

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

22 March, 2001

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on March 22, 2001 from 3:45 - 5:10 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies) presiding.

MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor **Burian** asked for and received a motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting of February 15, 2001. They were **approved** by voice vote and without dissent as submitted.

The **Chair** then bade farewell to the outgoing members of 2000-2001 Council. He thanked them on behalf of the Duke faculty and encouraged them to attend future Council meetings, to stay involved and to urge their colleagues, whenever topics interested them, to come and participate in the discussion too.

REELECTION OF THE FACULTY FORUM EDITOR

The **Chair** said that ECAC had asked the current editor, Professor Larry **Evans**, if he would be willing to accept nomination for a further two-year term in this office and he had said 'yes.' He then threw the floor open to other candidates who had likewise agreed to serve, if elected. There being none, he asked the Council to ratify the reelection of Professor Evans as Faculty Forum Editor. The motion having been made and seconded, the reelection of Professor **Evans** was subsequently **approved** by acclamation.

REPORT ON THE A.P.T. PROCESS

The **Chair** then announced a slight change in the agenda, namely that he would first turn to the report of the *Ad hoc* Committee on the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Process, in order to accommodate the Provost's busy schedule, thus enabling him before he had to leave to hear as much as possible of the discussion of this important report. While there was no motion on the floor, he expected ECAC to draft a resolution taking the day's discussion into account and to present it for consideration at the next meeting of the Council. He then invited Professor Peter **Holland**, Chair of the ad hoc committee, to present his report to Council.

Professor Peter **Holland** (Psych/Exp.) began by reading part of the

Provost's charge to the committee: "The APT process is the most important single component of our strategy to build an excellent faculty at the University. By the APT process, I intend the entire set of actions, including mentoring, review and evaluation by which we bring faculty from initial appointment through reappointment to the decision on tenure to promotion to Associate Professor and then to the subsequent possible promotion to Full Professor. This process is absolutely critical to build the best possible faculty."

The committee was charged with examining the standards, criteria, expectations, communications and procedures at every stage to be sure they were promoting excellence as well as with evaluating whether the process was as efficient as it could be, consistent with the goal of excellence. They concluded that the APT process was, in fact, promoting excellence but that it was not as efficient as it could be. Hence, their recommendations primarily concerned procedures. They considered the Duke APT process in detail, comparing it to that of a variety of other universities. They explored variations within Duke University across the schools. They were suggesting changes that would streamline the APT process without compromising consideration of intellectual issues. There were three points to be made about the streamlining: First of all it was felt that the recent preoccupation with procedural uniformity was not in fact justifiable by historical or legal precedents. The appeals process had not been driven by concern about the details of the dossier and whether the points were in a particular chronological order. Second, procedural details of process had been established by executive action and not by action of the Academic Council. They existed in guidelines and handouts etc. distributed by the Provost but they were not in the Faculty Handbook. Thus, many of their recommendations could in fact be implemented the same way by executive decree. At the same time, it would make sense that the Faculty Handbook descriptions of the APT process be as congruent as possible with actual practice. In addition to streamlining the process, they were also reaffirming the basic aspects of the multilevel decision making system that was central and more or less unique to Duke University. They had made fifteen recommendations which were listed at the end of the handouts including the rationale for each of the 15 recommendations. For instance, on page 6 one can find the explanation for why recommendation 1 was suggested. While Prof. Holland didn't want to read them to members, he wanted to describe their tenor. There were basically four sets of recommendations. The first set concerned pretenure matters: 'the mentoring and reappointment processes are fully as important as the tenure process itself.' If Duke wasn't giving its young faculty proper mentoring and proper feedback at a time of review, it was going to fail them at the time of the tenure decision. So their first set had to do with the pretenure aspects of faculty mentoring and review. There was great variation among schools in the university in these procedures. The second set of recommendations concerned

