

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL
102 ALLEN BLDG
CAMPUS BOX 90029

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, February 11, 2016

Call to Order

Anita Layton (A&S Council Chair): Welcome. Good to see everyone again. We have a lot of exciting items for today, so let's get started. We will first approve the January meeting minutes. I know that Mary has worked very hard on those minutes, so I just want to say a big thank you, Mary. All right, so is there any requests for corrections or amendments? [There were none.] Do I hear motion to approve? Wonderful. Thank you very much. All of those in favor? Good. Okay, so minutes approved. Yay. Moving on.

I heard from Dean Ashby that the Dean's Cabinet and the Provost's Office are drafting changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding the appointment and promotion of regular rank non-tenure track faculty. We have a lot of non-tenure track faculty colleagues here, and in our own department, so this is extremely relevant. Before I get into details, I want to make a couple of things clear. This is not an initiative coming out of Arts & Sciences Council. In fact, I have very little to do with this, other than tell you what happens. This is not an item that we are going to vote on, okay? This has to do with the hiring and promotion of regular rank non-tenure track faculty, all across Duke, in all the schools and institutes. This is for the Academic Council to vote on and approve, not us. Nevertheless, the provost and our dean are very interested in your inputs, so they asked me to tell you what's going on, and for you to let them know what you think.

Okay. Why are we messing with the Faculty Handbook? Because it needs updating. Right now, the Faculty Handbook says very little about our non-tenure track faculty. Whatever it says, apparently are contained in four pink pages tucked in an appendix in the form of a 1990 report. Let's put that in perspective: I was a Duke undergrad, and I hadn't yet enrolled here to become a student in 1990, okay? That was before I was an undergrad, which means it is old, okay? So, it needs some serious updating. Also, to give our non-tenure track colleagues status in the main body of the faculty handbook, so I think this is a good thing to do. And just to sound like a broken record, this is not something we are voting on.

The document describing these changes are on the Sakai site. I encourage you to go read it. I'll give you some highlights. It talks about hiring new appointments. The dean or institute director authorizes those lines, and there are different titles for different parts of faculty. You have the PoPs, research faculty, clinical faculty, lecturer, and these faculty will receive annual reviews like the rest of us. There are also periodic, formal evaluation reviews for reappointment and promotion. Departments and appropriate programs can establish criteria for these processes. So I haven't said very much, but like I said, I encourage you to actually look at the document on the Sakai site which has all the details.

Where are we going from here? I'm in the process of forming an ad hoc committee to study these changes, and to suggest revision. Meanwhile, please look at the document, and discuss with your departments, and send me comments. The provost would like comments by March 4, because they need

to move forward with Academic Council. Okay. Questions? Before you ask questions, I was tell you that my knowledge is entirely limited to whatever I read in the document. Quick questions, nonetheless. Yes?

Reeve Huston (History): We're a little Byzantine. Right? If different people can vote for the initial hire, and then for promotion. Do you have any idea why that is?

Layton: No, I am sorry. Can you email that question? I will forward it to appropriate people, appropriate knowledgeable people, at Duke. Anything else? That was not very successful.

Catherine Admay (Public Policy): Can you tell us a little bit about the timeline here? Provost Kornbluth wants to know by March 4th, and then we're not voting on it. The Academic Council is, when?

Layton: I don't know when they're voting on it. I think she wants the comments by early March, so she can incorporate the comment, and possibly make changes. When that is ready, she's taking it to Academic Council. I'm not part of that council, so I don't really know what their schedule is. I think she said spring of this year, but I'm not sure whether that is actually going to happen.

Chris Walter (Physics): Let's say somebody is coming in as an associate professor. There's an initial vote for appointment by everyone in the department, including the assistant professors, with the idea being that you're bringing this person into your department as a colleague.

Layton: You said associate professor, or ...

Walter: I'm just giving you an example ... Cause if it's assistant professor, it doesn't, it doesn't ...

Layton: But that's what happened in Physics. In Math, it doesn't happen that way.

Walter: I'm just saying what the rationale is, but then there's a separate vote. Let's say the people who are associate professors, who would vote for that person. The only ... The Byzantine part here is that when someone first shows up, whether it's a professor of the practice or a normal ranked faculty, everyone in the department including, say, the assistant professors, if that person is a full professor, should have some say whether or not they are hired. That's kind of the rationale [inaudible 00:09:51].

Mine Cetinkaya-Rundel (Statistical Science): One reason for the revision, you said it was old. Is there some other reason for the change?

Layton: The two that I read in the document, that it needs updating, which I understand to mean that it is old. That's my translation. It also did explicitly say that it wishes to give non-tenure track regular rank faculty status in the main body of the Faculty Handbook. That's what I remember.

All right, so thank you. Remember to please look at the document. Talk with your departments, and then send me comments, because I know regular rank non-tenure track faculty are very diverse, very different in the humanities and sciences. So it will be good for us to have many perspectives.

IDC Update

Layton: What's next? Curriculum. Yes. All right. At the last council meeting, the IDC committee presented to us a framework of a new curriculum. There was lots of excitement. I had meetings with lots of people, which is good. Today we're going to get a brief update from Suzanne. Before I give her the stage, I'd like to talk a little bit about the process.

How are we going to go from here to this new curriculum, that's going to transform our undergraduate education? As you all know, the IDC committee was formed in the fall of 2014. They were charged to reimagine our curriculum. After many months of idea gathering, they presented us with a framework in January. This framework, by most accounts, I would say is not a tweak. Right? The framework is innovative and it is very different. The committee arrived at that framework after lots of meetings, after talking with lots of people, and I believe they studied the curriculum of our peer institutions. What we need to remember is that the IDC committee is a faculty committee with resources available to a faculty committee. Which, as we all know, is not very much. They are now peer consulting with lots of resources that are able to carry out research studies, and full analysis, that allow them to arrive at the conclusion with 95% certainty. What they're trying to say is that they have talked to people, they have met a lot of people, and they came to a conclusion that they think is best for us. Now to move forward, they will need your help, and they will need your input.

