

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 April 24, 2014

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Good afternoon colleagues! Thank you for coming to this specially called meeting of the Arts and Sciences council. I'm going to cut short the announcement part of the meeting, and move our one official item of business to the end. Representatives, we need you to stay to the very end for ECASC elections to hear about and vote for our nominees to the executive committee. In a moment, am going to ask Peter Lange to give his talk as the centerpiece, and then have Dean Patton give her address, and at the end we will have our one item of business.

Approval of Minutes

You have seen on our website copies of the minutes from April 10. Are there any corrections or amendments to the April 10 minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I move.

Wayne Norman (Philosophy): Seconded.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? Thank you, the motion carries.

Introduction of Peter Lange

A couple of weeks ago when ECASC was thinking about the end of the term we had the idea of inviting Provost Lange to come to the council and give us an address. We thought this was an extraordinary opportunity; it is rare in higher education to have a provost with the kind of leadership and experience that Peter has shown at Duke since he became provost in 1999. As provost, this is our last opportunity to have him address the council, and I very much wanted to take advantage of that opportunity. We have asked him to reflect on the directions of change at Duke and higher education in general, but before he does, let me say a couple of things about Peter and his legacy in Arts and Sciences.

In some ways, many of you will understand what I mean when I say this is a homecoming for Peter. He came to Duke in 1981 as a professor of political science from an institution north of the Mason-Dixon line. He became chair of the political science department and when he became provost, he brought into the Provost's office a kind of commitment, devotion, care, and thoughtfulness about Arts and Sciences' curriculum issues and faculty development that were first formed through more than 15 years on the faculty within Arts and Sciences. I think it is very appropriate that he addresses his home colleagues in the Arts and Sciences here at the end of his tenure.

I want to sketch very briefly some of Peter's legacies for Arts and Sciences in an unconventional kind of way. Let me ask colleagues to show with your hand if you came on the faculty here at Duke from 1999 on to the present. How many of you came on the faculty then? Colleagues, look around. All of you are part of Peter's legacy, and one of Peter's most important legacies, other than programs, initiatives, and abstract things, is in people. It is in you sitting here right now, and in those colleagues who are now old timers from before 1999 now having the dynamic colleagues that have been recruited to come here under your tenure.

Let me ask another question. How many of you do some kind of research of an interdisciplinary nature or more concretely, have been influenced by, work with, or have gone to events at one of the interdisciplinary institutes? Let me name them: Franklin Humanities Institute, the Institute of Global Health, Duke Institute of Brain Sciences, Kenan Institute of Ethics, The Social Science Research Institute, and the Nicholas Institute in Environmental Policy. Look around the room. You, too, are part of Peter's legacy; not just in your own work but in the ways in which you bring that light into your units within your departments and programs. I have one last question. How many of you as faculty advisors or DUSs have talked with a student about how to work their way through the curriculum? Can I see a show of hands? Some you may not be aware that Peter was the chief architect of curriculum 2000 and he brought that vision of curriculum right here into the

Arts and Sciences in a very powerful way that still continues to shape the way in which we teach and in which students earn their degrees.

I could go on and on; this is how I think about Peter, which is not in terms of abstractions. Peter's legacy is in all of you, and I don't see a colleague whose hand has not gone to the ceiling in these last couple of minutes because Peter Lange, with his vision, has done exactly what an extraordinary provost does. He leaves people who have changed in their research and their approach to education, who are in a better institution and who will carry that on even after he steps aside. Peter, it gives me great pleasure to introduce you and welcome you back to the Arts and Sciences council.

Provost's Address

Provost Peter Lange: Thank you, I am not sure that any talk I give can possibly match what you just said, at least in its enthusiasm. I am going to talk to you about how I see what we have been doing at Duke in a broad sense, with a few references to Arts and Sciences in particular over this fifteen year period and [talk about] what we have been trying to do, and in substantial part, what we are doing, although we have not "done" because "done" has a certain finality to it and I think we are just on the way.

When I came to Duke, and into the 90s, Duke spent a lot of time figuring out how to be like other institutions, especially in the northeast. A lot of [people were] looking to the northeast and the Ivy's and saying, "How can we be like them?" Some of you know that at that time we had this semi-amusing expression "Harvard: Duke of the north." It is kind of funny, but why were we doing that? I think today we are much closer to knowing what we want to be, and not spending nearly as much time looking at other places and deciding how we can be like them. I think that is probably the biggest change, although I am going to show you one change in a more specific way that is pretty startling when you look at it.

The theme of this [talk] is how we can make Duke a leader among 21st century universities by being excellent both at the core activities that any great university must have and developing qualities that, in their individual excellence and in their combination, also set us apart from our peers. In other words, how can we be as strong as possible in the things that every great university has to do, and also be distinctive in the qualities that make us different? I think that is what we have been trying to do, and I hope I can show you that we have had some success in the pathways we have been working on.

Let's start with what we have been trying to accomplish. We have been trying to build core strengths that involves talking about the strength of our schools, the strength of our faculty, the strength of our students, the infrastructure on which we build, and creating a culture of nimbleness that has allowed us to be more innovative, quicker, and less risk averse than most of our peers. I think that has been critical to what we have accomplished, but we have also been developing these strengths that in combination make us distinctive, both by how good we are at each one of them and how we bring them into combination of interdisciplinarity, globalization, and knowledge in the service of society.