the deans' role in the APT process, especially the tenure decision. The last committee that reviewed this process, the Ascher committee in 1990, had essentially suggested that the Dean of Arts and Sciences be excluded from the decision-making-process and essentially what had happened since then was that many of the deans felt that if they were going to do this they had to stay out of it. So what his committee was suggesting was that the school deans should be actively involved in the tenure and promotion decisions and they should feel empowered to seek new information. Furthermore, some things may best be done by the dean. So, for example, in dealing with interdisciplinary issues, the dean's office may be the very best place to deal with these issues. They suggested a conduit directly from the candidate to the dean's office, because many people, in writing to them about interdisciplinary scholarship, were concerned that departments sometimes did not properly reflect the 'outside of the department interests' of their 'up for tenure' faculty member. A third set, the largest set of the recommendations, concerned operation of the APT Committee. We considered a lot of options ranging from the evolution of the APT Committee in replacement of it by a set of APT committees at the school level, much as the one run by Basic Sciences in the Medical Center, and then supplementing the APT Committee with this extra level of APT Committees. Instead, however, they ended up agreeing to keep the present arrangement, providing it would be simplified. Hence, they suggested a large number of simplifications in the procedures to be used by the APT Committee and a few changes in policy, including a compromise on the much maligned chairs ranking exercise. The final set of recommendations concerned modifications to the Faculty Handbook to reflect actual modifications and practice. These were, in fact, policy decisions that just sort of happened along the way and they should be reflected in the document. The first concerned the "up or out" policy which all seemed to know about but which did not seem to appear in the Faculty Handbook. The second had to do with standards for promotion to full professor which seemed to be in practice rather variable and not necessarily adhering to what could be seen in the Faculty Handbook. He concluded his overview by inviting questions.

In response to a question of clarification by Prof. Roxanne **Springer** (Natural Science) concerning recommendation 12 according to which multiple meetings on a given case should be eliminated, Prof. **Holland** replied that the recommendation reacted to complaints about wasting too many meetings on a given case. To clear up a misunderstanding (the questioner had thought that the recommendation was about interfaculty meetings of the departments), he added that the chronological order of the fifteen recommendations mimicked the different levels of the review process.

Professor Prasad **Kasibhatla** (NSEES) wanted to know if there were

any significant differences among the schools and between men and women in the statistics described on page 4 according to which 56% of the tenure track faculty actually achieved tenure reflecting a primary gatekeeping function of the departments. He also inquired about the reason for the absence of any faculty buffer between the school administration and the central administration regarding reappointments. In his response, Prof. **Holland** pointed out that the reappointment process was very different from school to school, and what they suggested was in fact reinvigoration of the reappointment process, because this was often where the decisions were actually made. They wanted to make sure that that decision was done with the most information. As to the statistical significance, he said that there was no statistical significance. This concerned a fairly small number of cases that essentially referred to Arts and Sciences. The other schools had a few cases here and there. He was unable to say what 56% of two or one would be. In terms of men and women there were very few women represented in this set to begin with so now they were talking about 56% of half.

Prof. Randy **Kramer** (NSEES) commended the committee for a very well done report and some interesting recommendations. He noticed that policies at some other schools had been examined and he wondered if he could share that information. Prof. **Holland** replied that the first thing they found out in the replies from other institutions was that each felt it had the only right way of doing it. Very few universities had ever changed their major methods of doing tenure evaluations mid-stream. Changes were evolutionary. For the most part, however, there was remarkable stability at least in the recollections of the people they contacted. Most places were satisfied with their system, and most places did not have a university level APT Committee with as much perceived weight as Duke's. That was what was so unusual about it. They had looked at a variety of schools but didn't see anything that was spectacular. Essentially they didn't see anything compelling to make them say they ought to scrap the current APT procedure or even to get rid of the university APT committee. As to the school level, each of the schools had various ways of doing it and they all seemed to be successful.

