

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447 304
e-mail acouncil@acpub.duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday January 19, 2006

Paul Haagen (Law, Chair of the Council): Welcome and Happy New Year. The first order of business is to approve the minutes of the November 17th and December 1st meetings. Can I have a motion to accept the minutes as written? [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.]

There are no announcements today, so we will proceed directly to the Earned Degrees.

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated December 30, 2005

Summary by Schools and College

Trinity College of Arts and Sciences	
Dean Robert J. Thompson, Jr.	
Bachelor of Arts	50
Bachelor of Science	22
Pratt School of Engineering	
Dean Kristina M. Johnson	
Bachelor of Science in Engineering	12
Master of Engineering Management	11
School of Nursing	
Dean Catherine L. Gillis	
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	54
Master of Science in Nursing	30
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences	
Dean William H. Schlesinger	
Master of Environmental Management	15
Master of Forestry	3
Fuqua School of Business	
Dean Douglas T. Breedon	
Master of Business Administration	71
Divinity School	
Dean L. Gregory Jones	
Master in Church Ministries	1
Master of Divinity	15
Master of Theology	4

School of Law	
Dean Katharine T. Bartlett	
Juris Doctor	2
Master of Laws	1
School of Medicine	
Dean R. Sanders Williams	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	3
Doctor of Medicine	1
The Graduate School	
Dean Lewis M. Siegel	
Master of Public Policy	3
Master of Science	26
Master of Arts	71
Doctor of Philosophy	75
TOTAL	470

New Dean of the Graduate School

Paul Haagen: We now have the happy opportunity for Provost Lange to introduce the Dean Designate of the Graduate School.

Provost Peter Lange: It is my pleasure to introduce Vice Dean **Jo Rae Wright**, who will be the new Dean of the Graduate School beginning July 1, 2006. Jo Rae has been the Vice Dean for Basic Sciences in the School of Medicine for a while, and earlier was in various other positions in the School of Medicine. She is also an eminent cell biologist, will bring wonderful leadership to the Graduate School and be a worthy successor for Lew [Siegel], who is also here.

This was an appointment that was recommended by a wonderful search committee, chaired by Dave McClay. There were three strong candidates and both the President and I are also pleased that Jo Rae agreed after some deliberation to accept our offer.

I know Jo Rae wants to say a few things, and I think we should all welcome her.

Jo Rae Wright (Cell Biology): Thank you Peter for that really nice introduction. I just wanted to say hello and I'm really delighted to have this opportunity.

Some of my colleagues from the School of Medicine know that I have a long-standing commitment and passion for graduate education. I'm really thrilled to have this chance to expand it to include the whole graduate school. Lew is leaving an incredible legacy, big shoes to fill, but he's helping me in this transition.

It is a great opportunity to have this transition occurring right now, with the strategic planning going on. I'm working with Lew on developing a strategic plan for the Graduate School. So I'll look forward to working with all of you and I appreciate this chance to say hello.



Paul Haagen: I think it speaks volumes for how well things are going at the university that Jo Rae was willing to take on this responsibility, and it makes me think a little bit of when I was practicing law in Philadelphia. All their athletic teams were doing well. They sang this little song, "These are the good ole days." And I'm sensing right now that we're in a period of 'good ole days' at Duke.

Question for the Provost

Haagen: The next item is a question for the Provost and he will read the question.

Provost Lange: I know you've all come to look forward to these occasions, but today will not be one of those. Although I might, in the spirit of the meeting, say Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to present to the Secretary of the Academic Council no copies of my response on behalf of the Graduate School to the following question: This question is in regard to the change in how the health care fee for Duke graduate students is to be paid:

Currently it is my understanding [the questioner writes] that all Duke graduate students are required to have health insurance, but how this is

obtained is at the discretion of the graduate student. Because of their age, some portion of these students are covered by their parents' health care insurance, but of course others may not be. It is my understanding that the new proposed change in policy is that all graduate students are required to have a *Duke* health-insurance plan and that the department of the student is required to pay Duke University for that insurance. It is my further understanding that this new proposed policy was not discussed with the Executive Committee of the Graduate School prior to its being proposed, nor with the Directors of Graduate Studies in the several schools and departments.

The question is: If the above understanding is essentially correct, do you think it would be appropriate to communicate the new proposed policy in writing to Directors of Graduate Studies so that they may have the opportunity to comment upon and suggest improvements for this new policy?

Provost Lange: A question succinctly posed can nonetheless generate a good deal of paper in response. Let me first answer by saying that it is in fact *not* going to be the case that that graduate students be required to have health insurance from Duke University, or the Duke Health Insurance. They will be required to have [some] health insurance, as in the past.

It will also be the case that the Graduate School will help pay for health insurance for each student who is supported with full regular stipend from our own funds. That is, those graduate students who receive Duke grants will in the future have their health insurance paid by Duke University. That would, as you understand, then shift the burden for the payment of health insurance for students not on Duke money, and not on some other health insurance, on to a grant. And that will be the case into the future. But for the next year, the Graduate School has graciously agreed that it will pay the health insurance for all graduate students next year, so that we can have a one year of transition. So for the coming year graduate students, whether on grants or on our own stipend money, will have their health insurance paid by the Graduate School. And that is coming out of reserves that Lew has been husbanding away for the last 15 years.

