

Duke University

Durham
North Carolina
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

PHONE (919) 684-6447
FAX (919) 681-8606
EMAIL: ACOUNCIL@ACPUB.DUKE.EDU

April 18, 2002

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session from 3:45 - 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 18, 2002 in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Humanities) presiding.

MINUTES & ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** opened the meeting by asking for approval of the Minutes of the previous session, i.e. March 21, 2002. They were **approved** by acclamation as submitted.

Since this was the first meeting of the Council elected for the academic year 2002-2003, Professor **Burian** welcomed the new members of this Council and, for their benefit, he wanted to remind people of a few Academic Council basics. For Council addresses, phone numbers and e-mail, he referred everyone to the letterhead used for the agenda.

He then introduced his colleagues seated at the front table: Tilo **Alt**, the Faculty Secretary through the May meeting, and Linda **Lehman**, the Council's indispensable staff person, who was keeping everyone organized and on track. Linda also staffed the Council's housing list, where Duke people who had or needed property for rent or sale could turn for help.

Since no convenient room was to be had, it was not possible to arrange for a brief orientation for new members directly before the first meeting of the new Council. If there was interest after today's meeting for some explanation of the Council's structure, functions, and procedures, such an orientation could be held for 15 minutes or so before the May 9th meeting which was after classes and exams and therefore could be held in 139 Social Science with no problem. He also reminded people to initial the attendance sheets that were passed around at each meeting. Council bylaws required that attendance be taken to determine whether or not three consecutive absences were unexcused or not. If people knew in advance that they would be unable to attend, they needed to inform the Council office. Otherwise three unexcused absences would lead to the replacement of the member by an alternate.

Finally, he wanted to remind members of a custom that seemed to have gone into hibernation but that the Chair would gladly awaken on demand. In past years, both the President and Provost had

kindly agreed to answer questions on any topic of current interest sent in writing to the Academic Council office by a member of the faculty. By resolution of the Council, the question would be circulated with the agenda of the earliest possible meeting at which the officer addressed would be able to provide an answer. It would remain anonymous unless the questioner desired to be identified. Council office would forward them to the appropriate office and see that they were put on the Council agenda.

By extension of the announcements, the **Chair** wanted to take a moment to introduce to the Council a new and important member of the Duke community. Tracy **Futhey** had been appointed Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer at Duke University last February. She was responsible for the strategic evolution of the university's information technology infrastructure and directed the allocation and effective use of computing resources in support of campus programs. As most of you know in our 2001 strategic plan, Duke identified information technology as one of its major goals. The Chief Information Officer was the person designated to provide the leadership for achieving that goal. Tracy Futhey held a B.S. in mathematics with a computer science concentration and a M.S. in industrial administration, both from Carnegie Mellon University. Prior to coming here, Tracy had spent 17 years at Carnegie Mellon in a variety of information technology positions, ranging from computer consultant in the early years to CIO in the later years. Much of her recent work in that role had revolved around deploying and facilitating projects in wireless networks and mobile computing. These projects were the result of collaborative efforts with faculty, and that was the strategy which she hoped to employ as well here at Duke. He invited her to come to the podium and say a few words.

Tracy **Futhey** said she had been at Duke for two months and that President Keohane had told her that spring would come early, but she had neglected to tell her that it would last only two days before the onset of summer. (Laughter) The technology business was similar in that one needed to ask the right questions, otherwise one might not get the whole story. She had already met quite a few people and she was ready to move on to formulating some plans for how she thought technology might be able to help support the academic mission. As Peter had mentioned, historically, she had focused a lot on working with faculty to find ways in which their research might have interesting applications beyond it into the classroom and into the computing infrastructure. So she hoped to use that strategy here as well and ask any of the members if they had thoughts about how that might occur and she invited everyone to relay that to her. With that she excused herself as she had to attend another meeting which had been called by ITAC.

The **Chair** now called the meeting into **executive session** in order to consider honorary degrees.

ECAC ELECTIONS

Having gone back into open session, the **Chair** turned to the matter of the election of four new members of the Academic Council Executive Committee (ECAC).