So you have all studied the framework, and departments have been asked to talk about the framework and submit responses by early March. Many of you have indicated, quite correctly to me, that for this curriculum, which is rather open, to be successful, we need truly robust advising. Therefore, I have asked Steve Nowicki to come talk to Council in March about the plans that he has for improving advising. Nowicki is out of town today, so he couldn't talk to us for this meeting, but he will come in March. After March, we're going to have a number of months of discussion and feedback. Based on your input, the committee is going to likely revise the framework, and then at some point, we will get a proposal. A proposal, an actual proposal for the curriculum that we are all waiting for. I can see the questions in your head, which is, "When's that gonna happen?" The answer is I don't know, and you do know me, you will know that Anita is severely allergic to uncertainty. I do not like uncertainty, and that's why I'm in that in Mathematics. I have to tell you, that quite contrary to my nature, I have to admit that this is an iterative process, an iterative process that depends on faculty input. Therefore, this iterative process will have to take however much time that it needs to take. No more and no less. After we get that proposal, whenever we get it, we're going to talk some more. I'm sure we'll have lively conversation and very interesting discussion. We'll talk, and at some point, we will vote. When will that happen? I have no idea. It will be in the future, and not soon. Maybe you'll have a different Council chair by then.

This is where we are. Okay? We would like lots of discussion and tons of input. That's why we have provided for you a number of channels for your input. We are organizing faculty-led lunch meetings, and I think Suzanne put out some paper that has the schedule. Please join us. She's holding weekly office hours so that you can come talk to her. Suzanne and the IDC team are visiting all the departments and some programs. Suzanne is meeting with a lot of you individually. So have I, which I really enjoyed because I learned a whole lot. There's also going to be short updates at Council meetings, like today.

So Suzanne is going to give us a brief update about what the committee has done. Then she'll take a couple of questions and comments. This is not going to be a marathon, hour-long Q and A like we had last time because number one, we got other things to do, and number two, no less important, number two, the council forum is only one of many ways for you to provide your input. Okay? Now I'm done talking. Suzanne's turn.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC): Thanks Anita. What I want to do is give you a brief update in four parts about what's been happening since we first floated this conceptual framework in January. I think first, we've been really, really delighted to hear all the feedback. We've been delighted with the good, the bad, and the ugly. They've come in equal parts, but I think it really goes to show us all about how important this issue is, and how engaged faculty are. I think it also speaks to the fact that this is a faculty-driven process, and we're hoping there'll be lots and lots of more conversations like that. I would also say the committee has been immensely, immensely grateful for the level of engagement on all the issues. It has been extraordinarily helpful.

Second, so what have we been hearing? I think we've heard lots and lots of specific details, but what I want to do today is just outline four big-picture cluster things that have emerged in conversations thus far. Again, as Anita pointed out, lots, lots more is coming.

The first issue: expectations. I think these are really befuddling people, left and right. Are they requirements, are they not requirements? Are they a passive-aggressive version of requirement? Maybe they should be requirements. Lots and lots of questions in this area. I think for us, and I'll discuss this a little more in a moment, I think we're taking a step back to see what it is we're trying to achieve by expectation, how we're articulating it, and are there better ways to do that. We're taking a bit of a pause there. I would also say, in the area of specific things, there have been a number of folks who have said, "Well why isn't X not an expectation or a requirement?" Language being one of them, for example, and so we're looking at that, as well.

The second area where we've received quite a bit of conversation, is around the dual areas of depth. In particular, what do we mean by the orange trapezoid in this secondary depth? How are we articulating it? More importantly, what do we mean when we say, "a different area?" How different does it have to be? What do we mean when we allow students to articulate the nature of that depth? That's an area, again, where we're hearing lots of feedback.

I think the biggest surprising area has to do with conversations about the major. I think we started this process thinking the major was a sacred cow we would not approach, but lots of folks have said, "Well isn't this an opportunity to kind of think through the major? Wouldn't we want to pair these together?" I know Cary, you've talked about how to think about writing in the context of the major. Lots of ideas emergent around the major. Again, that for us, was a bit of a surprise. Vis-à-vis the mentored scholarly experience, I think lots of people say this is a great idea, but, "Ooh! Yikes, is this going to be massive amounts of work for faculty? And how are we gonna manage this?" Finally, a question, or a series of questions about specifics. I loved Misha Angrist's language last Friday at the DUS meeting when he talked about, giving us some granular detail on things like the first-year course and on things like advising.

Third part of this brief update: what are we doing with this feedback? What's our process, how are we engaging it? We're approaching it in different ways. Right now, we're announcing it. Lots of units are sending in their departmental feedback. We're also getting individual perspectives from folks, and going through it in real-time. Also, away for a moment, where we can aggregate it and take a big picture look. Some of the things like the first-year course, we're going to put together a small faculty working group to try to see what makes sense, see what doesn't make sense. Things like advising ... This is Steve Nowicki's baby. We're going to let him hold that baby and carry that baby. He's been working on it for years before we started this process. I am excited to hear about how this will work in the context of March, and how the two processes will meet together. I know this is something David Rabiner is super excited about. I would say that in our committee conversations, we talked lots about getting faculty engaged with mentoring of students. So I'm just putting a plug out there for anyone who isn't a pre-major advisor,

maybe it could be fun to be one. I just signed up this morning. I know David Rabiner's hitting up everybody on the committee to do so, as well.

Some things like the question of the major. As I said, we started with this being a sacred cow. I think we're excited that people want to think through their major in the context of this. It's really not something that we as a committee are going to say, "This is what folks have to do." We really want to let departments come to the table on that, by themselves, and see what makes sense. Other things I think are really creating a moment of pause for us when I say that the question of expectations is one of these areas. I think we need to take a step back and think about what it is we're trying to achieve in these different areas. We're starting this just tomorrow, kind of thinking through the basic structure, and what makes sense. How do we best achieve the goals that we're after here? So that's what we're doing with the materials in real-time.

In terms of where we're going, I think Anita outlined we're sort of in a heavy, heavy discussion phase, and that's what we're driving toward. Again, what we floated was not a proposal. It was a set of ideas to generate conversation toward a proposal at a later date. I think everybody on the IDC will collectively commit mass suicide if we have to wait 'til Anita's off the council, because I think that's three years from now. I think I'm getting a little nauseous just thinking that it would take that long, but I think-

Layton: 18 months.

Shanahan: Oh, it's only 18 months. Well, so maybe that's better. Anyway, but I do think we're setting up a series of conversations that I'm hoping will really engage the faculty on different issues. In particular, I really want to plug the yellow slices of paper. These are faculty-led conversations where two faculty, sometimes from similar areas, sometimes from different areas, are going to get together with colleagues and have a conversation about what's on the table, what's not on the table, what they'd like to see on the table. Some of these will be wildly open-ended conversations. Others: Anne with Wahneema are going to have a conversation about the humanities and humanistic social sciences, and what role and place thing will have in the new curriculum. Mike Munger, and Peter Lange are going to fight it out over disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. I think that will be one for the ages. I'm looking forward to it. David Malone and Priscilla Wald are really interested in the first-year course, and I think they're going to focus some of the conversation there. Each of these will take on a different flavor, and which goes with generally, fairly different perspectives.