Prof. John **Baillie** (Medicine) wondered if he was correct in observing that this particular report didn't refer to the Medical Center APT process which was separate. Professor **Holland** replied that the Medical Center's Basic Science APT process was part of the university APT process after having first gone through the Medical School APT process. The questioner rephrased his question to ask what oversight there was of the process in the Medical School in clinical and basic sciences. Provost Lange interjected that he should direct his question to Chancellor Snyderman, because the Provost had no role in the clinical science APT process. He

didn't know of any regularized review of APT on the Medical Center side. If he wanted that he would think that the clinical chairs would be an appropriate place to bring up the issue. There was a body of clinical chairs that met on a regular basis. That might be an appropriate place or some other committee structure within the School of Medicine. Professor **Baillie** summed up by saying that there was no university oversight on the Chancellor of Health Affairs regarding-these matters. The **Provost** added "on the clinical side."

Prof. Barbara **Shaw** (Natural Sciences) said she had two questions. First, she evinced surprise at the existence of a 'up or out' policy and wanted to know if it had been implemented in recent years (the last five years). Apparently it was not in the Handbook.

Dean Lewis **Siegel** who was asked to respond said that people had come up early. He could not recall anybody who came up early that ultimately was denied tenure. He did remember that there had been a couple of people that they learned about who never quite made it to the committee or it was looked at very early and it seemed like the case wouldn't make it and the candidate was advised perhaps it was a good idea to withdraw. So it hadn't been tested.

Barbara **Shaw** added that what he was saying was that nobody had been denied a second chance. "Not in the last five years," the Dean responded, " but maybe in the last 10 years."

Barbara **Shaw** then asked her second question, namely if he could provide the reasons why he supported this policy.

Prof. **Holland** answered that what they were afraid of was that a department advised its candidate that he/she was a hotshot candidate, therefore, he/she would be put up for tenure early. But then it turned out that after the letters arrived that they were not as excited about it and the case was not as competitive as it might be the next year, and essentially the department ended up shooting itself in the foot. As to the reason why his committee supported the policy was that with a committee of six very few of the votes were unanimous. The idea simply was that they didn't want to have everyone going up two and three times, even if just for the extra administrative load. Departments should be able to have a good feel for when their candidates are ready. The departments should advise the candidate if whether or not he/she was ready for tenure. There was no point in trying to say that a promotion attempt should be made and if it didn't work then it should be tried again next year. He thought it should be up to the candidate and his or her chair to figure out the appropriate time. There were a couple of committee members present who had other impressions.

Professor Len **Spicer** (Radiology) as one of the dissenting committee members said that it had been a tradition in academia a long time, i.e. if an unequivocal decision could be made and it was clear, then it was in everybody's best interest to make it as soon as possible, particularly the candidate's, because one had to get on with one's career.

Barbara **Shaw** added that this would mean that the 'up or out' policy would include review at the departmental level. Right now, it didn't apply to the department level, only to the APT level.

The department didn't have to tell them if it didn't pass on the file, Len **Spicer** replied. Upon Prof. Shaw's question if that was the one chance a candidate had, the Provost commented that his interpretation was that unless the case came to APT committee, the 'up or out' rule did not apply. To clarify further, Prof. **Holland** explained that a department could send a folder to APT committee with the department's support, but if the vote was 7 to 6 it was not strong support and strong support at the next level may turn out to be less than strong support and may be rejection.

Dean **Siegel** added that he had seen in the last 10 years "waves"¹¹ on the campus by one or two departments that had decided that they were going to put cases forth and test the waters. It could be a true burden on the APT committee with cases that they really shouldn't be deciding at that point in time, but the idea came about in some departments because it was so unclear in the Handbook. It had been the general understanding of the committee that they were only to look at cases once; they would not be overwhelmed with multiple cases.

Professor Tom **Rowe** (Law) wanted to make a couple of points in connection with the up or out rule. He read it partly at least as a rule designed to create incentives for those thinking about candidates coming up early or a department deciding 'we're ready,' incentives that said 'let's be very careful about seeking early review.' What he would caution was that these incentives were fine when they worked. One had to foresee the cases when they didn't. In other words, when a department went ahead and said despite the up or out policy they thought this is a good one for early review and then they were surprised when they were turned down, they might still have a good candidate for tenure at Duke despite that happening. He didn't think it had to be entirely a yes or no on 'up or out,' because one could soften things by saying that there was a strong presumption of up or out. There might be occasional arguments for exceptions to what was otherwise stated as the general rule. And so he would say that even if the rule and incentives created by it may made perfect sense, he would caution them about putting it in terms that appeared to allow for no exceptions whatsoever, because if one did that, then one would have the case that tested the real meaning of 'no exceptions.'