Before circulating the ballots, he wished to say a word of thanks to the stalwarts who would be completing their terms at the end of the academic year: Rob **Clark**, Prasad **Kasibhatla**, Rich **Schmalbeck** and Doug **Tyler**. All of them had contributed in special ways. All of them had brought particular expertise and shared breadth of interest and dedication to the university and to faculty governance. Last year they had said farewell to four women who he had called the four graces of ECAC and he supposed, as a matter of equity, he should say they were now losing their four musketeers. At this time, three members were to be elected to serve regular two-year terms and one member for a single year. The bylaws of the Council prescribed that ECAC prepare a double slate of candidates, that is, two for each open position. Hence, there were eight candidates. He would also remind Council that the bylaws stipulated that the chair had to call for nominations from the floor, but that nominations had to be for a full slate and candidates had to be willing to serve. He commented that he didn't think there would be any such nominations when none were forthcoming, (laughing) He then asked the nominees to stand. For a one year-term he introduced Richard DiGiulio of the Nicholas School and Ann Marie **Pendergast** from Pharmacology and Cancer Biology. For two-year terms, he introduced Jennifer **Francis** from Fuqu and Paul **Haagen** from the Law School. The next pair was Michele **Longino** from Romance Studies and Kenneth **Surin** from the Program in Literature, and finally Kenneth **Hall** from Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science and Barry **Myers** of Biomedical Engineering. He asked the tellers to distribute the ballots and to report back at a later point in the meeting.

PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPOSITION OF HARASSMENT GRIEVANCE BOARD

The **Chair** said that they were now ready to turn to the main items of presentation and discussion of the agenda, namely the proposed change to the composition of the Harassment Grievance Board. This had come before Council partly because the precise formulation of this policy was in the Faculty Handbook and substantive changes had to be approved by this Council. Cynthia Clinton, the Director of Harassment Prevention in the Office of Institutional Equity, was present. Sally Dickson, Vice President for Institutional Equity, was also present if any questions arose.

Cynthia **Clinton** started by presenting a brief overview of how harassment complaints were handled when they came to their office so that Council could understand how the harassment grievance board was implicated. Harassment complaints could be submitted to their office in two ways. The first and by far the most frequent way in

which harassment complaints were handled was the informal process. That basically meant that when someone came to them with a complaint their office worked with the department, unit or the school to try to resolve it in an informal manner. It did not necessitate and certainly didn't require any sort of hearing panel at any point to hear the complaint and decide whether or not the harassment policy had been violated. Although the complaint was handled through informal means, that did not diminish the significance of the complaint or the types of resolutions or corrective actions that may eventually be implemented because of the complaint. This is how 99.99% of complaints that came into their office were handled. The second way that the harassment complaint could be submitted was through a formal complaint of harassment and there were very specific procedures for handling a formal complaint that were set out in the harassment policy. This was where the Harassment Grievance Board came into place, because when a formal complaint of harassment was filed, a specific process would be followed. First, mediation was attempted and failing that then there would be a hearing. The HGB or the Harassment Grievance Board served as a pool of people from which her office drew individuals to serve on these hearing panels. With respect to those situations where a faculty member was either a complainant or the respondent, part of the hearing panel would be made up of faculty members. As the policy now stood, the HGB represented a pool of people from which members were drawn to serve on the panel. The HGB was made up of ten faculty members. The proposal called for a reduction to six faculty members for several reasons. One was that they had had no more than two formal complaints that had gone to a hearing in the past six or seven years, and they didn't expect any significant increase in the number of formal harassment complaints. The second was that there were several challenges and there had been several difficulties related to composing or constituting the board with ten faculty members and even more challenges related to trying to bring all of those people together on a fairly consistent basis for training, for meetings, for orientations of the harassment policy. The group of thirty people constituting the HGB as it stood now, consisted of ten faculty members, ten non-faculty staff, and ten students. It had been fairly unwieldy and not as manageable as a smaller group might be. So they were proposing that the number of faculty members, the number of students and the number of non-faculty members be reduced so that the entire board was now eighteen instead of thirty.

Presently, when both the complainant and the respondent (person accused of harassment) were faculty members, the hearing panel should be composed of five faculty members. As of academic year 2002-03 this would be reduced to three faculty members. This would bring the number in line with all the other provisions of the policy. No compelling reason existed for the current number which was based solely on the fact that both parties were on the faculty. They didn't expect an increase in the number of formal harassment complaints. Moreover, it was very difficult and very challenging

to get five faculty members to agree to serve on a hearing panel. From their experience, three faculty members would be sufficient to decide a complaint and its resolution and recommendations. She would answer questions.

