

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday April 17, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): The first item of business is approval of the minutes. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of



the March 20 meeting? [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.] Thank you John.

Meeting dates for next year and a roster of new Academic Council members are posted on our website. (www.duke.edu/web/acouncil)

I'd like now to call the Academic Council into executive session for the purpose of considering honorary degrees. All who are not faculty members should leave the room.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Information about honorary degree candidates is available to faculty in the Academic Council office

Faculty Secretary Election

We now go on to the annual election of the faculty secretary. The primary responsibility of faculty secretary is to provide the minutes of these meetings. The faculty secretary is also on the Executive Committee and ECAC wants to thank John Staddon for the minutes he has provided this past year and we have put his name forward for reelection to this position. You received brief biographical information with your agendas. And at this point I will ask whether there are any nominations from the floor for candidates who

have already agreed to serve in this position if they are elected. Hearing none I offer the name of **John Staddon** as faculty secretary for the coming academic year and ask all those in favor to signify by saying aye. Opposed? Passes unanimously John – congratulations.

Election of New Executive Committee Members

The next item on the agenda is the election of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. As you know the Executive Committee members are elected for two years. Each year some members finish their terms and new members are elected. And before I proceed I'd certainly like to acknowledge the ECAC members who have completed their terms. Susan Lozier (Nicholas School who also served as vice-chair of the Council), Lori Setton (Engineering), Ken Surin (Literature). I'd also like to acknowledge and thank the members who will be continuing: Amy Abernethy (Medicine), Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology) and Tom Metzloff (Law) and John Staddon.

For today's election we have asked Professors Martha Adams and Paul Zipkin to act as tellers. Thanks to them. They will distribute and collect the ballots. When the votes are counted I will announce the winners before the end of the meeting. You received with your agendas a brief description of each of the candidates who have been nominated. We have 11 divisions, 8 members, divisions this year are humanities, engineering and general/miscellaneous. The ballots will be passed out. We will continue with the meeting, but let me tell you who the candidates are: Amy Bejsovec (Biology), Erika Weinthal (Nicholas School), Stanley Abe (Art, Art History and Visual Studies – Stanley is on leave and is unable to attend today), Roberto Dainotto (Romance Studies), Ana Barros (Pratt School), Jeff Glass (Pratt School)...Just to remind you only elected members of Academic Council can vote not the alternates so just make sure you remember who you are.

After the ballots had been counted (thanks the counters for ballots, Paul and Martha), the results were:

McClain: Those individuals elected to ECAC for two year terms are: [Amy Bejsovec](#), [Stanley Abe](#) and [Ana Barros](#). Congratulations. And I thank everybody, those who stood for election. We thank you very much.

Proposal from the Nicholas School and Pratt School to establish a dual Master of Environmental Management and Master of Engineering Management Degree

Next on the agenda is a proposal from the Nicholas School and Pratt School to establish a dual Master of Environmental Management and Master of Engineering Management (MEM/MEMP) degree. Rob Clark is ill today, so Jeff Glass of Pratt and Lincoln Pratson of the Nicholas School will present the proposal. I need to mention that it was determined after the documents went out that the term joint degree was being used incorrectly. These are actually *dual degrees* not a joint degree; so the proposal is for a dual degree between Pratt and the Nicholas School. We will hear the proposal today. It's a two meeting item coln...

Jeff Glass (Electrical & Computer Engineering): We also want to introduce Dr. Brad Fox who is the Executive Director of the Engineering Management program. He and Roshena Ham have had a strong hand in the administrative setting-up of this dual degree proposal. Thanks for your time in letting us present this proposal. This will be pretty short in terms of presentation and then we'll open up for questions and



answers.

This statement summarizes why we think this is important. We have a great opportunity here for addressing major environmental challenges that cross the boundaries between engineering and technology into environmental policy and environmental law, and environmental science. By putting the two schools together in this dual-degree proposal we feel like we're giving another option to the students to elect to take both levels of study with some relief in both financial and credit, but still maintaining the integrity of both programs.

The first thing we realized at the Executive Council was that MEM and MEMP is kind of confusing nomenclature so let's clear that up. The MEM was first. That's why we have the MEMP in the engineering management program. So Master of Environmental Management is referred to as the MEM and the Master of Engineering Management Program is referred to as the MEMP. That's really just an administrative point.

Basically what is happening is students are simultaneously taking two master's degrees via an integrated curriculum that we designed between the two schools. The curriculum brings together a number of what we consider very important areas...Engineering solutions coupled with business concepts, environmental science concepts, environmental law and environmental policy.

I think the time is really ripe for this kind of dual degree because of what we see in the news every day related to energy, related to water quality, related to environmental health issues and bringing together the engineering approach with many of these, but at the same time teaching our engineering students that to implement these engineering solutions requires much more than simply engineering. It requires an understanding of policy, law, environmental science, etc. And I think at this point in history or in society this is a particularly good time to introduce something like this.

So the basics of the degree are shown here [slides]. It's a 60-credit combined – both programs, 60 credits. And with the way this is done the normal 48-credit degree from the environmental management side and the normal 30-credit degree from engineering management do share some credits and this is not a new concept or even the number of credits they share is not new. We're taking this from others, although this is a dual degree, I'll use the term joint because if you do search on the website at Duke you'll see many of the prior degrees listed as joint. And I think that just speaks to the integration, to the fact that there are still two degrees, but they are integrated in a very intimate way as the students progress through the programs.

The point there is that they get some relief from each side by counting credits from one program towards the other in order to make it a viable program for them to participate in. The time frame can be anywhere from 28 months here, but here is actually a possibility for them to go through in 32 months and spend another semester. They really have to push and do an overload if they want the 24-month. But that would be the most cost-effective and the most time-effective for them. Then they would have a savings of about 12 months where if they choose the 28 month option they would have a savings of about 9 months compared to if they had just taken the two degrees in series.

The cost is about \$33,000/year. And that provides 75% of the Nicholas School environmental management tuition and about 80% for the engineering management tuition for the two different programs. And then beyond that 24-month period they could take courses on sort of a one-at-a-time basis, depending on

how much they were able to overload or if they have some courses they want to make up or even take some extra courses at that time.

Admissions are actually separate for each program, so we're making sure the integrity of the admissions committee and admissions of both schools remains and that we have control of each school over admissions so that the proper students are admitted for both the environmental side and the engineering side.

We don't expect there to be a large number of dual degree programs... We expect it to provide another option, which is I think a very interesting option and a very exciting option for some of the students who have an interest in both the engineering and the environmental side. We only expect on the order of 5-10 students. That's just a guess. I mean honestly we don't know how many will be interested, but it is a lot of work and a lot of effort. So it may not be very highly subscribed. It would be good if it were highly subscribed and we have to add resources and it's more than 10 students. But at this point we don't expect that to be the case.

I think maybe the other point to add there is that from a financial and a resource standpoint, we don't need any particular number because we're utilizing courses that already exist. We are enhancing extracurricular items like seminar series or the fact they have become more and more joint. We have an energy talk for engineering this week that the Nicholas School students will be attending as well. But I guess the point here is that it is not adding an awful lot of burden to faculty or to staff. So we feel like there's no minimum number that makes this viable and still it can be an option for students who are interested in both programs.

