophy and Associate Dean for Student Development): Thank you very much. I’m sorry I’m late, but I have a class on East Campus, a class on the Philosophy of Education. The students had so much to talk about; it was hard to get away. I was happy to hear about the presentation about the art museum. Kimerly is coming this evening to visit with students in the arts theme house, where I am Faculty in Residence, so I will be hearing some of this again, in a different setting.

I want to very brief because there are other items on the agenda. I’ve often thought that committee work can be viewed as drudgery, something to be avoided by many faculty under certain circumstances, but I’ve sometimes thought that probably members of the Faculty Scholar Award should be charged a fee or something for the privilege of serving on that committee, because it really is almost unfair for just the four of us to have this opportunity to read these extraordinary dossiers and to interview some of the students in this process. They really do represent the very best that Trinity College and the Pratt School of Engineering have to offer. Patricia Bauer, who’s a member of our Committee, new on-the-faculty professor in Psychological and Brain Sciences, has been introduced to the students of Duke in a very, very special way. Imagine getting your feet wet by participating in this kind of process.

We always do this fairly early in the academic year. We used to do it at the end of the junior year, but we had so many students who were studying abroad that they were unavailable for interviews. So several years ago we changed to the Fall of senior year; that’s worked out very well for us. As you know from the report we had 25 candidates submitted by 16 different programs and departments. We selected 8 for interviews, and we chose 3 students as Faculty Scholars, and we’re submitting two names for consideration of honorable mention. Let me just mention a couple of things. Elizabeth Kirby was nominated by the Department of Psychology, specifically from the program in neuroscience. Rahul Satija was nominated by the Department of Biology, but with very, very strong support from the Department of Music. He’s majoring in both from those schools. And Stephanie Weber was nominated by the Department of Chemistry, with very strong support from the Department of Biology. All of the candidates were extraordinary in many ways, but these are the three whom we would like to put forward for consideration as Faculty Scholars for the 2005-2006, along with names of William Hwang, biomedical engineering, electrical and computer engineering, and physics, and Jacqueline Ou, mathematics and biology, for honorable mention. I’d be happy to respond to any questions.

[The Faculty Scholar Committee report was approved by voice vote.]

Benjamin Ward: I thought there was a fair chance that the recommendations would be approved, so I took the liberty of inviting the students to join us…I don’t know that an ovation upon entrance is a regular occurrence in Academic Council meetings, but it is richly deserved on this occasion. I have the pleasure of presenting to you Rahul Satija, who is majoring in both biology and music, and who also is concert master of the Duke Symphony Orchestra. Stephanie Weber, who is majoring in both biology and chemistry. And Elizabeth Kirby, who’s majoring in Psychology with a special emphasis in the program in neurosciences. These are our faculty scholars for 2005-2006.

Paul Haagen: These are really remarkable young people. We’re proud of each of you and wish you much success and we want to thank Ben and his Committee for their wonderful work on selecting people, and promoting a recognition of scholarship among the undergraduate students here at Duke University.

Benjamin Ward: Let me just acknowledge Patricia Bauer, who is here. I don’t see any other members of the committee here. Patricia would you stand?
**Name Change Proposal: Slavic Languages and Literatures Department to Slavic and Eurasian Studies**

Paul Haagen: The next item of business is the report from Edna Andrews, Chair of Slavic Languages and Literatures. She will be presenting a proposal to change the name of the Department to Slavic and Eurasian Studies. This is a proposal that has been reviewed and approved by the Academic Programs Committee, and by ECAC, and has the endorsement of Dean Davis, Dean McLendon, and Provost Lange. Edna:

Edna Andrews (Chair of SL&L): I actually didn’t think I would have to say anything. I know you have the accompanying materials with all of the letters from everyone except God the Father, and if you have any questions I’d be happy to answer them. We’ve been doing this now for 2 years, so I’m happy to answer your questions, but I think that you probably don’t want to hear me talk about this at length. Are there any questions?

Berndt Mueller: By broadening the scope of the department, one not only has a vision for opportunities but one also has additional, how should I say, responsibilities, focusing on a wider range, and that in some sense, if you want to remain a program of excellence, in a wider context, you have to have additional resources. My question would be whether you have the commitment from the University to actually make this program that is also successful and excellent, and has a broader scope.

Edna Andrews: Well, let me say a couple things. We have actually raised more external federal grant money since 1991 than any department in the humanities at Duke. We have been using the Eurasian word since 1991. So, as a matter of fact, this is actually historically already been in place. This name change is coming a decade after all of our fundamental curricular changes. I do believe that because we have been avid grant writers, trying to bring in our share of federal funding to the institution, that the administration will continue to support us. We, as you saw in the letters, at least in my report, we are not fundamentally changing our curriculum. In fact, this is a curriculum that has already taken form.