Professor Robert **Mosteller** (Law) didn't think material had been sent out about the change on the hearing panel from five to three. He had raised that with ECAC and wondered if that was a wise decision. If faculty weren't involved then they always had five members. As it stood right now it would be five voting members and if it were changed apparently to three voting members it would go against a preference for five rather than three expressed in the policy except for good cause shown. He just wondered whether this was really something where the tail was wagging the dog or whether they really wanted to change this.

His interlocutor replied that they had talked about this in her office. A five member panel hearing a complaint involving two faculty members would have only three members having a vote, namely the three members of the faculty serving on the panel. So in this case, where both parties were faculty members, again only three faculty members would vote on the harassment complaint.

The **Chair** commented that in his judgment this was a modest change which did not invoke the two meeting rule. He was, of course, willing to defer it if there were those who wished to think further about it, but if not he would appreciate a motion to accept this change.

A brief discussion followed, mainly centering on the point that nobody had received the proposed language of the change in advance. In addition, the issue of a gender imbalance was raised in the case of a three person panel, whereupon Sally **Dickson** suggested that a vote on the proposal be postponed to give everyone a chance to consider the two points in advance of the next meeting. This was acceptable to the **Chair** who also assured another questioner that Council members would receive all of the relevant documents in their packet, including the full harassment policy. During the discussion Cynthia **Clinton** also answered a question regarding the number of votes required to get a finding of harassment. It would be a majority (three of five) and the panelists may come together with a combined report that was submitted from the entire panel.

ECAC ELECTION RESULTS

The **Chair** announced the election results that had been handed him by the ballot counters. Ann Marie **Pendergast** had been elected to a one-year term and Paul **Haagen**, Michele **Longino** and Barry **Myers** to regular two-year terms. He congratulated them and asked them "to stick around" for a few minutes after the meeting so he could begin to reveal to them and tell them the truth of what they had gotten themselves into. (Laughing) In a more serious vein, he assured them

that they would find it an interesting and rewarding office which included learning about how this university really worked. He also expressed his appreciation and that of the Council to the other candidates for what was a very close election. These people too had given Council a strong and tangible expression of their willingness to serve the university and its faculty governance and he could assure them that they would not be forgotten. (Clapping)

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF & PH.D. PROGRAM IN MOLECULAR GENETICS &
MICROBIOLOGY

Professor **Burian** next turned to the "two main courses" of the agenda, beginning with a proposal to create a department of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology as well as a doctoral program in it and the presenters were listed as Joe Corless, Vice Dean of Faculty & Academic Affairs, Jack Keene, Chair of the Department of Microbiology and Joe Nevins, Chair of the Department of Genetics.

Dean **Corless** began by stating that his team in the last three years in the medical school had developed a proposal that had emerged from a process two years old. They started back in early 1999 with an effort to try to see how the general representation of microbial pathogenesis within the School of Medicine might be accomplished. A departmental review for microbiology had been done in March of 1999 and one of the issues that came to the fore was one hole that stood out very strongly, namely the absence of microbial pathogenesis within their system. A similar issue had been raised in the Immunology review and then Dean Edward Holmes in December of 99 appointed a task force to see how microbial pathogenesis at Duke might best be dealt with and that task force interviewed everyone at the university who was involved in pathogenesis of any sort especially colleagues in the Department of Medicine, those both within the Medical Center proper and over at the VA, all the faculty in microbiology in this area as well as absolutely significant faculty with secondary appointments for example in pathology and also biochemistry. The result of this culminated in the recommendation that a major increase in faculty in this area was needed, somewhere between four and six faculty (two senior faculty and two junior faculty) that it should be based in a basic science department. That was a fairly strong feeling both of the basic science faculty on the committee as well as the clinical science faculty, many coming from the Department of Medicine and also pediatric infectious disease and that was where matters stood at that point. At the same time a review of the Genetics Department was begun which coincided with the time when Genetics was developing a description of itself and one of the issues that had come forward was that the Department of Genetics had a very strong presence in the area of fungal pathogenesis. So if one thought of the different types of microorganisms, there were fungi and viruses with bacteria that would cover most of them. So, already at this point there was some issue of what fusion might exist. Through the presentation of these reviews at the Academic