So the summary here I'll show for students academically it's appropriate and relevant and very good timing. And there is cost and time savings if they do both. It's good for both the environmental-management and the engineering-management programs.

The students who aren't in this dual degree will benefit from some of the extra-curricular activities that are done and ultimately some course designs that are integrated more fully. There are diverse students in both classes that will help, I think, the diversity of experience for students in both engineering and environmental management. And I think it will be an opportunity to attract some students who maybe wouldn't be interested if we didn't have this dual degree.

Even if the numbers aren't large I think there will be some good students excited about this dual degree.

And finally I think it's good for Duke. I think joint school activities are appropriate and something we are constantly striving for here at Duke. And it's synergistic with other activities both in the Engineering School and the School of the Environment. And that includes again Gendell Center for Engineering, Energy and the Environment and the new undergraduate cer-

tificate that I understand has recently been approved in energy and the environment.

I think that's everything from a presentation perspective. We are open for questions.

Questions

McClain: Let me start, since ECAC had raised the question about the additional advising burden on faculty for this masters program.

Glass: So the question was: will there be an additional advising burden for students that come through this program in particular? And our response to that is that essentially in the engineering management side we utilize advisors who have an industrial understanding already – so many times adjunct or the program directors, myself, Dr. Fox, [serve as advisors], and therefore we would continue to advise. And it would not be an additional burden for new faculty or additional faculty to come in, especially with the numbers we are talking about 5-10 students. I think on the environmental side if you want to address that – they are utilizing regular-rank faculty that fits in better with the masters program on the environmental side. Do you want to comment on that further?

Lincoln Pratson (Nicholas School): I think it won't be a significant increase in the advising load because we are talking about 2 ½ to 5% increase in the number of students...

Paul Haagen (Law): Jeff, have you determined if



there is excess capacity in, for example, the Law School's environmental law classes? Are you promising that those classes are available?

Glass: No we are not promising any additional classes for this. I think any of the law component would be already in existing classes which as Lincoln mentioned if it's on the environmental side it's only a 2 ½ % increase. On the engineering-management side it actually would be within our current number of students. In other words...we don't know what will happen in future years, but at the moment they would be integrated in with the current class. So the class size would actually be the same.

Haagen: The question I was actually asking is: I assume these would be law classes in the Law School?

Glass: As you may know, we do a law class with engineering management that is in the Law School, but we hire Law faculty to do it through the engineering management program.

Haagen: So that's where this would be?

Glass: That's where the core law course would be – exactly. And I don't know if there are sort of environmental law probably not classes, but topics within your...

We have an environmental law class as again students would be accommodated within the existing...

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology/ECAC): I have a general question. Are there any new classes specific to this dual degree?

Glass: At the moment I would say there are no new classes specific for it. As I think I may have said, joint activities have increased I'd say, since I started this degree discussion about two years ago. Joint activities have increased quite a bit. We've had joint seminars, joint round tables and a number of co-curricular items, but no new classes. And I think at the 5-10 level it's more likely to influence the topics in our current classes rather than add new classes on. Although there may be some special independent studies and that sort of thing that would be added.

Kathryn Andolsek (Medicine): Do either of these two masters require a thesis or a capstone project for a masters paper? And if so do you have topics which would be amenable to students that would have the breath of interest represented?

Glass: Great question. Let me talk from the engineering side and then it's more appropriate for the environmental side. From the engineering side we have a capstone simulation that we utilize, but it's actually optional for students. So it would be very focused on business, but it's also very conceivable that in the future that could be an environmental business. No question about it. I think for an energy business that would be a really exciting thing to do. But it's optional so the students who are in that dual program are more likely, I would say, to work on the environmental side where they would have a required masters project.

Pratson: The masters in environmental management has to do a masters project and I think the projects could easily accommodate the engineers; in fact I've advised 2-3 engineers this semester on their masters projects and it worked out well.

McClain: Thank you. Remember this is a two-meeting issue. We will vote on this at the May 8 meeting.

Academic Programs Committee

Professor Lynn Smith-Lovin chairs the Provost's Academic Programs Committee and is just finishing up her first year in that role. At the end of each academic year, the chair of APC provides a report to the Council on the committee's activities. You received her written report and Lynn will make a few comments and respond to any questions that you have. Lynn.

Lynn Smith-Lovin (Sociology): Thank you. This has been a very successful year. I'd like to start by thanking the members of the committee. The committee has 12 members that represent the entire range of units that report to the Provost, as well as a large number of ex-officio members. This committee has worked together very well in spite of their varied backgrounds. It takes quite a bit of work. We just had our last meeting at 8:30 yesterday morning. So I'd like to thank all of the members of the committee for their hard work this year.

One of the primary duties of the committee is to process the external reviews, since they come up through the ranks. We handle them just before they go to ECAC and come to you. I believe that we are more caught up with the external reviews of departments than we have ever been in most people's living memory. And we're very proud of that. Most of the hard work that went into that was actually done by the committee last year under the leadership of Catherine Fisk. But we continued it this year and now we're actually handling the external reviews of units in a timely enough manner that we're actually talking about the programs as they are actually operating as opposed to the way they operated 2, 3 or 4 years ago – which is a very good thing.



These [slide] are the departments that were reviewed this year and forwarded to the Provost and the graduate school for memos of understanding to be developed. We have a smaller number of external reviews that are currently underway. Physics: a resolution just came from the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty a couple of days ago and we'll handle that the first thing in the fall and there are 3 other reviews that have just been through the department level and that we'll be handling next year.

As you can see we are relatively up to date and I think that these reviews will be more effective because of that. We approved and passed to you 4 new degree programs this year. Probably the most noteworthy is the first fully joint Ph.D. program with the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill: that is a Ph.D. program in German Studies. And of course you handled that, but I think that is major landmark for the university and for the committee. We also approved a Doctor of

Nursing Practice which you handled and there were two other programs – a Ph.D. in Coastal Systems Science and Policy which was a reorganization of that program which we think will make it administratively and academically more efficient and the joint dual program that you just heard about. We had a number of other significant discussions. There is a long list in your written report, which was on the website.

But I just want to hit a couple of highlights in my presentation here today. First we reviewed a large number of proposals for the Provost's Common Fund. Actually I believe it was 35 – there was one that came in just before the deadline. And a third of those were funded in some way from a total of \$425,000, which is the largest dollar amount that has ever been used for this purpose. The proposals were not only numerous, but of very high quality and reviewing them was a tough job, but we thought it was very worthwhile.

We approved and passed on to you proposals for the Social Science Research Institute and the Global Health Institute to make regular-rank non-tenure-track faculty appointments. Obviously, the matter of faculty appointments is one of great importance and so I consider that one of the major discussions of the year. We also discussed – actually a couple of times, including in our last meeting – a proposal for accelerated sabbatical leaves for teaching and service in Arts and Sciences. I believe Dean McLendon is going to talking to you about that proposal just after I finish.

Those are what I would consider the highlights of the year. You have a long list of other things that we talked about and I'd be happy to answer questions about any of those or about any of things that I mentioned or any issues that are program issues that you think should be on our agenda next year.

