

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, March 5, 2015

### Call to Order

**Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History):** We welcome you to the March 5<sup>th</sup> of the Arts & Sciences Council and we appreciate your turning out. I'm going to change the order of business today due to some last minute changes in schedules. I'd like to turn first to Lee Baker and his report on student athletes, then we'll have announcements and updates, and then we'll turn to Sherryl Broverman and the report of the plagiarism review committee. Then we'll turn to bylaw revisions, and we have a moment for dean's corner at the end of the meeting. I apologize in advance because I have to catch a flight and I will be leaving at 4:30 or so; Chantal Reid from ECASC will be chairing the last portion of the meeting.

### Mitigation Strategies for Academic Irregularities Among Student Athletes

**Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs):** I circulated an old memo; one of the reasons I did not update it is to demonstrate with an historical record that we've been on this for about five years or so. What we do at Duke in terms of our athletic academic success is nothing short of amazing. When we look at the graduation success rate (the number of students who graduate minus the transfer/go pro/early departure), we really are at the top in the country, along with Stanford and Notre Dame. That's basketball, football, but more importantly, field hockey, swimming, lacrosse, cross country. We really take the mentoring as well as the academic support of our students seriously. They are students first, but are also playing at a very high level of intercollegiate sports. For the last 25 years or so, we've led the ACC honor roll among our peers and we really crush everyone in terms of honor roll for football. Our football players both graduate on time and are very academically successful. That said, this system is built on a lot of trust. Our DUS's, our faculty, our staff have a lot of discretionary power to do stuff with our student athletes ... to maybe make a decision that wouldn't be in the long-term interest of the university. So there's a lot of trust built into the system, and thank goodness the trust works, and there are checks and balances in place. That said, my colleague Brad Berndt in Athletics and I work really hard as a team to make sure there's no "soft spots." We have some mechanisms in place to make sure there are even no academic irregularities. Our approach, philosophically, is to use a lot of data to see if there's any irregularities, but then we also use a person-to-person system to also ensure there are no irregularities.

I wanted to go through a couple of the strategies that we follow, then open up for questions. First, Martha Putallaz is our faculty rep to the NCAA as well as the ACC. We also have an athletic council, chaired by Jim Coleman, made up of faculty and staff. Within that athletic council, we have a faculty council with members appointed by the President. Each year, I have to report the academic progress of our athletes to this council. It holds the students accountable, it holds myself and Brad accountable ... it's just a good exercise to see where we are in terms of GPA. Christoph (Guttentag) also reports in the fall on the admissions side of things. What's grown out of that is these strategies. We've identified the most popular classes taken by our student athletes, and Matt Serra in our Office of Assessment has been a great partner on this. We've all heard about "easy class" lists for athletes. I was pretty sure we didn't have an official list, but we could easily figure out which classes were disproportionately taken by athletes. We've crunched the numbers, and does anyone want to take a guess as to the most popular classes taken by athletes? One might think Markets and Management, but you know what it was? It was Spanish and Introductory Calculus. I'm okay with that. If you dig down a little deeper, many of the students that were not recruited athletes have probably had those in high school and so we do offer them, they do need

to take them. That might be the explanation there. I'm very comfortable having our languages and our math department being over-represented by student athletes taking classes.

Every semester, after drop-add, we start looking at which classes have more than 50 percent athletes in them, and we look for team clusterings. Sometimes, it just happens, with practice schedules. But we want to look at it and explain it. There has been, on one occasion, where we canceled a class. Something just didn't look right and we wanted to mitigate risk. It ended up being fine, but in general now we are advising teams against clustering. We don't want the field hockey team taking up half a class, so that when they travel, half the class is gone and it disrupts the education. So if you have too much of one team and it's traveling season, it can be disruptive, particularly in a small class.

We also analyze independent studies, and have done so well before this became an issue at UNC and Syracuse. I thought if there's going to be a soft spot at Duke, it's going to be independent studies. So about five years ago, we did an exhaustive study of how many athletes did independent study with particular faculty members and/or just doing a lot of independent studies. Now, independent studies, particularly when tied to undergraduate research, is a high-impact learning practice. We want our students to have faculty-student interaction in this particular type of learning environment. But it's hard to consistently control quality on independent studies and – I hate to say this – sometimes faculty can be fans. Again, we don't want to police that relationship; we want to encourage it. But we don't want it to go on more than once unless there's academic justification, like a senior thesis. We have strict scrutiny on that second independent study. That's been working well, and just by putting that in place, we've reduced the number of repeat independent studies. Then we looked at all the faculty members who did a lot of independent studies with athletes. Thank goodness, we found that they just do a lot of independent studies. I took every one of those faculty members out for coffee and I explained the stakes. Again, using information but also using the "high touch" interaction, personal approach. Everyone was very understanding and excited that I noticed they were doing all these independent studies. Basically, I told them to keep the work product forever, because you never know when an investigation might come. Everyone agreed.