Peter **Holland** observed that one could apply that argument at the normal time for tenure as well, i.e. in the 8th year.

Professor Rowe responded that they were focusing on a particular early review problem and there were some kinds of good arguments for exceptions and one could foresee the situation and perhaps in such a rare case one wanted to make an exception. They might want to write that into a rule rather than make the rule categorical.

Professor John **Aldrich** (Political Science) explained that there was a following step to denial which was the potential for appeal through the provost, and so if it was a compelling exception there was a procedure for it.

Tom **Rowe** felt that more work in the pipeline may change the picture, hence it was not just a matter of an appeal from the initial decision.

Professor Tina **Williams** (ECAC/Natural Sciences) added that she thought the rule seemed to be a disciplinary one partly because they said that the department ought to be the deciding factor about whether someone was ready to come up for promotion and that they could send out the letter and look around and check around. But when one put a candidate up one was essentially saying 'this is what we want.' So it seemed to her that it allowed a department to hold a faculty member who was perhaps too eager to come up early to be able to point to an up or out policy. She thought it was helpful to the process in many ways to be able to control a slightly over eager faculty member by saying 'well, we think you're going in the right direction, but let's wait until those things in the pipeline have come through.' She thought the rule was perhaps a useful one for the department, because it allowed them to not allow a faculty member to come up on their own.

Tom **Rowe** thought that the reason or the incentive for having some policy of this sort was that these were decisions made by fallible people who would occasionally make mistakes and he was not suggesting no up or out policy. He questioned only whether it could be stated in absolute terms rather than as a strong presumption that 'we're usually not going to listen to your second attempt.'

Dean **Siege 1** thought to put down formal ways of getting around rules presented a problem. This was actually easy as long as it was made clear. Part of this whole suggestion was to try to put something down that was both realistic as an incentive and as clear as one could make it and reasonable and that the ultimate decision is with the provost. There had been times when the Provost had said that there was potential here, there needed to be more time— not to increase the tenure clock. He would not make a decision for

another year, and instead would say, 'This is what you have to do before I will [review it] and make a final decision.' The rule was still there. It should not be a practice that was done routinely. It was always possible. With that it needed to be made clear where the buck stopped.

Professor Kalman **Bland** (Humanities) noted that of the three criteria for promotion to full professor, the evaluation of the service component (in addition to research and teaching) was not addressed at all. The report supported the evaluation of the three traditional areas for promotion to full professor as well as to lower ranks, but it did not address the details sufficiently. In a related question he asked about the dean's rankings that were based on reluctant departmental chair listings. He wondered if the dean's ranking collapsed the three categories into one one single score or did it treat each of the three categories, as separate numerical rankings. He didn't know much about this ranking list and would like some clarification.

Professor **Holland** explained that while the ranking system used to be oral and could be hidden and also could change from day to day and was done by the chair, there needed to be a more definitive way to do that. The idea was usually that the APT committee would ask the chair to say well, where did this person fit in your faculty's expertise in terms of their research and they gave a number that also included an overall number as well as one for teaching. It was a multifaceted number and usually it was the research and scholarship number they were most interested in but sometimes they were also very concerned with the other numbers, especially in cases of promotion to full professor. Chairs objected to this policy, especially when they had to write it down, thereby making it part of the permanent record. And so the committee actually had a lot of discussion of this particular issue, because they were evenly split on whether they thought it was a good idea or bad idea. What they ended up with was this grand compromise that maintained the idea that one could rank people and it may be multidimensional ranking or it may be unidimensional ranking, but nevertheless instead of forcing the chair to do it in writing, the chair would have to whisper to the dean and then the dean would have to do it in writing. That was the grand compromise. Now, what was the other issue, how to evaluate teaching and service? They noted that there had been a number of committees for the evaluation of teaching. He was on two committees for evaluating teaching under two different provosts. As far as he could tell nothing ever happened with the reports of either of them. There was another one they cited in their committee. He assumed something had happened from it, but the point was not a whole lot had happened in terms of changes in the way teaching was evaluated. The APT committee saw in most cases only the students' evaluation of course and teacher. The Medical Center often provided information about essentially peer review, because courses were team taught and one person may