Because we have caught up largely with the external reviews we hope to have more time next year to deal with broader or more general program issues and take a more proactive approach in constructing our own agenda and would certainly welcome your advice and interest in that regard and any questions you have.

Questions

Earl Dowell (Engineering): Lynn, you mentioned Memorandums of Understanding. Does your committee have a mechanism or part of your agenda examining actually what happened as a result of the MOU? Do you look at them 2-3 years down the road and say this did happen, this did not happen, what has...?

Smith-Lovin: We have not, in the year that I have been chairing the committee. We did look at several examples of recent MOUs in order to see the kind of product that was coming out of the series of reviews and the resolutions that we were constructing so as to try to target our resolutions more specifically to the kinds of issues the MOUs dealt with. To be frank, up until this year just handling the external reviews that were piled up, to get our resolutions done, and sending them on was a challenge. I think that now we might have the luxury of doing something like that.

McClain: Thank you very much Lynn. I sit ex-officio on that committee, and I have to compliment them for doing an incredible job. They really do work through a lot of issues in a very effective and efficient manner.

Accelerated Leave Policy

Next on the agenda is a proposal from Arts and Sciences for an Accelerated Leave Policy. Dean McLendon will present the proposal. If the Council is comfortable with the proposal we will ask for an endorsement today. The Provost indicates that following the approval of the Board of Trustees he will present language to Academic Council in the fall for inclusion of the new policy in the Faculty Handbook. George...

Dean George McLendon: Thanks Paula. I recognized that following my little two-page report we have a modest phone book on the plan for unrivaled excellence in athletics, and so I know that that will take some time. So I'm going to try to keep my remarks brief.



I wish to give a brief rationale for this proposed change, say a little bit about the process by which this has gone through the faculty and then just say a bit about the specific proposal. So let me start with the most important part which is the rationale: why should we think about any changes at all? We have a perfectly standard, within-the-Divinity-School, biblically based sabbatical policy: every Sabbath of years one gets a certain amount of time off and if you stay as long as Reynolds Price you get a jubilee year.

What motivates this in part was our understanding that both internally and competitively we had opportunities to take what have and make what we have better. And that was important in a couple of contexts. One was that I think most faculty have noticed that we're constantly asking ourselves to do more. We're asking that we not only be engaged and great lecturers in a classroom setting, but that we also engage with our students beyond the classroom, that we serve as research mentors, this is a faculty that, as judged by the attendance today, takes faculty governance seriously and so we ask each of us to play roles in the governance of our departments and the broader university. And all these things require time. Furthermore, we

espouse broadly a sense of values that says that we value research and teaching and service.

But many faculty have felt like we value *re-search* and *teaching* and *service*. And so in thinking about those challenges we first worked with the Arts and Sciences Council under Craufurd's [Goodwin] leadership of the committee that took an existing set of practices which was:... any time we asked a faculty to do something the only currency we had available to trade for that service was teaching relief. And that set up a very odd expectation that somehow everything that you did should come at the expense of teaching.

And so Craufurd, with a typical economist's verve, set out to lead a process where we looked at various other alternatives; and not surprisingly we came up with an economic incentive plan which said we won't preclude teaching relief as one way of valuing the work that you do as director of graduate studies for example. But instead we might also offer a monetized equivalent.

And that was suggested then through this committee to the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council, was recommended to whole Council, was voted on overwhelmingly. That process has gone into place. And what we found, in fact, is that most faculty actually like teaching the courses that they've chosen to teach. And so most faculty choose a monetization rather than course relief.

For us honestly it is budget neutral, because we have to pay somebody else to teach the course anyway. I'd rather pay the person most qualified to teach that course.

That was a good first step, but we realized as we were implementing this that perhaps it was necessary, it certainly it was not sufficient. And it was not sufficient because in the limit sometimes the only thing that can compensate for time is time. So if you are a humanistic scholar for example getting one course off here and there never gives you the concentrated time to focus on the book that is necessary to move your intellectual program to the next level where you will be better able to communicate your new understanding to your graduate and undergraduate students.

And so we thought about doing something a little non-standard which was to actually try and put our money where our mouth was. This is not standard university practice always, but we thought it would be fun to try. And explicitly to try and align our reward system with those things that we say we value.

So, if we really value the quality of undergraduate teaching, then instead of trying to find ways to keep people from undergraduate teaching we ought to have some sort of reward system that acknowledges that undergraduate teaching.

If we really value university service then we ought to have some kind of reward system that aligns with that value. And without a whole lot more insight than that we turned to what I would call the Allen principle. You remember when Nancy held the seat that Paula

currently occupies her standard dictum is "have you asked the faculty." And so we decided in our process the first thing we should do is ask the faculty.

And since this is something that at present only applies to arts and sciences faculty we started with the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. As they had done in the earlier case that I alluded to, they put together an ad hoc committee chaired by Maureen Quilligan to consider what the implications of such an incentive policy might look like. They spent quite a bit of time working on this. There was a lot of discussion back and forth. Ultimately, they submitted a recommendation to the Executive Committee.

I worked very closely with the Executive Committee, first under Lee Baker's leadership and subsequently under Suzanne Shanahan's, to refine that proposal. Then we took it out to all the departments through the department chairs and got feedback. And that ended up with what I will call a richly textured and structured proposal.

Which is to say that it is a little more complicated than the one I had in mind. And it's a little more complicated for actually pretty good reasons, because one thing that I've had to understand as a physical scientist, in a job that serves a very broad range of constituencies, is that what works extraordinarily well for chemistry departments may not work terribly well for departments of literature, or anthropology or whatever.

So we got feedback loops in to this process from all those consultations. And that ended up with some of the nuances that are in the suggested proposal.

What I will say is that I am certain that the proposal as presented is somewhat imperfect. I'm just not sure which parts of it are imperfect. And I suspect that each of you who have bothered to read it have your own views on which parts are less perfect. Being an experimentalist, my view of this at present is: the theories are all very interesting, but we're probably going to have to run a process for several years and find out what the unintended consequences of it are. Some will be good unintended consequences. I've already seen examples of that in the process of this discussion. Others will be undesirable unintended consequences but we don't know yet what they are.

And so at present what we have is a distilled wisdom of dozens and dozens and perhaps hundreds of faculty inputs into this. And my suggestion is that I think we're just going to need to run this for several years and see how it plays out. And then have an analytic process which says what are the additional good things that happened, what are the unanticipated problematic things that happened.

The one thing that I would remind everyone of is that this possibility for acceleration takes nothing away from everything that the faculty already has. You could choose to entirely divorce your personal academic and professional choices from any of the proposed values of the university and I would still anticipate that in the traditional time frame, 7 years out, if you applied for a sabbatical one would be granted.

But if you choose to align your personal choices with the values of research, teaching and service that we speak to, then you are given an opportunity to accelerate that sabbatical, the details of which are in the proposal.

And some of the nuances were built in to make sure as we did test cases that in any department with any teaching load within Arts and Sciences, it would be possible for faculty to accelerate a sabbatical leave.

