

Minutes of the Regular Meeting Of the Academic Council

Thursday, February 19, 2004

3:50-4:39 PM

139 Social Sciences

Prof. **Nancy Allen** (CliSci, Chair of the Academic Council) opened the meeting with the wistful thought that if there were only enough lawn chairs, the meeting could so pleasant outside. But, returning to the grim realities of the accustomed venue, she called up the minutes of January 22. Were there any corrections? Turned out there were. Prof. **Barbara Shaw** (CHM) had three sentences to correct, worked out subsequently with the Faculty Secretary as follows:

On Page 8, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence to read: "Over the last six months there has been just one person serving around 1,000 undergraduate students, 20 faculty, and 200-300 graduate students, staff, and post-docs, and he is the only person who is allowed to maintain and trouble-shoot computers, and install programs on them."

On page 13, 3rd from last sentence to read: "**Shaw** was still troubled, thinking there might be matters of interpretation, say, that would change in the new context."

On page 14, 1st line, 3rd sentence to read: "She would just like to ask that her department have the opportunity to review this, so that the chemists are aware of the new policy [language]."

There being no further corrections offered, the minutes of January 22, 2004, were approved by voice vote, without dissent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nancy Allen updated the Council on one matter from that previous meeting. The Classified Research Policy matter was to be carried over to this next meeting for vote, but further conversation and follow-up questions after its discussion at the January meeting have prompted Vice Provost for Research James Siedow to request a delay of Council action until fall, so that the Research Policy Committee can consider various issues that were raised. In spite of a remark that the carryover would take some of the "mystery" out of today's agenda, that's why we don't after all see that particular item back before the Council today.

President-elect Richard Brodhead will attend our March 18 Council meeting, a most welcome occasion we can all look forward to.

Next, as she had mentioned, the Academic Council Student Affairs Committee is being formed

and Prof. Prasad Kasibhatla (NSOE&ES) has agreed to chair it. We will look forward to their work.

She was also pleased to announce an upcoming event honoring President Nan Keohane. With support from the Provost's office a Duke Faculty Symposium will held on Monday, March 22, from 2:30 to 6:00 at the Doris Duke Center. ECAC (the Executive Committee of the Academic Council) has been working with an organizing committee chaired by Prof. Fritz Mayer (PPS) and including Profs. Peter Euben (PS), Ruth Grant (PS), Elizabeth Kiss (Kenan Inst, for Ethics), and Michele Longino (RS, F&FS, ECAC). The topic for the symposium is taken from a question posed by Diderot to Rousseau. "Does Progress in the Arts and Sciences Serve to Improve or Corrupt Morals?" There are to be two panel discussions, with faculty chosen broadly from across the University, to give their thoughts on that question as it applies today, in comparison with Rousseau's answer 250 years ago. President Keohane will be there to take part in this scholarly discussion, and to enjoy herself. We will be getting information out to faculty about this occasion, but particularly want the Council members to be informed. The Doris Duke Center is the wonderful building in the Sarah P. Duke Gardens, a great venue, and if it's nice weather there we might in fact be outside part of the time.

The next item on the agenda called the Council to go into Executive Session (Faculty Only).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council went briefly into Executive Session to hear presentation of candidates for honorary degrees. At its conclusion those waiting in the corridor were invited to return.

QUESTION TO THE PRESIDENT

By established custom, faculty have an opportunity to propose questions for the President, the Provost, or other administrators. These are submitted to the Academic Council office for forwarding to the officer for formal answer. At this time we have a question for President Keohane. It was pre-circulated to the Council, and the President has been given time to consider her answer. The question is:

"We are all astounded and pleased by the remarkable success of the recent fund raising campaign and congratulate you and the professional and voluntary leaders of this seven year campaign on the brilliant outcome.

"To better understand the impact that the campaign will have on Duke's future, could you tell us the following? Of the \$2.3B raised, how much of that will add to the University endowment? And of the total university endowment, both new and old, how much will be used for the funding of the capital and operating costs of the new buildings now under construction or proposed for construction over the next several years?"