I think they'll be a great opportunity. They are smaller formats so folks can really weigh-in on how they're thinking, and what they're thinking. I really encourage people to participate in those. We've set up seven of them so far. We would love if anybody in this room, where you have colleagues who would like to partner with someone to lead a conversation, that would be super. Again, these can be really open-ended, or they can be more focused. They're not something that faculty leads really have to prep heavily for. We need to think through some ideas and have a plan to facilitate a conversation amongst our colleagues. It's not as if you are presenting and planning. We'll also say we manage all the logistics, so really, you could show up and do your thing. Again, this is all in the service of how do we refine the framework, alter the framework, change the framework, move forward toward something in the hopefully, not-too-distant future, that looks like a proposal. That really depends on the nature of the feedback, and how we're organizing things.

That's it for the update. I did want to just make one point about data. At the last meeting, we talked about how 83 percent of Duke students do more than one thing, so major-minor certificate in some combination. There was a question about the 17 percent who do one thing, and the question was, "Who are these people?" Thanks to Matt and Bao, we actually have some sense of who they are, and let me just give you

some rough characteristics here. They are folks with an average SAT score. They tend to be more men, than women; more white than not; overwhelmingly non-athletes. They are much less likely to do global education, DukeEngage, graduate with distinction, and their biggest major is a BS in Econ. So I don't know what you make of that altogether. I think we might think different things of that in this room, but there you go. A little tidbit there. Questions, comments, concerns, thoughts, feelings?

David Malone (Education): I've been in some meetings when I've heard folks talk about reexamining the major. You mentioned that, and I just wondered if you had thoughts on that from all the work your group has done. I know y'all weren't looking at that, but what we might gain, how that might be done, what the benefit would be in looking at majors?

Shanahan: I think we started thinking we might tie in the major to this conversation. Really, for the single reason that many, many conversations over the past decade at Duke, and I know you've been a part of these, has talked about the size of the major and that majors seem to be inching up in the number of requirements. It may get more difficult for students to explore, to have intellectual adventures, to try things, try different things, et cetera. We actually looked at the possibility of that.

I actually got a chart, so. This is just an outline. Maybe you folks can just grab one. This is what we looked at really early on in our work, which has a list of the majors, and what they require in terms of prerequisites, co-requisites, and requirements. Right? You see there's wild heterogeneity across majors in terms of that. There are a number of majors which are your standard 10-course major. There are lots of those in the Social Sciences and in the Humanities. They also tend to be more horizontal majors. One of the recommendations that's been on the table for years, is should the major really just be eight courses, instead of 10? When we looked at that, we could imagine that making sense if you were a 10-course major. If you're a 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-course major, it would be very difficult to drop to eight. You could drop by two, but that doesn't necessarily address the gap, So this idea of diminishing the size of the major is something that's been on the table for a while. I know Chemistry, for example, right, has accreditation issues. It's not possible for them to suddenly just drop the size, but it is a question that's been on the table. That aside, I do think there's a question whether folks can consider, is their major too big? Are there ways to kind of create greater opportunity and degrees of freedom? That's something that's been an on-going conversation at Duke.

The kind of things that emerged in our conversation most recently, are things like Cary suggested. Do we want to think about having writing requirements within the major? Did we want to think about whether they're expectations or requirements? Things like language facility and compelling communication being part of how we think about a major. So is there a way to create synergy between those? That's certainly something that we would encourage folks to think about and engage with. I do think asking everybody to redo their major may not be the best strategy.

Frances Hasso (Women's Studies): Just three quick things. One is, I'm looking at this yellow- and I'm just thinking about the fact that why could be ... that length ... that foreign languages and writing are a big piece that's being proposed to. I just ... Just seems like that's underrepresented here. Secondly, I read the notes from January, and I came away with two thoughts that were, by reading them, I don't know, graphically. One is that it seems like there might be some issues in the Natural Sciences that are structuring some of this, but I wasn't quite sure what they were. I'm sort of arguing for the possibility that some things actually are very different in different divisions. I don't know what they are. My second impression of reading the January notes, is that there were ... It seemed like this project was trying to use the curriculum to actually do some social engineering that's about student life. That was a little striking, and maybe problematic. So I just wondered about that: to what degree would we like to foreground how

this project is actually relating student life? I had ... Yeah. I actually wrote this down. I forgot the details of it, but that was a little bit worrying.

Shanahan: So let's start with the first one. Carol in languages is doing a lunch. Certainly, if somebody in writing or other people in languages would like to do a lunch, I'd be thrilled to have that happen. That'd be super. They're really ... It's a come on down, kind of, situation, so absolutely. The second comment was about the Natural Sciences. Could you give me another sentence there, in terms of-

Hasso: This was like reading against the grain and reading all the documents I've read. Some of the revisions, like the flipped classroom idea, is coming from some concerns and pedagogies in the Natural Sciences and it's being touted universally. I just remembered the detail. In terms of my last point about student life ... so the way it's being done, is certain things are being treated as a third rail. Like the possibility of sorority-fraternity, sports, and some other ... you know, I kind of categorized three issues that are not being addressed, like curriculums being revised to, I don't know, deal with them.

Shanahan: A number of folks have commented on the flipped classroom issue. I think this was really our attempt to figure out how do you engage students, before they get here? The online modules, right? As a group who has not worked out the granular detail, that seems to make sense. Certainly, I don't think we were borrowing the pedagogy from the sciences. I also don't know -- Mohamed Noor's not here -- I don't know if we were responding to issues there anymore, or not. I just don't think that was how we framed it, even if it appears that way.

On those things about the social engineering, I actually think, and other folks on the committee would speak to this, but when that came up in terms of alcohol usage, et cetera, I think I was honestly like, "Wow." We've never had a conversation that's talked about those issues in the context of the IDC. We did talk about the curriculum as a scholarly invitation to this community and creating opportunities for students who understand this four-year experience as a scholarly opportunity. So I think there was that. My sense is that came more, and other people were here, so they can speak to it as well, that came more from people reflecting on what we've put on paper. I don't think David or ... I don't think we really were thinking in those terms. I don't think we would imagine this as a social engineering project in any way. I do think we want to encourage students to understand this is a scholarly community, because it is. I don't know if anybody would read a whole lot beyond that.

Layton: Why don't we take one more question.

Hae-Young Kim (AMES): Referring to the data about 83% of the students who do more than one major, what is the trend of the combinations or pairings? In the committee's view, to what extent do they look different from each other? Given the new curriculum's aim to broaden students' explorations of curricular path would depend on advising and the first year experience, what is the committee's view about the prospect of change in the pairings/combinations?