The one in fact where I first thought this wouldn't happen at all would be my own department of Chemistry, because of the teaching loads and the split between graduate and undergraduate. In fact, I very rapidly found out by doing some test cases that even in that department, many faculty would qualify, but not all would qualify. If all faculty qualified, then all we would be doing is just creating a different entitlement program with somewhat more generous outcomes rather than creating an alignment of values and rewards systems.

So let me stop there and ask if anyone has any questions or comments.

Questions

Earl Dowell: You mentioned early on when you were talking about monetary compensation for service



and/or teaching; of course, you otherwise would have given relief for teaching – but that was revenue neutral. Will this proposal be revenue neutral?

George McLendon: No this is going to cost me some real money.

Dowell: How much?

McLendon: It depends on exactly how to model this because we don't know yet how much people will align their values... But I'll just say it's affordable. I have to decide, do I really believe in the values that we espouse? If I really believe in the values that we espouse then it's worth spending some money on them. If I don't I wouldn't be bringing the proposal to you.

Dowell: You're presumably are trying to change some behavior with this incentive plan: what behavior are you trying to encourage?

McLendon: Well a couple, obviously.

One is we would like all of my faculty colleagues to be more aware of our individual responsibilities for

service. One thing you'll note is I don't connote "this service opportunity counts, this one doesn't count." Because most of us in departments are well aware...I can sort of smile and think about this...that in any given department there are some people that you'll find who are on lots and lots of committees and there are some people who are on zero.

Simply reminding folks that if they want to apply for this accelerated opportunity they will have to go through the task of explaining why they deserve it, creates an intentionality to faculty choices which is not currently present.

I'm also quite honestly, in Arts and Sciences, recognizing the reality that we are a school whose revenue stream is differentially highly dependent on the engagement, the quantity and quality of undergraduate teaching at Duke. And that's simply true. So reminding folks that, while in no way do we want to diminish the quality of our graduate programs and there's nothing in this that suggests that, we really do need folks who understand that how well we teach our undergraduates really matters.

And so those are the two things that I would hope to see more intentionality brought as people think about the possibility of having that differential award system.

Dowell: If I'm a faculty member and I want to take advantage of this program is the idea that I write a proposal to you or the chair of the department saying I plan to do x, y and z....

McLendon: You don't have to do anything that complicated. You just keep track of your contributions and teaching and service. And then at the appropriate time you inform your chair: "I think I've filled out all these boxes." And the chair looks at it and says "why yes you have" and then they forward that to me and I look at it and say "why yes you have."

Now recall that in the 3 components the first one still remains paramount, which is you have to have something that's going to advance your intellectual project and standing. You can't say I taught all these courses, I'm really tired, I want to go down to Wrightsville Beach for a semester and hang out. That one I won't approve. But that is seldom true for any of the members of my faculty. Generally, people have extraordinarily interesting things that they want to do. That's first and foremost in their minds because that one tends to always be met. And these other things simply create intentionality. But the anticipation is that if you have met these richly textured set of desiderata, then I'm not one to second-guess that process. I would generally approve this.

Garnett Kelsoe (Cell and Molecular Biology): All good experiments have an end point, a defined end point. When will you make the decision about the unintended benefits and/or disadvantages? Is there a sunset period on this change?

McLendon: I think some of that will be done in collaboration with this body and with the Provost, but you need to have a review 3-4 years in; you have to

have enough people who through this process so you have enough information to be able to make a considered set of analyses – and whether it's 3 years or 4 years I'm agnostic. It should not be longer than that. I'm reminded of Curriculum 2000 that 4 years in, we were asked if there were some positive features to that and some less positive features and so we had to accentuate those which were positive and mediate the others.

Kelsoe: Would there ever be a conflict of interest if someone who was participating in the program and



wished to participate and just prior to that period of time in which the program is changed. It seems to me there will be a certain inertia to this that will be difficult to stop and certainly there will be some responsibility to the individuals who entered the program in good faith prior to any changes.

McLendon: So I'm actually being optimistic. I'm pretty convinced that in general this will have a positive outcome. So I think it is unlikely that we will simply terminate it 3 years out. But there may be lots of tweaks that have to happen. Let's take the Eeyore view for a moment. If it's simply disastrous, then we will have to have a phase-out period. We will be morally obligated to do so. But I can tell you if it's disastrous we'll tend to know that earlier rather than later.



The other thing that people commonly ask, which I haven't gotten a question about yet, is when might this start? And I think the answer would be, after approval by this body, by the Board of Trustees and after the new language was in the Handbook, then we would start doing a retrospective analysis to find out who would have already been eligible. And the reason we would have to do that is we don't want people moving through as a cohort, lemming-like, because of the obvious cliff on the other side. And so we would sort of prequalify some folks.

Once you've taken accelerated leave your clock resets. You can earn another accelerated leave or you can say wow that was too much trouble. I think I'll go back to the normal one at 7 and I'll be fine with that.

Peter Burian (Classical Studies): I have a couple of comments, partly because I was on Maureen's com-

committee, and I remember there were a couple of opportunities that we looked at. The first is that no matter how richly textured, it can't say everything. One of the opportunities that we thought about which was, for obvious reasons, close to my heart was kind of differential valuation for service in small departments, where it is not possible to give course relief, for example, and where people tend to be department officers all their lives, more or less, because there are just not many colleagues.

So I hope that we had thought about the possibility that there might be some differential evaluation of those services rendered without compensation in cases where in many other departments compensation is given. That's one thing,

The second opportunity, I just wanted to mention thankfully, is that at the end of this document you mentioned an analogous possibility: policies also being developed for non-tenure-track faculty. We saw as one of the great opportunities this finally dealing with what is I think the most painful difference...

McLendon: Because this was an acceleration of sabbatical opportunity, it could not have applied to Professors of the Practice because they had no regular sabbaticals to accelerate. So I just got back a report which we'll be working on and responding to next fall from an equivalent ad hoc committee of the Arts and Sciences Council dealing with Professors of the Practice.

What they are recommending is not anything nearly so complex and structured, merely that we look at a traditional sabbatical policy of 1 and 7 for those folks. I haven't done the full economic analysis or other things, but my initial response is: I think that would alleviate an enormous amount of current dissatisfaction among folks in that rank in Arts and Sciences. And so if we can find ways that it make sense – and we're going to have lots and lots of discussions with department chairs because they would have a much bigger impact in music (say) than it would ever have in physics. And so we're going to have to look at all of the implications. But we will be doing that over the next year.

Patrick Wolf (Engineering): I have a couple of questions. I'm in the Engineering School so I'm wondering what's going to happen in the Engineering School. But I also had some other questions...if it's going to be added to the Faculty Handbook. Are there separate Faculty Handbooks?

McLendon: Peter would be far better to be able to speak to that than I. It will create an interesting challenge for my engineering colleagues though, if they'll rise to it...

Provost Lange: So the issue is that not only does this have to go into the Faculty Handbook, but sabbatical policy is in the university bylaws. So, assuming the policy is passed here and the policy is passed by the board, we have to draft a university bylaw consistent with the policy and then draft a Faculty Handbook

provision consistent with the bylaw provision. That's why we're waiting.