I thought that you might want to know what Eurasia is. It is a question that we often ask ourselves. This word became current at the beginning of the 90’s, with the collapse of the Soviet Union. There were some terms that the academic and political communities were looking for to talk about these regions, and Eurasia — certainly for the Department of Education and for the Federal Government — has often referred to the former Soviet Union also including parts of central Europe that were non-Slavic. So over the last 10 years, we have changed our curriculum fundamentally to include Turkic and Turkish studies. We have included things like Jordan, in much course work. We had also worked in Hungarian, but since UNC is getting a named Chair in Hungarian Studies, we will gladly let them handle that. So at this point we’re really looking more at cross-disciplinary changes, as opposed to geographic-based definitions.

Berndt Mueller: Basically, I understand what happens. You don’t need additional resources already.

Edna Andrews: I don’t feel comfortable about talking about resources, but maybe Dean McClendon would like to say something about that.

George McClendon (Dean of Arts and Sciences): We already have, in fact, additional resources under this program. I think what Edna is saying is correct, that the name change primarily exists to recognize the reality on the ground, and the way that program has developed over the last decade or more. She’s also exploring — as she alluded to very briefly — ways that we can better invest in places that are complementary to investments that are going on in our sister school down the road, so that one way that we can make best use of resources is to invest in places that we need to here, and also take full advantage of those going on at our sister school. So I think in the end, we will end up with an extraordinarily strong Slavics and Eurasian unit. It will just be composed of more than just what’s at Duke.
Edna Andrews: Yes, and of course the studies where it probably make more sense to this community because Duke has been an advocate for that term for over 20 years in various programs: we have Romance studies, Germanic studies. So this also fits in to, quite frankly, the old term languages and literatures. Well I have to tell you, at least for the last 6 years that I can remember no one at Duke has spelled the name of the department right anyway. It’s actually, Slavic Languages and Literatures, but for some reason that “s” has been cut off (which is more appropriate in Slavic languages, actually; you would not use the plural).

Paul Haagen: Thank you Edna. Well I’m glad to know I was in a strong Duke and Slavic tradition in misstating the name of the department. We have a resolution, and that is, “be it resolved that the Academic Council accepts the proposal and recommendation to change the name of the Duke University Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures to the Department of Slavic and Eurasian Studies, and endorses this recommendation.”

[The resolution was passed by voice vote, without dissent.]

At this point, Provost Lange drew members’ attention to a random student who had wandered into the room looking, as it turned out, for his keys. Not finding them, and finding little else of interest, the student left and Chair Haagen returned to the Council’s business.

Interpretations of the Intellectual Property Policy

Paul Haagen: The next item is the interpretations to the intellectual property policy. Provost Lange will address this matter and Professor Hadley Cocks, as chair of the intellectual property board, is also here to answer any questions.

Provost Lange: So as one of the unique byproducts of the iPod project, what we discovered last year was that more and more students liked using their iPods to record lectures, and given the enterprising character of our students, they began to think of ways that they might help their fellow students by recording those lectures. Interestingly enough, there were also professors who recorded lectures, with much the same purpose, although they wanted to control exactly how that distribution happened.

The issue arose because the students, who were quite entrepreneurial, came to one of our professors, and asked her whether they might record her lectures and then put them up on the web. And this professor said, “well, gee in principle that would be fine as long as you let me tell you when you can put them up because I don’t want you putting them up the same day that I’m teaching. Because then, even for me you might not come to class.” And so we went and looked at the policy that was in place, because we actually thought that the issue was covered in the policy, and it turned out that the policy probably did cover this issue but not with sufficient clarity. We wanted to be sure that faculty prerogatives were respected, their own intellectual product, in this case their lectures, were covered, but that there were also opportunities to use recordings of lectures, either audio or audio-visual. We intended that our policy would facilitate recording and distribution in accordance with faculty members’ wishes.

So what these two provisions basically do is amplify, or clarify, existing provisions in the Faculty Handbook text to enable students to record for their own purposes lectures, and also to create a process and an approach to allowing lectures to be put up for more general use by recording by students or by recording by faculty or by recording by administration, but under the full control of the faculty member whose intellectual property rights are preserved in the new rules.

Mariano Garcia-Blanco (Molecular Genetics and Microbiology): We in the Medical School have been afraid of the possibility that our curriculum could be recapitulated in Singapore in a medical school, and maybe that there may even a fee for this curriculum. It’s not clear; this is also hearsay as far as I can tell. But if these lectures actually become an item for sale, is this also going to impinge on the Medical School?

Provost Lange: Well, the medical school is covered by the policy, but the relationship between the faculty of the Medical School and their curriculum and the possibility that lectures
would be sold… We would never, I don’t think, argue that the simple, the simple reproduction of lectures was not a product which is fundamentally under the control of a faculty member. Now there are issues when lectures become highly produced in the course of developing distance-learning courses. Those issues are somewhat different, but that’s not what’s being discussed here.

Paul Haagen: In considering this item, ECAC felt that the interpretation of these rules was not something that required any vote. We thought that taking the view of the organic nature of the common law, that this was simply a development or an interpretation. If anyone feels differently, I’d be glad to hear an objection, but otherwise we’ll just move on with the last item on the agenda…[There being no objections, the suggested procedure was adopted.]