Shanahan: I think, as most folks know, the most common pairing at Duke is biology and chemistry. It's the greatest love affair of all time. I don't imagine that love affair will go anywhere. The chemists are loving the fact that that's a fabulous pair. I think there's lots of folks who were actually pairing within cognate disciplines ... sociology, anthropology. So there's a fair bit of that. What we did see in the data, which was what we're trying to emphasize, was an increasing matching of passion and parents majors. You have chemistry with the dance, or the kinds of things that animate students, and make their parents simultaneously happy. That's where the pairing was what we imagined.

We super, super naively -- and we have been proven oh so wrong on this one -- said to ourselves, "Oh, well, we can talk about having one depth in one division, and another depth in another." That really became very clear that that doesn't make sense. That we don't want to discourage folks from taking language and art history, right? There are reasons why those kinds of pairings make sense. I think what we're trying to do is now work out what "different" might mean, and whether it can, in fact, have any meaning as we've articulated it. I think our basic idea underlying the secondary depth was to create breadth through depth in some sense. This is something we picked up in a lot of the literature of higher ed that said, "You can think about breadth as a sampling in a menu. One course here, one course here, one course here, or having several courses in another area," so there are two ways to think about it.

The other thing that we really wanted to do was to really encourage this emergent pattern of students doing things in wildly different areas, and thinking through how they bring them together in creative ways. That was the basic logic behind it, but as I said, figuring out what depth means is something we need to take a step back on because I think what we're ... In an incredibly interdisciplinary environment, there's blurring and innovation and scholarship and creativity in variety of combinations and we don't necessarily want to undermine that. Our objective in secondary depth was to have students engage in substantive ways in two different theoretical bodies, two different methodological bodies, and two different empirical bodies so that they're really engaging in different sets of ideas. That's the kind of, essence of what we're trying to achieve. I fully take on-board the fact that the orange trapezoid is a problem.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): Two questions. The first has to do with the unifying experience. That's a half-credit course each semester, right? That's the current ... I understand for-

Shanahan: No.

Broverman: We're not even a proposal yet-

Shahanan: No.

Broverman: Okay. My understanding, just cause I'm trying to explain it to my colleagues, is that there's a group of faculty who are the designers of it, and then there's a second group that are the implementers of it, at some level. That may not be the language you would use, but there's the people who are creating the content that is the unifying topic people look at when there's books and movies, whatever. Then, a separate set that are working with students on the daily interaction.

Shahanan: I'm hesitant because tomorrow and the next day, it'll be three different ways, because it is really moving as we get feedback. I would say the original conception was to essentially have five to six faculty from across divisions who represent the different areas of component, communication, and languages, cultures and civilizations, to each in a flipped format, provide lecture material on a common topic, right? Whatever that common topic was. We also hoped that they would engage students, but that then there would be a parallel [inaudible] operative that would be writing-intensive, and things like that. I think, as we've talked to people, there are lots and lots of models out there. I know David, and then Priscilla have their own ideas. I know folks who go to that lunch will have lots of others. I think for us, what we're after is a common experience that introduces Duke students to the range of opportunities on campus, the range of scholarly perspectives, and epistemologies, and puts that in conversation. That's the idea of the first year. We really want to create a space for a common language and logic across all students.

This was something that we heard really loudly from students in many conversations. We also heard from faculty in many conversations, that it'd be great if there was really, sort of a common body that students were working from. Lots and lots of details. This is a really complicated thing to do when you're imagining 1,700 kids having the same experience. The question is, what would it look like? Is it doable? Is it worth doing, et cetera?

Huston: Yeah, my question builds on that. It's about process. First as a statement, it's really, really crucial that any proposal we vote on gets into the nitty gritty of how this first-year course is going to work out, cause there's so many things that could go wrong and make it a disaster. I'm just wondering, do you agree, and-

Shanahan: Oh, yes. Absolutely. We totally acknowledge the high degree of difficulty of this kind of course. This needs to be meticulously worked out, and this is why we're putting a working group together. It needs to be worked out in two ways: what are the different models for something like this, and what are the models that faculty are the most animated about? That's the first question, and then down to the absolute nitty bitty gritty details. Yes.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): This isn't really a question, it's sort of a request. On these lunches ... a couple of them you mentioned have themes, for example, David's, that would be a Duke 101. If this is online, could you put parenthetically what the themes-

Shahanan: Yup. I will do that. Absolutely. I think we'll put them on the website.

Layton: Thank you. So I know there are more questions and comments so sign up for the lunch meeting. Send her emails. Ask her to take you out for coffee. Go see her at the office hours. Okay.

Committee on Faculty, Teaching Development and Support Report

Layton: Next ... faculty teaching. One of the charges for the Council is to promote faculty development. Some of you have mentioned to me that teaching seemed to be somewhat of an under-appreciated mandate of the Duke faculty. In fact, the Council has a standing committee on faculty research, but nothing on teaching. Back in October, we formed an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Teaching Development and Support. Today, committee member Carol Apollonio is going to tell us what the committee has accomplished so far.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): Thank you Anita, and everyone. This is ... I have two purposes today, and with luck it won't be more than seven minutes, plus questions. We might have more time to talk about the curriculum. Just a thought. Just a thought.

The two things I want to tell you about is who we are and what we're doing. We are the very awkwardly acronymed FTDS, which is Faculty Teaching Development and Support ad hoc committee. This is something that was created by ECASC in response, as Anita said, to our awareness that teaching is important, and that we do have a standing committee on research here. The charge that we have is to address the issue of whether or not a standing committee on teaching is warranted, and if so, what the charge of such a committee would be.

We are lean and mean. There are four of us. We are faculty-driven. We are associated with the Council and nothing else. We're here as your colleagues on the Council. I think I may be the only person here, Owen Astrachan was here, briefly. But what I am doing today is channeling Mike Munger's beautiful

purple slides. He's the chairman of our committee, and he of course represents Political Science. Owen Astrachan is with Computer Science, Andrea Novicki represents the Center for Instructional Technology. I am in the Department of Slavic and Eurasian Studies. For those of you who like to keep track, there are four slides left, out of six.

Our charge is to survey faculty on what would be useful for us, a standing committee on teaching, to do. We want to investigate what is going on at other schools related to teaching, and account and assemble that information in a way that would be useful for us. We want to see what's going on at Duke already to support teaching and promote teaching. That includes what we do for supporting, of course, teaching technology. We also want to explore the opportunities for faculty development, mentorship. We want to encourage, or see what can be done to encourage collaboration among different faculty members around teaching. Regardless of discipline, regardless of the level of usage or non-usage of technology, from zero to a whole lot.