It's likely to be...I can't tell you exactly what it will be, but it's likely to be something which will allow schools to set their sabbatical policy within the context of the 7-year framework and therefore would open a path to other schools coming forward with proposals like this one, but not mandate that for any particular school. That would be the basic structure.

Wolf: So the other questions were, I mean, just sort of applied it to my department and sort of calculated that we would be effectively reducing the number teaching faculty by one in my department. You know if everybody sort of qualified in 5 years for a leave so in the very end who pays for that?

McLendon: Well Pat does in your case!

Wolf: Overhead, gifts? So who is paying for it in the end?

McLendon: The way that I currently have this structured it's an opportunity cost for me that's coupled with what I'm accepting the faculty are telling me our shared values are. And there are opportunity costs.

It's made a little bit easier for me, honestly, because I was saddled with this really weird thing called deans' leaves, which were sort of an ad hoc, under-the-table process where, when people came and said "I'm going to leave unless you give me a leave" (which is sort of bizarre!)...Then the response will be "Oh no no no no!"

The problem with that is that there is no transparency. It was widely believed that you only got such a leave if you were one of the dean's friends. What I explained to the faculty is I don't have any friends. [laughter] And so I was able to take a number of dollars that were already being spent in that way, and say we're getting rid of that mechanism which is for many reasons undesirable. And that creates some pool which allows us to reinvest in these other things. And then when folks say, "well you know how do I get a leave?" And I say it's real clear. You can accelerate them as fast as you wish to accelerate them. All you have to do is align your values.

How that works out in Pratt I have no idea. Your budgetary mechanism...I find my budgetary mechanisms complex. Yours are truly extraordinary.

Wolf: You're telling me that this costs nothing. You're going to take money from one place and put it into...

McLendon: No I'm not telling you it costs nothing. There is still additional...as you suggest at the margins there's going to be...there will be a cost. And all I'm telling you is that I'm willing to accept that cost. Whether you and your colleagues within the Pratt School, and Tom as your Dean, would be willing to accept an equivalent cost would depend on what you differentially value. Nothing is free. There is an opportunity cost in doing this.

For example – just a purely hypothetical example – in the limit we might be able to hire one less economist (!), and that will cover the cost of all of it! In

practice we have to decide what our differential values are. So I can't speak to Pratt. It would be inappropriate for me to do so. I've gotten so much feedback from my faculty saying in general that – give or take a tweak here or there – they believe this is sufficiently transformative for Arts and Sciences that the Arts and Sciences Council voted unanimously to move this process forward. And in the end my job is to make your jobs better. That's all my job is. So that's why we're doing this.

McClain: May I get a sense as to whether you are comfortable with moving this forward and offering a resolution? OK hearing no objections:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the Arts and Sciences proposal for an Accelerated Leave Policy and that following approval by the Board of Trustees the Provost will present language to the Council in the fall to incorporate the policy into the Faculty Handbook.

[The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]. Thank you, George.

Strategic Plan for Athletics

The last item on today's agenda is an update on the Strategic Plan for Athletics, which will go to the Board of Trustees in May. The full report was distributed with your agendas. And copies of the Executive Summary have been placed on the edge of the tables. So Chris Kennedy, the Interim Director of Athletics will provide some comments and a presentation and will take your questions. And with him is Michael Gillespie. Chris...

President Brodhead. Would you allow me interrupt this orderly proceeding with a disorderly comment which is just a word of introduction to Chris Kennedy,



who I'm sure needs none. It was not quite two weeks ago that I received news from Joe Alleva of his accepting the position of athletic director at LSU. Everyone in this room will know how long and how well Joe served this university and how much reason we have to thank him and there will be time to thank him before the end of things. But of course it's the nature of that kind of job that as soon as you take it, new responsibilities from the new institution begin to come to that

person. And so it was clear right away we would need to ask someone to step in as interim AD.

I took a bunch of soundings and they were monotonous, if I may say, in that everyone understood that we had one person here who, by length of service, by breadth of knowledge and by qualities of judgment, was the person we would be fortunate to have step in as the interim AD and I thank you Chris for doing that.

One thing to say about it is that Chris has been a major player in the evolution of the strategic plan so this what we're about to have come forward is no stranger to him any more than it is to Michael Gillespie, who as you know came in to chair the Athletic Council, and the new configuration of that Council that this body approved last year. Pardon my interruption.

Chris Kennedy (Interim Athletic Director): Thank you Dick. I want to talk to you a little bit about the process that produced this plan before we talk about the plan itself. I'm going to be brief because I suspect there may be a question or two. It's been a long proc-



ess – more than a year. We decided that it wouldn't be prudent for Joe Alleva and me to retire to a room somewhere and write this plan. And so we engaged Jared Bleak, from Duke Corporate Education, to chair a steering committee. And the steering committee represented many aspects of the university community – faculty, students, administration, staff. It included, for example, Tallman Trask, Michael Gillespie and Martha Putallaz. It hasn't met in a while, so I don't know if I'll remember everybody. Steve Nowicki and then Donna Lisker – she took over Larry Moneta. And there was a broader planning committee which also included trustees, alumni, other students, student athletes.

An important part of the process was reaching out to a number of constituencies and getting a feel for where we needed to go, because what the plan produced is different than it would have been if we had retired to that dark room and written it. It is I think – I hope – in its final form now. And I expect it will go to the Board of Trustees on May 9 for their approval. I know you've all had a chance to see the entire plan, the executive summary of which you may have had a

chance to read. And I don't want to go into great detail because I do want leave room for questions.

The final process for boiling down all this input was to actually write the plan. Michael Gillespie was invaluable in the contributions that he made. We had some help from Blair Sheppard at Fuqua as well to help us conceptualize some things.

There are as you can see 7 phases to the plan. Rather than go through them one by one, I'll point to the most important things, going forward. I think there are 3.

The first is to aggressively fund-raise, to raise enough endowment to pay for scholarships. It's the Stanford model of how they pay for athletics. So that we no longer have to rely upon subsidy or, as we're trying to call it now, an investment from the university on a yearly basis.

The second is to get football on stronger footing. Football is the key to generating revenue that will help us be self sufficient.

And the third – and this is something that emerged in the course of the process – was our recognition of the inadequacy of our facilities. We started out sort of focused in on athletics, varsity and intercollegiate athletics. But as the process went on, we became more and more conscious of the inadequacy of our facilities for all the other athletic endeavors at Duke: club sports, PE, intra-murals and just plain free recreation. We engaged a consulting firm Brailsford and Dunlavey and evaluated those facilities. They were the firm that was involved in the development of the Wilson Center. And based on some of the things that they told us in addition to some of the things that being insiders we already knew, we developed this plan for the facilities and programming plan going forward for HPER.

Beyond that you can read the executive summary for yourself. You know the fundamental premise that I think underlies the thinking about this plan was to make it fit in with the mission statement of the university as a whole. That is, if we're going to do something we're going to do it very well. We're going to be excellent. We're going to set a standard for others to follow. And what is outlined in the plan, I think, are the steps that get us there. You know we're very good at a lot of things and not so good at some others. And so the plan is an attempt to sustain the one and to improve the rest. And Michael and I will be happy to entertain questions.