Priorities Committee that group kept coming back to the issue of how microbial pathogenesis was handled at Duke and what they planned to do about it. So, as a result of these efforts and also because of the intervening developments in the area of genomics and genetics in the past three years that have occurred since this process began, a very strong sense evolved that there would be an excellent conjunction of expertise in these areas. There were three main points to talk about in the "rationale." One was to build on current expertise not only the fungal expertise in fungal pathogenesis within genetics, but also on strength in some of the faculty in microbiology and in viral pathogenesis in both departments. So this would be an excellent incubator in which to develop additional bacterial pathogenic studies. It would also offer an opportunity to synergize future studies in microbial pathogenesis with programs in genetics and genomics and to synergize already common intellectual ground of the two faculties, particularly in virology, fungal pathogenesis, and RNA biology. By way of a little bit of history, he said that back around 1989 they had originally started with a combined Department of Immunology and Microbiology. Then that divided to create a Department of Microbiology and a Department of Immunology. At that point, many of the faculty in Microbiology had very strong ties [with Immunology?]. There was more coherence within the topical matters that were within Immunology as opposed to the coherence and the topical matters within Microbiology. To add to that further, in 1994 two key faculty from the Microbiology Department, Dr. Joe Nevins and Dr. Bryan Cullen were tapped to move over and start a new Department of Genetics. Joe Nevins took on the chair of that particular initiative and had grown that department very well. So the faculty that were involved in this process were faculty for the most part who had been working with one another collegially in a number of ways for many years. The new department would be made up of fifteen tenure-track primary faculty (nine from Genetics, six from Microbiology) to which they intended to add about nine more faculty to get themselves up to a very strong critical mass in this area. There would be forty-three graduate students (twenty-five from Genetics, eighteen from Microbiology) and fifty-two postdoctoral fellows (thirty-one from Genetics, twenty-one from Microbiology); this would be a self-sustaining critical mass within this area. Any of these areas were vibrant and promising. – Some financial facts were that about \$8.9 M of sponsored research (annual direct costs) would be available right now (7.1M from, Genetics, 1.8M from Microbiology). This had decreased recently due to the departures of faculty to other institutions as well as transfers to other departments within their own institution. Nevertheless, it was still a very sizable amount. There would be \$3.5M in pending support from other sources and \$430K from the Viral Oncology Training grant for which the PI was Dr. Nevins in genetics.

With regard to overall plans for growth and development it was envisioned that Dr. Nevins would serve as the chair of this new

combined department. A major focus would be in the creation of research centers which he would take over and explain a little bit in more detail. They were planning to recruit nine new faculty in these areas: microbial pathogenesis, virology, and genetic systems and develop and expand the Ph.D. program. This expanded Ph.D. program would be evolving from the program that currently existed within the Department of Microbiology. They had a good Ph.D. program there that, in fact, quite a number of the students who were in the Genetics Department had entered through the Ph.D. program in Microbiology.

Another point was that this faculty had already been working together for several years, about three years, in doing a joint recruitment of students for microbiology and genetics. One of the issues in the Department of Genetics had been that it had not had its own Ph.D. program. There were some concerns initially that the University Program in Genetics might be adversely impacted by having a department with that title as well. He thought that this may be something to be concerned about, but it had not seemed to have an adverse effect on the University Program concerning recruitment and at the meeting with the Academic Priorities Committee, Dean Siegel had announced that there would be a 50% increase in the number of slots available for the University Program in Genetics. So maybe they would have a good impact, not an adverse effect.

Concerning the research centers to be created, Joe would talk about those a little bit more. He then invited Dr. Joe Nevins to come up and continue the discussion and presentation.