Slide number two, and by the way, I just want to remind you this is Mike Munger's beautiful slides. The most important thing that we're doing right now is we're developing a survey that we will share with all of you, and we hope for a really strong response from you, our colleagues, to see what it is that you think is important for teaching. We will be asking the questions that are listed here, plus questions about how Duke recognizes, evaluates, and rewards teaching. I'll just go through the points that we're making on the survey. What is the place of teaching in faculty priorities? How much do we value teaching as individual faculty members? Then, under teaching itself, what are our priorities in terms of our needs for support of our teaching? We also want to be sure we understand what Duke does well and does not have to change at all, in terms of teaching. We want to ask all of you and your colleagues about other programs that you know about, other institutions. What do they do to support teaching? That's something that doesn't have to be elaborate. It can just be names of institutions that you know about that are doing innovative or just basically positive things.

Finally, this survey, and again this is all about what we want to put on a survey, just demographic information. What are the divisions, what is your division, what is your rank, and might those correlate to the needs that we have for faculty support here at Duke?

Currently, we're engaged in creating a draft of a survey that would be worthy of sharing with you. In the quest to get your responses and contributions, what might we be missing in the questions we're asking? As I said, we're lean and mean, and we really are eager to get a lot of positive input from everybody, to make this a really good survey that would be worth taking, and that will give us results that are worth looking at. The survey should be ready within a couple weeks. I don't mean the survey, I mean the draft of a survey. At that point, we're going to ask Council members to respond, and also to communicate with your colleagues and your departments in programs to make sure that we have the broadest possible input in making this survey. Ideally then, we can take into account that input from everybody, create a good final survey that we can present to you on April 15th with responses, too, at the end of classes this spring.

The final slide has to do with the other thing we're doing right now, which is to look at what other institutions are doing to support teaching. Some of these are, of course, the peers with which we usually compare ourselves. We're also very curious about what institutions are doing innovative things that we don't usually think about, and how might we incorporate that wisdom in whatever we decide to do to support teaching. It's a qualitative collection of information. We're not attempting to do anything exhaustive.

I guess I would just like to remind you all that this is a faculty-driven process. This is something we're doing in the Arts & Sciences Council. We're an ad hoc committee, we're not going to last forever. The

purpose is to make some proposals about a standing committee about teaching. I can do my best to try and answer questions. I think what you say will go into the record in the minutes, and so we can look at that also.

Lee Baker (Trinity College): As we are thinking about this new curriculum, we are trying to shift, I, Valerie too, was trying to shift the notion that applies from service to teaching because advising is teaching. To see this as a component of and like an instructional resource. Will you be, in your survey at all, asking anything about advising, or is this like instruction, and not mentoring and advising?

Apollonio: No. That's a super question, and we will take that into account. Thank you. It's an extremely important thing, particularly as a new curriculum comes into being, and it depends so much on advising. Absolutely.

Hasso: Just a technical ... Got to make sure that survey is not too long.

Apollonio: Yes.

Hasso: Okay? Because I definitely quit on a very important survey at Duke last year. It was just impossible to spend that much time. I would just say really pilot it a few times-

Apollonio: Yeah, so that when we share the draft with you, please tell us what to take out. We would really appreciate that.

Hasso: It's better have a really great response rate.

Apollonio: Absolutely.

Malone: When Ruth Day was chair of the Council and I see Ruth over there, we did quite a few surveys of the faculty, and I think Ruth, you probably could offer some recommendations for things that worked and didn't work, in terms of faculty surveys.

Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience): Sure. I'd be glad to do that on the side, but first of all, it should look attractive, and not like all the survey monkeys that ever been created. Give an overview of what the parts are, and someone to engage faculty in actually doing it. Not to just keep putting in more and more questions to answer, lots of other things, but to have it organized and structured, so people know where they are. Also, promise them something in return, of what they'll get out of it once it's completed. There are other things that deal with what I would call cognitive accessibility. That is the ease of which people can find, understand, remember, and use all of the information as they're working on it. I'd be glad to consult on the side if you would like.

Apollonio: We would really appreciate that, and if you have the surveys that you gave out, or some record of that, we would absolutely love to avoid repeating what has been done, or to draw upon your wisdom.

Huston: I just want to reiterate the importance of what was said about the length. I get these things constantly, and not just from Duke. People, researchers all over the country want to quiz me and often they say this will only take a half hour of your time. I just stop doing it. I don't have time to do it. I don't care how nice it looks. You know, I can handle 90s-style HTML from some old website, but it's got to be short. Otherwise ...

Apollonio: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Layton: Thank you for that report.

Housing Program Update

Layton: Okay, so the last item for today, we have Joe Gonzalez, our Dean of Residential Life, who is going to tell us about a new housing program. Thank you, Joe.

Joe Gonzalez (Residential Life): Certainly. Thank you. Pleasure to be here. I would say it's not exactly new, it's young, though. This is actually year four of what we refer to as our Duke Houses Residential Model. Some of you may be familiar with the information that I'm about to review. Some of you may not have seen any of it at all. So I'll try and hit the middle here, with what I address. I need to go quickly because I'm going to assume that many of you are like me, and you have to be somewhere right at 5, or shortly thereafter.

This is just a brief review of the timeline. This was initiated at the request of the board that we consider a new residential model. We used to operate with what we call the quad model. We engaged on that endeavor, and rolled out Duke Houses in fall of 2012, so this is actually year four. Some people wonder what's the difference between this model, and the one we were in before. We didn't build a lot of new buildings, so we didn't get new architecture or anything like that, for the most part, to work with. I highlight some of the differences here. A couple that I would point out that I think are rather significant is, in the previous model, all sophomores were guaranteed the ability to live on West Campus. In the current model, that is no longer a commitment, and probably 500, at least, of the students who live on Central are sophomores. So that is the dramatic change. Previous to this, we had under 50. The sophomores had the option to live on Central, but less than 50 chose to.

Our big reason we had to forego that commitment was the core foundation of this model, is what we call "right of return." When a student leaves their East house, and joins their upper-class house, they have the prerogative to stay in that house until they graduate if they wish. There's no way you can do that if you're also going to commit that all sophomores can live on West Campus. We chose the right of return, since it was what we were developing this model around, and that's why we had to go the other direction.