Let's start with the schools. Here, the first thing I would stress for you is that we have a system of management that has worked very well. All of you are familiar with it, and sometimes you like it but sometimes you don't. This is the system that says, "Deans, you run your schools. You take in all of your resources, you are responsible for all of your expenditures, and you pay some costs that are university-wide." The idea there is to give the maximum incentives to the deans to raise money and dispend it in the ways they and their faculty can best do that; the deans being much closer what happens in their schools. There are systems that are much more centralized, as we all know. At the same time if you think about that, that is a system that is inherently centrifugal. In the ideal world, every one of those schools says, "Great! I get to keep all of my resources, and let's keep the center as small as we can, so we can do what we want."

For Duke, that won't work, [because] we are not big enough. Almost every one of our departments is smaller than the departments of our peers, so we need a centripetal force as well. That has been coming out of the provost's office and the central resources that we provide to the schools to spend on the priorities that we collectively have identified as our institutional priorities. That is an enormous strength for us. The reason you sometimes don't like it is because you can't just go to the provost and get whatever you want, and sometimes it appears that the provost's office is imposing things on you that you might not immediately think is your highest priority. We have collectively decided that we can maximize our strength by doing these things together. The reason you like it is because you have a lot of autonomy; just to give you a numerical sense of that about 90 percent of the resources in the provost's area are in the schools. Sometimes I know it seems as though 90 percent is in the provost's office and 10 percent is in schools, but in reality, 90 percent of the resources sit in the schools. The reason the provost has any leverage is because the schools' budgets are so tied up. If you can deliver a bit of incentive and encouragement, you can get things to happen.

We have done great things over the last fifteen years because we have had great deans. We have built this collaborative climate among the schools so that adds some centripetal pressure and we have seen a lot of improvement as a result. Some of you may have seen this slide before; this shows the standing of the research productivity of our faculty across all of the schools against all of our national peers. [For those] who cannot read this chart, Duke is the red bar, which makes us tied for fourth. This is measured in ways that are attentive to the differences between disciplines. Above us are Harvard, Stanford, and MIT and tied with us are Princeton and Berkeley. That is a pretty good league to be in, and that is a core strength. That is a strength of our faculty in research, which is something we can be proud of and is obviously something we need to continue to aspire to maintain and improve. It is something that has required great hiring from the bottom up. The provost doesn't hire people and the dean's don't hire people; the faculty [members] hire the faculty. What has happened is that our faculty [members] have raised their expectations about who they want to hire and we have raised the ability of the institution to hire the people we want.

What is happening with our students? In this chart [on the slide] the red [line] is the applicants for Arts and Sciences, the thin line is Pratt applicants, the blue line is SAT scores for Arts and Sciences matriculates, and the thin blue line is Pratt matriculates. What you can see here is a tremendous increase in the attractiveness of Duke and a very substantial increase in SAT scores; 3.4 percent is big in SAT scores. First of all, they are somewhat asymptotic, so it is hard to push it up. Second of all, don't forget that its 47 points out of 1600, so this is pretty good. I can tell you that compared to our peers we are in the upper quartile of improvement, which is true in both applicants and the quality as measured by SAT [scores], which is the only quality measure we have that we can use across schools, but SAT [scores] are not the full story by any means.

What about our diversity? This [on the slide] is probably my favorite chart since I came [to Duke] in 1981. On this chart, you can see the diversity of our student body and the way it has changed. Down here [on the slide] is 1984; this is number of minority students that we had, which is all non-white students: nine percent. Ninety-one percent of the students were white. This is where we are today with the entering class. If there is any humongous or phenomenal change in the character and culture of this university, it is captured in this slide. It is clearly not the only one, but in a way I think this is remarkable. If you were here in 1984 you didn't realize how white the campus was, but when you walk into the chapel today at freshman convocation you can understand how diverse the campus has become.

Here is what happened with our PhD students, and you can see a very substantial improvement in the number of applicants, the selectivity, the yield, and in the average GRE [scores]. This is for PhD students across Arts and Sciences. How have we done this? It takes money, and our net revenue picture is quite startling as well. I want to point out that this [graph] is in constant dollars, so the dollars in 2013 represent in buying power the same as the dollars did in 1999. What you can see here is that we went from a total revenue, in the provost's office, of 526 million to 961 million. These numbers are striking because of the difference. We had a five percent average growth rate from 1999 to 2009; that is a ten year period. Five percent a year for ten years gives you a lot of money to build the faculty, to get better students, and to do the things we have done. Since 1999, we are down to 2.8 percent or 4.4 overall.

It is unlikely that we are going to go back to a five percent growth rate on an annual basis. I think we are going to be higher than 2.8, but we are not likely to get back to five percent. One of the challenges that the faculty and deans will have is how do we continue this trajectory of improvement combining core strength and our distinctiveness with less resources? I would urge you to remember that during the downturn when we were down to negative numbers, we managed to sustain momentum. There is absolutely no reason that we cannot sustain our momentum in a period of 3.5 or four percent growth. We will have to be clever and more intelligent; when we cut 10 percent during the downturn, it didn't have huge effects. When you have as many resources as we had at five percent growth per year, you build in a little slack. We are going to have to be clever, but we can do it.

What are some of our biggest challenges with respect to sustaining and improving these core strengths? As I said, some schools are fiscally stretched, and Arts and Sciences is probably the most stretched, although it is coming out of this through the excellent leadership of Laurie and her team to bring the budget fully under control. It is important to understand that it is faculty growth and its size relative to the budget that has been the critical factor in this squeeze. It is not because a lot of money has been thrown away on other things; it is because the faculty grew so fast. I just want to show you the faculty growth from 1999 to today in Arts and Sciences, and you can see [on the slide] the growth rates. There has been huge growth over this period. It is what has allowed us to do the things we have done, but it is also worth remembering that if the budget is a little squeezed, there is a pretty good reason. If the downturn hadn't happened, we probably wouldn't be having this conversation.