Joe **Nevins** promised to make it brief. He wanted to add to the first presentation that three years had passed since the time the task force had reviewed the situation in microbial pathogenesis. Part of the issue they were facing right now was that there had been no action taken during that three year period. Part of that was due to the fact that during that period of time they had gone through two deans in the School of Medicine. Moreover, this was not one of the issues at the top of the priority list within the Medical Center. The new dean, Sandy Williams, had elevated it as such, viewed it as a very important priority to address, and so now they were in a situation where he thought they could effectively address it. But because of that delay, they had experienced a loss of faculty. They had experienced a situation where, particularly in the area of microbial pathogenesis, and specifically bacterial pathogenesis, the concentration of efforts had declined and it was really a critical issue, and it was a critical issue before the events that occurred this past fall that had heightened everyone's awareness of bioterrorism; that was not the reason for doing this, it was an illustration of its importance, but that certainly wasn't the driving force.

So, what they were doing with this was to create a new department that brought genetics and microbiology together in a way that could be very synergistic. It presented tremendous opportunities to develop programs, particularly in pathogenesis, that took full advantage of the merger and the interaction of bacteriology or other microorganisms and genetics, the ability to apply genomic technology that didn't exist four or five years ago and was now very real. One could address the genetic variation of the pathogen, one could address the genetic variation in the host, i.e. the patient, in a way that brought those two disciplines together very effectively. What they had decided to do in thinking about creating this now quite substantial department was to provide some organization that would effectively allow them to build these programs in a very focused and organized way, with the sense that, particularly in the area of microbial pathogenesis, there was a very strong need to carry out a very rapid, focused, and aggressive recruitment to build those areas up from where they were.

Assuming that this department concept went forward, the plan was to do it in the context of creating a series of programmatic centers. They were not meant to be divisions that had the connotation of an administrative organization, but rather programmatic focus, that would not only bring individuals together within this new department, but from other departments as well, in a way that could focus activities, take advantage of all the strength of the faculty in microbial pathogenesis and virology, for instance, as well as experimental genetic systems that could move forward to faculty recruitment, to provide opportunities for training grants, to provide opportunities for program project grants, and other types of funding opportunities that became available. That was particularly crucial around the area of microbial pathogenesis since there would be exceedingly rich opportunities for funding because of the events of the last year in areas such as viral and bacterial pathogenesis. This gave them the opportunity to move forward in those ways, i.e. in an organized way, without creating an administrative structure that was rigid, that didn't allow for new growth. He and Joe Corless would take questions.

Professor David **Harpole** (Clinical Sciences-Medicine) asked how this would interact with the Genomics Institute. He just wanted to get an idea. His interlocutor replied that it fitted very closely from the standpoint that much of the initial genomics efforts that had gone on, the creation of a center for genome technology, was one of the five main centers of the Institute of Genome Sciences and Policy, that had grown out of efforts within the Department of Genetics. It wasn't that it was meant to be a Department of Genetics activity, that was just where the initiatives had come from. Part of the activities of that Genome Center was focused on genomic analysis of fungal pathogenesis. There was a very strong cryptococcus pathogenesis group that was within genetics and microbiology in Arts and Sciences biology and infectious disease. The genomics effort, the genome technology efforts, very much

impacted on that. There really was a major change compared to even three or four years ago, where now one could consider almost routine the ability to sequence the genome of another pathogen, or find the differences in clinical isolates that conferred pathogenicity. It was feasible now, just as it was almost feasible to consider finding the genetic determinants in individuals that conferred susceptibility to infection, so, putting those two things together became very powerful, it was a very integral component.

Joe **Corless** added that the idea of the centers here was to foster interdisciplinary components. If one looked at the more detailed information that was in the handout, one could see that, for example, in microbial pathogenesis, there were a number of people from other departments as well, such as Biology, and Chemistry, that did important research in this area as well as separate faculty in pharmacology and cancer biology that had taken specific types of yeasts and created entire libraries of these with genes deleted and control elements, that could control and turn on all of the genes for the entire organism. So, the Medical Center, in a sense, was poised to have many different information and experimental approaches [available] by collaborating with the Institute of Genome Sciences and Policy. He thought they were just going to have a particularly tight attachment to it because of Joe's involvement.

