

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

November 16, 2000

The Academic Council met in regular monthly session on November 16, 2000 from 3:45 p.m. to 5:18 p.m. in 139 Social Science Building with Professor Peter **Burian** (Classical Studies) presiding.

MINUTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Chair** asked for approval of the Minutes of October 19, 2000. They were **approved** by voice vote as submitted. He announced the composition of the fourth-year review committee for Dean Gregory Jones of the Divinity School: Tom Spragens (Chair, Political Science), Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology), Kalman Bland (Religion), Dean Mary Champagne (School of Nursing). Following that, he explained the reason for the special session of the Academic Council on November 30. During that meeting, the Council would discuss the draft of the university's strategic planning document that would go to a retreat of the full Board of Trustees on December 2. There would be no motion on the floor on November 30th, rather the discussion was intended to help the Provost in gauging both faculty support and faculty concerns connected with the plan. The final revision of the plan would be discussed and voted on at the Council's February meeting prior to a vote by the Board of Trustees at their meeting on February 23-4. Because of time constraints, the two meeting rule will have to be modified and the discussion of the draft plan on November 30th would, in fact, serve as the first meeting on the issue.

Prof. **Burian** then announced that the regularly scheduled meeting of December 7 had been canceled. He expressed the hope that members received his letter regarding the renovation of the Faculty Commons, and he reminded people that the Commons would close after lunch on November 22 to reopen with a new look and new menu in January.

Finally, he said that ECAC would like to take this occasion to congratulate a friend and former chair of Academic Council, Jim Siedow, on his recent appointment as Vice Provost for Research. [Clapping]

At this point, he announced that it was necessary to proceed with item 5 of the agenda first, i.e. the renovation plans for Perkins Library, in order to accomodate key members of the Nicholas School who were being detained on school business.

PERKINS LIBRARY RENOVATION

The University Librarian, David **Ferriero**, introduced the subject of the renovation by recalling the credentials of the principle architect of the project, Geoffrey Freeman of Shepley and Bulfinch. He naturally and particularly stressed Mr. Freeman's experience and expertise in library construction and renovation on many of the nation's more prominent campuses such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, MIT, UCLA, and a host of others. He asked him to share with his audience his relevant knowledge and expertise and to situate Duke in this context. Following that he would ask Robert **Byrd** as Chair of the Perkins Library Renovation Committee to walk the audience through the time table, to share some of the information that the committee had been receiving as it was meeting around campus with various groups and constituencies and then offer an opportunity for discussion at the end.

Geoffrey **Freeman** (Architect) explained that his philosophy concerning university libraries is inspired by Vartan Gregorian, one of the great library thinkers. His basic thesis is, "you can have great libraries, but you cannot have a great university without a great library." About 10-15 years ago there was very much a question challenging the thesis of whether the library would continue to exist as we knew it in terms of its collections and services and being the center of activity or indeed whether it would wither on the vine and go away. It could be shown, however, that the library really was a central research vessel as a center of intellectual activity for undergraduates and graduates, post docs and faculty. The library was alive and well and really needed to be rethought in terms of the focus of the university's mission, both symbolically and physically. If the technology within these facilities was integrated with the use of the collections and the maintenance of the collections, then the very serious intent of the use of the library was vastly increased. He emphasized that his primary purpose was to understand first of all what its role might be. He thought that one of the preliminary things that he was hearing, was that the building in its present state was totally inconsistent as a facility functionally with the aspirations of the institution. He was interested in the level of scholarship, the mind set of approaching the library and he concluded that the building didn't facilitate that at all, didn't support it. He needed to understand what was distinctive about Duke, because research libraries were not all alike. Hence he was trying to understand this community and how to serve the vision of this institution in the strongest academic sense with the library being

an intellectual center. All of his successful projects in the past were a function of knowledge of the community involved. Thus he saw his charge as one of understanding the particular institution as the various pieces that went into the project were being assembled and from this to create a library which was actually complementary to and part of the vision and aspiration for scholarship. At this point, Perkins has a wonderful collection and extraordinary services, but the building as a whole really didn't support the type of scholarship envisioned by any means.