President **Nannerl Keohane** came to the lectern and spoke to the Council as follows: This is a question that I take some delight in answering because I think the news is good and it is certainly important to share it with the faculty. Thanks to so many people at Duke and across the country, the Campaign has indeed been as the questioner said "a remarkable success." The question asks about endowment and about facilities, which are certainly among the two most lasting tangible legacies of the Campaign. So let me take them in turn. The Campaign raised \$774 million for endowment across all schools and programs, meeting and exceeding its endowment fund-raising target. This was endowment for a variety of purposes including unrestricted endowment, but also professorships (132 of them), financial aid for undergraduate, graduate, and professional school students, libraries and various kinds of program support. \$516M of this total have been received by the close of the Campaign on December 31, and we can look forward to another \$258M in endowment as the remaining pledges are paid.

To put these numbers in perspective: the value of Duke's endowment was just under \$800M at the start of the Campaign. We will have virtually doubled it through new Campaign gifts. And of course with the market-related rise in the value of our original portfolio, and the appreciation of those endowment gifts, our endowment has been further strengthened. So the market value of our endowment at June 30, 2003 was over \$2.5B, which is a testament both to the Campaign and to Duke University Management Company (DUMAC).

The second part of the question relates to facilities. The Campaign has funded in whole or in part a splendid array of new facilities, some of which are now well established, others that are in progress, and some that have not yet even broken ground. I would like to recap the most significant accomplishments under all of those headings briefly and then explain something of the financing. But I think you'll agree that taken together all of these projects are - and have the promise to be - truly transformational for our University.

- The additions to and renovations of Perkins Library
- The Center for Interdisciplinary Engineering, Medicine and Applied Sciences
- The Nasher Museum of Art
- The French Science Center
- The Divinity School Addition
- The Nicholas Building and the Ocean Sciences Teaching Center for the Nicholas School
- The Law School Addition
- Rubenstein Hall in the Sanford Institute
- The Magat Academic Center and the Fox Student Center at Fuqua
- The Freeman Center for Jewish Life
- The Doris Duke Center in the Gardens
- The Theater Studies Addition to the Bryan Center
- The McGovern-Davison Children's Health Center
- The Albert Eye Institute
- McClendon Tower in the West Edens Link Residential Complex
- The Brodie Recreational Center on the East Campus

The Wilson Recreation Center
The Yoh Football Center
The Schwartz-Butters Athletic Center

Now, the Campaign contributed in some way to all of these projects. They cost all together, including those which are still prospective, a total of \$667M. Campaign gifts have accounted for about 47% of this, \$312M. This includes \$195M in gifts directly for construction, plus endowment gifts that have been designed to support construction or program costs, and also expendable gifts that we may use for construction or put in quasi-endowment to support building or program costs. So, to be a little bit more specific, in terms of old endowment there will be transfers of some Levine Science Research Center endowments to support CIEMAS and the French Science Center as functions move from LSRC to the new building, approximately \$27M. In terms of new endowments raised through the Campaign, \$75M is directly related to the buildings, for either capital or operating costs, plus, as mentioned above, about \$42M in expendable gifts that might become quasi-endowment for a possible total of about \$117M.

Now, further, operating support, as such, is the responsibility of the deans of each of the schools or units (athletic facilities, children's hospital) and is built into financial planning as the projects are brought forward. We have a number of endowments in every school that are designed to support programs in the new buildings, but we have few if any endowments which are directed specifically to maintenance and operation. Instead, we have brought to the Board of Trustees detailed plans in every case, projected out over a number of years, about how we will be funding these maintenance costs. The sources of revenue vary for each school and project and they involve transition support from central strategic investment funds, incremental research activity, further fund raising and other sources. So clearly then, the Campaign will leave a lasting legacy at Duke in terms of both financial and physical capital - and more importantly, in terms of the teaching and research they will sustain.

In thanking Pres. Keohane for this detailed over-view, **Nancy Allen** admitted having gotten lost in some degree in the number of buildings. "I think we all need a tour." (On those scooters, or whatever — Segways ~ she suggested).