The other significant change I'll point out is the selective living group percentage on Central increased unexpectedly dramatically. It was 13 percent when we were in the quad model. The ambition was to level the percentage of selective beds on West and Central, so they were roughly both between 30 and 35 percent. Now, we're up to 70 percent of Central is selective. That was mainly a result of the sororities being added to Central Campus. They're a demographic of ours and there's nine of them that are now on Central that didn't exist before. They ended up all in Central because they decided as a group to go into housing because they didn't have housing previous to this. They all had to be on the same Campus. The university was only able to offer them Central Campus, if that was going to be how they did it. We actually were trying to get them to do six on West, and three on Central, but they said, "No, we all have to be on the same Campus." So that's how we ended up with the nine sororities on Central.

Chris Walter (Physics): Just a question. That 42, is that mostly fraternities and sororities, or is it half of it? I don't really know how it works.

Gonzalez: Forty two selectives? Let me see. There's 15 fraternities, nine sororities, so 24 (Greek). So 18 are non-Greek.

These were the goals for our residential model. The first two are what I would say the primary focuses of the model. The other three are certainly important, but when we were designing the model, the first two were really guiding a lot of the design choices that we were pursuing. So that's sort of what we're hoping the model would yield.

A lot of this comes from a set of assessments we did each year. But we did a review last year since it was the end of the third year, we thought that was a good time to say, "Okay, how's it going?" Those classes were trending. Things were going a good direction in almost every case, but we haven't reached where we think we can get it, just yet. I'll give you some examples. Right of return is something that we feel is an indicator of the success of this model. If students are choosing to return to their house, then we feel like there must be some good reasons why they want to stay where they are. So far, each year, the number of students who choose to return to their house has increased. I don't know that it's going to increase much further than where we reached last year. That might be about the ceiling on that. But if that is, that's a pretty good place in our opinion. But the fact that it went up from 57 to 82 from year one to year three is a positive indicator test. This was done between year one and year two. We wanted to see, well why did you exercise your right of return? We surveyed the students who chose to exercise their right of return, or not. What we discovered wasn't really much of a surprise. A big reason why students chose to return was real estate. We'd rather they choose to return because of the community at their house, or the affiliation, an identity thing happened with it. The reality is, especially from year one to year two, the primary reason they return is because they like where their house was. The other reason ... The prime reason they moved is because their desired roommate wasn't in their house. In year one, from year one to year two, if I lived in one house, and Lee lived in another, and we wanted to be roommates that next year, we couldn't exercise right of return. We had to leave so that we could get together in a new place, in a different house. We changed that rule after year one, so that one of us could exercise right of return, and pull the other in. That was something that the students really felt good about, so that change helped a great deal.

Here's where we start seeing the difference between the independent houses and the selective living groups. We are, as I said, we're trending the right direction on this particular question. The responses approaching four on our survey this year, is slightly over four. We're going in the right direction, and so we're narrowing the gap between the independent response of this question and the selective living group. That's our envision, is to continue to narrow this gap. We don't expect them to actually be equal because selective living groups are going to have inherent advantages when it comes to community living. They have to apply to become a member of that group, get chosen. They have different obligations they have to meet before they even move in the house, in terms of participation of activities. They're going to have a different level of community than an independent house. We believe we can narrow this gap further. Yes?

Walter: Can you just tell me what the Y axis, if that's a percentage or like a 1 through 10 number? Also, what does administrative mean 01:00:26?

Gonzalez: Okay. The scale is 0 through 7, on this particular instrument.

Walter: Okay, 0 through 7 check boxes. Okay, we gave a quiz and said, "0 being worst-

Gonzalez: But they could actually ... Actually, I think it was 1 to 7. They could either, like if they felt very ... If it was very poor, they could give a 1, and if they really like it, they would rate it a 7. So 7 in ... On this instrument, this is a national instrument that we use, a benchmarking instrument. It's used by a number of housing programs so we don't necessarily control the scale or the question. Our goal is to get the 5. For this instrument, that's where they say, "If you can get the 5, then you have a good result." So our goal is to get to 5, and each year we're getting closer to that.

Administrative houses are houses that are sponsored by a department, so Baldwin Scholars is the best example of an administrative house. I apologize. I know I'm going quickly but ...

Again, this is a question we just talked about ... The ability to meet other students. Here, we see that the difference in responses isn't nearly as severe. The ability for students to meet other students, and assumably interact in positive ways, is a very close. It's not necessarily dependent upon the nature of the house as is that sense of community. We see this on a number of the other questions I'll show you, where the questions actually more level, in terms of the outcome, or the responses are more level.

This is this year's surveys. We had to use a slightly different survey. It's in a new, different format. Just to give you a sense of how many people were responding extremely helpful versus very helpful. Again there's a difference between the selective and the non-selective in terms of the overwhelming majority of the responses, are on the right end of the scale. They're at the 5, 6, 7 level. So that's a good indication in our opinion that again, we're making the progress that we're striving to make.

This is the one we expect to be the hardest to ever close the gap on because there's a much different ... That's a much different bench for a student to have an affiliation to a house, versus you know, like they got a chance to meet other students, and that type of thing. Again, the selective living groups are going to have inherent advantages on this question, but we do hope we can continue to narrow the gap. Again, we made it really a strong amount of progress in this question, from year one to year three. We've made more progress on this year, as well. The average this coming year 4.28, so that gap is continuing to narrow, but there is a difference between the selective and the independent. We don't expect that to disappear completely, but we do hope that we can continue to narrow it. One question that I think we would want to try to look at is, do students who join selectives have a higher desire for community than students who do not, and is that part of this equation as well?

So this is one that both confuses us and troubles us. It's the ability to interact with students who are different than you? Part of the question is how does this student interpret this question? We say, "different from you." What does that mean? Again, we don't write that question, so we're kind of tied to the language that the instrument uses. But we're troubled that the results are going the wrong way and pretty much across the board. The other thing that confuses us is the houses that actually have diverse communities are the independent houses. They have at least, in every house, 40 percent of the house are non-Caucasian. Whereas in the selective living groups, there are some of them that are 100 percent Caucasian. We're a little bit baffled by that, as well, that where we have the diverse communities, aren't getting stronger results. Again, what are they thinking when they answer this question? We are encouraged that the answer to this year's question seems to be a little bit higher, so we're pleased by that; but again, it still seems to be ... The higher numbers seem to be with the selectives than the independent which just, again, doesn't go to the experience that we feel we're having when it comes to being exposed to students who are different from them.

Walter: How many students are answering this?

Gonzalez: It varies. Usually somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000.

This is what I'm referring to when I say the number of students who are ... The number of houses who have diversity, and where they are, this is where we get a little bit confused on ... If we have a diverse community, shouldn't we be doing better on these questions? We're going to see if we can come up with some questions that maybe target the answers a little bit better, so we know more with more certainty, what the students are answering, versus, "They're different than me," cause that could be interpreted too many ways.