Then, and this is Brad Berndt's idea, we convene twice a semester an academic oversight group made up of DUS's and faculty and others interested in athletics and higher education at Duke. What this does is align little things, like paying the same for tutors in athletics as for tutors in academics. We want to have the same policies in place for both sides of campus. This has been a tremendous success; it's a high functioning, high impact committee that does some really great work.

So those are some of the approaches we're taking and I'm comfortable with it. I just got back from a meeting where all my counterparts in the ACC got together and shared best practices and initiatives. Other people take a much heavier hand, looking at grades of athletes to see if they are statistically different than the mean average. They will take athletes out of classes. I think we have the right touch in terms of having oversight but not being too heavy handed in terms of managing course selections and scrutinizing grades.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Did your review include summer school courses?

**Lee Baker:** No. Athletes are our biggest constituent in summer school courses, so it would be difficult to do. What we have done is to try innovative things which allow athletes to participate in things like DukeEngage and Study Abroad. Athletes aren't often able to participate in these programs for a variety of reasons, such as training. So we've designed an immersive Spanish language program for our athletes that is service learning. It's active learning in the community, using their Spanish in the community.

**Robert Wolpert (Statistical Science):** Would you have caught the type of abuses that happened at UNC?

**Lee Baker:** I'm very close with my counterpart over there and they have many of the same strategies in place. We've had many conversations about this issue and I think she was doing a great job. Could it happen here? Absolutely. This is my best attempt at mitigating, but again, it's built on trust.

**Robert Wolpert (Statistical Science):** For example, the classes taken disproportionately by athletes. Those should have shown up at UNC.

**Lee Baker:** Those were more like independent studies and they might not have shown up. Laurie (Patton) and I talk a lot about how proud we are of our student athletes. Ten percent of our students are recruited varsity athletes. It takes one, two cases and that whole reputation could unwind quickly. So we're doing our best to make sure it doesn't happen here.

**Brad Berndt (Athletics):** I think a group like this has the responsibility to ask the tough questions and if you don't get answers, that's our fault. But I think cross-transparency is the bedrock of what we do. We've got to be trusting of each other. But at the end of the day, people do things they shouldn't do, and we, as an institution have to call them on it.

**Lee Baker:** Some people can rationalize their actions. They can make a logical, perhaps unethical – but they say it’s ethical – choice. “I’m helping this kid out. He’s getting beat up on the field. He needs a break. It’s just one class.” So they are sort of faking themselves into thinking they are doing something right, with perhaps disastrous outcomes. I think everyone is well intended, but we’re hoping no one rationalizes non-compliance as ethical behavior.

**Robert Wolpert:** Would the procedures that you are putting in place detect the hijinks that happened at UNC?

**Lee Baker:** Yes. I’ve also talked with Bruce Cunningham, our registrar, and he would have been able to flag them as well. But then again, something could happen...

**Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies):** One of the things that happened at UNC was there was a kind of firewall between the coaches and the academic side and the coaches just simply didn’t know anything. At least that’s what we heard.

**Lee Baker:** We have an effective structure in Athletics in terms of academic coordinators for each team having access to coaches. On our side, our academic deans as well as advisors work closely with the coordinators, which work closely with me and work closely with the faculty. So we can get to a coach. Communication happens on a regular basis. It might not be perfect for all terms, but there’s a structure in place for all our high-impact teams and we’re comfortable with it.

**Brad Berndt:** This year, we’re also going to a dean-specific sport, with each dean being assigned to a specific team, so the academic dean can more easily identify things like clustering in courses. So that’s another level of checks.