Professor John **York** (Basic Sciences) asked for an idea of what experimental genetics might mean and was told by Joe **Nevins** that given the focus on building programs in microbial pathogenesis, they didn't want to leave genetics behind. Where they saw opportunities in this enlarged department was really in genetics, model systems, particularly, that offered opportunities to study disease models or non-disease models that were relevant to pathways or phenotypes in certain senses of interest. He thought the best example was in the context of disease models. So, as an example, it would make tremendous sense to recruit an individual that was focusing on the use of the mouse or another model organism as a mechanism for studying bacterial pathogenesis and then marry that individual with someone that was studying the pathogenic organism in a way that they could be synergistic. They couldn't do everything in the world, one had to pick and choose, so one might as well do it in a thoughtful way that took advantage of other activities that were going on. So, experimental genetics would be focused in that manner, to take advantage of what else was going on and provide a synergy.

Joe **Corless** added that one of the issues in the external review was to look for more presence in the area of vertebrate genetics and he thought there would be a strong development of the mouse systems within that context. In addition, they had a strong leader, Doug Marchuk, who would be the proposed person to lead that center.

John **York** also wondered whether it was somewhat unusual to have

such a high concentration of centers within one particular department and whether this might dilute it too much and also whether there would be a director of each center. Joe **Nevins** answered in the affirmative regarding the last question. Concerning the other two, he replied that it was really just a matter of thinking 'what's important?' There was a real need to focus activities on microbial pathogenesis and secondarily to rebuild programs in virology. It represented the strength that existed in either the existing Department of Genetics or Microbiology so it was helpful to generate it that way. RNA biology was really more of a programmatic area where functioning activities were already going on that involved people in those two departments as well as a number of other departments. They didn't anticipate recruitments in that area, he didn't see any credible need to build that particular area, it was just programmatic, and experimental genetics really was a continuation of some of the focus that they had already had in genetics, but now with a view towards synergy with a broader department. He didn't believe there was any particular concern with 'it's too many, too few,' just as long as they made sense and as long as there was a reason for it.

Joe **Corless** said that he'd like to just jump back a number of years to an earlier time when Basic Sciences in the Medical Center were struggling with how to reorganize themselves. They felt to some extent part of the molecular biology revolution had passed them by. There was also great growth in neurobiology and cell biology of for which they couldn't configure properly, and couldn't move very effectively. They came up with the idea of organizing themselves into separate sections which after five years they would decide if they were viable or should be merged back into another department. So rather than go that route again, they had thought that the center approach was more flexible and gave them greater agility. Also, in putting together the brochure for their Medical Center spring faculty meeting at the end of the month, they just included a listing of the different centers, they had something like 40; there were clearly ten major ones they had added, among others a liver center and a thrombosis center. Again, they had a programmatic focus to reflect the same kind of idea. He thought this would give them the interdisciplinary flex.

The **Chair** thought that Council was ready to broach specifically the Ph.D. program and the speaker continued with his presentation saying that the Ph.D. program was really just a natural consequence or continuation of this same discussion that there was and had been an existing Ph.D. program in microbiology. The proposal here was really just to continue that in the context of this expanded department of molecular genetics and microbiology. The main support for that graduate program had been a training grant in viral oncology, that he had been the PI of for some eight or seven years. It was quite a viable training program, but again, with the decline in faculty in microbiology, it had been more and more difficult to have the critical mass of faculty to serve as mentors

for students, so this change with a focus in recruitment in virology would improve on that. Their plan would be then very soon to look for opportunities for training grants, particularly in microbial pathogenesis to support activities in that area. Joe had mentioned the fact that this was in the context of the University Program in Genetics which for a long time had been a very strong and vibrant group on campus that went from the Medical Center, through Arts and Sciences. At the time the genetics department was being formed, the University Program in Genetics changed to become an admitting program and a degree granting program, and the decision was made at the time for the Department of Genetics to just combine efforts with the University Program so as not to create a conflicting situation or a confusing situation for students. What this graduate program would do, he believed, would allow them to enhance the activities in those areas, really apart from strict genetics, allow the University Program in Genetics to continue to flourish, and he hoped the two would be synergistic with one another. There had been an influx of additional support for positions in the University Program in Genetics to allow it to grow further. But the intent here was definitely for those two programs to operate side by side, non-competitively and, he hoped, in a synergistic way.