PATRIOT ACT

FOUOW UP TO DISCUSSION AT THE JANUARY 22 MEETING

There being no follow up questions to the Question for the President, the next topic introduced was related to the discussion last month at the January 22 meeting when Prof. Michele Longino (RS, F&FS, ECAC) asked V. Pres. for IT Tracy Futhey about the impact of the Patriot Act as it relates to OIT, and information technology [more broadly]. Pres. Keohane had joined in that discussion and had said she would be willing to come back to the Council and let us know what she found out in the interim. **Allen** then recognized the President again to speak.

Returning to the lectern, Pres. Keohane spoke again, as follows: As our chairman has just said a question arose at the January 22 meeting of Council about the implications of the USA Patriot Act for Duke and other universities. We did not have immediate answers to those questions so the Provost and I promised to follow up and we have done so. It turns out that the supposition that caused the most concern is not confirmed by the facts. You may recall that it was suggested that members of the University community who are approached by representatives of the Department of Homeland Security and asked to provide information about colleagues would be required not to divulge that fact to those who are targets of the inquiry, on pain of prosecution themselves. That understandably raised some degree of consternation for all of us. There are apparently some features of the Patriot Act that might lead to such a situation, but we have determined very clearly that these features do not affect university campuses, so that nobody here need fear of being put in that very difficult situation.

More basically, we also discussed how members of the faculty should handle requests for information about colleagues from government officials. Many of you are familiar with such requests because you receive an occasional inquiry from the FBI, for example, seeking information to help determine whether a colleague should have a security clearance. We suggest that you continue to handle these requests just as you've always done, since nothing in that respect seems to have been changed by the Patriot Act. And the same should be true of other requests that seem to you familiar or routine, for example for information about students, which are usually handled by the Registrars of the several schools. However, if you are approached by a law enforcement person making inquiries that are related to the Patriot Act we suggest that you contact either Paul Stirrup in the Internal Audit department or David Adcock, University Counsel. Either of those offices will be able to guide you on how to handle any requests that seem non-routine or raise any questions in your mind. And similarly, if you are not accustomed to handling requests for information of this sort, of any kind, you are welcome to refer those as well to Paul Stirrup or to ask the advice of University Counsel before responding, whether they have anything to do with the Patriot Act or not. We want you to be aware of that resource.

Finally, during discussion on the 22nd, when there was some fear that faculty members might face a new form of jeopardy under the Patriot Act, the question was raised whether University Counsel's office supports faculty members who are charged with some offense while they are performing their duties. I responded in the affirmative, and I've confirmed that that answer is generally accurate. Obviously, there are some potentially complicated issues here. If faculty members are determined to have broken the law, Counsel cannot be expected to defend them in that kind of situation. But if persons have acted in good faith in the performance of their duties in areas like this, which are still sort of being interpreted, Counsel would be ready to defend them.

SOCIAUY RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT GUIDELINES

Again thanking Pres. Keohane, and there being no pressing follow-up questions on this matter, **Nancy Allen** took up the Socially Responsible Investment Guidelines which the Council had considered previously in December and which the University Priorities Committee has considered

on several occasions. Professor Jim Cox (Law), who chairs UPC, regrets that he couldn't be here today. We do appreciate his committee's work on this topic. She now called on the President to share with us her thoughts on the latest draft of this document that will go to the Board of Trustees next week, that document and her cover letter having been included among the pre-circulated material for this present meeting.

Following a now well-worn path to the lectern, Pres. Keohane had this to say: I'll be very brief because the material was included in your meeting packets and we've had discussions about this in the past. Just to indicate what the purpose of today's consideration is, we will be bringing this proposed policy, which was attached to my memo of February 6, to the Board of Trustees. We hope for its approval at their meeting next week. At the meeting in December when the Board first considered an earlier draft of this policy, the comments of Academic Council were reported by Nancy Allen and by the Provost and we will certainly report any further comments that you may have. We're not asking Council's formal approval of the policy because we think it is a Trustee policy, but we do think it's important for members of the Board to know about any suggestions or concerns that the faculty may have. This redraft includes taking into account some of the topics that were raised at the earlier conversation here in Council, which were helpful, although not all of them were we able to take into account. I think most important for many of us was that it became increasingly clear that even though we all felt we didn't want to set up a new purposely-built committee to consider these issues at this time, at some point down the line that might be indicated. It was very gracious of the University Priorities Committee to agree to act potentially as this filter if issues arise. As I said to Jim Cox (chair of UPC), if against our expectations there turn out to be a lot of these issues then we may have to rethink that because UPC has plenty of other things on its plate. But we would expect that in many instances someone might suggest a concern to the President or senior officers who would then decide whether it was appropriate to take it to UPC, whether it was at a significant enough level in terms of University community concern. And we could decide either "yes" or "no" on that, and if we decided "no", the person could still appeal to UPC if they wish. We would expect that there would be relatively few such claims in any year that would rise to a level of UPC consideration. But if they do, we think there should be a community filter before we decide whether to take it to the Board. So that's the policy and those of us who have worked on it will be glad to answer questions or to receive your comments to transmit to the Board when we present the policy next week.