Now, with regard to the process. The Dean of the Graduate School brought this matter to the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty at its first meeting of the year on September 6, 2005. The URL for the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty Minutes is as follows (get out your pens...):

http://www.gradschool.duke.edu/about_us/executive_committee_of_graduate_faculty/sept6.pdf

If you go there you will find that in the minutes the matter was in fact discussed with the Executive Committee of the Graduate School.

As you know, all students at Duke University are required to have some form of health insurance. The Graduate and Professional Students Council has for years wished this fee to be a part of what Duke supported, and Lew has been working for a number of years to do so. It turned out to be a rather more complicated issue than you might imagine. How would the pool of students who to be covered be in fact determined? Should it be required or not? (As I said, *Duke* health insurance will not be required). There were also issues about cost subsidies, and the policy that has been developed has satisfied GPSC. GPSC is enthused about the project as I understand it. The Graduate School, as I have said it, has generously agreed to pay the fee for all students for the coming year, and thereafter we will move to the new plan. I don't know if there are any other questions.



Helen Ladd (Public Policy Studies): I'd like to raise an issue about where are the Graduate School is getting this money to pay for this. You referred to it as money that had been "husbanded" away. My understanding is that that money is coming from an increase in the registration fees. The registration fees are \$2,300 for next year.

Provost Lange: In part.

Ladd: That increase had a disastrous impact on my students in Public Policy. Master's students are generally not eligible for the sorts of stipends that pay for it. This is a dramatic cost subsidy from Public Policy master's students who are in a professional degree program and going into jobs in the public sector. These are not high-paying jobs like doctors or lawyers that pay an additional \$600 per year in the registration fee. Could somebody comment on that please?

Lange: Well, first, I think that that would be the case not simply for Public Policy master's students, but for all master's students. So I think that even if that effect were recognized, I think there should be no particular paranoia on the part of Public Policy about its master's

students being targeted. All master's students are paying an additional fee. Beyond that, I will ask Lew to respond.

Dean Lew Siegel: A couple things, before we start. Let's be explicit in some of these remarks. First of all, this policy applies to PhD students – PhD students who are receiving full stipends supported by the university. Two, the confusion about the Duke plan is as follows: We will make the payment on behalf of the student for health insurance, something that the student now has to pay out of his or her own stipend, but we will only make that payment to the Duke student health program. The person can have other health insurance, it's just that they will have to pay for that themselves. But we will make the payment in one plan.

The primary reason for that is to keep that plan affordable to all students. We were losing the youngest and healthiest people from the plan to other plans that didn't offer anywhere near as good care, and thus driving the cost up to everybody [on the Duke plan]. So this was a way in which we could affect the process so as to keep costs low.

The Duke plan is put out for bids every year, so it isn't something they necessarily pay excessively for... In terms of the subsidization, it is a straightforward subsidization. As Peter has said, all master's students pay tuition; some fraction of their tuition goes back to the Graduate School. All students pay a registration fee, all registration fees go back to the Graduate School. From this pool of funds we make stipends, and this pays for health insurance for PhD students. That support goes to approximately half the Ph.D. students enrolled at this university. The PhD, is one degree that we want to support institutionally, as a special commitment of the university. It takes a long time for a degree, the monetary cost is extreme, and the university subsidizes that in this revenue we get.

Our arrangement with Public Policy, by the way, is one of the most favorable-to-the-unit that we make with respect to the graduate programs, master's programs in the university. It usually is a 50-50 split in the tuition, but in Public Policy it's far lower than that percentage in the tuition package.

Dowell (Mechanical Engineering & Materials Sciences): On the point you made that when you're paying for the health care fee as a student, you'll only pay for them to take the Duke Health Plan. Is that true also of the student who has a research grant and stipend in which the payment is coming from the research grant? Is that person also required to take the Duke plan? If I were required to pay as a PI for the health care from my research grant, must that be in the Duke Health Care Plan?

Siegel: I can't say what will happen in the future. We would like to find some way to keep the population in the plan. What will happen next year, which is the only year for which something is definite – which will certainly change after that – is the Graduate School will pay for all those students, including the students on research grants. We simply will pay that money out of

pocket. We will never recharge the researcher. If the research grant wants to pay some additional amount for health insurance, they're just paying for extra coverage. The fact that the university will pay the one plan by itself, we presume will keep a substantial number of people in the plan. The big expense to the Graduate School – part of the utilization of every dime we got plus the reserves – is in fact to dramatically remove the burden from research grants. At the same time this year we are asking for a significant raise in the rest of the stipend to keep us competitive with other institutions. So the students are getting quite a deal, actually.

Dowell: Oh I'm sure that students are thrilled. And they don't really particularly care who's paying for it. But the fact that you are paying for it out of research grants are less thrilling as I'm sure I can explain right now.

Provost Lange: Let me say something about that, without making this a policy statement – because, as Lew said, we have a year to work this through. It seems to me that allowing to the PIs the opportunity to purchase whatever insurance they want for the graduate students creates a situation of jeopardy, with respect to conflict of interest and care for the graduate students that I would not be terribly comfortable with... That is, it would create a situation where (Earl's nodding as I'm sure he understands this) the PI might well have an incentive not to include the health insurance money in his grant and then to buy perhaps an inferior health insurance in order to pay an inferior amount against his or her research funds. The graduate student working in that lab. really has very little opportunity to contest that decision. So in my own view, as a first approximation, I think that I would prefer to not leave that decision to a PI. But I do understand the situation with respect to putting more pressure on grants.

Dowell: I think there are two points on that. One is, you're right except that the market forces largely preclude that from happening.