**Linda George (Sociology):** I know the coordinators for football and men’s and women’s basketball, and they are terrific people. They are very proactive and want to know about things like course attendance. I’m advisor to a fair number of athletes in other sports, like tennis and swimming, and I never hear a word. I wouldn’t know if they have an academic advisor. The students are doing fine, don’t get me wrong, but I want to know what the academic advisors are told their mission is, and is there a shared understanding of how proactive they would be? It seems to me you should be able to easily look up the academic advisor for every sport in case you have a student who is running into problems.

**Brad Berndt:** Instructors should be getting a form at the beginning of every semester that’s been signed by Lee and myself listing the academic dean and the academic coordinator.

**Linda George:** Advisors should get that information, too.

**Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** I was wondering about the distribution of resources since students in sports other than football and basketball don’t seem to be getting the same support as students in those sports.

**Lee Baker:** Let me ask a question: in those less-visible sports, do they need the support?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Maybe not. I just want to make sure that athletes in lower profile sports get the same level of support.

**Brad Berndt:** So the most under-prepared students are the ones who get the most resources, but there is a person assigned for each sport.

**David Malone (Education):** When you disaggregate this data into revenue sports and non-revenue sports, do you find the same patterns?

**Lee Baker:** Yes.

**Laurie Patton:** Just a small thing to say: Lee and I, wherever we are in the world, have to make academic disciplinary calls that might not be the same call that Athletics would make. Most of the time we agree, even when those decisions impact revenue sports. But in the times when we disagreed, Athletics did not push back.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you, Lee.

### **Announcements and Updates**

**Tom Robisheaux:** Some announcements and updates: our February minutes are not quite ready for review. I would like to call attention and thank openly and publicly David Malone and Inge Walther and the Curriculum Committee for their work on the course credits proposal that Council approved last meeting. Second, I sent to all faculty the announcement

from David and the Curriculum Committee that beginning March 23<sup>rd</sup>, the committee will suspend active consideration of new certificate proposals due to the consideration of the new curriculum. Finally, colleagues, we need you to be active consultants in your departments. There are several really important issues coming up, including the plagiarism sanctions review report. One of the important roles of Council members is to be purveyors of information back and forth to academic units. This is a particularly critical time for you to communicate in department meetings and with your departmental chairs. Let me call your attention to a few things coming up. One, the plagiarism sanctions review report, and if there is a motion, and if it carries, to adopt and endorse this report, that has consequences for each and every department in A&S. So please talk with your colleagues, share the report with them and bring responses back. The second involves strategic planning, and Laurie will have a word to say about that later. Word has already gone out to the department chairs. This is independent and on a separate track from the university strategic planning process, but of course they are going to be interwoven. I ask you, as Council representatives, to talk to your department chair, get informed about your departmental responses to the questions that came from Laurie's office – this in anticipation of the April 9<sup>th</sup> Council meeting with our A&S colleagues sitting on the Provost's strategic planning committee. We want our folks sitting on that committee to know what you think. Finally, we hope to have a set of bylaw revisions come to a vote in the coming weeks, including what we are going to talk about today. Please share the documents on Sakai with your colleagues. We need an informed view on this.

### **Plagiarism Sanctions Report**

**Tom Robisheaux:** About a year or so, the Executive Committee, in response to individual faculty concerns about the sanctions involving plagiarism. This is just for A&S, but it's already having a ripple effect to the other schools that teach undergraduate. The concern is about the appropriateness of our sanctions and are they applied in a fair, transparent and even fashion? Where can we make some improvements? I think this goes right to the heart of what we do at the University, and I think it's perfectly appropriate to come together and ask if we are doing a good enough job educating our students about the importance of integrity, making clear what those sanctions are, having faculty members who are aware of the policies and their application of those policies. We were delighted when Sherryl Broverman and Steve Vaisey from Sociology, Melissa Malouf from English and Karin Shapiro from AAAS agreed to look into this. They have worked so hard in such a short amount of time, and we are grateful for your bringing it to Council for our discussion.

**Sherryl Broverman:** So Tom outlined our charge. It had three parts. Our process was to talk to multiple stakeholders on campus: we talked to Larry Moneta and Dean Sue in Student Affairs and Steven in the Office of Student Conduct; we met with student government; we met with Honor Council. I really commend this committee because they wanted primary literature. We went and actually read cases that came before the University Undergraduate Conduct Board to try and see if the sanction that was applied was consistent across multiple cases, and what kind of language was used to develop that. So they really dug deep. So our charge was: is it appropriate, is it consistent, and if we lowered it, would people choose to cheat rather than get a bad grade? I'm going to give you a list of eight findings and then a set of recommendations.