There's also a couple other questions that we touch upon. Diversity, I pulled, just to show ... The encouraging data on these particular years, the questions seem to be getting on the higher end of the scale. We think we got better results this year than we did for the previous three years, but we haven't had a chance to break that down and put it on the same kind of scale as I was showing you before. We're still in the middle of processing a lot of this.

Another one. This is one that we find pretty encouraging. When it comes down to your overall satisfaction with your residential experience, it's pretty similar across the board. Regardless of nature of the house, they're all scoring right around 5, or slightly above 5, but there's not that dramatic gap between the independents and selectives like we saw on some of the other questions. This is reassuring that students are having a good experience, regardless of where they're placed, for the most part. There's obviously some who aren't as happy with their experience as others, but on the whole, we're doing well regardless of house.

Baker: If we worked that out by the really nice dorms, and the not so nice residence, would you see-

Gonzalez: Yes. Actually, we got some of that recently. There's a huge difference between the results from Keohane versus Crowell, which hasn't been renovated. Actually, one thing we're very excited about is we put some money and renovated Edens this past summer and Edens' results this year on the facilities question compared to Few, Kilgo, and Keohane ... So it shows that our investments there really paid off. The students are so much happier at their facilities in Edens. This also shows that Crowell and Craven, are in desperate need of it because their results are terrible. Those are the two quads that haven't been renovated, and so there's a big difference.

Baker: So some of this is real estate and not real community driving this.

Gonzalez: We want to see if we can break that down because I think the facilities does tie to that so much.

Some overall summary points. Trending the right direction. Still in the early stages, we're in year four. Facility condition has a higher impact than location, and we can look at that if we just look at the results from like Few versus Craven. They're almost exactly the same place, and the results were dramatically different. Goals aren't necessarily to have the independent houses have the same results as SLGs, just narrow that gap. Make sure ... Our challenge is to make sure the students have the resources and a structure and a place for success, because we do believe that when it comes down to it, the students have to want their residential experience to matter. It has to be important to them. They are the ones who are going to make the resident experience special, in our opinion.

This is one of my favorite student leaders who graduated last year. Laurel's an interesting case to me because she was president of her house her sophomore year, which was year one of the model. What made her unique other than she was outstanding as the House Council president, is that she was also a member of her sorority. She had just pledged a sorority, and joined a sorority, yet she had a huge commitment to her independent house. She went abroad her junior year, and then her senior year she returned and became house president again for Sherwood house, and continued to devote her energy to that environment. She's our shining example of when you have a strong leader who believes in it, what can happen with that house ... The Sherwood house has consistently been one of our strongest independent experiences for independent students to have, and living there with the sense of affiliation they have is just dramatically different.

I welcome any questions.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Do you have any data regarding impact of this change on vandalism, alcohol toxicity, and GPA?

Gonzalez: We don't have GPA. We could probably find a way to run it, but we don't have it on GPA. We can pull on vandalism. Although, our observation from vandalism so far is, even before we did the model, overall, vandalism has been going down, which we are pleased about. Most of the vandalism been almost about 100 percent of it happens in the Greek fraternities.

Rosenberg: Why am I not surprised?

Baker: If I could just ... I just want to say, many of you may not know Joe, but he's a partner in our educational experience. I mean, we are a residential, liberal arts college of arts and sciences, and we worked hard with this housing model over the years, trying to tweak it, trying a range of working with student's group, and all. I just want to say, it's been a pleasure working with you on this. I think it is important that we really recognize you as a real partner in educating our undergraduate students. We brought you here today because I think this is ... Where students live really does impact their academic excellence and commitment to the overall mission. I appreciate you walking through it with us.

Gonzalez: Thank you. One of the focuses that we're sort of moving to, obviously community and equity are still going to be core focuses of our work, but really trying to find a way to connect our independent communities to faculty in a different way. The Visions of Freedom community that's going to be implemented in fall, I think is a terrific example, and we think that can happen at a much different way. We would love it if there's other faculty who were interested in perhaps considering creating that type of concept, and seeing if you would like to develop a relationship with one of our independent houses. We're very excited about that pilot program next year, and hopeful for what it can achieve. If we can have all the elements come together that we're seeking, you know, having the house course where the students who take that course are actually from the house. It's a true houses course, versus just one where people opted in. They're going to have the faculty coming in and doing different discussions with the house committee around that theme of Visions of Freedom. We think it has tremendous potential, so we're excited about that.

Malone: Well, I want to thank you for coming, also. I talked to a lot of seniors who say that the best residential experience they've had in their four years at Duke was their first year here on East Campus. For a variety of reasons, which to me seem much more consistent with the mission that we have in undergraduate education about having students be open to new perspectives, meeting people that might come from different backgrounds that they are. I guess this stage is really about the housing model as it exists after the first year. I just was going to ask you if you could comment a little bit on your sense of the first-year living experience, and why that isn't a model for all four years, as opposed to this change at the end of the first year.

Gonzalez: Sure. Your comments or conversations with students match the surveys. By far, the strongest results we get on our surveys come from the students on East Campus. That's where they're most satisfied, they feel like they had the best experience if you ask them. They almost always say that was the best year, in terms of the residential living, so it's very much aligned to what we hear from students, as well. The challenge is, at least with the way Duke's designed, you can't have your cake and eat it, too. Like if you want to have a first-year campus, you can't have a model where then they stay with the same people for four years. We used to have a model where you could move in and you stayed in your house until you graduated. We lost that when we created the first-year campus, and I don't think anybody would

go back on that. I think the first-year campus has been a tremendous success. But when we created that, we created then the upper class experience, which I think Duke has been working to try to get right ever since then, and hopefully we're on the right road with this current model. Hopefully we can continue to improve it. The first-year campus is a very successful one, so we would-

Malone: We could consider the question of not having selective housing, of just having students live in ways that they might be randomly assigned.

Gonzalez: Yeah. I think that's an important question that seems to me, to be a very difficult one to change. Perhaps it can be, but I think it's going to take the will at the very highest levels to say we want to do this, because that is such a dramatic change. One thing I will throw out is the selective living group experience is working for a number of students. That needs not to be lost sight of. If they did not exist, were there things that we might be able to do? Certainly, but that's not where we are right now.

Anne Allison (Cultural Anthropology): What is the percentage of students that go into selective housing?

Gonzalez: Forty-four percent of our beds on West and Central are selective, and 56 percent are independent, which is something that people don't always realize. I think there's an assumption that more beds are actually selective, but the majority are actually in the independent houses. There's more selective houses, but they're smaller. They tend to be around 30. Whereas the independent houses tend to be 60 to 90.