Lange: How would that be?

Dowell: We want to recruit the best students. If we don't treat them well, they go to Stanford or MIT or Princeton.

Lange: Yes, but once they're on your grant, they're at Duke. You can't change from year to year...

Dowell: You could, but you could get around that by letting the department have some autonomy with respect to that, that's one thing. The other thing is that as a friendly amendment, I think that is a lovely plan to have the Graduate School pay for it the first year, why not expand that to the second, third? There is going to be a disparity between those students who are on research grants and those who are not. There's going to be a cross-subsidy. And I'm sure that Lew has thought about this...

Lange: Do you want to answer that Lew?

Siegel: It's a question of what we can afford to do – about half of our costs this year. The whole plan will cost the Graduate School about \$3.5 million. About half of that is what we would pay just with an increase in the

stipend. The other half is the relief of what otherwise would be paid through to the Duke plan on research grants. I can't speak for my successors – whether they would choose to spend that amount of money that way; that's all I can say.

Dowell: There's one more point and then I'll shut up. It is a good principle that the person who pays the bill has something to say about the policy. Conversely, if you propose an added expense to someone, maybe you should pick up the expense. So I think that the groundswell on this is that it's taxation without representation!

Lange: Well, that's an interesting perspective, and I would offer as an alternative view of this matter that the Graduate School has responsibilities to graduate students, which are recognized by the institutional structure we have. And that therefore the Graduate School, using its representative structures – which include the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, which was in fact consulted – has a right and a responsibility to determine policies with regard to graduate students, which are deemed by the Graduate School (in consultation with the faculty and with the Provost and the deans) appropriate to assure that we have both the best graduate students that we can get, and that they are afforded the best education under the best conditions that we can offer.

So I do believe that we need to recognize that the Graduate School has a responsibility which is independent from this so called "representation" – which is not a term I would use in exactly the way you're using it – that the Graduate School has a responsibility toward these graduate students, which is not entirely dependent on the will of the PIs or of the Faculty Director.

It does have a responsibility to work with the representative bodies of the Graduate School in determining those policies. There are many other areas where that's true. It has to do with education. Otherwise, we could argue that each school or faculty body ought to be able to determine every and all condition of graduate education within their unit. Clearly we don't believe that. We believe that the Graduate School, in consultation with the graduate faculty, sets a large number of regulations with respect to how graduate education should happen, not just in a bureaucratic way but in a substantive way, because of a view of how we best assure graduate education in the university.

With regard to cross-subsidization, the only point I would make is that cross-subsidization is a fact of life in all universities. Graduate education is no different. But the point is here that we have isolated one element, and in doing that it gets all the focus... I understand that point, but we do need to recognize that the Graduate School is filled with cross-subsidization. All graduate schools are, even the ones at schools with are entirely or almost entirely science and technology graduate schools.

Dowell: I agree with everything you said, but I still think that that begs the question: Someone has to decide if this is a good cross-subsidy or not, has to decide what

the impact of that cross-subsidy is, what it will do to the students in the sciences and engineering in the Graduate School. Because at the end of the day, most of the funding in those areas come from the individual faculty, and actually most of the tuition came back in recognition of the responsibility of those individual programs.

Lange: Most of the tuition still comes from that.

Dowell: That's what I'm saying. And that is that for a reason.

Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology): Peter, with the responsibilities of the University to graduate training, would that also include for example, an attempt to raise an endowment on behalf of graduate education comparable to President Brodhead's goal for increasing the endowment to support undergraduate training? Would it be useful? Whether it's taxation without representation, certainly these charges do come to the individual mentors for most graduate students. Would there be, or is there some attempt, to gain a significant endowment to support graduate education as a part of the university endowment?

Lange: Yes, there is. Not on the scale of the overall financial aid package. But I think there is \$10 million dollars additional as part of the plan. There was a fairly careful calibration of what we could aspire to and what we thought was a reachable goal, and the \$10 million emerged. Obviously we would like to go higher, and Jo Rae and I are in agreement that that will be one of her priorities as Dean: actively seeking to raise endowment for the Graduate School. But I can assure you that when that endowment arrives, we will be able to have a conversation about how it was cost-subsidizing what – how it will be used. And that will be again an issue which the Graduate School has to determine as a matter of policy in conjunction with the Executive Committee of Graduate Faculty.

Voting Procedures Relating to the Appointment and Promotion of Regular Rank, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Paul Haagen: Thank you, Peter. The next item on the agenda is a clarification on voting procedures relating to the appointment and promotion of regular rank, non-tenure track faculty. The background on this is that in November of 1990 the Provost appointed and charged a committee to recommend formal review procedures for regular rank, non-tenure-track faculty holding the ranks of professor of the practice (PoP), research professor, clinical professor, lecturer, and associate. This report was accepted and endorsed by the Academic Council on April 18, 1991. The Provost is here today in response to recent questions regarding the procedures, and is introducing a set of clarifications and a marginal expansion of what was permitted under the rules as adopted in 1991.

Provost Lange: Basically this was in response to a faculty member's request. We're not proposing any changes in the rules. The issue was the relationship of professors at a particular rank, and in the tenure track, to

appointments of professors in the same rank or in higher ranks in the PoP track. Under the current rules, they are not allowed to vote because there's an equal-status rule. The same rules apply whether you're in PoP rank, or in the tenured rank. The question was raised whether the rules were consistent with that and the rule change that we made clarifies the fact that rule should still stand. That's a very simple answer.