Questions

Orin Starn (Cultural Anthropology): I appreciate the way that you and Mike and Joe Alleva reached out and tried talk to faculty and think through these questions. And also in this debate about big-time college sports (pro and con as this kind of kabuki theater, ritualized dimension...) and we're all familiar with how complicated those arguments are and you know how complicated the questions are. But that said, I preface

that because I don't want sound too...I'm sure I'm going sound too strident about this.

I really feel like we're missing a major opportunity here. I think we have an opportunity in thinking about athletics and the future at Duke to set an exam-



ple for other Division I schools and to scale back athletics to put athletics in a place as one dimension, not a central dimension – *pace* President Brodhead and the Board of Trustees.

I don't think athletics should be a central part of any university. I think athletics has an important part, along with the arts, along with civic engagement, along with science projects, along with intellectual development. But the idea that athletics should be central in a university seems to me...it's a weird 20th century invention. And it seems to be the wrong way, the wrong starting point in all of this. And what I feel like in this plan – and I appreciate the thoughtfulness and the dialogue and stuff – but this is really a plan about ramping up sports at Duke so that we will be able to keep up with the Jones and all these...build new facilities, have a big new subvention from the university's general fund.

And I feel like that's the wrong way to go. I feel like leadership for Duke would be to say what are we doing? Why are we as universities running these giant sports programs spending \$50M on it at Duke? Why can't we have it more in proportion to what it should be in the educational mission of the university? And I think that the report really – and it tells a partial truth about – you know I love student athletes at Duke. I love sports. I teach about sports. But I think this report is a very partial, rosy view of the student-athlete experience at Duke and what's going on at sports at Duke.

A *Chronicle of Higher Education* study just showed – and this jibes with my experience with student athletes at Duke – that the average division I student athlete spends about 40-45 hours a week on stuff related to their sport. I know the NCAA limit is 20, but you have film study and individual training and all this other stuff.

So we basically have at Duke now is about 600 kids who are spending 40 hours a week to be excellent, – and they are terrific and wonderful lacrosse players,

field hockey players, basketball players and football players. But is that really what we want for a university – the experience of a student to be, their central interaction to be, with their coach rather than with their professor?

And what does this say about the time that student athletes have to be well-rounded students: to be engaged in theater, to be engaged in journalism, to go on study abroad – and not just in the summer – to participate in DukeEngage?

So I feel there are issues around, you know...what is it? Why are we doing this? Why don't we think about what it is exactly the mission this university should be and get athletics into a more balanced perspective?

Two last points. Football: You know Joe Alleva has said himself, at least when I've talked to him, that you have to lower admission standards if you want to compete. I mean, it's great to want to win some games, but this as we all know is like fierce multi-million dollar competition. And the fact is we've already been doing these admissions *stretches*, as they are euphemized, to admit kids who have SATs in the 400's, who cannot really function, most of them, even though they are lovely kids, and I've had great interactions with them in a regular Duke classroom.

Where now, even though we're not going to lower the admissions bar any further, we're certainly going to make more stretches. There's absolutely no way we can compete otherwise. And what that's creating is two Dukes. It's creating the Duke of students who come in through the more normal admissions mechanisms and it's going to create a whole tier of students – who may in fact I think be able to benefit at Duke – but it's a separate Duke, without the writing skills, without the academic preparation, to really make this a campus where students can connect and interact with one another.

And then finally, then I'll shut up. You know we're accepting here the whole premise of continuing to work within the NCAA. You know the NCAA – and this is the biggest public secret in America – is a fundamentally messed-up, hypocritical organization. Look at the freshman eligibility standards – this is the organization that's supposed to be looking out for the interests of student athletes – you can play any sport as a freshman. These are the NCAA guidelines. You can play any sport as a freshman in the NCAA with an SAT score of 400. Not 400 on verbal and analytical, but 400 *combined*. You can have 200 and 200 if you get a certain level of grade-point average in a selected number of courses. I mean if you have a C average then you can have 350 and 350.

This is not the level of athletes who can actually be students in a functioning university system. I could go on and on about NCAA and the rest, but I also think we need to show some leadership in terms of a reform and addressing some of the fundamental hypocrisies and messed-up things that are going on in this system that we seem to want to just keep going along with

without challenging the whole premise of sports and its place in our university.

Kennedy: We've never met face to face, but my guess is that you are Orin Starn. [laughter] I agree with you completely about the NCAA. It is a strange organization. And we do need to sit down and talk. The only thing I would say about part of your questioning was something that was established before we ever wrote the plan. The only thing I would say that I differ with you on: I really don't think that athletics is central to Duke. It's central to the experience of some of the people that engage in it. But I've always viewed it as supportive of the educational mission of the university in a number of ways.

Richard Hain (Mathematics): There are a lot of different things to say, but I want to talk about money, that's what always fascinates me. And so one way to read this plan is that – and you said it yourself – is to invest in the revenue sports, especially football, because it's under-performing as a revenue generator, and



use the new revenue to fund other things like recreation, all the Olympic sports and so on. And you then list a large number of things, places where you want to spend money on football. Even with no changes to the current situation, there are what I see as very dangerous trends for the university in the funding of athletics and I'll get to that in a minute. I see that this plan is going to accelerate that trend.

In fact what I'd like to do – I actually asked way back in the fall to talk to ECAC – is give a presentation about this; I was never responded to.

McClain: That was my error.

Hain: I asked to give one today and I can't, but I printed out a few pages of what I was going to say. There are budget items on here. (They are not top secret; they are all on Federal filings that Duke makes.) And I'd like to hand these out. Any objection?

These are some of the bullets¹. You will get this page [shows page] and this is a graph – I collected

¹ Full information is at:

<http://www.math.duke.edu/~hain/athletics/questions.html>

An annotated version of the Plan:

http://www.math.duke.edu/~hain/athletics/athletics_plan.html

and

these data and then Fred Nijhout helped me to plot this out. It is an investment model. Suppose you had a dollar to invest at Duke. You could invest it in Arts and Sciences salaries, you could invest it in tuition dollars, you could invest it in Arts and Sciences, or you could invest it in athletics: where would you get the biggest return?

The return on athletics, even if you normalize for inflation, is huge. From 05-06 to 06-07 it actually went down a bit. That's also an interesting and relevant story. But overall it went up 100%. Nothing else rose more than 20%. Tuition went up 20%. Faculty salaries went up a fraction of that, a few percent.

There are arguments one can make here and I know there is always hair splitting. I'm very used to talking about it, and I'd be happy to at length. I conjecture that, after inflation, the median salary in Arts and Sciences has increased no more than this in a decade.

Where did I get the data? The data on athletics was from Duke's Title IX reports to the federal government. Tuition is from the Provost's office, and so on. And the Arts and Sciences salary increases are from the letters to the arts-and-sciences chairs. Some of the Arts and Sciences data are also...

If you look at this, there's a figure that says Arts and Sciences was growing at 5% per year. Peter or George may contradict that. According to the data I have that's right, just a little bit faster than tuition, which makes sense because George has made the point that 80% of the budget of Arts and Sciences comes from tuition.