actually listen to what all the other people did. So they said 'well, ok, we've been dealing with this process of trying to evaluate teaching better for years, that's not what our committee is about. We're working on the APT process.' Since it wasn't clear what would actually constitute service, they essentially did not discuss those issues.

Kalman **Bland** then asked if, therefore, regarding teaching, thought should be given to the point of how to help chairs whisper in the ears of the deans, how to define service, because something was being recommended which was not even easy to rate in vague terms.

The **Provost** explained that in teaching they actually were doing something; in Arts and Sciences at least they had increased the amount of information that was machine readable, which was to improve the process by making it at least possible to make systematic comparisons and they were getting cases where one person only taught small courses and another person taught very large lecture courses and basically right now what the committee was doing was to give a little extra credit to a person who got a little bit lower teaching evaluation but they were teaching courses of maybe 80-100 students. Readable forms were needed that allowed a little more systematic analysis. The other improvement he thought had been made with respect to teaching was that the department reports now provided a separate analysis of teaching and on occasion depending on the quality of the person during that second report, it may expand somewhat or a little bit more than somewhat beyond just the teaching evaluations. That depended he thought substantially on the quality of the person and attention that the person in the department gave to that section. He was now talking about cases of tenure. They didn't actually spend a lot of time on service for cases for tenure. It wasn't a heavily weighted category. It counted for much more on promotion to full professor, but he would talk about that next month when he would present his initial reactions.

Professor Craufurd **Goodwin** (Economics) expressed a certain unease with recommendation #12 whereby it could become possible to review a case in one meeting. Postponing a vote until the second meeting was a requirement which was employed by this Council and offered some sort of safeguard against having a vote when people were busy and tired and said this required serious reflection between two meetings. He wondered about the reason for this recommendation.

There were a couple of reasons that Professor **Holland** could recall. First was that APT committee members typically had read these dossiers in great detail and although it was true that the discussions were very important, when one was dealing with essentially a Nobel prize winner, for example, it was unlikely that one opinion was going to persuade one way or another. Essentially the idea was that one would use as many meetings as necessary. If

a case was a clear-cut yes there would be no need for multiple meetings. If a case was not a clear-cut yes, then there would be as many meetings as necessary.

In response to the question of what would happen in the case of a clear-cut no, he said that there was no such thing as a clear-cut no. They said a couple of [times] in the document that any time a decision looked like it might not be a 'yes' one began pulling in all the extra procedures. So one never short-circuited a potential no case.

Craufurd **Goodwin** asked if he would say that this only applied to a favorable vote.

Peter **Holland** replied that he could check the main text. He thought it was clear from the discussion on page 10 that a clear-cut yes was what was envisioned there.

Professor **Burian** interjected that as a point of information that in the case of meetings such as this where the rule is to vote only at a second meeting one could make exceptions precisely when there didn't seem to be any dispute.

Professor **Holland**: 'But with the important modification that's not clear in the recommendation (but clear in the text) that it is only in the case of a clear-cut yes.' Thus, for example, with the election of Larry Evans to be editor of the Faculty Forum, did that count or was it already discussed last time?'

Peter **Burian** replied that elections were different. They tried to do them as quickly as possible, preferably when candidates weren't actually in the room, [laughter] He thanked the presenter and turned to the preceding item on the agenda, the request of the Department of Psychology/ Experimental to change its name to the "Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences." As members could see from the material included in their packet this proposal had been vetted- and supported by the Academic Priorities Committee, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Provost. Final approval was vested, of course, in the Board of Trustees. In this case ECAC had drafted a resolution of support. He would now like to invite Professor Christina Williams, Chair of the department to offer her reflections on the proposed change.