DISCUSSION OF SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT GUIDELINES

Prof. Josh Socolar (PHY, ECAC): had two questions, or comments. The first is in the paragraph that describes what UPC will be asked to do. It says first that it will be asked to examine the issue, and then it implies that that examination will lead to some kind of recommendation. The question is, does that mean a recommendation to divest or not, or what? There's a difference between examining and recommending.

Pres. Keohane saw that as a fair point and the sort of thing that we probably will have to live through and practice. What we envision here is that UPC would review the issue and determine what you might call the level of seriousness or the level of attention that they believe the University should pay. Then, if they believe the level rises above some kind of threshold where it does deserve attention by the Board of Trustees, they would recommend that it receive that attention. And then it would be up to the Board to decide whether to proceed with some of the activities prior to divestment or to think immediately about divestment. She would assume that in most instances, if we take the experiences under the South African divestment situation as a guide, there would be an attempt to do some things short of divestment before deciding actually to divest. But that would be up to the Board. She supposed the UPC could make a recommendation on [those matters of decision]. It would certainly be taken seriously by the Board.

Continuing to a second comment, **Socolar** had seen many drafts of these proposed guidelines, and kept coming back to the same issue. That concerned the ending of it, after the Board may instruct DUMAC to take appropriate action. It seemed to him to offer more and more barriers, rather than taking action, rather than just saying that the Board should take some kind of action consistent with Duke's commitment to ethical standards in the conduct of its business. He didn't see why it has to be formally stated that you have to try direct correspondence, you have to try proxy votes, you have to try this, you have to try that. It should be up to the Board in the particular case to decide whether it's even worth pursuing all that. The situation might be clear enough that they should simply take action.

Pres. **Keohane** found that interesting, because they had thought we were addressing that in this redraft. But perhaps it's not clear enough. The Board may instruct DUMAC to take appropriate action, including the exercise of these various things [provided]. Maybe it's the word "further" in the last paragraph that is misleading, because we do [conceive] there could be circumstances in which the Board would proceed directly to think about divestment.

Socolar: But then, again, in that last paragraph, why should the Board have to consider whether the company has been afforded reasonable opportunity? They might want to consider that, but they might not. It might be just be an issue that they don't want to be dealing with this company, that it's not worth it.

Pres. **Keohane** supposed that it's always up to the Board to decide what reasonable opportunity includes. But she did think that the Board would be — if she could speak for them, although they would want to answer for themselves — that they would be more comfortable with a policy allowing them the opportunity to try to work with a retrograde company before it was decided to move to an action which is as significant as divestment. Frankly, if she could put a gloss in it from the point of view of thinking about how investments work these days — if all of you think about that ~ it's a much more complicated world than it was in 1986 in terms of the types of investments that we have. In 1986 it made sense to say, "shall we divest from Mobil or IBM?" At this point a huge proportion of our investments are in hedge funds or in special accounts and

so we can't just go to the president of Mobil and say "we don't like what you're doing and if you don't stop it we're going to divest." We have to work through several different layers of managers and funds and all these things. One of the reasons, she thought, that it may seem a little like it's going to take a while is that we would probably expect that in most instances, with the way the world works these days, much of our influence would indeed come by dealing directly with the company, even if we can't easily sell the stock. I don't know if that's the way it will work out in practice, but I think that's part of what is in people's minds.