Robert **Byrd** (Chair, Perkins Renovation Committee) thought that the process was going very well at this point. That was so in part because there was strong support and interest from the university administration, from the Provost's office, from the President's office, and from the Office of the Executive Vice President. The Perkins Library Renovation Committee was appointed by the Provost. It included library staff, representatives from OIT, the Provost's Office, facilities, and thanks to their work with the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and to the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council there was strong faculty involvement and representation on the committee. The participants on the committee included Caroline Bruzelius from Art and Art History, Gary Gereffi from Sociology, Helen Solterer from Romance Studies, Peter Wood from History. In addition two of the administrators on the committee had faculty appointments also: Cathy Davidson and Bob Thompson. There were also two students from DSG Academic Affairs Committee and two students from GPSC. Thus the committee was an excellent one for bringing together the different constituencies within the university and they were working together on this project. The basic task of the Committee was to step back and do the kind of thing that Mr. Freeman just described, namely to understand the role of Perkins Library and its value for the community. What did it need to contribute to the intellectual life at Duke? That was the committee's main project for this semester. The members began by drafting a number of preliminary statements from different members of the committee about the role of Perkins Library and what should be in it. Those elements were then brought together into the statement that was dated October 20: "Reenvisioning - Perkins Library: A Working Draft for Discussion Purposes." Input was sought and received by the following constituencies: the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council, the Duke Student Government Facilities and Athletics Committee, the President's Advisory Committee on Resources, the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, the Duke Student Government Academic Affairs Committee, the Graduate and Professional Schools Council, the Library Council, the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, the Duke Student Government Legislature, the Library Advisory Board and the Arts and Sciences Council. In addition, open meetings were held for graduate students, graduate and professional students, undergraduates and two of them for faculty. They heard strongly that the renovation

plans had to be guided by a vision for what it meant to do research and how a research library functioned. Hence, it was clear that they were not just dealing with single elements, but they all fit together in a whole. Printed books remained very important for research and study and it was critically important for many faculty and students in the humanities and social sciences, especially humanities to have a large accessible book collection in Perkins. The committee also heard that those materials that were housed off site needed reliable and speedy delivery and that faculty needed to be involved in criteria for selection of those materials. He added, however, that this was not the purview of the renovation committee. They would deal with the building and its capacity; but in terms of what materials were housed where, was something for the resource specialists to deal with, and the area subject specialists in the library to work with the faculty on. Other concerns had been expressed about the place of technology in the building, about the need for improvements in security and safety, air quality and lighting, about the balance between user friendly space and study space on the one hand and research space and book space on the other and concerns about what was meant by a welcoming and inviting environment. 'Are we trying to create a social space, do we want spaces that will really encourage intellectual engagement and exchange?' They were wrestling with these various issues. In the next two-three months (Dec. through February) some small working groups would be formed that were composed of library staff and faculty and students who would look at some of the key strategic issues for planning the library. Those included collections, user space, services and special uses such as exhibits and presentations. There will also be one dealing with technical services and technical operations of the library. Data thus collected would enable them to work with faculty and students to produce some models about how a large book collection in Perkins could be accommodated and what, in fact, its size needed to be. Meanwhile the architects would be working on an examination and analysis of the existing building and then in February and March would begin to work with these five working groups to develop the models that the working groups produced. In the spring, the Committee would be coming to Academic Council again and other groups including students to enlist its help in assessing the work of the group, to look at the options to make sure that they were on track with that vision that Council had, that the community as a whole had for Perkins Library. That would be before a building program was recommended to the Provost which they hoped to do by the end of the academic year in May.

In the subsequent discussion, several questions were raised. The first was about the total cost of the project. While no one knew at this point, the architect offered a guess so far as the building renovation was concerned that was in the \$30M range. Another question concerned the issue of open stacks in off site storage facilities. David **Ferriero** responded by saying that for technical

reasons browsing was not an option but the retrieval and use of books on the storage site was doable. In response to a question about the continued use of the existing building, **Ferriero** said that space considerations and other delimiting physical aspects would be factored in only after they had figured out what their needs really were. Finally, Prof. Richard **White** (Botany) commented on the inadequate state of Duke's science libraries and the urgent need to do something about them. The university librarian replied that there was another process that he hoped to launch soon to take a look at science library needs. He called his attention to the Library's home pages to get the full text on science library needs.

PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR NSOE

The **Chair** now turned to the next item on the agenda, namely to the discussion of proposals for a name change and for new divisions within the Nicholas School of the Environment. He explained that today's discussion would proceed without a resolution on the floor and without a vote. Because the last APC meeting had to be postponed, the committee would not vote on the resolutions until November 22. As soon as possible thereafter, the resolutions would be distributed to the Council by e-mail attachment, so members would have them in advance of the next meeting (November 30) . Pending a positive vote by APC, The Provost would also support a resolution in favor of the proposed changes. The Provost was present and could answer any questions put to him. At the beginning of the November 30th meeting, ECAC would offer a resolution regarding the changes discussed today and put it to a vote. He then turned the meeting over to Dean Norm Christensen.

Dean **Christensen** (NSOE) thanked the **Chair**. He explained that at the heart of the issue was the faculty's wish to reconcile two very worthy goals: the strengthening of the core disciplines that in many ways define what they hoped were true centers of excellence and the increasing need for interdisciplinary collaborations to solve problems that are not within the domain of any single discipline. Both goals were essential elements in a world class environmental science program. He added that the Nicholas School within the university was by no means the only unit working to try to reconcile this dichotomy. By way of giving a brief overview of the historical background of the proposal, he said that it included an external review followed by a provostial task force to consider the recommendations derived from that review. The recommendations from that task force were subsequently discussed in divisional and schoolwide faculty meetings. In numerous meetings of the school's faculty council, the products of those deliberations for a resolution outlining proposed changes in the school's name, structure and governance and an amended set of bylaws to codify those changes were set forth in the document before Council. Among those proposed changes, three were particularly important. Two of these three required the approval of this Council and the

university's Board of Trustees. Specifically, they were requesting the following: first, that the name of the school be changed to the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences as an important symbol of the unification of the school and a more accurate reflection of its intellectual scope and vision; second, that the school be reorganized into 3 divisions: a Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences, a Division of Environment Sciences and Policy, and a Division of Coastal Systems Science and Policy. Each faculty member in the Nicholas School would hold a primary appointment in one of these three divisions and the initial list of such appointments was included in the materials before Council. It was expected that many faculty would also hold secondary appointments in one or more divisions. Each division would establish policies for extension of voting rights to those secondary faculty. As was presently the case, each division would be the primary locus for faculty evaluation, appointment, promotion and tenure. Voting procedures on such matters would be those spelled out by the university Faculty Handbook. The third point was that on all matters related to faculty appointment, promotion and tenure there would be a vote of the eligible voting faculty first of the division, then of the entire school. Votes at both levels would be transmitted to the Dean, the Provost and the University Committee on Appointment Promotion and Tenure. A negative vote by the entire faculty would not prevent any dossier from moving forward for consideration. This combination of division and school-wide votes on faculty development was unique at Duke and it was intended to place the primary steps in the process of faculty evaluation among those colleagues working most closely to a candidate's area of interest. But was also intended to insure that the interests of the entire school were considered in all evaluations. Furthermore, it would insure that faculty across the school are familiar with the work of all of their colleagues. It was important to note that the faculty and administration view this set of proposals as an integrated package.

The **Chair** thanked the presenter and opened the floor for discussion. Professor Stuart **Rojstaczer** (NSOE) rose to say that he had prepared a five minute speech regarding the issue before Council. He said that although he would recommend that Council approve the proposed changes, his purpose was to criticize the process by which the changes had been agreed upon. He said that the idea to merge Geology with NSOE was half baked and its implementation took place by wearing down the will of the faculty. He explained that five years ago he had discussed before Council why he thought a merger of Geology with NSOE was a bad idea. He had argued that 1) the academic cultures of the groups were profoundly different, 2) the faculty in both groups really had no interest in merging, 3) an external review of the then Geology Department recommended against merger, 4) this was a top down idea literally forced upon the faculty, 5) it was a typical shotgun marriage and the objectives of this marriage were vague, and that

6) there was a lot of talk from deans about potential synergy between the groups, but there was no real plan as to how this synergy might be achieved.

