

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 September 11, 2014

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me welcome you all to the first meeting of the Arts and Sciences council for the academic year 2014-15. Some people like to look at the spring as a time for growth, renewal, and new activity; I do that sometimes when I garden. The great thing about the academic year is that the time of growth and renewal is in the fall. That is one of the things I love about the start of the council year for us because we have a chance to start new things, continue a few things we have been working on, and also bring in some new members to the council and repopulate some of our committees. In other words, we do all of the things that one likes to do in the spring with the high hopes that all will work out in the end, and it will in the spring when we harvest.

Approval of Minutes

The customary first order of business is to review, approve amend, and correct the minutes of our last council meeting. You have had the April 24th council meeting minutes this week. I would like to call your attention, and if you would, call your colleague's attention to the minutes of that meeting. Sometimes when council minutes are archived, few people ever go back to them even though they are really important because they are our institutional memory. I want to call your attention to the address of Peter Lange's; that was an extraordinary time and it is not often that you have a provost of the stature and experience of Peter Lange to come before Arts and Sciences council and give his view of the directions of change at Duke and in higher education. Are there any proposed amendments or corrections to the April 24th minutes of the council meeting? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Steffen Bass (Physics): So moved

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The council minutes have been approved.

Announcements and Updates

One of the pleasures I have this year is introducing to all of you the new representatives on the council. We have a whole new crop. We try to have roughly one-third of the council representatives turn over in any given year; and as you know, the term is for three years. We have thirty-five seats in the council representing thirty-five academic departments and programs. Ideally, we should have only twelve elections in the spring, but this spring we had a larger number than usual. We have about twenty new members or returning members who were re-elected to council. I would like to take a minute to recognize our new members, who have been marked by a light green color [on the slide].

Among the fourteen members of the social sciences, almost half are new members or returning members after having been re-elected. I ask them to stand up. We have Catherine [Admay] from Sanford and Michael Munger from political science among others. From the humanities, which is our next largest division, we have eight new and re-elected members out of thirteen representatives. Would you all stand? I would like it if you could hang around at the end of the meeting and introduce yourself to each other. Part of what makes the business of council work well is when we get to know each other a little and talk about our background, academic interests, and what animates us when we come to council. Finally, from the natural sciences we almost have an entirely new body of representatives with some who have been re-elected, like Dick MacPhail in chemistry who doesn't seem to go away. Would all of you please stand so we can recognize you? Thank you colleagues.

Finally, at the end of the semester we also had elections to the executive committee of Arts and Sciences. The results of those elections were circulated in an announcement, but if you didn't get that announcement, let me recognize the four new colleagues on the executive committee. They come from the ranks of the representatives who were sitting in the council at the moment of election. There is a group that has come to work with each other very well, so let me ask the retiring members to stand if they are here; [they are] David Malone, Dalene Stangl, who isn't here, Bill Seaman, who is

also not present, and Charlie Becker, who is off running the empire of the economics department. You should know that the agenda of the council and many things that the council and faculty do not get to see is often aired through very critical voices on the executive committee. I have had enough time already to meet with this new executive committee to know that you are going to be extremely well served. I will ask them to stand; returning is Steffen Bass from physics and John Brown who has a concert a week from Friday. I would like our new colleagues to stand; Linda George from sociology, Michael Munger from the social sciences, Chantal Reid from biology, and José María Rodríguez-García from romance studies. Of course, I am continuing on as usual.

I want to point out something that happens that you are largely not aware of, which may be the single most important thing that ECASC and I do in consultation and collaboration with Laurie Patton, Lee Baker, and Steve Nowicki. That is to appoint new members to the standing faculty committees. Several of our core committees have new members and some have new chairs. I can't mention all of the colleagues who do this, but this is such important work. It is often not recognized openly, it is often unrewarded in a material way, and yet all of us at different times benefit in the most direct way from colleagues who shoulder the burden of the responsibility on these important committees because they let us do what we otherwise love to do best, which is to research and to teach. We can trust that the job of faculty responsibility and governance is being carried out by colleagues who are dedicated to it.