Paul Haagen: Questions? ECAC would like then to put forward a motion that the Academic Council accepts and endorses the clarifications and amendments to the procedures for appointments, re-appointments, and promotion for regular, non-tenure track faculty, in Section C of the Faculty Handbook.

Helen Ladd: Can I just say, I don't understand what's happening.

Paul Haagen: The language has been clarified so that there is no ambiguity any longer and in addition – and part of the reason we're going to need a motion here – the provost has changed the language to permit tenure and tenure-track faculty at or below the rank of the person to be appointed to serve on search committees. So it is an expansion of the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty at or below the rank of the person at that margin, as to search committees. Other than that, it is merely a cleaning up of language.

Ladd: A tenured associate professor could be on a search committee for full professor, and these are search committees not review committees.

Paul Haagen: That is correct.

Member: And then is there a link across the regular professor versus professor of the practice, there's also tenured associate professors, [they] could be on search committees for professors of the practice?

Paul Haagen: That is correct, but it is also an acknowledgment of this set of rules adopted almost exactly 15 years ago, that a tenured member of the faculty or tenure-track member of the faculty, who is below the rank of the regular-rank non-tenure track faculty, cannot vote on a re-appointment or promotion.

[A member called for a motion, which was seconded.]

Paul Haagen: We have a motion, it has been seconded, is there any further discussion? [The motion to approve the change in language was approved by voice vote, without dissent.]

Update on Strategic Planning

Haagen: The final item on our agenda today is an update on the strategic planning process. Provost Lange will make some introductory comments, followed by Prasad Kasibhatla, who is the Chair of the Planning Steering Committee. I've asked both of them to come because we are at a critical stage in the strategic planning process. It is a stage in which is it still possible to move the way this great super tanker is being steered; but we don't have a lot more time if it's going to come into port, and so I wanted to make certain that we had a fairly full presentation to the Council of where things stand right now.

Provost Lange: The way we have organized this effort in some ways is parallel to the way the actual work is going. I am going to describe to you where we are and then Prasad is going to offer, from the perspective of the Chair of the Planning Steering Committee, and therefore the Chair of the Faculty Committee (which is interacting with the planning process at the highest level) a commentary on the way the process is working to date and where we are. It's a pleasure for me to do this update. I last spoke to you about planning in October; since then, there has been a great deal of activity and much progress.

I want here to particularly to thank John Simon and Prasad Kasibhatla, without whom we could not have made nearly as much of the excellent progress that we have made. Prasad has been providing outstanding leadership in the Planning Steering Committee, which has had a very heavy workload, and John has been overseeing a huge array of what we have referred to as controlled chaos, over several months, to assure that we can bring the pieces together. We are, I think, in a good place. We certainly do not yet have a fully developed strategic plan for the University and its schools, centers, and institutes, but we are substantially closer than we were in October. That said, some of what I say today may remind those of you with good memories of things that were said earlier. This is either a merit of good planning, or a problem with regular updates, or worst of all a sign of the repetitiousness of your Provost.

The timing of this update is good as Paul has already underlined. After thorough deliberation by the Planning Steering Committee, the Academic Programs Committee, and UPC and several other more specialized committees, we have just sent detailed comments back to all deans and major center institute directors on the first drafts of their plans. In other words, all those plans came in, they were all reviewed by one or more of these committees plus some other committees, the written comments were then developed by those committees. They were then incorporated into a synthetic letter that was developed in our office, which gave comments back to the individual deans or center or institute directors, describing the responses. Often those comments were supplemented by the direct reports of the committees which evaluated those documents. We have given all of these folks until the 1st of March for their second – and we hope relatively final – drafts. These will then be looked at again by the Planning Steering Committee, as we hone our priorities and the funding for them. As you can well imagine that is a critical stage because we will then have to bring the money and the priorities together in a way that assures (as was the case with the last plan) that if we identify things as priorities, we are able to supply resources to support them.

We've also shared with the deans the reports of most of the working groups we charged with looking for specific opportunities. So there's lots of cross-fertilization. All the deans have seen the planning documents of the other deans. They have also seen the planning documents of various working groups and so

forth. We are also continuing to hone in on our financial resources that will be available for the plan. I will not be discussing the financials today because they are not at that stage, nor have we had the discussion with the University Priorities Committee, which should happen first. But we will be having extensive discussions in the coming weeks as part of an iterative process between programs and resources that leads to a sharpening of priority-setting. This necessarily will entail discussions with UPC, APC, and ultimately the Planning Steering Committee. We seek a balance of resources and priorities.

So what I am reporting on today is the development of the University Strategic Plan. This plan sits on top of, and both informs and is informed by, the planning that is done at the level of our schools, centers, and institutes. And you'll remember in October when I talked to you about certain broad themes, those themes were directly communicated to deans and directors through documents they received; they were designed to inform the plans that they would develop. Now we've received those plans and in fact part of the commentary that went on from the Planning Steering Committee was saying, "well wait a moment. This is supposed to be something that appears in your plan that you address, but here's what we have. We don't see that, here are some of the ways we think you might work on that." They're not giving them explicit instructions so much as saying well there are priorities here that we see that you haven't addressed.