Broverman: On increasing faculty connection efforts, what's the result of the FINvite? How is that working out? Are you coming up with other ways? Has that shown to be successful?

Gonzalez: I think the students have enjoyed it a great deal. They certainly have utilized it a great deal. When we rolled it out in year one with Deb Johnson has been a main architect, we really didn't know if the students were going to use it at all, and they spent all the money. We started wondering, do we have enough money, because they were using it at such a high level. We actually did have to put restrictors on that program for this year, so that houses had a limit on how many times they could do certain things, or how big the roof could be, so that more of the invite programs could be sponsored.

Broverman: Has that proven effective in achieving your goals?

Gonzalez: That is a different question. Like I said, they've enjoyed it a great deal. I think what we're trying to figure out is how can we see what the impact has been, if any. We've got some feedback from the faculty who've participated and their observations. We've tried to get feedback from some of the student participants, but I can't tell you that we are in a position where we can say it's accomplished these certain objectives.

Broverman: And so do you have the next step to try and achieve that objective under ...

Gonzalez: In my mind, Visions of Freedom is the next step. To me, that offers such a more immersive opportunity than a FINvite can. If this pilot program works well, I really hope we can find other concepts and themes to bring with faculty who are very connected to it, who like to have that association with the house, and really bring it into that house in a level with some depth to it.

Walter: When you talk about a particular house, does that map onto a physical house? Or when you say a house, could that be a floor of a dormitory? I mean, what exactly is meant by a house?

Gonzalez: Yeah. That's a great question. Unfortunately, some of the houses are very natural to their architecture. Like they make very complete sense. Look, there's a house, and that's what it is. Unfortunately, 10 years ago, we renovated Few, and before that we renovated Kilgo. When we renovated those two quads, we were renovating for the quad model, and not the house model, so we actually broke up a lot of that architecture that designated the houses very concisely. If you go to Few, in particular, you don't see the houses. We had to really create them as best we could, and they don't have that same kind of physical coherence like the Craven houses might, where it's very easy to see this is where this house is. Some locations have it better than others in terms of, is the house designed to be that kind of size. Yes.

Malone: I wanted to return to something Lee said about housing being such a important part of the overall learning experience. In some ways it's tied to what Frances said earlier about ... I don't know if you were here when Frances mentioned the notion that our proposal for a new curriculum might involve an element of social engineering. I'm wondering, most of your measures were really about the characteristics of the houses. Do you all have, in Student Affairs, more goals that have to do with the individual development, or learning outcomes for students? As we move towards a new curriculum, we might find ways to make these things more aligned and more consistent with each other, and work, not across purposes, but towards certain desired student developmental outcomes that we all share.

Gonzalez: We do. When we develop those we very much work to try to get them aligned with the university's goals, the institution's goals, that were pretty much academically focused. We really want to make sure that ours were aligned and supporting those envisions. So we do have goals and objectives within Student Affairs along student development, whether it's along the lines of wellness, or along the lines of leadership, or academic success, things like that. We do have some of that. If you go to our student cribs website, there's a page that actually outlines those. Yes.

Karin Shapiro (AAAS): I was wondering if you could just tell us a little bit more about this Visions of Freedom program?

Gonzalez: Sure. I want to give credit to Tara who's the DSG vice president for academic affairs, because it was really her brainchild. She was able to partner with Dr. Michael Gillespie who's on that focus program Visions of Freedom that's a first-year program. They engaged initially, I think, on the idea like, is there a way to extend this onto West Campus? I think originally, their idea might have been with the people who were in Visions of Freedom perhaps move over and enter a house and stay together. We evolved away from that and went to a system where they were allowed to select 18 students to be put into the house where Visions of Freedom was going to be next year. They were allowed to find six upper class students, and 12 first-year students. They had an application process. They received, I think, around 35 applications. They interviewed them, and selected the 18 that they want to put into the program for next year. Some of the elements, again, that we are still working on, that would help with all involved, is the house course that's taught by two of the members that they just selected with Dr. Gillespie sponsoring it, as the faculty sponsor, that would be around, or touch upon, the theme of Visions of Freedom. Ideally, the students who are in the course live in that house. They don't necessarily have to be the 18 that signed up. It could be some of the others students, as well. But we want them to have first shot to sign up for that course before it's opened up for other students. Then the hope is that Dr. Gillespie and some of his faculty partners, they want to bring in lecturers, dinners with faculty, that type of thing. Discussions with faculty along that theme of Visions of Freedom, and have them occur in the house, or invite members of the house to go and meet somewhere and have those discussions. That type of thing. We're still working on those elements, but that's a little bit of what we see in our minds of what this will be.

Catherine Admay (Public Policy): Hi, Joe. Thank you for coming. It's really great to see you here. You really have a huge positive impact on our campus.

Gonzalez: Why, thank you.

Admay: I'm just wondering as a person who is faculty in residence on East Campus and see what a difference it makes to have community that is around faculty ... I know there's only one person who is an equivalent faculty in residence for West. I'm just wondering like, why do we have all of this richness of faculty involvement on East, and then one person on West? Is there any opportunity to increase that? What's holding that back? Is it a money issue, a theorization issue, what's the reason for difference in treatment?

Gonzalez: There's been a progression, or an evolution, on that issue since I've been here, which has been 11 years. When I first arrived, or shortly after I arrived, the dialogue was actually around how do we create the ability to have faculty in residence on West Campus. We actually put together a plan where we would take beds offline to create the apartments so there might be one per quad. At the time, we had Ben Ward who was the faculty residence in Edens. Shortly after, we opened Few. Few had one as well, cause Joe Nadeau was there. Then we went a much different direction. We've sort of put this claim together, and said, "How much would it cost, and could we pull it off?" Then all of a sudden we decided it's going to be, meaning the broader Duke entity, decided that maybe faculty in residence is really a first-year program, and our ability to connect to upper-class students is a different pathway. So then we went in a different direction, and that's where we've been pursuing some of these other ideas. So we were going down one road, and then we averted and went in the complete opposite direction.

I would say that it is incredibly difficult for faculty residence to engage with a community of 400 to 500. It's just not a realistic ratio. It's also not realistic to try to create a ratio that is realistic, in terms of the amount of beds we lose, and how much it costs to create the apartments that the faculty would need to be successful. I think you have that reality of to get to the ratio that would work, has real barriers that in my observation are unsurmountable, but what we have right now in terms of our buildings. I'm also convinced that we can find ways to successfully connect faculty to a residential communities. Again, I'm hopeful that Visions of Freedom gives us one way to do that well.

Layton: Well thank you, Joe. Thank you everybody. Our meeting is adjourned.