Joint Degree Task Force Report

The final item on the agenda today is the Joint Degree Task Force Report. Professor John Payne of the Fuqua School is here to present the report and to answer any questions on the recommendation and procedures. This Task Force was formed, I think, after there was confusion and uncertainty about what standards, were to be applied when we considered this possibility in the specific case of the Frankfurt Program. And so the Joint Degree Task Force lays out a framework for thinking about how these programs would be considered.

John Payne (Fuqua School): Thank you Paul. First, let me thank the fellow members of the Task Force for all their help in developing this report. I also want to take this opportunity to thank Professor Will Mitchell for his insights in strategic alliances and criteria we should be using for selection. And finally I’d like to thank Patty McHenry of the Provost’s office for all her work in support of the Task Force. Because everyone’s had an opportunity to read the Joint Degree Report, I will not go through it in detail. What I’d like to do is just make a quick 3 points, and then answer any questions you might have. To begin with, the Task Force saw the possibility of joint-degree programs with other universities as fully consistent with Duke’s strategic plan. In particular, we saw joint-degree programs as offering potential efficiencies in scale, but most importantly, to build on the complementary scales of different universities, and that this would be true both internationally as well as for schools within the US.

Next, I want to stress that while this report recommends that Duke University allow the establishment of joint degrees with other universities, it makes no recommendations with regards to any specific program. Any specific joint-degree program must follow the normal and quite rigorous approval and review mechanisms that are outlined in the report.

Finally, let me end by stressing the key point in this report, which is that students in any joint-degree program should be viewed as earning a Duke degree. We are not proposing to set up two classes of degrees. Any joint degree program should be comparable to Duke programs, in terms of content, the quality of students to be admitted, the experiences of and the expectations for those students; and that any graduate of such a program should be viewed as an alumnus of Duke University. That is a principle we decided on and really everything that is in the report follows from that single idea. And with that let me stop and answer any questions people might have.

Paul Haagen: Any discussion of this or any questions?

Ken Spenner (Sociology): I think the report was well done. At the end you mentioned two critical issues…and those issues are respectively…university tuition…and ….three or more schools.

John Payne: I’d like to take what I think is the easier one, which is the last one. Imagine, say, three universities, each comparable to Duke in quality. Imagine that they would be schools with complementary skills and resources, and we would make them come together in the program. If those schools are of comparable quality, it seems to me that it might well be that we would be the third. I think the key notion here would be in bringing that program over to this body and others, a sense that it was of comparable quality and the students and experiences would be comparable to any other Duke University degree…we were not prepared to come up with a recipe for how to answer. There are obviously issues here in terms of protecting, if I may use a business term, the
brand identity or brand image of Duke University, which many of us have spent a long time trying to develop.

We also recognize, however, that there might be times in which we would want to perhaps have a lower price for some other degree. Recognizing, as it says in here, that we’ve got to be careful that we wouldn’t be cannibalizing those contracts. Again, I will admit up front here that we did not get in to the details of that because we thought each one would have to be dealt with be case by case.

Berndt Mueller: All these degrees are, as far as I can see, are professional…?

John Payne: One of the degrees actually that we articulated is a possible joint degree in German, between us and UNC.

Dean McLendon: And that’s a PhD?

John Payne: Right

Berndt Mueller: My question is, what about undergraduate degrees? Are they covered?

John Payne: I think they are covered. But it is again a question of what particular program would bring forward. I see this as something in terms of Duke University as a whole saying that these are something that we are willing to consider.

Dean McLendon: Because of what you can call branding issues, and the pricing associated with that, it is much easier to think about how we’re going to do this in a context of a PhD program…I wouldn’t preclude some future possibility where an undergraduate collaboration might be very attractive — and it is covered by the policy that you suggest. I just can’t think of anyone in reality right now that I would want to try and deal with on the undergraduate level.

John Payne: Well, I agree with that completely and that would be my view is that it would be covered as part of this, but the details of whether it would make sense and all the crossing issues, and all the issues in terms of implementation that I can imagine might apply at the undergraduate level would need to be worked out.

Paul Haagen: Okay thank you John. Again, I want to emphasize that we understand this to be an approval for a framework for approving. Any particular joint degree would have to go through the Academic Programs Committee, would have to come to ECAC, would have to then come to the Council for approval. So this is merely approval for a framework and, I guess of the concept of a joint degree.

The resolution that we prepared is, “that the Academic Council accepts the Joint Degree Task Force Report, dated September 12th 2005, and endorses its recommendation that Duke University facilitate the establishment of appropriate joint degree programs with other universities in the process for approving joint degrees.”

The resolution was moved, seconded and approved by voice vote.

Paul Haagen: Just in conclusion, one of the things I hope to do over this year is to be very careful with your time. I would like to have as many of the matters that come here be matters where we really do need significant faculty discussion and input, that we streamline those matters that simply need to be processed, and that we make this our collective faculty parliament, to do all the positive things that come out of faculty governments. I think we’ve been well served by faculty governance here, and I would like to continue in the fullest and most efficient possible way. Thank you all.

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 PM.

Respectfully submitted

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, October 3, 2005