The schools also have developed plans, as this suggests. These intersect with the University Planning themes and goals and with central resource report strategies. The schools are expecting to draw on central strategic resources to help them with startup or the capital costs of some of the initiatives that they have to develop that intersect with the university priorities. So the schools are developing plans, the university priorities, plus their intersection, that's where strategic funds are likely to be placed. I also want to emphasize that our plan this time cannot and should not represent a break with what was established and successful with *Building on Excellence*. Instead it is intended to build on those accomplishments and failings and on the means, especially facilities, that have been put in place to develop the excellent faculty, students, and programs to which we aspire.

I really want to stress that a number of the things that we're doing in this round are precisely designed to put resources of faculty and programs into the wonderful new facilities that we've built. The facilities would not live up to their potential unless we did that, but we could not have done that in the absence of those facilities.

So there's an intersection over this 10-year period between getting the facilities in place and then delivering on the faculty and programs. So let's start with aspirations. Simply put, our aspiration is to create both distinction and distinctiveness for Duke University. We would like to be among the half dozen or so leading

universities in the US that – and here I quote *Building on Excellence* because this aspiration has not changed – “define what is best in American higher education.”

This ‘distinctiveness’ theme has actually been around for a while – but we’re hammering on it more now. We can learn from other institutions, but we must also set our own sights and help set the standards for others. That is what leadership means... We cannot reach this aspiration if we simply mimic our peers or potential peers. We need also to be innovative, both in some of our signature features, and in the way we combine features to make us the institution that we want to become.

To be distinctive is not necessarily to be unique. In fact I can tell you in higher education that if you do something that is both unique and really good, it’s likely that it will not be unique for very long. Other people may not do it as quickly, but especially in the world of the web, there are very few innovations that last very long if they’re really clever. So to be distinctive is not necessarily to be unique, but it does mean doing things very well and doing some things very well that others may also do, but not do as well.

Building on Excellence puts us in a position to move more rapidly towards this aspiration, so a little bit of retrospective: what *Building on Excellence* did from our point of view in very broadest things. First all, we found out some substantial fragilities. These were identified. And what it meant was that there were areas in which losing one faculty member, or not doing any intense resource allocation to one area, could have major affects on the excellence in teaching or research at the university on a sustained basis. Where that was most evident, where we especially shored up some of our substantial weaknesses and vulnerabilities (or created the potential to do so), was in the sciences and engineering. And if you go back and look at *Building on Excellence* you will see that this was very explicit as a theme because we felt at that time we were in danger of sliding so far back in sciences and engineering that we would never be able to catch up, even in a period in which science and engineering was becoming a more prominent area, especially of intellectual growth.

The second obviously related thing we did was to put in place facilities that were critical to our ability to hire the best faculty, and to serve the research, teaching, and learning needs of our faculty and students.

And finally we developed major strengths in some of our signature research and teaching themes, departments, and programs that are going up.

To make major advances in our aspirations in the next planning period, we need to continue to stress a number of themes that have become a strong part of Duke’s signature, cutting across the plans of both the university and the individual schools. Some of these themes are familiar to you: interdisciplinarity, internationalization, diversity, the creative application of technology in research and teaching. Some are receiving substantially new emphasis in the current plan. The most prominent is knowledge at the service of society,

research on student experiences, and on active outreach by our scholars. In each of these areas the next plan will strengthen our commitment both by deepening what we are already doing, and by creating new initiatives underlining our commitments in these areas.

At the last Council [meeting], I indicated the broad strategic areas that we expected the University and school plans to address. These have not changed over the last 4 or 5 months, although they are beginning to take on heft, in fact so much so that some dieting may be necessary before the plan fully emerges into the light – by which I mean they’re asking for too much money.

The first of these is faculty development. A phrase I used in October and that I really want to stress here – because it is a characteristic of the next plan – which must really rest with the faculty, is that *there must be no self-censorship with respect to our aspirations in the hiring of faculty*. As I’ve said before and I often hear from faculty colleagues as we go around, departments sometimes have said, “Oh you know, the Dean will never pay for it, or some of the other colleagues will never go for it, or that person’s so good they’ll never come to Duke so let’s not even go after them.” We cannot do that in the next planning period. If we do that, we are censoring ourselves and we are diminishing our own quality at our own expense and by our own effort, rather than by the efforts of our competitors.

What kinds of initiatives are we going to use in faculty development that embody some of this willingness for us to deliver the resources to you as a faculty to act in this way? Well, one of the things that we’ve been planning to do is to offer the opportunities for cluster hiring through the use of strategic funds that would be offered to hire 2 or 3 faculty members in an area whether it would be in one department or across two or three departments, even knowing that there are cash-flow problems in the short run that would seem to prohibit it. That’s where the strategic funds come in, because in the longer run those positions could be absorbed into the units. So we will allow you to anticipate and cluster hires in areas of strategic priority, expecting those positions to work into the regular budgets over time and when the strategic money ceases.

A second, related, feature is anticipated hiring against strategic priorities. Sometimes we have retirement agreements, so that a faculty member is going to leave in 2 or 3 years. That faculty member might be in an area of high priority for a unit. Or for a university initiative. You don’t want to wait, as we so often do, until the person leaves and then try to hire their replacement, which may be much more difficult than hiring a year or two ahead, letting them move in even as the other person is going out.

The third mechanism is meeting the real costs of hiring the best faculty. The deans will know that they can come up to a point for strategic funds to make strategic hires of really outstanding faculty that cost a lot of money. Obviously there needs to be a business plan to support that appointment over time (by business plan I mean not only a financial plan, but also an intellectual

plan). But through strategic funding we can enable deans to make some appointments which they otherwise might not be able to make, at least in the short-run.