First, we really thought it was appropriate and thoughtfully applied and really commended the Office of Student Conduct for their professionalism and their ability to be uniform about that. Now, the committee thought that the penalty is a pretty light slap. The suspension can often be the summer. So, depending on what time of year you went before the board, if you get a one-semester suspension for plagiarism, that can mean you can't take summer courses only. There was some feeling that we could toughen this. While we found incredible consistency within the administrative process, we found that faculty create chaos. There are about 14 different places where faculty can create variability in outcomes, and both in the judicial procedure and the separate grade sanction, which is independent from the judicial procedure. So we're going to try and come up with recommendations for that. For example, if a student cheats on her homework in my class, that might be 5 percent of her grade. I might give her an "F" for that assignment. Another faculty member might give her an "F" for the semester. That's strictly within the choice of the faculty member, and they might treat two different students differently in the same semester, because most faculty do not have clear policies on how they handle this and what the grade sanction is. This is a huge opportunity for Duke to take the lead on clarity and transparency. This is the most inconsistent part of the process.

We looked at the idea of whether students are cheating because they are desperate and failing. They are not cheating because they are going to get a "D" or an "F." The majority of students who have been found responsible for academic misconduct are "A/B" students. Now, as our committee thought, a "B+" is failing at Duke for many students. So they might feel incredible pressure to keep their grade above a certain amount but it's not because they are failing. It might be the last ditch at 2 in the morning when they are unprepared, there's been a lot of data on that, but to not fail doesn't appear to be the motivation. It might be to improve the grade, but it's not to not fail.

In the Faculty Handbook, there's a policy we think should be re-written and consolidated. It talks about integrity in one place and misconduct in another. We believe it's part of professional integrity for us to follow university rules about how to handle students. We have found that a faculty member might decide, "I'm not the integrity police. I don't want to handle this," and ignore it. There are lots of anecdotal stories of faculty who decide to give whatever grade they feel is appropriate without contacting the Office of Student Conduct to see if that student has any priors or if they are already on probation, which would dramatically change what you should be doing. There's a lot of loose cannons that end up not doing what they supposed to be doing, so there's a clear opportunity for better and consistent education.

**Steve Vaisey (Sociology):** I think the issue there is people regard the Office of Student Conduct as being a helpful resource, but I think we need to take it one level up, where people understand that's part of your responsibility. For example, if I decided teaching a course for 12 weeks is better than teaching a course for 14 weeks ... I can't do that. We need to think about this issue in the same way. It's a professional obligation to contact the Office of Student Conduct when you suspect academic misconduct because that's the only way the system works. Otherwise everyone is doing their own thing and the student convinces you it's a one-off, but they may have one or two other priors that are on record with the OSC. So it's not a question of faculty discretion, it's really something we should do. So one of our recommendation is to change the language in the handbook so it's not "expected to," it's actually "required to." That's more consistent with what the intention is.

**Sherryl Broverman:** When we started looking at why students cheat, what do they know about it, how do they understand plagiarism, and after the Community Standard was introduced, there was a lot of education initially about it. Right now, when you arrive at Duke, you have to do an online module. There's no consistent, integrated education about academic integrity on campus right now beyond the first term. That's again a huge opportunity for us to create a program that teaches people about the importance of academic integrity as well as educates about what counts as appropriate and inappropriate conduct. I want to identify a split here: there's teaching about academic integrity and then there's educating about the consequences of misconduct. Those are two separate programs; they should be aligned. Actually, neither is happening right now. As part of this, the Academic Integrity Council hasn't met in a few years. Judith Ruderman used to run it wonderfully. It is defunct right now, and while that's a provostial decision not an ECASC decision, we really recommend that it be reconstituted, reinvigorated, and work closely with the Honor Council to try and promote more integrity on campus.

Finally, this is something that really stood out to us: Duke needs to make visible that students are being held accountable. Bottom line, to sum up a lot of data, almost every student on campus knows someone who has cheated; almost no one knows anyone who has ever been punished because the sanctions are invisible. Not that we need to post names, but "I'm going away for the summer," "I got an internship," or "I'm going to Europe, I won't be here in the fall." We actually asked Duke Student Government Honors Council how many students they thought got suspended from Duke every year. They said probably two. It's almost 20. So the sanction is invisible and it creates a social norm that people are cutting corners and getting away with it because no one ever sees anyone caught. We think we really need to raise the visibility of this; that Duke takes this seriously and that students who are found responsible are being sanctioned.