The process of appointment sounds terribly boring, but it is never boring for me because faculty governance is being renewed. If we are going to have vibrant Duke faculty engagement with our collective responsibilities for the governance of this institution we must have colleagues who are going to come forward to serve on committees and gain experience. I promise it will transform you; if you have done nothing but work within your own unit, I promise that working with someone from the other divisions will change your view on Arts and Sciences and it will make you a more valuable colleague. It can also prepare you for leadership responsibilities within your unit and Arts and Sciences in a way that you perhaps cannot recognize right now, but those of us on the executive committee see this all of the time.

I will now mention the chairs of the committees that have received a lot of new members. The assessment committee is beginning the process of preparing for accreditation, and we are also learning under the leadership of David Malone that accreditation is a lot more than compliance. It is also about learning from our teaching and making it better. Could Cary Moskovitz and Susan Wynn please stand? These are unsung heroes; Cary and Susan chair the course committee. I won't ask you, because I know every hand would go up, but if you have ever proposed a course to be taught at Duke, Cary, Susan and their committee reads it, reviews it and approves it. It is only with their approval that you are cleared to teach your course. That is a massive undertaking, and they are the faculty members who are looking after the quality of our academic curriculum on a weekly basis. Our curriculum committee also has a number of new members on it. Somehow, I was lucky to twist David Malone's arm. He left ECASC in mourning over the lack of exciting work to do, so in August I tapped him to see if he would be willing to serve and Laurie made the decision to ask him to serve as chair of the curriculum committee.

For the new representatives on the council, let me briefly mention a few things that ECASC thinks is important. You may have never been a representative before and some of you may not want to be here since some of us do this out of a sense of duty and obligation, which is perfectly fine. Colleagues work in many different ways as council representatives, and I cannot tell you how important your work is. If I were to boil it down to a few simple things, it is this: you are the link with programs and departments. Do not assume that your colleagues receive information. Do not assume that they know what council is doing. Do not assume they know about new initiatives or what we are talking about here. Finally, do not assume that they read the minutes. Talk with them about it, inform them, ask your department chair if you can be on the regular department agenda, if not every month than every couple of months. Where we have the most difficult moments of faculty governance are when we have episodic and excited involvement in a process that has been long and slowly developing.

Your job is to consult with your colleagues and bring their views along with your own here to council. Attend council meetings. That begins with the documents that you will routinely get. Every time we meet, I will prepare some documents for you, [for example], when committees have proposals to make, I will make sure that document is made available to you. This is a very rarefied group of documents that has gone through unbelievably long iterations and careful writing. We do not give you things that are not carefully thought through, so please read them and inform yourself. When you attend council meetings come and ask questions. We have a practice in recent years of not voting on a new proposal in same session in which it is proposed and discussed. You have a chance, then, to go back and inform yourself again.

Please, if you do not attend [meetings] bring your alternate here. One of the rules of the bylaws that is often not known is that we have no proxy voting in council. You or your duly elected alternate must be physically present to vote. If you are not [here], all of your colleagues do not have a voice on votes when they come before council. Colleagues consider their votes to represent lots of different things. Some colleagues do systematic polling within their department, some have lots of conversations, some know instinctually the minds of their colleagues in their department, some vote with their conscience, and some actually approach issues from the vantage point of Arts and Sciences as a whole. It will work in different ways, but vote after having carefully thought through the issue before you. Finally, we always have some members of council who serve on some committee or who step up for some temporary duties in the course of the year, such as Chantal Reid and Jack Bookman who helped out the council in the spring with a discussion board. Over time, you will become better informed about the day-to-day business of the council.

I want to make a special introduction. After all of these new people who are joining council, I want to introduce Sally Kornbluth our new provost.

Provost Sally Kornbluth: I am here to support Laurie and the Arts and Sciences and hear what she has to say today, but I will say two things. I will be coming back in November to talk with all of you because next year we are going to be doing strategic planning. This year is going to be a pre-strategic planning year in which I am going to want a lot of faculty input into what the themes of the plan should be. I want to talk to you about what I am thinking in terms of the approach to planning. If any of you are on the academic council, it is going to be the same thing so you can take your choice.