Athletics over that period has grown at 9.25% per year. And you can put in some values: athletics in 2001 was \$30M, according to Duke's Title IX, and Arts and Sciences was roughly at \$200M and you can plot it. I'm a mathematician, so I like to do this. If you plot it out you can run different numbers if you like – but what you get to is that by the 2020s an Athletics Department half as big as Arts and Sciences and by 2050 it will be bigger.

What does that mean for the university? You can say that athletics is smaller than arts and sciences, but if you have 2 numbers and the smaller one is growing faster than the bigger one, they will eventually cross. And that's what's happening. You have to ask what's Duke going to look like in 15 years if athletics is half as big as Arts and Sciences and in 30 years, 40 years? It will be almost as big as Arts and Sciences. What does this mean for Duke?

The other thing I want to say there is this plan outlines a plan for accelerating the increase of spending on athletics, so that means that athletics will grow to the size of Arts and Sciences much sooner.

I want to talk about some of the other things. There's a big fuss made in the plan about the graduation rate for athletics and there is a case made for spending more on big-time athletics. So I looked up

<http://www.math.duke.edu/~hain/athletics/>

the graduation rates. Duke graduates 97% of student athletes. I actually think that's better than the average student population.

However, the graduation rate of the main basketball team was 67%, which was 22nd out of 65 teams in the NCAA – equal to Stanford but it's a third of the way down the teams in the NCAA. It's lower than UNC; UNC graduated 86%.

If you want to put more emphasis into big-time sports the graduation rate, I guarantee, is going to drop. We're competing with other schools that have much lower standards. And so part of this report does not add up, because you have wildly competing goals. I just think the graduation rate of athletes is going to drop if you are successful in football – if you're not, you're not going to gain the revenue – or spend a lot more, and you will have dug a deeper hole.

Here are some data points. Alabama is paying their football coach \$4M. This is the trend of the future. Three more coaches earn over \$3M. And one of them is one of your comparison schools: Notre Dame pays its coach \$3M a year. The others are USC, which is a peer school of ours, and Oklahoma. So how much are we going to pay our football coach? We've gone up from less than \$500,000 to \$1.2M.

Some information landed in my lap, but I think it's useful for people to hear it. I have detailed budget figures from 04-05. That year there were 10 assistant football coaches and their average salary, including benefits, was \$169,000. At that point it would put them as the second or third highest person in my department and above the top-paid person in some other science departments. And I think that's obscene. I talked to Joe Alleva about this and he said "it's the market." The market is driving up coaching salaries very, very quickly – far faster than anything else at the university. And I think it's going to sink this boat. It just doesn't add up. The numbers just don't work.

If you look at the revenue sources drop in the graph of revenues to athletics: I was told the drop is due to the expansion of the ACC: same TV revenues, 12 teams instead of 10. So revenues go down. You might say in the long run it will go up. In the short run it has gone down.

Another thing that doesn't add up: everyone wants to win. People fire their coaches because they have only a 50% record. But everybody can't have a better-than-50% record. How do you know you're going to be a winner? UNC spent a huge amount of money on their football team and they lost almost every game. What happens if Krzyzewski leaves? Is basketball still going to lay a golden egg? He does at the moment – he's very good – but there's no guarantee it will continue forever. There's no guarantee football will ever be competitive.

The last thing I'd like to say concerns facilities. The claim here is "the facilities are falling apart!" We've got to do this even though a huge amount of facilities work was done in the late 90s. I live in a building, the Physics building. Math does not have lab

space, so our situation is not so bad, although last fall there was a bad leak in the roof that destroyed \$4,000 worth of books of one faculty member. The university refused to pay for those books.

Physics though has had to deal with – they are in the same building – pipes bursting, including one very recently. Several of those times, according to Dan Gauthier who is the chair of Physics, there were 10's of thousands of dollars worth of damage to equipment in labs. You say football facilities aren't good enough you can't recruit players. But what about facilities for science or other departments? We need decent facilities so that we can attract faculty members so they don't leave because their experiments fail because of leaky plumbing or because of leaky roofs that destroy all their books.

That's it. Sorry to sound so negative. I think there are huge issues in this report for the University, for its intellectual aspects.

One more comment. In my slides I put the university mission statement because I thought it would come up. I didn't print it out. But you said you wanted to make athletics consistent with the university mission statement. But what I pulled off the web says nothing about Duke doing everything well. It said nothing about athletics. It says a lot about scholarship and training people to do all these wonderful things, but...but, final comment: I'm a jock. It's not that I don't like athletics, but I want a certain picture of university and this plan doesn't fit with it.

Kennedy: I think there was a question embedded in there!

Hain: It's our chance to comment!

Kennedy: Let me say one or two things. Just as informational point the 67% graduation rate for the men's basketball team reflects that the data trails behind the times because we give them 6 years to graduate. It reflects that period in the late 90s and early 2000 when we had all those guys leave early to play pro basketball. People who stay here graduate.

Hain: Yeah ok, but when you have these players leave early, why? It's because that's when the basketball team is the most successful.

Kennedy: And they have the opportunity to move on..

Hain: And you say we want to have successful teams – that's going to drive down the graduation rate.

Michael Gillespie (Political Science): I think one way we'll put it when we were talking to ECAC there hasn't been a Duke basketball player who hasn't graduated from some school unless they were getting paid several million dollars a year to play basketball.

Roy Weintraub (Economics): A couple of comments on those very lucid but uninformed set of remarks. Years ago testifying before the North Carolina State Utilities Commission, faced with demand forecast for electricity growth in North Carolina which predicated the need for more electricity generating plants – nuclear power plants – based on the mathematicians that they hired, their forecast of exponential

demand growth. If we had paid attention to that in 1980, all of us would own 1000-megawatt nuclear reactor. Those kinds of forecasts gave us the kind of nonsense from the Club of Growth report and exponential growth is not something one wants to play around with unless you want your hands burned. The other comment on that is that the growth of expenditures in athletics, is directly tied to the decisions of this group in insisting that the Department of Athletics in the late 1990s fund women's sports and increase the number of scholarships for women. That's what that number is. This is a decision made by this group on the basis of a committee of this Council.

Hain: I don't think that's true.

Weintraub: It is true. I chaired the committee.

A voice: It's Federal law, also.

Gillespie: Let me just say one word about the financing so that we're clear about it. There is a large difference between what the budget is for the Athletic Department and what the university contribution to athletics is. It's important to keep that in mind. I think it's an order of 3 or 4. And Duke has one of the lowest costs to the university budget because of television revenues.

Now, I don't necessarily disagree with both comments about the enormous growth in athletics and the impact that that might have upon universities. It certainly is changing the nature of universities. Ohio State has \$120M year budget for athletics which I guarantee is bigger even with 55,000 students in the Arts and Sciences, by the way.

So I mean it certainly is possible that those things can occur. But that's... I agree with Orin that we need to try to work the President's Commission or whatever to try to do a whole variety of things to leave what we have.

But I think we have to recognize where we are and our special status as an elite university. And we have to continue to try to improve the facilities for Physics and hire better faculty, but you know our attractiveness to students depends a great deal upon our success in athletics. I think that that's just where we are, and regardless of what we would like to do in some abstract world we have to think about where we are and where we are going.