Professor Blanche **Capel** (Basic Sciences) asked if they intended to share applicants of the two programs in the sense that they would circulate applications and choose the best program. Joe **Nevins** responded that number one the answer was 'yes,' and the mechanism was mostly formal. As long as there was good communication amongst the admissions committees of the genetics program. And it didn't just stop there, it went to the cell and molecular biology program as well; because of the nature of these disciplines there was a lot of overlap in students' interests, and sometimes a student fits better into one area than another. If that made the most sense, it was the best way to most effectively use the slots available, and the student was happy to do that when it made sense. The best mechanism to make sure it worked was good communication. So far that had been the case.

Since there were no further questions, Professor **Burian** thanked both Joes for their presentation. He said that if approved by the Council, this proposal was expected to go to the Trustees in May, hence it would be brought back for a vote. He thought that ECAC would propose a motion that included both the emerging department and the approval of this Ph.D. program. There could be further discussion next time, but there would then be a vote on the proposals.

PH.D. PROGRAM IN BIOINFORMATICS & GENOME TECHNOLOGY

He went on to say that there was one further proposal which was similarly to go to the Trustees in May, so he asked people's indulgence for a little longer while they heard about the proposed

Ph.D. program in bioinformatics and genome technology. This involved, again, Professor Nevins and also Professor Siedow.

Vice Provost James **Siedow** said that given the lateness of the hour and the fact that the document that members had before them spelled out the dimensions of the program, he would try to be brief, although everybody said that and then went on forever. (Laughter)

Basically, the Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, CB squared, which was what he was the interim director of, and the Center for Genome Technology, which Joe Nevins was the director of, were two of the five centers that got developed two and a half years ago with the development of their initiative in genomics. At the time, with CB squared, as they were calling the Bioinformatics Center, the goal was to hire a permanent director. The Provost had said that he only had to serve a year and basically they were in a little bit of a holding pattern, because they didn't want to get too far out in front of bringing a director on board. One thing that became obvious right after the outset was that they really needed to develop a graduate program, because there was a huge demand for graduate students to be trained in this burgeoning field of bioinformatics, even though that field itself was very broad and not all that well defined all the time. They felt that was something they could do. As the 'CB squared' steering committee began to talk about this, it became readily apparent that to try to set up a bioinformatics program without incorporating genome technology was simply going to be a mistake, and it was one of the things that they could do at Duke that would set them apart from some of the new bioinformatics programs that were beginning to appear elsewhere that seemed to be linked very closely with the biology departments giving them a smattering of computational science, and in some instances didn't seem to be too connected to the technology at all. So they thought that with their two centers here, and the fact that it was felt Joe didn't have enough to do (laughter), they decided they could put these two things together and came up last year with a certificate program in Bioinformatics and Genome Technology, with the idea this year, of putting together a full-fledged Ph.D. program. That process got started last summer. This was an extremely broad interdisciplinary topic. They were really getting together computational people and biological people that often times had not talked to each other too much in the past, and had radically different cultures. As a result of that they had run into a pothole or two along the way, but in the end had come up with a proposal that made sure that both the biological side and computational side were balanced.

The two obvious questions that he would just answer up front were whether number one this overlapped with anything that Duke currently had and the answer was 'no' because unlike a large number of graduate programs that had come up, one simply ramped together a bunch of existing courses. Basically those had ten courses. They planned to have ten courses on the books next year, eight of them

didn't exist now. So they were really starting this from scratch. Duke really needed that because it didn't have existing courses in this area.

Finally, number two, concerning timing, in terms of supporting students, one of the reasons they would like to get this program approved now was to utilize the summer to begin to advertise the program, so that the summer could be used to write training grants, so that next year they would be in a position to advertise, recruit, and the year after next, fund the students entering the program. He would be happy to answer any questions and asked Joe Nevins if he had anything to add which was not the case.

In the absence of any questions, the **Chair** remarked that the presenter had apparently been very convincing. (Laughter). He reminded the audience that Council would meet one more time on May 9 to deal with the three main topics that had been discussed today. He assumed that the same people would be able to be present to answer any questions or add any further comments at that time.

Joe **Corless** asked members to e-mail them any particular questions people might have; that way they could prepare more details. The **Chair** thought this a very good idea and said that Jim Siedow was offering the same thing by a show of hands in the back of the room. So if people had questions or comments that they'd like fully treated, they should send e-mails, otherwise there would be opportunity for discussion here next time.

He then asked for and received a motion and a second to adjourn.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt
Faculty Secretary