Prof. **James Rolleston** (GER) asked whether other universities have analogous policies. Wouldn't this be a situation where universities acting together would be very strong, i.e., financially very powerful, rather than everyone working independently?

Pres. **Keohane** thought the answer to the first part is yes and the answer to the second part is under some conditions. In terms of the first part, yes, a number of other institutions do have such policies. In fact, in the earlier stages of drafting this, we, through the person of Paul Baerman, her special assistant, and also some students who were working with us on this, looked closely at the policies of about twenty similar institutions, the ones you would expect that we normally compare ourselves to — mostly private institutions. Almost every one of them had some kind of policy of this kind. We decided on reflection that Stanford's policy provided the best model for us. And so, somewhere deeply buried in this draft you can find the core of Stanford's policy, although it has been changed a lot since then. So, we have looked at what other people are doing. We found it interesting that Duke at this stage was unusual in not having such a policy, one of the reasons that we felt encouraged to [decide on one].

Concerning the second question, you will recall that in the South African situation the powerful instrument short of divestment was the Sullivan Principles. The fact many universities joined together to support the Sullivan Principles, along with many corporations, made an enormous difference to its at least partial success. She thought the chances are that if we got into a comparable situation, where there was a serious wave or movement on a particular issue, something like that might well be proposed. There are limits on what we can do in terms of collaboration, though, in terms of financial actions, for antitrust reasons. So we would probably have to do it through a third-party mediator.

Prof. **Tom Metzloff** (Law) was sure the following possibility has been discussed, but this policy focuses on outliers ~ corporations that are perhaps outside the norm in terms of violating some aspect of environmental or international law. What consideration was given to a really quite different approach, which is setting aside a particular percentage of the investment funds for chosen socially-responsible goals, such as investments in Durham's Self Help Credit Union? Providing working capital, or other affirmative goals that we deem as socially responsible for the University, would take a really quite different tack than our penalizing individual companies.

Pres. **Keohane** didn't think that possibility had been talked about that at any length, although they had talked about a couple of things that are relevant [to that idea]. Again, it's hard to foresee exactly how the climate will develop. But it's quite possible that that would become an option

that people would think more about. We have done something that's similar. There's also a reason why she thought it would have to be thought about long and hard. What we've done that's similar is to set aside \$10M of the endowment to invest in businesses in North Carolina, in investment and venture capital or whatever to help support our region. That \$10M is sequestered from the rest of the endowment, and is not counted as we look at endowment returns. It's designed to serve the kind of purpose you're talking about. Although it's not exactly philanthropic it's sort of in the same spirit. So, we have at least that precedent. But the main problem is that if you're going to judge people, meaning your managers, meaning their incentive bonuses, how they stack up against other people, how much money they provide for the purposes of the institution, in the end the main measure you are using is how successful they are in terms of their return [on investment]. Commitments like those mostly don't provide a very great financial return, even though they may provide a strong psychic or social return. So there would have to be decisions that we are willing to sequester more money and therefore reduce the amount available for the University. That decision could be made, but at this point hasn't been much discussed.

TRANSFER OF BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY & ANATOMY TO ARTS & SCIENCES

Thanking the Council for these excellent questions Nancy **Allen** introduced the last item on the day's anticipated agenda, the transfer of the Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy from [partly in] the School of Medicine to [wholly in] the School of Arts & Sciences. The Council had received a number of items pertaining to this topic. In accordance with Council procedures this issue qualifies under the two-meeting rule for discussion today and for further discussion and vote next month, prior to its going to the Board of Trustees in May. Before the Provost introduces the topic she would like to say a special thank you to last year's Academic Priorities Committee (APC then), chaired by Prof. John Simon (CHM), and to this year's Academic Programs Committee (APC now), chaired by Prof. Tim Strauman (PSY:SHS). Both committees and their chairs put in many hours asking excellent questions and considering the matter with the diligence that faculty governance allows. John and Tim both had other obligations today and could not attend. But we do have additional resources in our audience today, including Dean Sandy Williams from the School of Medicine and Dean Bill Chafe from Arts & Sciences. We also invited current BAA chair Prof. Richard Kay and chair-to-be Prof. Steve Churchill. She called on the Provost to introduce the topic.