Most important in that regard is *startup assistance*. Any of the deans in the science and engineering departments will tell you that startup is the biggest constraint on their ability to make the kinds of hires that they want. We are dealing sometimes now in startup packages of a million, two million, or even three million dollars for a prominent science or engineering faculty member. When they are appropriately used, those startup funds end up really enriching the programs and the quality of research and teaching that goes on at Duke. But in a cash-flow sense, they are often not available to the dean. The dean will often fail to make an appointment even though he or she would very much like to do so, and the person is clearly a person of great strength and potential, because they do not have the money to do it. This startup piece is designed to particularly assist in that area.

A second broad strategic area will be the undergraduate experience. We recently received the report of the taskforce on this topic. Some of the examples of the kinds of initiatives they're proposing are curricular innovation, particularly, with interdisciplinary certificates and interdisciplinary majors, and more cooperation across the frontier, which has been too high a frontier, between the School of Engineering and the School of Arts & Sciences in the training of undergraduates. That means, in particular, more opportunities for Arts and Sciences undergraduates to take courses in the School of Engineering and to get the kind of experience that engineering can sometimes offer.

We also propose better integration of the curricular and co-curricular programs. There's been too much separation between what we do in the classroom and what happens outside the classroom. A number of proposals have been made, including things like changing the way we organize space in the dormitories, and the type of activities that are being done there: for instance, bringing advising into the dormitories, bringing more classrooms or classes into the dormitories. How should we organize the relationship between the activities that Student Affairs undertakes and that Trinity College or Pratt undertake?

A third area that was identified is enhanced senior experiences in research, and more capstone experiences generally, for our undergraduates. And associated with that, greater engagement of professional-school faculty in providing these kinds of one-on-one or one-on-two experiences. Making more use of the University as a whole for these kind of targeted experiences that individual undergrads have. We know this works. Many of our undergraduates have wonderful experiences, for instance in the School of Medicine, working in labs in medicine. There is no reason that undergrads might not work with a Professor of Law or a Professor of Business on a project as part of his or her graduation and capstone work.

Another area is arts, and here the key is a balance between the programmatic innovations and the kind of renovated and new facilities we have. There are some exciting new proposals, particularly with respect to how we organize the arts for our students to get the maximum experience. Going down one level more, there are a number of broad intellectual initiatives in the plan. I'll just give you a list here:

Global health, which you've heard about. An initiative in mind, brain, and behavior that would span from the Medical School all the way across the campus. Imaging: imaging has become an extremely important area across multiple areas of the sciences and engineering, and the sciences and engineering across the campus could contribute to it, an imaging initiative which would span many areas – we have a task force report on that. The possibility that Sanford Institute will become a school.

And then, the last one I want to focus on, is Central Campus. Now most of us think of Central Campus as a place. But actually Central Campus is a nexus where many of the strategic themes that I've just been discussing with you will intersect and come into play. Let me just give you a few examples. Central Campus is designed to be a place where many of our arts faculty will come together. The Art and Art History department has proposed that it move to Central as has the Center for Documentary Studies. A visual set, the library set on central might be a visual-studies library primarily, mostly digital. Not a big library, but really an access facility with the appropriate kinds of librarians to afford our students with the ability to get the kinds of arts digital resources which we have on campus, but have not previously been readily available.

So a first theme is arts, as I said, including also performance opportunities. Language, literature, and cultures departments are going to move to Central, and that entails the opportunity to intersect those departments with the arts, which are reflections of the cultures which those departments are teaching about. There's a lot of excitement about that possibility.

Another one of our priorities is internationalization. If we had the opportunity on Central to bring the International and Area studies centers together in a single space or in a shared space, and to make those centers more able then to interact that would obviously help students make interdisciplinary connections.

As for interdisciplinarity, I think one of the most exciting moments we had this year was when we brought a group of the departments that we were hoping would consider central as a place that they wanted to go, and the chairs of different departments said, "you know, we don't really have to have all of our offices right next to each other. Maybe we could spread our offices around a little more so that we would have easier interactions with faculty from other departments with whom we have common interests. Why would we have to be, you know, the X silo, and the Y silo, and then the Z silo, each of which has only one classroom and only one so-

cial space reserved for it? Why can't we have a more open model?"

Addressing this issue obviously requires interaction between the architects who program the space and the departments that are there. But it's a perfect representation of the kind of more interdisciplinary culture that we think would be creative both for research and teaching.

The last thing about Central is the undergraduate experience. You've probably heard from the beginning that we have been talking about Central as being the endpoint of the developmental model in housing. That the housing that we would have on Central would be designed to help a student launch off into his or her post-Duke career. A housing arrangement that's more apartment-like, and less dorm-like, right? And of course that's the whole idea behind Central.

And you've got to remember the scale. The scale here is not much bigger than the space that runs from the staircase to the left of the quad to the staircase to the right of the quad, you know those two short staircases, one goes up to Davis and one goes up to the Clock Tower and so forth up to the Chapel. That's it. We're not talking about a mammoth space, in the first phase. But you can do a lot in that space if you think creatively about how to use it.

Beyond the core academic plan, there are additional strategic needs under consideration. One is academic capital improvements, especially around classrooms. I'll come back to that one in a minute.

A second is backfill from the new Central campus spaces. As we move departments out, we need to think creatively about what's going to take over these spaces. I'll give you one example which has come up recently. As Romance Studies moves out of the Languages Building, that is going to create an opportunity either in that building or in the Library if the Library moves into that building, perhaps to create a new West Campus learning center that would complement the current learning center – which means classrooms and the appropriate activities that would also be on Central.