Those are the findings. Our recommendations were broken down by target audience. For faculty education, DUSs or chairs need to emphasize that faculty are required to follow the recommendation in the Faculty Handbook. Also, strengthen language in the Faculty Handbook so that it's a requirement to report first signs of misconduct. We think they should also review with faculty the critical steps to take if academic misconduct is suspected, or bring in Honors Students to do so. There's a huge amount of education that needs to be done so faculty follow university policy, because they are currently not doing so. Something simple that would serve as both faculty and student education, besides putting the Community Standard on every syllabus which we're supposed to be doing now, is to put our academic misconduct policy on the syllabus. "If you cheat in my class, here's what I am going to do, as far as who I am going to contact, and what the grade sanction will be."

I alluded to earlier the big issue for faculty. Grading is in our purview; it's our domain. We think, though, that every unit and school at Duke could come up with a consistent policy. So you know if you are in Computer Science, for example, and you do inappropriate conduct, here's the sanction. It's on the website and it's on the syllabus and it's clearly defined. If for some reason a department can't come to unity on a decision, faculty can opt out as long as they can clearly state how they differ. One of our biggest recommendations is that there be consistency if possible, and if not, then at least transparency about the grade sanction. We'd like to operationalize this if possible, have it put on the course syllabi and uploaded as part of the annual review. So if there is no sanction policy on the syllabi, faculty are expected to follow the department's decision on grade sanctions. We're trying to figure out how to operationalize this. We come up with a lot of "faculty won't do that" comments and how do we use requirements to get compliance.

**Steve Vaisey:** There were cases where there were several mitigating factors that faculty can use to determine the number of semesters of sanction. One of those is the student's demeanor and attitude. One of the cases that we read was kind of

spooky, we all had a very similar reaction because they talked a lot about the professionalism of the student. To me, that just sort of rang out as this is a person whose parents went to college and this is a person with a lot of cultural capital who knows how to handle themselves in front of authority figures. To us, that didn't seem like the kind of thing that should be rewarded. We can imagine a first-generation college student or students who are from disadvantaged backgrounds in other ways being more likely to be a deer-in-the-headlights in front of the board.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Professionalism was the word that raised hackles among the faculty when we were reading the cases.

**Steve Vaisey:** So just that there should be an awareness that those things should not be counted as a mitigating factor.

**Sherryl Broverman:** It would be great if we could build student education into all four years at Duke. Academic Integrity Council could help with that. Social norms marketing to change the culture that everyone gets away with something. I'll throw this out there even though it's not part of our charge, but I think a lot of students misuse the short term illness form and yet they get away with it. That sets a precedent that it's okay to lie and contributes to this culture of cutting corners without repercussions that we think we need to address head-on.

Our final recommendation is this idea of making visible. Again, we've talked about a crime blotter, obviously not naming names, but the idea that eight people were sanctioned for something during this academic year. How do we let students know that Duke is actively responding to misconduct and maintaining rigor in student performance? There can be programs to stimulate thought. We came up with one: imagine walking through the Bryan Center and there's all these cut-outs of students that are missing from Duke because of academic integrity problems. "I'm not at Duke because I plagiarized from a paper." "I'm not at Duke because I copied lab results from a friend." You have to weave through those as you go through the Bryan Center. Use these kinds of performance art to get people to see there are sanctions that are employed and Duke does take this seriously. Some kind of visibility because right now every student we talked to said nobody gets in trouble, because everyone who gets in trouble manages to smooth it in such a way that their peers never know.

**Robert Wolpert:** (indecipherable comment about Faculty Handbook and how faculty don't know that reporting a case to OSC does not mean faculty have to hand over the case to OSC)

**Sherryl Broverman:** We want to change the language, not that faculty memorize the Faculty Handbook. Right now, it's a gentle "expected to," not a "required." We want them educated about the process and the various options available to faculty. Most faculty don't understand the faculty-student resolution, that you can sit down with a student, talk about it, come up with a joint suggestion that keeps it off their record unless they have priors and unless it's so egregious that it's not appropriate.