Going back to the challenges and continuing to strengthen the diversity and inclusiveness of our faculty. We know that the Arts and Sciences council is leading a discussion about our vision for diversity in the next ten years, which is going to be critically important as well as implementation. We have developed a number of instruments that have allowed us to grow the diversity of our faculty and our student body while also sustaining our deep commitment to black faculty growth. Doing that in the next ten years and how we do that is a conceptual challenge, not just a financial or an implementation challenge, because diversity is becoming more complicated as a value for universities.

Next is faculty renewal in times of slower faculty growth. For me, this is the single biggest challenge Arts and Sciences has. If you can't grow the faculty as fast or add as many faculty every year because of the money to do it, and you don't have as many faculty retiring, which is a pattern that I will come to in a second, and you don't have any faculty leaving because they like it here so much or Laurie is so effective at retaining them through other mechanisms, then between the three of them the departure rate combined with a slower growth rate means....how are we going to have that incredible energy of intellectual renewal?

I will tell you the way the problem manifests itself. We have said this, and it is a political problem for the dean. If we have, as we have had for certain periods in the last decade, 29 or 30 faculty leaving and you want the faculty to be the same size then you can have about 35 searches because you hit on 75 or 80 percent of your searches. This year there will be about 17 faculty members leaving rather than 30. If you have 17 leaving and you want to keep your faculty even, then you can have about 21 searches. From the dean's point of view, and if you think of it politically, the department chairs will say, "Why didn't we get a search?" If you have 35 searches, almost every department can have a search almost every year. If you only have 20 searches, it is a different thing and the renewal process gets slowed down. This is going to be a real challenge for the dean, but it is one that has been created, in part, by our success, which should not be forgotten. Finally, I would say this: there is a danger of getting complacent. Here we are, ranked 7th, we have the 4th most research productive

faculty, and we have the deans and provost pushing us, why can't we slow down? That is another face of complacency, and if we get complacent, we will lose ground because everybody is pushing. To get the best students and the best faculty we will have to continue to push and maintain the nimbleness that we have had. How do we make appointments across schools or departments? How do we leverage one appointment into another? How do we create a cluster? How do we spend more resources one year and recognize that we may spend less next year, but therefore be able to hire the person we want now? We are going to have to keep that up or run the danger that we lose the advantage that we have gained.

Let me turn now to the distinctiveness side of the equation. We have talked about the core qualities, but our strategic distinction comes with the development of qualities that individually, but especially in combination, we do better and differently than our peers. That is where our distinctiveness is; nobody is unique and if you are one year you will not be the next year because everybody watches everybody else to look for cool programs. Distinctiveness comes from doing these things so well that they can't be replicated. You have to remember that we have to do this in an environment in which winners are taking all. Why do you think that in a period of constrained financial resources, nationally applications went up by 52 percent? If in 2008 somebody said, "Those elite privates are going to be in trouble, because everyone is pinching pennies and they will not want to send their kids to a school that costs fifty-thousand dollars." The opposite happened; you saw the application data. There is a flight to quality, and it is a winner-take-all, so you have to be really good to reap the benefits and make your faculty better, students better, and your educational experience better.

We have built our distinctiveness around these four elements: interdisciplinarity, globalization, knowledge in the service of society, and engagement. I am not going to spend a lot of time on [engagement] but we have built it into so many parts of our experience, whether it is the student or faculty experience. We have done this in a way that builds synergies between them, so we have addressed global challenges, which often require interdisciplinary solutions. You don't solve these kinds of issues with one discipline. You have these global challenges and you put your knowledge in the service of society with the interdisciplinary culture that we have built. Lots of people do that, but many do not as you saw earlier, which is fine. We need the mix, but we have put a lot of emphasis on this because that distinctiveness is enabling us to hire so many great faculty [members] in a lot of fields. The thing I want to stress is that there are no quick fixes. You do not build these strengths in one, two, or five years. It takes time, persistence, and an accumulation of success. I am going to show you some of the things we have been working at for a long time.

How far have we come? Let me start with interdisciplinarity. I don't expect you to read this [slide], but this is a timeline of our public commitment to interdisciplinarity at Duke. It starts in 1988 with an accreditation self-study called "crossing boundaries" that made the argument that Duke, by its size, location, the way the campus worked, and by the fact that its departments were inevitably going to be smaller, that its greatest advantage could come from internal collaboration of what we now call interdisciplinary work with departments and units across schools working together. Along the way we created an office of the vice provost of interdisciplinary studies to drive that agenda because you could not drive an agenda without someone who was charged with realizing it. We had strategic plans; first shaping our future then building on excellence and making a difference, each one of which reaffirmed that value, elaborated on it, and pushed what it was going to be. We have been making difference in setting up the institute structure, which Tom referred to. We did little things that people don't notice.

In 2002 we changed the way we distribute research overhead. I don't know how many of you are in the sciences, but we used to distribute research overhead by the location at Duke where the research was done. What that meant was if you did the work in a center, the dean didn't get the money instead the overhead went to the center. This set up a big conflict between the deans and the interdisciplinary units because the deans said, "You don't want to do work with those colleagues in the center. It would be a lot better if you do it in your department." We changed the rule so that no matter where you do the work or who do the work with, if you are the PI the overhead goes to your dean and the school from which you originate. All of a sudden the dean doesn't care where you do the work. In fact, the dean may be happy you are doing the work with someone else from another department or school because you are going to get more work done, it is going to be more appreciated, you are going to get more grants, and there is going to be more overhead returning to the school. It was a little thing that was subtle and under the surface but it makes a huge difference in the science and grant community within our interdisciplinary work. Notice the long time frame: from 1988 to today and we are still working everyday with Bass connections being the next step.