Five years later, the external review committee, a group very sympathetic to the aims and goals of NSOE noticed within literally one hour of arriving that the entry of Geology into NSOE was a failure. He quoted from the report of the the external review committee as follows: "The arrangement is still an awkward combination of a traditional department and an interdisciplinary school. The relationship between constituent faculty is not as collegial as needed. The school has suffered a loss in momentum and focus since EOS (formerly Geology) was created." Moreover, in their eyes the School of the Environment should focus on "Strengthening their standing as a leader among interdisciplinary environmental programs." Indeed, this focus on interdisciplinary studies was a principal rationale for reconstituting NSOE from the faculty of the old School of Forestry and the Marine Lab in 1991. The external review recommended two solutions to the problem, 1) either dissolve EOS entirely and try to engage EOS faculty into interdisciplinary studies in NSOE, or 2) get EOS faculty out of the School and create a separate department in Arts and Sciences or Engineering. They did not tip their hand in the report as to which alternative they favored. In either case, the school would return to a wholly interdisciplinary model.

The response of the faculty in NSOE and those of the Duke administration to this report was curiously "orthogonal." The faculty came to the nearly unanimous conclusion by formal vote that if they had the choice of divorcing they would gladly do so. Provost Lange decided to ignore the report's recommendations and ignore the vote of the faculty. The Provost liked to say that with regard to this merger, the advantages had outweighed the disadvantages. This was, at best, an embarrassingly naive assessment. He was following in the tradition of others before him, i.e. 'if you didn't like a faculty vote, tell them to vote again until they get it right.'

The end products of over five years of poorly thought out decisions on the part of top down management were the documents Council has before them. The once interdisciplinary focus of the school, its principle reason for being, had been largely abandoned and the package did not represent what was best for the School. Still, he would recommend that members vote for it because he didn't want, nor did anyone else, to revisit the topic of NSOE structure. His talk, however, was really about the consequences of unchecked university leadership. He called for a filter that would ensure that half-baked ideas were not implemented and that would ensure that faculty opinions and wishes were honored. Enough meaningful faculty governance was needed to make sure that messes like this would never again be repeated.

In response, although not knowing in advance what her colleague would say, Prof. Emily **Klein** (NSOE) had prepared a brief statement to which she would now add that he was absolutely right from the standpoint that this marriage had been a very difficult one and that all of them were ready to put it behind them and move on. They disagreed, however, on the question of what was best for Geology and the Geology faculty at Duke University. In a perfect world the wishes of each group of faculty for faculty growth and space or other resources would coincide well and perfectly with the priorities of the university as a whole. But they didn't live in a perfect world, rather they were living in a world of limited resources where difficult decisions needed to be made about priorities in a university, and one thing was and remained clear still which was that the Geology Department within Arts and Sciences was not a priority. She didn't think it was because Dean Chafe hated them. It just simply wasn't a priority. His priority was to put resources in the natural sciences elsewhere, and Geology faculty and the Geology Department were faced within Arts and Sciences with the very real likelihood of attrition as faculty retired and no possibility for growth. There was, however, a unit on campus, the Nicholas School of the Environment, in which it seemed Geology could be a high priority and in which it could be an area of fusion of resources. From a distance this was not a totally crazy idea intellectually, and, indeed, over the past several years (the past 3 years being in the Nicholas School of Environment) they had enjoyed replacement hires, additional hires and, in fact, yesterday, the Provost had announced that they were clear to advertise for yet another position. That would not have happened in Arts & Sciences. To be sure, the name, Nicholas School of the Environment was difficult for Geologists to identify with. Therefore, one of the recommendations that came out of this and indeed it was also originated actually in the external review, was if EOS stayed in the school, the name of school should be changed to embrace the new 1/3 of the faculty of the school who are not environmental scientists, but, in fact, were earth scientists. Hence, the name change from the Nicholas School of the Environment to the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences. The cultural differences also led to some of the divisional structure members saw before them. She concluded by saying that she completely understood what Stuart Rojstaczer had said but that she still came back to a view that geology within Duke University was healthier and was being nurtured because of its inclusion in the Nicholas School of the Environment in a time of limited resources. That's why she supported and had participated on these committees to bring this forward.