McLendon: I'm neither going to agree nor disagree with anything that was said. But simply provide a datum. And this is one I know because I was on the faculty group which sets the university budget at Princeton. It's actually set in a funny way. And I know for a fact that Duke University provides a direct subsidy to athletics which is less than Princeton University provides to athletics, despite the fact that they are only nominally a Division I school, with no scholarships.

That for certain is true. And that doesn't negate any of the other ones that anybody made and it doesn't detract from the need to deal with the intellectual issues, the moral obligations. But I don't think you want to make the argument purely in terms of money. Be-

cause I don't think you will find that in the end...the opportunity costs to the university are smaller here than they are at many ivy league schools. That's just true.

Hain: No, I agree with you on many problems. But I actually think there is a case to disagree with Weintraub. I mean something's got to break, sometime; the bubble will burst. The question is when and how. If you invest heavily in it and it bursts we might be in a bad situation. It may be prudent to slow things down a little bit.

Burian: I'd like to make a couple of comments. I'm not a mathematician or an economist and I'm certainly not a jock. [laughter] But, I do have something



to say about the Strategic Plan...first of all it seems to me in a way this is not a strategic plan. This says we want to do everything and we need lots more money. There are no financials here. It is very interesting to hear the conversation about money, because finances of the athletic program are one of the great state secrets of this university. I was on a committee which looked at the athletic budget. I've been on lots of such committees over a number of years and this is the only time we were sworn to secrecy before the documents were distributed. I will, needless to say, not betray any secrets here.

What the report suggests is, instead of a tax just on Arts and Science and Engineering as the home of the people who really most benefit from the athletic program, the word has gone out the whole university should be taxed. It suggests that Deans should be encouraged to direct money toward athletics differentially.

It talks about a partnership between faculty and the athletics program, but it's a partnership that it seems to me like everything else in this report premised on the exception that everything that has happened out there in the world of athletics – NCAA other universities and so on – has to happen here. We have to have recruitment that makes earlier admission possible. We have to have more exceptions toward various standards. We have to find increasing para-academic roles, special tutoring, that offers no resistance to outrageous demands on athletes' time at the expense of their studies.

All these things, remind me, don't promote a partnership with the academic side. They are designed specifically to benefit the athletic program as it is, and this new and even better more-expensive version.

Football is the really interesting case, because it's treated so paradoxically in this document. The problem with the athletic program is that the football program doesn't win, doesn't bring the revenue we need. So let's spend a lot of money improving facilities.

The generous and wonderful Spike Yoh gave us a \$20M football building. That was going to change everything and it changed exactly...what we know. It's not clear to me that the facilities is the answer to that problem at all.

My own feeling, and I was especially struck (I actually read this report!), I was struck by a moment in which we said, let me find the right phrase, that only...of all the top US News and World Report universities...of all the top universities in that report, only Duke and Stanford had 1A division football programs. The question nowhere raised is whether maybe all those other universities know something that we don't.

It seems to me at least it ought to be possible to open up the question of what sort of football program suits this university best. I have been told that you can't be in the ACC if you don't have a Div. 1 football program. So be it. It beggars belief that the university's basketball program could not find an appropriate home or even create one. So, what bothers me, I guess, and one reason that –I hope Paula that this discussion could be continued – is that rather than open up all the important and interesting questions that the athletic program raises this document closes them down from the beginning and says things are the way they should be only not enough of them.

Kennedy: Neither am I the best person to talk about finances since I'm a medievalist by training. And the only medievalist who is running an athletic program. [laughter]

President Brodhead: I wonder if you would permit me to say a few words about this, since I have lived my life as a faculty member at faculty meetings I find it extremely hard not to talk at them. But, also



this is a matter that falls to the President's responsibility in some special way.

I would be quite disappointed to be at a university at which a subject as interesting and complicated as this did not generate intelligent discussion from multiple points of view. It is not the case that any of these questions are trivially easy and so there should be discussion. This report came to this body a meeting ago and there wasn't much discussion. I actually found today's experience much more interesting and reassuring than the one that took place at that time.

I only want to say that these are questions that require the attention of the administration and the faculty and the athletic department in an absolutely continuing way, whatever is decided or not decided today. And I would only make a couple of points on the other side of the ledger.

While expressing my great respect to Dick and Orin for your seriousness of purpose. You know I have spent my life caring about education and caring specifically about undergraduate education in the domain where athletics is typically located in college. And I've learned some things that were not entirely obvious to me in my own youth.

One of them is that athletics actually does have an educational dimension to it that is not obviously to everyone with a Ph.D. in English. There are things that are learned from the experience of athletics. You know I know maybe 8,000 graduates of this place. When people tell you what they learned here, it's a combination of things that happened to them working together through a strange alchemy that produces the result of education. And so the notion that you could subtract...I'm not saying that's a reason to overstate the role of athletics, but it is also very easy to understate the role of athletics as an educational proposition. If the notion is raised that college athletes spent way more time on their sport than they used to that I believe is factually true. But that is not something that differentiates Duke from other highly competitively sports universities or from other universities. The presidents of the Ivy League adopted a rule that every sport had to have no formal requirements of athletic participation for an 8 week period for each of its sports. This was found not to increase the number of people who went to ballet, concerts or lectures on phenomenology, but rather to cause informal practice in self-discipline to take exactly the same amount of time in students' lives as the other.

This is not a fact that is easy for us or anyone else to get a hold of. It's part of the rise of standards, the culture of perfectionism – which has pluses and minuses to be sure it has minuses – so these are problems we like everyone need to work at. But they are not problems that are simple on solution or on which we are peculiarly on the wrong course.

As for the finances, I'll only say a couple of things. Chris made an important point. The goal of this plan is not to spend a great deal more money on athletics. The goal of this plan is in the short term to put more sensible fiscal support under commitments that this university is already liable for every year.

And then in the middle and long term to try to raise a better form of long-term support namely by putting endowment under the commitment that typically flows out of annual funds, especially for the support of athletic scholarships.

If we could do that I promise you this would be a great thing not for athletics but for the whole rest of the university.

And please remember the university at this moment is not only committing to do more about athletics. It's committing to do more about a whole range of other things. When I go to plans about New Campus and talk about arts facilities, performance facilities...I think we all want a campus where every form of engagement gets maximum opportunity and maximum enticement. And athletics being one of many and I think that's a proposition that Chris and others would agree to.

I guess I'll only say one last thing. Together with some others I have had a part in raising \$270M for financial aid in this university for every school here. The notion that we could have raised that money at the same time that we had decided to downgrade our athletic program in some serious way – I promise you I

would wager that we not have raised half that much money. The different values of the university are mutually supportive in ways that are very hard to analyze and very easy to get wrong. But I'll tell you that I don't want any value to get way out of whack with any other. But it seems to me that one needs simply to face that dimension of things, which is when people love this university they love many things. And if people give us money that can be used on Classics because they love basketball you know what, some part of me finds that a fact I could live with.

Burian: I'm all for it.

McClain: We're at the end of our meeting time. What I'm going to do is we're going to hold this over until the May 8 meeting. I want everybody to read the plan, look at the charge that Dick had and we'll come back to this. This will be on the agenda again for the May 8 meeting. Thank you we are now adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, May 3, 2008