What are the challenges? One of the challenges clearly is that as resources tighten, as they say in labor economics "last in, first out." Interdisciplinarity is the last in, so the danger is that it will be the first out when resources get tighter. We can't let that happen; we have to maintain the balance. So far we have done a great job, in part because of the culture among the deans who get this and understand the value of it. We have particular strains with the school of medicine because they have a different budgeting system, which makes it harder for them to manage this kind of thing but we are doing well. We have to maintain the flexibility. From the beginning we said the interdisciplinary institutes were not to become like departments. We don't let them raise endowment or hire tenure and tenure-track faculty. Why not? Because once they raise endowment or hire tenure track faculty, it's going to be almost impossible for them to go away. We require all of the appointments to be joint with departments.

We continue to innovate with Bass Connections and with the arts. We are seeing the fruits of success, one of which is that everybody wants to be an institute. With every new initiative, someone says, "We got six people together for three weeks, can we be an institute?" Another success is that you would not believe the number of faculty who come to Duke because they know they can work with faculty across units. "I can work with someone from another department! I

can work with someone in another school!” The creative energy that comes out of that is incredible. Of course, the challenge is that we have to sustain this with money.

What about global Duke? Again, there is a long timeline. I was the first Vice Provost for Academic and International Affairs in 1993. We had done a strategic plan for internationalizing the university in 1992. There is a 20 year plus trajectory of building in two phases. The first was when we were pursuing a magnet strategy to internationalize the campus by drawing international elements to Durham. The second phase, which added on to that, was pushing Duke out into world of which DKU is the most prominent example. Of course, we have built programs like Duke Engage to get our students all kinds of global experiences. Today, we have a global vision that was developed by the global priorities committee based on faculty initiative. We have DKU launching in August and we have students and faculty in over 100 countries in the world every year. It is pretty startling and it’s a challenge for our academic programs. How do we prepare the students for this?

We have new initiatives in Arts and Sciences that are centered on Africa and Brazil. How do those happen? The faculty [members] come and say, “We think there is a community and we would like to put it together and get support.” That is what we have done. We had three faculty [members] come to us about Africa who said, “Six of us have been meeting on the side, is there some way we can get support?” I said, “Go find how many faculty are working on Africa.” They came back three months later with a list of 120 faculty. That is a serious thing. As for undergraduates, 45 percent study abroad, there are about 425 students per year in Duke Engage, the MasterCard Foundation is bringing students from Africa, and the international undergraduate population was two percent in 1993 but this year it will be about 10 percent.

What are the challenges? DKU is obviously an enormous strategic opportunity, but it also a big challenge and takes a lot of time. We are learning a lot of lessons and I think it will be a long term success, but it takes a lot of time and effort. How do we reap the rewards of our global presence Durham and abroad? How do we ensure that our students are prepared for a globalized world? We have to keep working on this and keep thinking about it. How do we use our advising system, which I know you are working on, to get our students prepared in this dimension as we do in other dimensions? How do we fully realize this three campus model in Duke’s vision? I won’t go into that now.

The other distinct feature is knowledge in the service of society. You can start to see how these things are working together because you can’t do a lot of the things in globalization without interdisciplinary initiatives, which ties heavily into service in society. Again, this is in the 2001 university mission statement. If you look at President Brodhead’s initial inaugural speech in 2004 he laid out this as being the thing he thought Duke could make itself distinctive in. Here we are 10 years later and we are working hard on this. We have the assets because of the way these things intersect and we have taken a bunch of steps with strategic plans, the institutes and initiatives coming out of that plan, and now continuing to build new ways of tying together knowledge in the service of society, in some cases global, with interdisciplinarity into a synergy that makes them really powerful. It makes it hard for other institutions to be like us and they look at us now.

What are the real challenges here? First of all, we have to find the right balance. We have to continue to deeply value the traditional disciplines and the core strengths that we have. Not everything is in the distinctiveness side and not everything is in the traditional core strengths. To balance this, to sustain the balance, and to balance basic, problem-driven classical and contemporary knowledge is going to be difficult. That is a job the faculty working with the deans and divisional deans in Arts and Sciences need to be attentive to. We have to maintain focus because we can’t do everything. We have identified areas where we are going to be strong, but we have also said there are things we are not going to do. We have to sustain the focus on the US as well as on the global.

What are some of the challenges ahead? We have to continue to link strategic thinking and planning with the resources for priorities. That has been one of our hallmarks. When we created a priority we put money behind it. My guess is that the new provost will be doing a strategic plan before too long, and one of her challenges will be to tie that plan and the planning process to the resources to deliver on the priorities that emerge from it. We have to maintain the strategic focus and we have to have funding for the central priorities and keep the 10 percent or so because if it gets too low we get too decentralized and we lose the strategic focus. We have to focus on the faculty renewal problem, and I will tell you it is an issue in a number of our schools for the same reasons it is an issue in Arts and Sciences. We have to make choices between adding faculty and deepening faculty research. I will tell you that basically it doesn’t look like the Arts and Sciences faculty needs to grow that much. We are down to eight students per faculty member, which is the fourth or fifth lowest faculty-to-student ratio among our peers. There is a choice and everything is a trade-off. If you put more money in graduate students you have less money for faculty or if you hire less faculty and each faculty member is worth four PhD students. You have to make a choice. We have to continue to strengthen the diversity and inclusiveness of our faculty and student body.