Answering a question about undergraduate enrollments and majors, Professor **Klein** stated that currently, Geology has 35 majors, about three times the number when her department was part of Arts and Sciences. She did not have any evidence, however, to attribute the dramatic increase to being part of the Nicholas School. In

addition, there was within the Nicholas School of the Environment a very successful BA in Environmental Sciences and Policy run by Marie Lynn Miranda. Moreover, the Arts and Sciences Council had just approved last spring their new BS degree in Environmental Sciences which even though it was only half a year old already had seven majors. Prof. Marie Lynn **Miranda** (NSOE) added that the Nicholas School as a whole had undertaken extensive efforts to respond strongly to needs created by Curriculum 2000 which prepared them better than any other unit in the university to offer introductory level science courses to nonmajors. Prof. Prasad **Kasibhatla** (NSOE) for his part thought that one reason for Earth Science to remain within NSOE was the opportunity to create a very broad based and very strong environmental and earth sciences undergraduate program and he didn't think that this would have happened without the presence of Earth and Oceans Sciences faculty in the current Nicholas School of the Environment. He thought that Stuart Rojstaczer was not fully accurate when he said that it was unanimously voted to keep EOS separate. He thought it best the faculty stay together in one unit so that such a broad based environmental and earth science program could be developed.

STUDENTS AND ALCOHOL

There being no further comments, and after reminding the audience that the matter would be voted on at the next Council meeting on November 30, Prof. **Burian** turned to the last agenda item, Interim Vice President of Student Affairs **Clack's** report on students and alcohol.

By way of background information, VP **Clack** began by saying that the death of a student last year acted as a catalyst for a great deal of emphasis on how the alcohol culture at Duke might be changed to make it safer and more responsible. He reported on a survey conducted among undergraduates in 1998 which would be repeated soon in the fall. It revealed that there was a serious alcohol problem with 20% of the total undergraduate student population who were high-risk drinkers, i.e. drinking more than five drinks in one sitting within a period of two hours. When he took the position of Interim Vice President of Student Affairs for this year, he was given four major areas to work with: academic integrity, residential life, multiculturalism and diversity, and alcohol; alcohol had consumed more of his time by far than any of the others. In working with the Alcohol Task Force that was first created by Vice President Dickerson their efforts were moved into three target areas: education, alternative social programming and cultural assessment and intervention and treatment. In terms of education he wrote a letter to all incoming first-year students and their parents pointing out the great educational opportunities Duke offered while at the same time warning them of the threat of becoming a major part of the alcohol culture. He only received two

letters from parents in response. Next, over 15,000 pamphlets were sent out to students. They were given to every student in the resident halls in the system. Council members should have received a copy of the pamphlet in the mail. The title of the pamphlet was "Students Helping Students" on how to work with somebody who has some difficulties with alcohol. As a result, students were taking better care of each other. This showed up in one statistic, namely an increase in the number of cases that ended up in the emergency room where they could be treated, while the number of people who were drinking had remained roughly the same.

Further along, they had gone into a considerable amount of training their resident advisors, i.e. students who worked in the residence halls, to understand alcohol and alcohol problems. All of them received the book "Buzz" written by a Duke faculty member. They also went through 6 hours of training on alcohol abuse and intervention. That same pamphlet issued to faculty appeared as posters now on the buses that shuttle back and forth between east and west and also appeared on bulletin boards: "How do you help a friend who is in trouble?" They ran it as an ad in the Chronicle twice. One of the things they heard from the Board of Trustees last year when this issue was first raised by them was, 'you've got to educate these students. They've got to know.' He fully thought that the students were educated now and they knew what the dangers were of what they were doing and what they could do about it to help each other out. Also at the beginning of this year he met with Mr. and Mrs. Bath, the parents of the student who died last year. They had been instrumental in developing a 14 minute video tape entitled, "Wasted Youth." It was the story of 3 sets of parents who lost sons or daughters to alcohol. Over 30 copies of that video tape were made and distributed throughout the residence halls, and many student organizations, and it had been shown over 200 times to try to get students to be aware that they were not the only ones affected by drinking, that parents were people as well and that parents were hurt badly by alcoholism. They had also gone into alternative social programs. He was given \$64,000 to use to distribute to bring about programming social events that were an alternative to student drinking. The program failed. Instead, he started a program whereby the available money would be distributed in amounts of \$300 to \$1,000 among organized student groups through the Events Advising Center. He cited the example of Sigma Chi Fraternity which put on what was called Sigma Chi Derby Days. There was a dance band on the quad and the fraternity promised to keep the event alcohol safe. There were no cans or bottles. They surrounded their quad and kept people who might be drunk away from the event. They also promoted modest drinking. The event went off without a hitch. Not a single student from that event was found to be drunk, or taken to the emergency room.