Professor Tina **Williams** began by thanking various administrators for supporting and encouraging her department along the way. The name change was really a signal about a lot of other changes that her department was in the process of undergoing and would also signal what they wanted to do over the next few years. They had begun the process of rethinking their mission as part of a basic strategic planning initiative which they started well over a year ago and came up with the basics of the proposal or the outline of

the proposal that members had in hand. They were a department that started back in the 1980s as a unified Department of Psychology with the Department of Social and Health Sciences. In 1990 the unified departments split into two independent departments. Since that time since 1990 there had been talk and moves back and forth both to reunify the department and to alter the configurations of the departments. It was decided to take a very strong stand and tell the world who they were and what they represented and that was that they were a department that represented the psychological and brain sciences. They were a natural sciences department not a social science department. Their faculty did research in laboratories, they tested subjects, developed hypotheses and taught natural science courses. This was not unique to Duke, this issue of having a natural sciences department that represented psychological and brain sciences. Many departments across the country had moved to both changing their name and also using a name that reflected their orientation and strength. MIT did not have a department of psychology, they only had a department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences. Dartmouth had a department with the same name that they were choosing, Psychological and Brain Sciences. Louisville, Rutgers and Boston University had a department of Cognitive and Neural Sciences and there were other names that had been chosen such as Biology and Behavior and assorted others along the way. A number of departments were realizing that the neuroscience and behavioral end of the neural sciences was in fact rightfully a discipline in and of itself. Their hope as well was to utilize the increasing strength of the new Cognitive Neurosciences Center on campus which now had seven faculty members who were in their department. This proposal had in fact the endorsement of all the members of their faculty, including all of their colleagues in cognitive neurosciences. Because of a brain science symposium, they could not all be present today to show their support. What they planned to do in the future was to essentially focus on four areas of faculty strength and research strength that they already had represented in their department. To make sure that this represented the direction of faculty hires in the future, those were listed on a proposal that members had in front of them. They were also planning to start an undergraduate neuroscience major, essentially to upgrade their neuroscience certificate program into a major over the next year or so with the support and help of colleagues across the campus. They were also working with the Department of Neurobiology to think about ways to perhaps change or reorient Ph.D. training in the neurosciences across campus that may result in another proposal that would come before this body in the next year or so. Professor Williams emphasized that this was not a proposal that actually changed their relationship with their other psychology colleagues in the Department of Psychology/ Social and Health Sciences. They were not going to change their relationship with them in terms of running the undergraduate psychology major; in fact, over the last year they had developed graduate training in developmental

psychology that went across both of their two departments and the psychology department at UNC. Developmental psychology just happened to be a discipline that had both a natural science and a social science focus. All those folks went to the same meetings. They all published in the same journals.

Professor Timothy **Stenzel** (Pathology) pointed out that some of this seemed to be overlapping with neurobiology and wondered how they felt about this.

She responded that there was a statement from Dale Purves [Chair of the Dept. of Neurobiology] that certainly went to the Academic Priorities Committee and Dale was fully in support as were his faculty. The proposal had been presented to the entire faculty of that department. She didn't think this represented a conflict with the Department of Neurobiology which did cellular and molecular analysis. Psychology represented the system level and above, whereas Neurobiology was really at the system level and below, and so, in fact, they were good collaborators and many of their faculty and students were actively collaborating with folks in Neurobiology.

When it was pointed out that the letter was not part of the packet received by Council members, the **Chair** said that it could be included with the minutes of the meeting.

Responding to a request to clarify the existence of a Duke Psychology department, Professor **Williams** replied that there wasn't a Department of Psychology at Duke University. There were two departments, one called Department of Psychology: Experimental and another one called Department of Psychology: Social and Health Sciences. Both resided within Trinity College. The number of faculty involved was approximately 17 and she wasn't sure about the count in the other department but thought it was about 15 [Dean Chafe interjected that it was 13]. She confirmed that the name change was a request coming from 17 faculty members.