Another set of challenges has to do with the broader environment in which we are operating in. There is a tremendous demand for intellectual leadership. DKU is a product of the Chinese saying, “Your US educational model is something we need as we become a globally influential country.” We are also going to have pressure on tuition. I don’t think there is any question about it. Can we sustain four percent per year? Probably for a while for a set of reasons that are too complicated to review here, but we do review them on a regular basis. Even at a supply and demand level with the financial aid it is pretty obvious, but it is not going to go on forever. Of course, we are getting a lot of grief in public opinion. It is directed in a very diffuse way against institutions of higher education. Sometimes we are the target and sometimes it is the public, but it is a constraint on what we do.

We also have to seize these new opportunities. If you'll excuse me, when I was here a year ago I took a shot in the head, so I thought I would come back to that theme. I thought I would do it in following way. Last year I believed that due to the errors that were made under my leadership, we allowed process to get caught up with substance as we talked about innovation and the use of online. We never had clarity on what we were talking about on either side. Let me elaborate in a few slides what I think about in this area of online education.

First of all, in the area of MOOCs, which are massive online open courses that are not for credit. That is what the Courseras of the world offer. They are not for credit, they don't engage the Duke university name as a for-credit institution, and I have never said and I don't believe anyone at Duke has ever maintained that we are going to make MOOCs for-credit at Duke. It is certainly on no one's agenda now. I think it also must be said that the efforts to undertake MOOCs have somehow nationally and at Duke prompted an attention to pedagogy that we haven't had in decades. It is an attention to how and what we teach and whether it is good or bad. Are we doing things as well as we could? Might we do something better? There has been more discussion on that even if it has been controversial than we had in the preceding decade.

It has led to the development of new materials for courses. It has challenged the question of how long the courses are, and this is going to come back to Arts and Sciences in the form of whether our current system of counting for credit as courses is the best way to encourage the best pedagogy. We have seen a lot of faculty teaching MOOCs asking why they are teaching for 14 weeks. "I am only teaching for 14 weeks because somebody says I can't give credit for a course unless I teach for fourteen weeks. If I had a credit-hour system I could teach a two credit hour course and teach for ten weeks and the student could pick it up somewhere else." It is going to come back to challenges.

We have seen a lot of translation of what people have been doing in MOOCs into their for-campus courses as part of their lecture and discussion material. It has been a lifting up and bringing in to the more traditional course format in new and different ways. We are also starting to discuss, in some courses in the sciences, on whether MOOCs can be used as prep material. Let's say you are teaching calculus, and we know that students who arrive on campus may have had some AP calculus while others have gone to schools where AP calculus was not available. There is a big spread and they have to take calculus if they want to do lots of things. What if there were courses that were available for students to do on a voluntary basis that allowed them to prepare better? It is no different than saying, "Read this book before you take this course." If you do that, you might narrow that space in the class, which would allow the faculty member to teach in a different way. Whether you teach to the bottom, top, or middle makes a difference on where they are.

What about online in for-credit courses? Notice that nobody has been talking about fully online courses for credit, what we have been talking about is if there are ways to use online elements more effectively in some classes at the instructor's discretion to make the class different. We have lots of flipped courses going on and there is a lot of experimentation with using online materials to present parts or all of the lectures. The students are complaining, not because they don't like online, but because those courses are harder than regular courses because they have to prepare the material every week. They have to be ready for the class discussion just as in a humanities course where you have to read the book and if you are not ready you are lost in class. They have to do the reading and watch the lecture before they come to class. There is a lot of experimentation going on.

What about Duke-originated online lectures and sections that are taught online? This might be an opportunity in some places. We had an experiment this year where a faculty member split her course. The course always had flipped lectures, so in the first half of the semester she taught with in-class sections and the second half with online sections. We are going to get the outcome of that, but the interesting thing was the feedback. "These online sections are cool, because I get to see everybody's face online every time. I am not sitting in a circle where half of the students are obscured from me. In fact, it is a lot harder for me to look away and do my thing when I'm in an online section." That is not everybody and we are going to see what it looks like, but the point is that its experimentation. It is faculty trying things and re-thinking pedagogy. There are a lot of other examples, but all I am trying to suggest is that there are so many ways that we can experiment with this.

That is what I wanted to say. We are building a university which has enormous core strengths and which is becoming a distinctive place. It is a place that attracts faculty and students who are not the same as those we attracted 20 years ago. It is not the same school some of us came to 30 years ago. For me as Provost that is the most exciting thing. The dynamism, experimentation, change, innovation, and the willingness to innovate makes Duke a great place and it has been my privilege to be provost for 15 years and help to have that happen.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Peter, on behalf of Arts and Sciences council thank you for your stellar leadership these past fifteen years. We have an opportunity to hear an end of the year address from Dean Laurie Patton, and I will not waste any time with an introduction of someone we all know very well. I urge representatives to stick it out; I know you may have other things to do at five o'clock, so I am going to try to turn to our business item involving elections at about ten minutes to five.

Dean's Address

Dean Laurie Patton: We have a bit of a technical issue, but in the meantime I am delighted to introduce our new provost. I thought she should come over for little bit to say hello, and she is a master at squeezing five minutes into any part of her day. I will turn it over to Sally Kornbluth, our new provost.