Prov. **Peter Lange** noted, along with that introduction, that this issue has been under study and preparation for many months. The advance documents largely summarized exactly where we are, while also giving a little of the history. It was his strong belief that this is the best outcome for the department that we have available, and that it is in fact a good outcome from the standpoint that over time he believed the department will thrive under the new system. There are obviously issues of transition. It will be difficult for certain individuals, and there are some issues of

substance, including for instance how Gross Anatomy is going to be taught, long term. "We have not found any volunteers just leaping to that task." Those of you who taught Gross Anatomy will know why I said that, he ventured, adding that he of course had not taught Gross Anatomy. And there would be physicians who were miserably trained if he had. But in any case he really didn't have more to say by way of introduction, except that this move has been vetted at great length. Its various considerations have substantially improved the proposal, both substantively and in terms of its presentation. The deans are here. BAA Chair Kay is also here if there are questions. He himself would also answer questions, where he was the appropriate person to answer. He asked Deans Williams and Chafe if they wished to add anything at this point, and neither did.

DISCUSSION OF THE TRANSFER OF BAA

Leading off with a question, Prof. **Ann Brown** (MED, EM&N) asked how this change would affect instruction of anatomy in the Medical Center. Not enormously in the short run, Prov. **Lange** responded. In the longer term the School of Medicine will have to find alternative means for teaching that subject. That's part of the proposal. Dean Williams can answer in greater detail about how that will happen. There are various options. He didn't think a decision has been made for any particular option. There are complexities about how that will be handled. Perhaps Dean Williams would want to address that question in more detail..

Dean **R. Sanders Williams** (SOM) said, first, that the Provost has a standing invitation to come and teach Gross Anatomy. As laughter subsided, he further remarked [probably as a non sequitur] that the SOM is of course committed to excellence in teaching this important part of its curriculum. But it had become apparent to all he thought that the model that exists now for that teaching is not sustainable over time in its present form. There are some branch points in this decision. Some schools of medicine are abandoning direct dissection of human cadavers altogether and are going to the far less expensive and demanding mode of teaching with virtual anatomic constructions. He did think that the technology in this field is changing and they were making investments in the current year in educational technologies that would complement the actual hands-on contact of students with human cadavers. But Duke is committed to continued contact of students with cadavers for the foreseeable future, and they would do what's necessary to maintain that commitment. This is not a problem in the short term because we have an excellent teaching faculty. We provide resources for graduate teaching assistants and postdoctoral fellows to complement the efforts of the faculty, and we will continue to do that for at least at present. But it does present a problem as current faculty retire. The BAA department as it is now constituted will not bear the obligation of hiring faculty for whom it is a mandate that they teach anatomy. It was his expectation that the current faculty will continue to teach at their current level of effort and excellence until they do retire. He'd be deeply disappointed if that is not the case, and there would be no move from his standpoint to lessen that teaching activity. But, their eventual replacement is an issue and they felt that it will likely be met by their providing support to departments of the School of Medicine in which the discipline is anatomically-based. Those include Pathology, Radiology, and Surgery. One or more of those departments would take on the responsibility and Vice Dean Ed Halperin along with Prof. Matt Cartmill, one of the faculty

members from BAA, was leading a task force now to recommend to him how that will be done. He could say more, but thought that summary covers the current situation.

Prof. **Barbara Shaw** (CHM) wanted to verify that there are currently 9 faculty members in the department. Dean **Williams** said that was the number, but 4 are based in the Medical School and are teaching medical anatomy. **Shaw** said that in addition to this commitment [of 4 faculty] did she understand correctly that there are 4 post-docs and 3 graduate students in the SOM who [also help in the anatomy teaching]. She wanted then to know how many graduate students and post-docs there are now in the department, in addition to those 4 post-docs and 3 graduate students, and also how many undergraduate and graduate students are served by the department, in courses that the department teaches? **Williams** answered that there is an important point for the future that he wanted to be completely clear about, in terms of the Medical School's ongoing responsibility for support of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. He believed that they have worked that out, but wanted that to be unambiguous to the Council. Prov. **Peter Lange** noted that the next chair of the department, Prof. Steven Churchill was present, and also Prof. Richard Kay, the current chair, and they might answer the question.