**Robert Wolpert:** (indecipherable comment about being careful when telling faculty that something is a requirement)

**Steve Vaisey:** I don't think it's crazy for an employer to have core expectations. We're not talking about some random thing here. We're talking about a core academic issue here. So, for example, there's nothing in the Faculty Handbook that says you can't shorten the semester by a third, but that's something that we know. The point is, it's on the same level as that. If you have a student cheat in your class and you go, "eh, he's a good kid..." We've looked at this issue a long time and part of the problem is people treat this as it's a one-off that they can handle on their own. This is part of the core mission of the university.

**Laurie Patton, Dean:** So we just talked about what the faculty would be voting on. I wanted to say two things. This would be an endorsement of the recommendations only at this point. Faculty are not discussing whether these will be enforceable or not. This is a really important conversation, but it's not what the faculty will be discussing and voting on. They will simply voting to endorse the recommendations. The next thing that we would like to do is: number one, if there are particular structural changes related to the Student Conduct Board, that's a university-wide thing and that has to go to ECAC. Anything related to what we do here in Arts & Sciences Council, here's what we'd like to propose: you all vote on the recommendations and then we work with ECASC over the course of the next couple months and into the fall, to be discussed with ECASC as to which we would want to make as policy and which we would want to make as best practices. After that robust discussion, Lee Baker will come back to this body and make the ECASC findings known.

**Steffen Bass (Physics):** One thing I was going to suggest is that sometimes you use the word "plagiarism," which is one particular type of academic misconduct, and other places you use "academic misconduct." Generally speaking, if you would just do a global replace to replace "plagiarism" with "academic misconduct," and keep that consistent in the report, you'll have a much more powerful argument pointing out to students what you actually mean.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I agree. Our specific charge was on plagiarism as the most egregious example of academic misconduct, but we certainly started looking at misconduct overall. But this is obviously a recommendation about the education of the academic misconduct process and grade sanctions associated with that.

**Cary Moskowitz (TWP):** You can tell me if this is off the base or charge here, but as far as recommendations, one thing I see missing is educating faculty about ways in which their assignments can promote or deflect plagiarism. Those of us who do this a lot can look at assignments and say that was looking for trouble. There's an intersection where things that are more likely to limit plagiarism are also things that help students get more out of the assignment. So I don't know if pedagogical education as well as policy education is worth considering?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Absolutely. I intentionally said that promotion of academic integrity and how it relates to good pedagogy is a separate discussion from how we respond to cases of misconduct. Now obviously we can reduce cases by changing the pedagogy and in our ECASC discussion, we talked about how the "Big Tweak" and more student ownership is likely to reduce academic misconduct as students feel a lot more invested in their academic adventure. So, you're absolutely right. There's a lot of data on that. We felt it was outside our purview. That's certainly something that the Academic Integrity Council, once we reconstitute it, would be educating faculty about.

**Linda George (Sociology):** I want to thank your committee. You've done a beautiful job. For those of us who are eventually going to vote on this, I'd really recommend reading the report. You've summarized it well, but it's one of the best composed reports that I've read.

**Chantal Reid (Biology):** We're going to move on to the next item. Thanks.

### **Bylaw Revision Proposals: Representation and Voting**

**Chantal Reid:** The last part of the meeting is going through bylaw changes very quickly and then Dean Patton is going to talk. I'm going to go through the revisions very quickly, in the interest of time. We already talked about the first part of the change in the bylaws that had to do with the Council and faculty and university relationship. Today we're going to talk briefly about voting and representation. The proposed changes have to do with the addition of new units and programs that are associated with undergraduate education that are not included and this would make sure we have the inclusion of those units that are not necessarily Arts & Science. In order for a unit to have representation on A&S Council, Council must approve by a 2/3rds majority vote. The second part has to do with voting. Right now, there is nothing in the bylaws about discussing an issue at one meeting and coming back at a second meeting to vote. That's what we've been doing all along, so we just want to write into the bylaws what the practice currently is. So what this is saying is we present an issue and discuss it, you take it back to your department and discuss with your colleagues, then bring it back to the following meeting to vote on it. The other change is to allow electronic voting. So if you can't be present for the second meeting, we're going to allow both electronic voting or leaving your vote with the council chair. We still do not allow proxy voting. There's a lot of text, so please read the text.

**Robert Wolpert:** Is it necessary to be as specific as you are about the voting text since technology is changing over time?