Another part of their effort was doing cultural assessment. Their attention turned to looking at the secondary effects of alcohol.

The idea was to get the great silent majority of Duke students the 80% who weren't high risk drinkers to begin to talk to those who were and say 'will you knock it off - will you stop making all that noise at 3:00 and 4:00 in the morning? Will you stop vomiting all over my bathroom? Will you stop trying to rape and assault people in our environment? Will you behave yourself? Will you act as a responsible person?' Then they would begin to get some cultural change.

Another issue was whether to talk to parents when students under 21 got into trouble with alcohol. Early results from talking to parents indicated they fully wanted to know what their students were doing. Clack recently appointed an Alcohol Policy Review Committee that met for the first time this week and had one other task to look at that issue. The difficulty was that there was always a 'on the one hand and on the other' answer. Their amnesty clause said in the case of anybody who goes to the emergency room because of alcohol overdose, that person would not be put into their disciplinary system, i.e. 'we won't discipline you if you'll get people there and take care of their health.' In the past month there were three students, one with a .311 blood alcohol content, one with .298, and another with .274. These students with an incredibly high alcohol content were at risk of losing their life. Yet the amnesty policy said that they would not be reported to the parents. This represented a dilemma, but on the other hand maybe they'd rather save a life by amnesty than see that their parents got notified or they got punished.

He concluded by asking all faculty members for their help and cooperation in this. When issues of alcohol came up in the student newspaper, to spend 5 minutes in class talking with students about alcohol and alcohol abuse. Certain faculty had included alcohol segments in their classes. If they would identify students in their classes that they thought had an alcohol problem evidenced by the way they went to sleep in a morning class - sometimes with the smell of alcohol on their breath, that would be helpful to know about. 'Get out that pamphlet and refer them to get some help would be one thing that you can do. Another thing that you can do if you'd really like to help me out is to teach a lot more on Fridays. Don't revolt on me, but one of the things that they know was that students were drinking more and more on Thursdays now. One of the reasons that they drink on Thursdays was that they didn't have too many classes on Friday. If members had classes on Friday he'd love for them to give quizzes. He'd love for them to do something where they have to spend Thursday night studying so that they would have to spend more time doing academic things. He would also like for faculty to speak out about alcohol abuse, not about alcohol use, but alcohol abuse to let students know where the professor stood.

Following the presentation, Prof. Korstad (Public Policy) wondered

if Student Affairs was treating students as children rather than adults. For example, students in his classes had fallen asleep because they were playing sports and doing eight million other things. It was not because they were drinking too much although that might be a problem. He saw the drinking age as a real problem.

Jim **Clack** responded that while he didn't disagree with a great deal of what Profesor Korstad had said, that regarding the 21% he was talking about, he would disagree, because if he accompanied him out at 1:00 a.m. some weekend and went to a commons room it might change his opinion as to how responsible students were. There was another comment regarding the problem of moving the drinking off campus to fraternity based housing near East Campus. Vice President **Clack** thought that there were some parties that were moving to places like George's Garage and Parazide that were reasonably safe. On the other hand there were parties that are being held in houses off the edge of East Campus that were very dangerous because students walked back to campus in a neighborhood that wasn't the best to be in, particularly in an inebriated kind of condition. The other thing he worried about with those houses was that the residential codes of Durham say that one could only have so many people in those houses like four and yet they were packing 18-20 students turning them into mini dorms and the parties got very loud and the neighbors very angry. At Trinity Park there was a council that they worked with, they talked with the police and there was a yes and a no answer to the problem. Parents often asked him where the students got alcohol. Is was easy. The really good fake IDs were available on the Internet now for \$15, as good as a driver's license.

At this point the **Chair** announced that he had made an agreement with Jim Clack to have a series of lunches around particular topics where people in Student Affairs who were working with these issues and faculty interested in them had problems with or questions about them and meet and talk and share information. The first one was to be on the 30th of November and the subject of that one would be academic integrity. This initiative was meant to help start a conversation about mutual interests with Student Affairs.

The **Chair** then asked for and received a motion to adjourn.

Submitted for consideration by the Academic Council,
A. Tilo Alt
Faculty Secretary