VOTE ON NAME CHANGE REQUEST BY DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY:
EXPERIMENTAL

The **Chair** now asked if it might be appropriate to suspend the two meeting rule and vote on the name change resolution at this point in the absence of any further discussion. After a brief discussion revolving around the point of not having heard from the Department of Neurobiology and the other departments affected by the name change and after assurances from Dean Chafe that he had seen the letters from the departments concerned which were in support of the name change and after the point was made that at the next meeting new Council members would be seated who were unfamiliar with the discussion and after Professor Stenzel's comment that he would be fine with a vote now as long as those letters would be attached to

the minutes, it was decided to proceed with a vote on the resolution before Council.

The **Chair** then referred everyone to the text of the resolution before them whereby the Academic Council was endorsing the request that the Department of Psychology: Experimental be renamed the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences. Since this was an ECAC resolution, it didn't require a second. The motion **passed** unanimously by acclamation.

REPORT ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AT DUKE

As the final item of business, Professor **Burian** introduced Betty Leydon, the outgoing Vice Provost for Information Technology. After expressing his regret that Betty Leydon would soon be leaving Duke for Princeton, he praised her accomplishments, saying that she gave Duke OIT, and with it the first rational central management of technology at Duke. She gave the university the energy and confidence that permitted it to confront its most pressing technological needs. ECAC had asked Betty to report to the Council long before anyone knew that she would be leaving Duke. Given that circumstance, it was thought to be all the more appropriate that she gave Council an overview of where Duke stood and what still had to be done.

Betty **Leydon** thanked the Chair for his kind words and stressed that she would be brief. When she came to Duke in October 1994 the university had realized that it needed to do something about information technology and so they had agreed to bring together six separate organizations to form a new organization centrally, and it was her job to try to figure out how to make that organization work as a whole. Also, the senior leadership was in flux at that time. There was no infrastructure to speak of in terms of technology. The network was not in place at that time. Pieces of it were, but it was not totally in place. Student access to computing was minimal. The clusters were filled with outdated machines and everyone was very unhappy about that. There were probably 20 plus e-mail systems so that it was impossible to communicate easily with colleagues. Duke's administrative systems were very old systems that were completely out of date. Everything was pretty fragmented around campus. So really it was a pretty easy job in a lot of ways because it was ready to be organized a little bit and then move forward. Another problem that existed was that there was no cooperation with the Health System which was at the time called the Medical Center; it was completely separate and had not really done anything in terms of collaborative information technology at all, because previous people in similar roles had really not gotten along with the people over there. There was a sound information technology infrastructure right now. A couple of years ago, OIT won the award from Educause (which is a national organization of information technology) for the best network in the country so

there was a really good network in place. There were very good high speed connections to the internet and even to Internet II and Duke actually served as a test bed for the Internet II organization "UK." The end user however hadn't seen the difference yet. With the PeopleSoft system for student management and the SAP system for financial management eventually everyone should have access on their desktop to the information that they needed. There was also a Center for Instructional Technology, which was just an idea when she first came here, with a Director of Instructional Technology so they had begun to provide some support for faculty to use technology in their teaching and learning. Duke had numerous committees and councils. The **Chair** had mentioned ITAC that worked to help spread the word about technology, to get input, to channel ideas back to the central organization, to hear complaints, etc. The things they still needed to work on were balancing central support services with the services in the schools and departments. She thought they constantly needed to work at coordinating IT initiatives. For example, coming along were things related to the Web, things related to security. Another area of importance was identifying the true costs of computing. That included all the support and maintenance that went on after the actual purchase of the item. Support and training were integral and essential parts to the technology costs. The cost of computing was always going to be competing against the other priorities of the institution. Faculty had to help the central organization fight for those dollars. The technologies were coming together which meant that anything that was done from now on was going to affect everyone. The PeopleSoft system, for example, was used by faculty for advising and by students for registering.