**Chantal Reid:** Any electronic means of conveying your vote?

**Linda George:** I think that's very much in line with what ECASC meant to recommend.

**Chantal Reid:** The last change is adding a new section addressing a way to increase participation in the voting process by the whole faculty, in the sense that if there's an issue that's very sensitive, then there can be a referendum by the whole faculty. There's a few ways in which that can happen. One is that a valid majority of the elected members of ECASC that pass a motion calling for a referendum. So if there's an issue that ECASC feels that the whole faculty should vote upon, there can be a referendum. Another way is if we have that is voted on, but we have a majority that is less than or equal to 60 percent, then we can have the faculty-wide referendum. The third way is if faculty members want to petition for a vote. They can ask for a referendum, but they would have to have at least 40 percent of the A&S faculty asking for such a referendum.

**Linda George:** Currently the bylaws have no way that faculty can say they are not happy with the decision that was made. Clearly we wanted to set a threshold so that just a couple of people can call for one. You can't have a referendum really, really easily. None of us want our in-boxes that full. But we did want to give faculty the right to say "we don't like the way A&S Council did their job."

**Lee Baker:** So the faculty is going to be really hard, joint appointments with different schools ... the same issues we've had a difficult time with in representation. We need to be really clear on what the faculty is and who can vote.

**Chantal Reid:** Faculty who are eligible to vote... that's a good question. So would it be only A&S faculty only or would it be faculty whose programs are represented in A&S Council and that contribute to undergraduate education? I'm not sure we talked about this, but we can clarify that.

**Linda George:** If you have an opinion on that, please let us know.

**Laurie Patton:** I really like this for so many reasons, and one is that part of what you as representatives struggle with is getting feedback on issues from your departments. Having this as a mode for faculty might engage them more in departmental conversations about what you all are doing on their behalf. So I think it's a really great idea.

**David Malone:** What are we doing now in terms of units gaining representation?

**Chantal Reid:** Right now, there's a couple of groups that are grandfathered in, and there's some that should be included that are not. When we were talking about this, we were trying to make the rules such that when there's another new program associated with undergraduate education, that the bylaws would be inclusive enough so that the process would be the same from now on. Does that answer your question?

**David Malone:** I was thinking of other Arts & Sciences academic units that make substantial contributions, so we could be thinking institutes here.

**Linda George:** Some units have a undergraduate teaching component, some don't. I think our thinking was if they didn't, then they would not be invited to join the Council, but something like Global Health, which clearly does, would be.

**Chantal Reid:** So you have to be part of the undergraduate teaching mission to be a member.

**Inge Walther:** I was just noticing that the text here, it states that those representatives who are outside of A&S have voting rights on general undergraduate education, but not on Trinity College academic issues. It seems to me that that could also apply to the referendum?

**Chantal Reid:** That's a good point. I'm going to encourage all of you to look at this online and bring to your individual departments and get their views so we can continue the discussion. I'm going to leave the floor to Laurie.

### Dean's Corner

**Laurie Patton:** This is just a brief update, as I do fairly regularly, to tell you what we're up to and where we are going. It won't take long and it will be very informal. The first thing is to remind you about the strategic plan. We're working with the Provost's office, and the Provost is really wanting to get conversation around the big question of what's your vision of where Duke will be in the next five years, fifteen years, and get as many groups engaged in that as possible. Our A&S representatives on that committee will be coming to A&S Council to discuss with you that big question. That's going to happen, I think, on April 9<sup>th</sup>. In addition, we've set up many other meetings for them with other bodies in Arts & Sciences -- including the DUSs as well as our inner staff as well as chairs as well as ECASC -- in addition to hosting a number of dinners that many of you or others of your colleagues in A&S have participated in. That's what's been happening in February, March, April. We in Arts & Sciences have distributed to your chairs a set of questions that are much more A&S-specific about your department's strategic goals, about the pressures on you in terms of space, and so on. Again, I'm repeating myself, but you can never do that too much. The purpose of this is for our office to gather as much data as possible to hand on to the next dean so that he or she will be able to move forward on some strategic planning on Arts & Sciences behalf immediately. So I just want to let you know that the last part of February and the next couple months has been active engagement on behalf of the Provost and to remind you that our deadline is much further out, on May 1<sup>st</sup>, for your departments to get their answers back to us. Please work with your chairs to make sure that conversation happens in your departments. So that's number one. Number two, I just wanted to endorse the plagiarism report. It should be obvious how great a job they did. It's a really wonderful document. Every single case that has come to me, or through Lee, has been one where the communication between the faculty and student has gone awry. Sometimes it's the student's fault, sometimes it's the faculty's fault -- it doesn't matter. That's the essential point, and the reason why I thought these recommendations were so great is because they really focus on better communication. I already outlined to you the procedure we'd like to follow in terms of thinking about how we handle these recommendations in the future. The third thing, as a shout-out, we're working on Signature Courses and we have some wonderful Signature Courses for fall of 2015.