Sally Kornbluth: Laurie did not clue me in to the size of this group. The last time I was in this room was when I was a member of the academic council. I have to say that I am a big believer in faculty governance, and I am really interested in hearing people's ideas. Obviously, I don't know everybody here, but I want the barrier to be low for people to ask me to

talk about things. I would love to come and talk to this group when you are dealing with substantive issues that I can have some input into or if you have substantive issues that you want to tell me that I should be listening to. I hope we get to have those interactions. Even though I come from medicine, I have had at least some touch with Arts and Sciences. I was a political science major who made the shift to biology by being in an environment where people are open to diverse thoughts and exposing students to a lot of different areas, so I am interested in how we can expose our current students to a real diversity of thought and how we get them to understand diverse perspectives and I am interested in hearing your perspectives. If anyone has any specific things they want to talk about, or [have any] questions, I am happy to do that.

Laurie Patton: Sally is going to come back next fall to say a few more words; we are really glad that you are here on any number of levels.

Sally Kornbluth: I do hope get to meet everyone over time. I know a bunch of people but I don't know everybody, so you are very welcome to talk to me about anything or get to meet.

Laurie Patton: I am going to be giving my talk from memory because I don't think anyone can get it up on the computer. The first thing I wanted to give you a heads up on was finances. The number one thing to be aware of is that we are still, as Peter said, in a bit of a turning-the-tanker-around mode. We have basically reduced our deficit from 7.2 million to 1.2 million next year. That is extraordinary and that is because of you; there is no other way to put it. I want to thank every single one of you in the collaborative budget process that has allowed this to happen. That collaborative budget process in which we gave you and your departments more data than ever had before ended up creating a great model, not only for financial literacy to be everywhere and folks to have more information about their departments than ever before, but in addition, for each of you to have more control over how you want to find deficiencies, reduce expenditures, and create revenue.

One of the reasons we have been able to do so much in that arena is because of our new masters programs that are going to be coming online. I want to particularly call out John Klingensmith on that, who is the associate dean of the graduate school. He has been working with us day in and day out in making sure these programs are Duke quality no matter what. They are really put through the pipeline with expedience but at the same time with real care. We have developed new protocols for those approval processes, so thank you John.

In addition, we know as we move forward that we are going to be able to continue searching. We have a few more searches online than we did last year. As you now know if you're familiar with working with me, the way do this because frequently we can't do as many searches as we have done in the past, is that we tend to do approved out-of-cycle searches. It won't hit our budget immediately next year, but in the year after, and we will still work with you on getting that search done. It is a way of keeping faith and momentum. As you know, I think all of the problems are time, money, space, and relationship, so we work with all of those in making sure we keep that hiring momentum going. We are very excited about continuing to work on those hires with you as we move forward. The key thing to remember this year is that we have about the same number of predicted departures as we thought. It did not go up or down, so we are feeling more comfortable in making those predictions in balancing the number of faculty vacancies with the number of searches we can do, as Peter was talking about. We are feeling good about not over-predicting or under-predicting as we move forward.

I want to remind you of the four major things that give us the squeeze. One is the reduction in SIP funds. Second is financial aid, which is continuing to push us and that is a national trend. Third is our F&As; we are still going up in terms of return, but it's not as high as we would like. Finally, is the number of faculty we have that want to be at Duke. We are pushing on all of those fronts, as you know. Just as a reminder, we are going to continue to have to push on all of those fronts as we move forward. The basic news is really good. We have a 1.2 million dollar deficit that we are projecting for next year, and it is something we could resolve tomorrow by dipping into reserves. If we did that, we would have no reserves left, so I am keeping that 1.2 million dollar deficit and it is there for rhetorical purposes to remind ourselves that part of what it means to get our fiscal house in shape is to make sure we build up our reserves at the same time. I am thrilled with that brief financial report.

The second thing I want to do is give you an update on the campaign. It is going full guns; we are now at 61 percent of our goal, which is about 430 million dollars. We are very excited about being at that percentage and other schools are around that as well. They range from 30 percent to 80 percent, so we are absolutely on track. This year we are doing well in numbers of commitments, checks that have already come in, positions raised, and initiatives. One of the things I wanted to say was the Bass Connections matching funds have proven to help Arts and Sciences. We have led in the number of chairs we have raised that are connected with Bass Connections, so we are happy about that. The other thing that I wanted to mention in terms of the campaign is that I know my travel schedule has been heavy this year, and it doesn't look like it's going to stop anytime soon. The schlep factor remains for me in terms of those gifts that are the best for Arts and Sciences, which is about 25,000 up to 500,000 dollars. That is where we are going to get most of our money, which means we will have to do a lot of small events and so on.

Next year, we are going to be continuing as usual with two specific exceptions. One: we need to focus on a particular building for our science faculty that we are collaborating on with engineering. Many of you who work in physics or related fields know that the Physics and Math building has been difficult for anyone to do research in for a long time. That has been our number one priority, and we have been really lucky to have Tom Katsouleas in the School of Engineering to help with this. We have almost completed the test for that building, which suggests we can think about going forward within two or three years. We still have to work on the finances, which is going to be a challenge. Our next challenge is the psychology and sociology building. It is the same problem; can you really conduct research in those

conditions? Can you really recruit faculty? Those are our two top priorities. I know there are a lot of other building issues for folks. We spend about one or two million dollars every summer re-doing classrooms and areas so people can continue to feel like they're working in a great space, so the campaign will focus on that.