Prof. **Richard Kay** said that as best he could remember it - there are several details being asked about - at the moment he thought the standing crop of undergraduate majors in the department is somewhere around 30 [graduating] per year. The number of undergraduates taught in classes is around 1,000. The number of graduate students in the department is 20, more or less. And there are 7 post-doctoral fellows. **Shaw** wanted to clarify that those numbers of graduate students and post-docs includes the 3 and 4 individuals who will be taken over by the Medical School.

Dean **Williams** said he knew only about those [3 and 4], and Prof. Kay had given the whole picture. But to be clear about the way we see the future playing out, we are continuing to provide funds to this department in the current budget year and he assumed in the budget year to come, although that has not been negotiated as yet. That's for the current number of graduate students who serve as teaching assistants in anatomy, and for post-doctoral fellows who are prepared by their mentors and are important to the Gross Anatomy teaching mission. He thought things were unlikely to change at least for another year. What we are [committed] to do long-term is to support the teaching efforts of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows for Gross Anatomy, as they are necessary for that teaching mission. The Medical School will not maintain ongoing support for their research activities. So if these individuals are housed in this department [BAA] we would expect to negotiate a fair effort-based financial arrangement to support their teaching. And that might well be true [for some period of time]. Likewise, as that teaching responsibility shifts to other Medical School departments, if efforts of these individuals are deemed necessary for that teaching we would support them. That support would be negotiated with those departments within the Medical School. We feel it is our responsibility to be fair and equitable to the existing faculty and support them for the durations of their careers. It is our responsibility to provide excellence in the teaching of medical anatomy, and we assume the whole financial responsibility for those missions. The other aspects of the department [BAA], although we wish to be collegial and supportive, are not rightfully within the core mission of the School of Medicine.

Prof. **Shaw** said that her reason for asking this is in trying to get a sense of the impact of this change on Trinity College of Arts & Sciences. Prov. Lange thought it fair to say that the impact on Trinity College should be relatively small, because the effort dedicated to Trinity College within the [budgeted] resources should be about the same to Trinity College. But that's not the total resources in the department, of course. That they will teach fewer undergraduates is unlikely. We would hope they teach more undergraduates.

Prof. **Nancy Allen** asked about the name of the department as the change is made. Prov. **Lange** said that the name of the department will change. The question is, should it change immediately, given that members of its faculty and some post-docs will continue to teach anatomy, or should it change only over time? My personal preference was that we should probably change it immediately, and just know that the anatomy portion is still going on. He didn't know whether this had been made clear [someone said no], and that's why the name is given sometimes as BAA and sometimes as BA.

Prof. **Kay** said that this question of the name was a bit of a surprise to him. The first that he had seen the proposed name change was in the documents that the Provost's staff had sent him for this meeting. He wasn't specifically opposed to changing the name, and Biological Anthropology might be a good name. But he remembered very distinctly that 17 years ago, when the department was being formed, there was a very long and not so collegial discussion about what the name ought to be. It seemed to him that wherever the responsibility for the name lies, whatever it might be, it ought at least to be vetted by the department. He hoped that these documents that are going forward won't stamp this as done.

Dean **Williams** ventured that the name of his department had changed three times, "and I was never consulted." Prov. **Lange**: But that wasn't at Duke. **Williams**: One was. **Nancy Allen** invited any further questions, including any comments from Dean William Chafe (A&S), who was present, but had nothing to add. She thanked all for their presentations and said that if there were other comments that people might have before our vote at the next meeting please forward them to us at the Academic Council office. Again, she appreciated Dean Williams' attendance this afternoon, and also Rich Kay, the Provost, Dean Chafe, and Steve Churchill. This change for BAA has been a long process, with challenges in getting to this point.

She asked if there were any new business, and with none forthcoming declared the Council adjourned, at 4:39 p.m.

Prepared for consideration by the Academic Council,

Donald J. Fluke, Faculty Secretary