I want to thank Inge, again. Faculty response to this has been so inspiring. We have a wonderful one on race, genomics and society for fall of '15; Marxism and society; Buddhist meditation and historical, psychological and medical perspective; discovering education in human development; how social scientists learn from data; the problem of love in western literature. These are the kinds of courses and questions we want our students to be thinking about. In spring 2016, we have how does biology work; the history of life: three big ideas; contemporary documentary films and filmmakers at Full Frame Festival; are things getting better: the question of progress in world affairs; the history of terrorism; as well as discovery in human education and human development: how the disciplines connect the dots. So some really exciting things. Faculty have really stepped up on this program, and I would like it to remain as robust as possible as we move forward into the future. Fourth, just to say that I've been in close touch with the Big Tweak Committee. Twice we've had to change our dinner because of the weather and I'm very excited about the conversation you all had with Suzanne, even though I was not able to join you last meeting. What I'm particularly thrilled about is the convergence of views about the restrictive nature of our curriculum, loosening that up a bit, and having more student authorship over curricular initiatives. I wanted to recommend to you and have put on the A&S Council website a wonderful AAC&U report called the LEAP Initiative, which is a new vision of how students make their way through the curriculum. I want to make sure you knew, as we are moving forward with this conversation that we really are in line with where leaders in American university education would like us to go and very few people have gone there yet. I'm in close touch with the Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee and a reminder to everybody that it's up to you all to say to the new dean and it's the new dean's job to get with your program. That's the way to think about it. When I hear people go, "Oh, oh, what about the new dean? They're going to change everything," that's the wrong way to have a "relationship" with power. There's a new way to think about it: how is the new dean going to get with your program? I'll do everything in my power to make sure the new dean gets with that program. Then, a couple of other brief things that I'm very excited about: Women in Science, you're going to be getting a newsletter talking about the progress we've made in the last three to four years. There are so many great things that have happened. You've heard me talk about it before, but please do look for that as one of my next dean's memos. Related to that, Ben Reese's office and I are going to be hosting on April 6<sup>th</sup> a program for specific departments to start with on stereotype threat and unconscious bias in the classroom. We think it's a really important issue that we think all professors should be engaged with, and it's a really good place to go ... right in the classroom in terms of how we can be more aggressive in terms of questions of diversity and inclusive learning. Please do get in touch with me if you don't know about this already. And I also wanted to say, thanks to Lee Baker, we are continuing to talk and create models for a four-year advising program with Steve Nowicki's office as well as a four-year dean model. Our goal in this is to increase the probability that our students will have a meaningful relationship with an adult in their four years that they are here. With that statistic that I keep talking about, that 70 percent said yes, but we should be really worried about the 30 percent that don't. So Lee has been working really hard on that and we're going to be coming back to you with a description of where we are moving in that four-year dean model, where the dean stays with the students all four years they are at Duke. The final thing is just good news, which is our campaign has hit \$340 million. Just to remind everyone, our goal is \$435 (million), so we're really pushing. We still have 2 ½ more years in the campaign. We may or may not change the goal upwards, but it's a huge slog and I'm kind of amazed we've gotten there. I also learned we've raised 17 chairs since I came on as dean, though none of those chairs have been completely invested yet, so they're not going to start paying out until long after I'm not with you, which makes me sad, but when you think of 17 new chairs that suddenly appear on the horizon, think of me fondly. I'll end with that. Thanks very much.

**Chantal Reid:** Are there any questions?

**David Malone:** In terms of the search for the new dean, do you have any sense of where the committee is in the process?

**Laurie Patton:** I'm trying to be as distant as I can, appropriately. I know they are in the midst of vetting some really great candidates. They haven't established a short list yet, but they are in the midst of going through that secondary phase of really looking specifically at candidates.

**Chantal Reid:** Thank you everybody. Have a good break.

### Adjournment