The other thing the campaign will focus on is financial aid, which is a really big stressor for us as it is for everyone. We are pushing on that and making a new case for financial aid in Arts and Sciences because so much of our goal has to be fulfilled in the campaign with financial aid. The other thing to say is that as we continue to commit to diversity there is an important level in which financial aid helps us remain as diverse as we are, which is part of the new argument that we continue to make. As you have been reading and listening to NPR, that issue is not over in the courts and we are trying to push to make sure that, in particular, the private elites can stand for a commitment to diversity. One of the major ways to do that is through financial aid. Those are going to be the two emphases in the campaign. We are going to need faculty help in making that case, whether it is through stories or any number of other things. That is going to make a difference, and in the fall, I am going to give you some ideas that we have about building that mini-campaign within a campaign for financial aid.

After covering the financial aid and campaign picture more broadly, I would like to move onto thinking about where we have come on several initiatives. The first is Bass Connections; we now have about 120 Arts and Sciences faculty engaged in Bass Connections projects of various kinds. We also have a number of students involved in it from Arts and Sciences. It leads in that area, and we have about 200 or 300 students involved in Bass Connections and we have almost 50 teams. There are two concerns; one is to make sure that all of the faculty are engaged in Bass Connections. The second is to hear from departments on how Bass Connections is affecting people. On the one hand, it has been transformational, but on the other hand departments may be feeling the squeeze in a number of different ways. What I would like to do is hear from departments in the fall, perhaps have a faculty forum, on what we can do better with Bass Connections, so I can transmit that to the Provost's office. I have influence, but not control, and if I jump up and down then people will listen. We have had a year now, so we have some data on the ground around Bass Connections.

I have another brief report to give you on DKU. It is going to open its doors in the fall, and we are very excited about that. There will be many Arts and Sciences faculty in over ten courses per small unit. Remember that DKU is going to be offering smaller unit classes as it is designed for its curriculum. The other thing I am very excited about on that score is that there is going to be an integration of the liberal arts in China committee, which has been working very hard this year with a number of faculty, students, and administrators involved in thinking about what the liberal arts curriculum is going to be over time. We have been developing a number of different models, reading a lot on education in China, and comparing the curriculum in a number of interesting ways. We are beginning to throw out some models of what that might look like.

We are open to suggestions; the whole point of taking five years to do this is that it is an iterative model and we are working from the ground up. Beginning in the fall we are going to be assessing those classes and looking at what's working and what doesn't about the classes we are offering and rethinking what we might do for a more permanent curriculum as we watch what happens in our semester of study away at DKU. The other thing I wanted to make sure people knew about DKU, and we will have Nora back in the fall around this, is that one of the things that we are particularly excited about is giving the faculty the opportunity to use our conference center to create small but scalable research programs around Asia. If you have ideas about that, I know Nora Bynum would be open to faculty suggestions as well as members of the LAC. In fact, if you have an interest in serving on that committee, you would be more than welcome to approach us and we could slot you in.

Another thing that I think is worth mentioning in this context is the online learning initiative conversations that we have had this year. Everybody here in the Arts and Sciences council has known and seen all of the work that we have done together, which has been motivated by a broader conversation in Arts and Sciences council led by Arts and Sciences council. I have been thrilled to watch it and see it unfold. I think we are seeing some interesting patterns. The student survey has shown that students come to Duke to have face-to-face interactions with professors and online learning is supplemental. That is the way they want it, and that is what we have heard loud and clear. We have heard faculty thinking about creative pedagogies that work for them. The broader thing we learned, even from the 2U experiment that only lasted a year, is that this question of residential education is absolutely essential for us. This question of face-to-face engagement is something that has to be part and parcel of everything that drives our understanding of technology.

I wanted give you an update on where we are at the end of year with the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences. In the humanities, we have been able to create small consortial grants for people who are ready to work on their own research and move through consortia and small mini-conferences at a number of different levels, so we have been able to fund those. We also have a Mellon grant; we have received it, but it hasn't been announced yet by Mellon, so this is something that can be talked about but not publicized in a broad way. The Mellon is giving us money to think about the future of the disciplines more broadly. We are going to be able to fund each department through the Franklin Humanities institute to think through what its discipline is and what the future of its discipline is. It is part of a pendulum swing that I have been thinking about a lot. We have also created a humanities advisor within our advising system as well as created some humanities and arts blue devil days. We have record numbers of blue devil days attendees, we are at record level selectivity at just under 10 percent, and we are at record yield. Also, in humanities writ large we are going to be focusing more on how we might be able to give emerging networks grants to and through departments.

In the social sciences, Angie O’Rand has been extraordinary at creating a collaborative network of research in population studies over the life cycle. Those have emerged into a wonderful research network, they have submitted some major grants, and we are excited about that as well. That should be continuing to thrive as we go forward. Finally, in the sciences we are very excited about inaugurating a women in science seminar. We will be in touch with people who are interested and we will have a major speaker each semester, or more if there is funding an interest. It will have a woman scientist who is going to present her work as well as do a workshop on the challenges for diversity in the sciences. We just hosted Elizabeth Travis who was with us for four days on this new idea of sponsorship rather than mentorship. She had an interesting idea on creating as much energy around building diversity in those fields as possible. Those are quick updates from our divisions.

I think I will end by giving you an idea of where I would like us to move in the fall. I have a background in faculty development and I used to be charged with creating university-wide conversations. I am struck by our online conversation in that it has given us a chance to think differently about pedagogy. We don’t have a teaching and learning center here that is only focused on pedagogy. We have an extraordinary teaching with technology center in CIT and Lynne O’Brien’s leadership at the vice provost’s level has been phenomenal. I would like to work with faculty in thinking about pedagogy with a deep commitment to it and what it looks like. I would be happy to receive proposals around what that Arts and Sciences-wide conversation could look like, maybe with a new model for a teaching and learning center. I think that would be extraordinary for all of us, and it could include some of the robust conversations that we have been having about online.