Of course, we have to watch out, because you know if Central becomes too 'cool,' what's going to happen to West!? We have to keep a balanced profile for our campus. And a new learning center – we know the classrooms on West are pretty crummy (truth be told, take a look around!). Now I don't think we're going to replace this room, so don't get your hopes up... If you're going to be on the Council forever, you'll still be meeting here every single meeting! [Some ECAC members interjected that in fact there are plans to move Council meetings next Fall to a more congenial venue...]

So we need to think about the second phase of Perkins, including thoughts about a sciences library. Additionally, Pratt and Computer Science will need space over the next five years, and we need to think about how that space is going to be provided, if we can find the resources for it, and then what kinds of things

we'll be doing in that space, particularly teaching-oriented space.

West campus renovations: we cannot forget our commitment to core infrastructure. I'm not interested in the next Provost and the Provost after that waking up one morning and saying, "God, you know I have no money, because my two predecessors spent the dollars we now need to renovate the dorms." And that is a nightmare. And I can tell you it's a nightmare for President Brodhead, because he was at Yale when they had to decide to do something about the Yale dorms, which were a disaster.

So we have to find a way in this plan to begin to create a stream of resources, they don't have to be mammoth but they have to be substantial, to allow us to embark on a progressive program to renovate the infrastructures of dorm living that support our students and ensure that students continue to want to come here.

Other possible projects in the longer term view are West Union and the Bryan Center. We still have a way to go but we're making real progress on the strategic plan. As you can tell, the pieces are coming together. There's a kind of integration that's happening around the themes and the way things have been around here. Pieces are falling together in a fairly integrated manner. We have high aspirations and we need to work to assure we have the resources to match these, but we also need to be sure that we promote the priorities that our most critical to the advancement of Duke as we develop the resource envelope with which to pay for it. Thank you.

Paul Haagen: Prasad Kasibhatla has been given the responsibility for heading the Strategic Planning Committee, and I know because, either for my sins or yours I have to sit on it, that he's doing an extraordinary amount of work. I wanted him to come here to talk about this process, and make sure that you understand where the entry points are.

Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas School): Thank you. Peter called me today and said we had 15 extra minutes and I kind of realized it was the royal we. What I want to do is to simply give you a sense of the process, and then give you my general impressions of how things are going.

In terms of the process, we, the Planning Steering Committee, received the school and institute plans sometime in the Fall and we started reviewing them. We broke up into sub-committees, with each sub-committee taking up three or four plans, and then the plans were discussed by the committee as a whole, and written reviews were provided to the Provost's office, which then shared them with the school deans and institute heads. In terms of the reviews themselves, we looked at the plans from various perspectives, and the best sense you can get of the perspectives is to look at the template that is part of your handout.

We looked at the extent to which the schools and institutes did a serious self-assessment and identified a strategic vision; the extent to which they developed strategies for achieving the themes that Peter has already laid out; the extent to which they identified resources

and had a clear financial plan; and the extent to which they identified benchmarks in how they would assess progress in the plan...I'm not yet in a place where I can hand out the reviews that we provided for each of the schools. A number of you have seen working-group reports, and the working groups were formed to a large extent before the Planning Steering Committee got under way, but right after the Plan Steering Committee was formed, there was an article in *The Dialogue* about the process and a couple of people at first expressed some additional ideas to form working groups and those additional working groups were added. In the last two days, we've started picking up the working groups reports.



The last two days we simply focused on working groups that were related to the infrastructure – things like information technology, instructional technology, library services – and also related to the broad university themes, the undergraduate experience and the arts. We haven't yet taken up the reports from the academic working groups. We plan to do that in the next two weeks, and the reason we want to do this on an accelerated time scale is to give some feedback to the schools so that they can incorporate elements of these working group initiatives into their plans.

So I think the next couple of weeks are going to be very critical in the sense that we have to really home in on these working group reports...Another critical step is to identify gaps and ensure that we have conversations in areas where we do not expect to get timely reports.

One example would be the Graduate School. I think one of the things that we would like to do is to have a meeting where we specifically talk with representatives of the Graduate School so that we can provide some input both from what we've seen in the school plans and in the working-group reports towards the development of the Graduate School plan. So that's where we are.

Let me give you my general sense of how things have gone. The interim plans that we have received so far I think have generally been well received. They've been well received by the committee, because to a large

extent they have been developed with general broad participation and broad discussion within schools and across-schools. I think that's been a hallmark of some of the documents that we've seen. I think to a large extent they embrace the university themes, the themes that have been identified. And they build on *Building on Excellence*.

My final comment is that I think the planning process and the Planning Steering Committee process in general, is a testimony to the tradition of faculty governance at Duke. So those are my comments, and I will take any questions.

Questions

Peter Burian (Classical Studies): Would you give us some idea of what sort of working groups?

Kasibhatla: In the two working-group reports that were in some sense institute reports, one had to do with the strategic initiative in the social sciences and one has to do with the strategic initiatives in the humanities. The social science one we've already looked at, the humanities we're going to look at. In addition, the other academic working group reports that we have so far are a working group of photo/media studies, imaging, research computing, which is really not an academic initiative in some sense but it's more infrastructure initiative, materials, broader resources, science, engineering, and policy, environmental health, and eco-system science. There are three more that we hope to get, again we're not sure when, and those are brain science, aging, and global health. So those are our academic...