ITAC was a mechanism for making decisions and having input in those decisions, but faculty needed to support that council and be active in getting their ideas to their representatives. Leydon thought preserving a positive working relationship with the health system was extremely important. It took a long time to develop that, but right now they were very much intertwined with everything that happened in the health system. They had a single network infrastructure and Landen Bain, the CIO of the Health System, and she worked extremely closely together. The other thing that needed thinking about was accelerating rate of change in technology and so there is going to be constant uncertainty. There was the Web, the wireless networks, hand held devices and the prospect of really infinite computing power and infinite networking bandwidth. Planning was going to be a critical part, because technological change more often than not outpaced lead time required for implementation.

She had a couple of specific updates, one was to report on the modem pool. It represented extremely old technology and it was dying and they had lost a lot of modems. She met with students and faculty members, and it was decided to maintain a modem pool

comprised of faster modems than was the case presently. There would be a pool of 64 modems probably forever. There were people, for example, who only used the modem pool when they traveled, or who usually used their DSL connection or cable connection at home but when it was down they wanted to use the modem pool, or they only dialed in from home once a month so they couldn't justify spending the cost of an internet service provider. So for reasons like these it was decided that this modem pool would be an express modem pool, meaning a 15 minute time out period. The other thing they were doing was to offer graduate students high speed networking services either through a cable modem or through a phone line that was faster than DSL connection at \$20/month. So, she thought, the modem pool issue had more or less been resolved for the time being.

The other thing she wanted to mention was the switch to secure Telnet. Everything would go over the network in an encrypted form so that there was no security risk like there was with the Telnet currently in use. The date for that switchover was April 9. Finally, they were working with the Provost's office on the planning for the academic technology support and all of the things involved in that. There were lots of wonderful things talked about in the Strategic Plan and they were gearing up for a program whereby in the fall of 2002 there would be a computer requirement for incoming students. Now what that device would be exactly they didn't know, but the most difficult part was assessing skills of students and faculty and providing training for both. They were working on incentives for faculty members, possibly giving them laptops, she cautioned, however, that nothing had been agreed to yet. Before taking questions, she invited everyone to send her e-mail messages if they had comments or concerns about the issues she had discussed.

Professor Bob **Hochmuth** (Engineering) asked whether there would be wireless connections by the time students were required to have what in all likelihood would be laptops. If every student had a computer and all were connected wirelessly then he could use his computer on his desk to demonstrate something to the students which would appear on their screen. He wasn't sure exactly how that would work.

The reply was that there was software that could project off computers if that was what he wanted. And the answer was 'yes,' there would be wireless networking. Again, the important thing was the planning process and deciding where wireless networking was wanted and who wanted to use it. The ideal would be to construct an environment where faculty could do what made the most sense for their teaching and research and certainly there would be wireless networks in the classrooms. All of this, however, needed to be thought through carefully so that they were really responding to the needs of the teaching and learning activities and not just

doing technology for technology's sake.

Barbara **Shaw** (Natural Science) said that she had made the observation in her department [Chemistry] that frequently computers for non-faculty were better than computers that faculty had. She wanted to know if there was a policy to address that.

Betty **Leydon** thought that there was no policy and that it was part of the academic planning process and something that would be addressed. There would be a large emphasis on access to the technology for both students and faculty members. She explained that what she saw when she first came here was the big complaint that administrative systems needed to be completely overhauled. Hence, there was actually more of a focus on fixing that than there was on the academic side of things. Certainly, since the Provost had been in office he was very enthusiastic about the use of technology to enhance the teaching and learning process and so she was sure that that would be resolved.

Barbara **Shaw** then stated that the complaint she heard every year was that the computers in the libraries [were inadequate?]

David **Ferriero** (University Librarian) interjected that this was the first time he had heard this and wanted to know what it was they [patrons, students] couldn't do. "Take them home?" They had 3-year replacements on all of the hardware in the library, so he needed more specifics.

Professor **Shaw** said that she would talk to him after the meeting.

Betty **Leydon** added that another way to answer that question was that once students were carrying around their own laptops it wouldn't matter.

With that and the movement of people toward the exits, the **Chair** took the meeting to be adjourned.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,

A. Tilo Alt Faculty
Secretary

2 attachments: letter from Professor Purves
letter from Dean Chafe