Number two is that the strategic plan we will be doing with the new provost is coming up, and that plan is going to happen for the whole university as Sally comes on board. I think it is important for us to begin thinking about that without making work. How do we use departmental reviews, look at them rigorously, and think about where departments want to go as the beginning data for our next strategic plan? That is going to take a couple of years, but I want us to start thinking about that now. I will say more about this in the fall.

The third thing is thinking about the “big tweak” of the curriculum. Basically, the thing we are concerned about is whether our curriculum is too complex for students. It is fairly simple but in a way so many of our opportunities for students are large. Is there a simpler path or a simpler curriculum? One of the things we want to do is think about those questions. Can we find a way for some integration of departments and departmental majors with our general education majors so there could be more space freed up for students to take risks and feel like they can fail. The number one thing we know about Duke students, especially this time of the semester, is that they don’t feel comfortable with failure.

Those are the big questions right now, and I will say a lot more in the fall. Those are the three things that I am signaling we would like to move forward with in the fall. The principle has guided so much of what we have done, whether it is the global health co-major, which is up and running, or the new Innovation and Entrepreneurship certificate, which is extraordinary and we are getting a social entrepreneurship institute going that faculty from all three divisions have been a part of. Whenever I think of any of those innovations, they are successful because of the following principle: liberal learning and the principles of liberal learning have to lead and everything else has to follow. As long as we commit to that principle, I think we will be even better and even more like Duke.

Announcements

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Representatives, I am going to ask you to stay for another five minutes so we can complete our business for this year. I know people have other commitments to go to, but let me announce the results of the elections. I have some lists of the new council representatives who will be serving in September. Organizing elections for 20 units and programs is very demanding; I want to make that very clear. Those units who completed elections have their results here. We have notified units of who has been elected, but I want to call your attention to a couple of issues for when you return to your units or if you think about your service in the next year.

First off, alternates are very important. We had a couple of units that still need to identify and officially recognize alternates. One thing that has happened over the last several years in council service is that colleagues are away more often than they used to be whether it’s leave or going to a conference, and having an informed alternate who can also vote for a unit is important. I will underscore this: our bylaws do not allow proxy votes. If you do not have a selected alternate, your unit may not vote. In that regard, representatives it is important that you work closely with your alternates.

Second of all, because we had so many new elections I have decided in consultation with ECASC to recommend that the new terms of service be staggered so that we don’t have as many elections at any given time. We have roughly 35 representatives to council, and it would work much better for continuity and also building more experience for those who continue their service to elect one-third instead of two-thirds of the council at any given time. The letters of appointment that will go to the newly elected representatives will either have two or three years of service. The bylaws call for three, but by doing half of the newly elected representatives in this fashion we will get back on balance. There is one unit that still needs to have a representative and that is the Sanford school for complicated reasons.

We have one item of business but I don’t think we have a quorum to do that, which is to elect members to ECASC. Let me make this suggestion because I don’t see a quorum here in the room that we do this as an electronic vote among current representatives of the council. I would much prefer to do that so that new members of ECASC can know exactly who they are and can begin their work after July 1 and so we don’t rush through an election. I see this is the sense of the meeting, so we will do this electronically. Just to be very clear, those who will be voting are current representatives to the council who complete their terms this year. Newly elected representatives would be voting for anything that happens after July 1.

The executive committee also serves as the nominating committee and I sent an announcement yesterday that the executive committee would like to put forward five names for you to consider. I want to make it clear why it is only five; normally it would be eight because we would be recommending at least two candidates for every position that is open and we have four open positions: two from the social sciences and one each from the natural sciences and humanities. What we do on ECASC is that before we make any recommendations to council representatives, I talk with every single nominee so that when we make our recommendations to you for nominations, we know that these are colleagues who will not only stand for election but will serve. If you'll take a moment to reflect on how busy your own time is and how many commitments you have, we don't want to waste your time voting for colleagues who are going to be on leave in the fall or who are unable to serve for some other reason.

I will briefly review the list for you, and then we will carry out an electronic ballot in the next few days. From the social sciences the executive committee would like to advance the following names: our colleague Linda George from sociology who has been serving as a representative this past year. We have a colleague newly elected who could also serve and has agreed to do so if elected to be a social science representative; that is Michael Munger who will be coming onto council. Michael is in the political science department and he was the former chair of that department. He has a lot of Duke experience and I thought the political science department made a good decision in electing him to the position. For the natural sciences we would like to advance our colleague Chantal Reid from biology. Chantal will be coming to council as an alternate next year, but let me make it clear that members of council also include alternates and she may serve on the executive committee as an alternate. Also, our colleague Dick MacPhail from the chemistry department and we will elect one person to this position. Finally, for the humanities position we would like to nominate our colleague José María Rodríguez-García who is here and who also stood for election in the fall. We will elect one representative in the humanities.

Let me make it clear, and I will have to follow up with an email, that nominations from among representatives are also encouraged. We would like to have more nominations, but I think because of the high turnover in representatives and also being able to guarantee that they would serve if elected made it more difficult for us to identify eight candidates for you. If you would like to nominate other representatives, you have the list of newly elected representatives and alternates. You may freely consult among yourselves and advance a nominee. I will send out a note on how we can organize that process and I think the executive committee would be very happy if they knew they could ride off into the sunset this summer knowing that the affairs of council are in good hands. Thank you colleagues, have a wonderful end of the semester and a good summer. You will be hearing from me about this last bit of business.

Meeting Adjourned