Provost Lange [interrupting]: And arts.

Kasibhatla: We've got the arts and the undergraduate experience, but I haven't listed those specifically as an academic; those are kind of broader. We only looked at that, we looked at those yesterday.

Paul Haagen: Ethics is broader and it's also academic.

Earl Dowell (Mechanical Engineering & Materials Sciences): Prasad can you say a little bit more about how the working group output is going to be integrated into the school plans? I think, as I understand it, these are going forward in parallel, and at some point they meet and the working group has a wonderful idea that requires the Law School and Engineering School to do something to affect the representation of that working group; and then do the people of the Law School and Engineering say, "gee I already have twice as much plan as I have budget now in my own plan, I really can't do that as wonderful as it is." Then what happens?

Kasibhatla: That is not going to happen and let me tell you why. One, the working groups were formed in consultation with deans who we thought would be the ones who would have to at least implement parts of those working group reports, and it means the deans know of the working groups and know of the charge of the working groups. Secondly, in the January 9 or January 10 feedback from the Provost to the deans, the working groups reported, whatever the working group reports had been provided to the deans. And finally, we

are planning to get our reviews in by about February 10th or so they can move forward, , so the deans have time to look at them while they're revising their plans by March 1st. So that's the reason we have this accelerated time. Those are the three reasons.

Provost Lange: Let me say one more thing about that. ... I'll try to give you an example. There's a report, I won't tell you which subject, but there's a report that recommends more positions across three schools. First, as Prasad says, the deans will be aware of them, right? If that ever becomes a priority, at the Provost's office we will be facilitating, you know this is one of those matrix things, right? I mean the deans have priorities for departments or units. The university and the deans through these task forces have priorities with respect to subject matter. So there are going to be intersections. The strategic funds are going to land on those boxes, so there's going to be an inducement to the units. Now they won't always like it, and they won't always do it. And there will be issues there. But we get these intersections and we find the places where through the faculty development funds which are supposed to be targeted on strategic priorities, which means both those which come through the working groups and those that come through what the deans are saying, we find intersections and then we target the strategic funds on those and hope that through that mechanism most of what we're trying to accomplish gets done. But there's no question that there will be some slippage there.

Earl Dowell: Peter, can I ask you a question about your letter December 9th. I just have a few questions. I wanted to give you a sense of where you think these answers are likely to lie. One question is: given the fact that salaries and infrastructure are sort of in the same budget, what's the tradeoff between faculty salaries and infrastructure? And then the second question is: what's the balance among faculty positions and all of the various types of faculty appointments ranging from professors of the practice to adjunct faculty, to tenured faculty, to this and that.

Provost Lange: Okay I'll give you my reaction: we have been to almost every single deans' cabinet meeting, we have been discussing issues of faculty development, and for instance the relationship between quality and size, and accepting as a fact of Duke, that most of our units will always be "undersized," and the strategic implications.

Secondly, we have asked the deans to pay very careful attention to the demographics of their faculty, and we're providing a lot of information about the demographic structure of their faculty and the expected turnover flow of their faculty. What is the tenure balance in their faculty? What are their targets with regard to that and therefore what balance of junior and senior appointments can be made? – because in the short-run although not in the long run that makes a difference, again for the balance of resources that you are putting in to your gross faculty budget, and the balance of resources that you have remaining for infrastructure.

It is part of my job, to ensure that infrastructure is not neglected at the expense of growth given the context of the specific unit you're looking at. Because the balance is not going to be the same in every unit, because basically the deans are always going to face the constellation of pressures from individual faculty members and from chairs to add positions at the margins – to let infrastructures slide. So that's the answer to the first question. It's an answer about process, not outcome, because I don't have an answer about outcome.

My general sense on the operational budget is that we're leaving the restrictive budget aside, that on the operational budget we're seeing a decline in the number of non-tenure track professors in the last couple of years. Before that we were seeing substantial increase but in the last couple of years we've been seeing a some rebalancing, and I should tell you, by the way, we have brought those numbers about...Deans and faculty don't always see those numbers on a 5 or 10 year scale. They see it on a year-to-year scale, but on a 5 to 10 year scale they sometimes say "oh okay. I didn't quite realize that that was the case." Does that answer your question?

Member: Yes, do you have a number in mind in terms of the balance between either those two divisions, either between the infrastructure and faculty size or salaries on the one hand or between non-tenure faculty or tenure faculty?

Provost Lange: There's no general answer to that question. It depends totally on the unit. Different units have different kinds of teaching responsibilities and have different kinds of infrastructure needs. They have different kinds of backlogs and problems in the infrastructure; some units have done really well in keeping up with their technology, for instance, other units haven't.

I'll go back to the earlier discussion about classrooms. Arts & Sciences has had a lot of trouble catching up in the quality of classrooms, and when we did that Faculty Climate Survey, that was one of the issues that came up most often in the Arts & Sciences Faculty. It used to come up in Engineering faculty, but it doesn't come up much anymore...So that then pushes up the classroom question and when I spoke about those learning centers, those are designed in part to address that issue. We'll probably take some of the old classrooms out of commission and convert them into something else. We're not about to have a shortage of classrooms, but what we have had now is a shortage of classrooms of quality.

Paul Haagen: Thank you Prasad and Peter. This clearly is going to be of central importance to the faculty, and I wanted to make certain that the Council understands the process and how this is going. The meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,
John Staddon

Faculty Secretary
February 2, 2006