The other thing I wanted to mentioned is that I have gone to some of the schools, particularly those that are smaller than Arts and Sciences, and I have talked to groups of faculty because I am interested in learning about the school. Since Arts and Sciences is such a large school, I have asked Tom to select some people, probably members of the council, from each division and have lunch or dinner just to get an introduction to your activities, interests etc. I have been to engineering and divinity, so I am working my way around. I look forward to getting to know you individually and as representatives of your division as we start to think about what the strategic plan is going to look like in the university as a whole. I look forward to hearing what Laurie has to say today, because obviously we are never going to do a university plan that is out of sync with what Arts and Sciences is thinking about. I think it is a good first step to hear what you are thinking about for the coming year, and obviously there will be a lot of ongoing discussions after that.

Tom Robisheaux (History): Thank you Sally. You are always welcome in Arts and Sciences and we will be seeing you on the agenda in November.

Finally, I briefly want to look ahead for you into this academic year, since this is the time that we renew, plan, look ahead and grow new things. There are two things that are top priorities for the executive committee this year. If you think about the first plan by its real title, "revising the bylaws" you are going to fall asleep. If you think about it in terms of what it really does, you are going to find it fascinating and important work because the bylaws outline in detail the powers and responsibilities that you and your colleagues have as faculty members in the joint governance of this institution. They have not been overhauled in a systematic fashion for a number of years and the faculty is very different from the way it was fifteen years ago.

ECASC has identified a few areas in which we need to bring our bylaws into the present so that our successors do not have to bother with it for at least a few more years. We will be bringing to you three separate sets of revisions to the bylaws. One is going to deal with university relations, because one of the things that has happened [over the years] is that the whole university administration and schools around Arts and Sciences, and also Arts and Sciences within itself, has changed a great deal. We have not revised our bylaws to reflect those relationships, and you will be interested to see the ways in which we are proposing to revise the bylaws. That will come to you in October.

The second group of bylaw revisions is probably less interesting in some ways, but we are bringing the descriptions of our charges and the composition of our faculty committees up to date. We are also introducing a new standing committee for you to consider, which will be a budget committee to advise the dean of Arts and Sciences. That will be a major new addition to the bylaws and a good legacy for all of us to leave our colleagues after us. Finally, the most interesting issue, and the one I look forward to, is on representation and voting. In the spring, I outlined to you some of the ways in which our bylaws as we adhere to them lead to some rather interesting and difficult situations. That will probably be coming in mid-winter. We will propose them in three separate batches and will hopefully be voting on these in the spring.

The second priority for this year is one that you will hear about from Laurie Patton, but let me say that those of us on the executive committee have been working quietly behind the scenes consulting with Laurie and advising her, and having lively discussions with Dean Lee Baker and Inge Walther and with faculty who lead our different committees. When I stood for election to the council chair back in 2012, I remember telling Ruth Day, our last chair, that one of the things I was most interested in is the undergraduate curriculum. The time has come for us to look carefully at our curriculum, assess it, and see where it works and where it does not in an open and formal way. We will revise it, reform it, and change it in ways that the faculty find meaningful. This is a process that will demand a lot of from us, and it is going to take a lot from you.

We like to say that the faculty own the curriculum, but I am very sobered when I realize that since the last curriculum we now live with was introduced and voted in by this council in 2000, two-thirds of the faculty have turned over. Literally two-thirds of the Arts and Sciences faculty do not own the present curriculum. They had no chance to engage it, and they have never been brought into it or had a chance to embrace the whole vision. They never got to vote for it or suggest that we change it. You might own parts of it; I know for me as a faculty member I feel very keenly about the tiny parts of curriculum that I understand and advise on. Do I understand the whole vision? I am not so sure.

In fact, I will give you a very personal view, which is not just me as a council chair but as a professor in Arts and Sciences. Our curriculum has become extremely complex and it has lost cohesion. For many of us, and for students especially, it has become more of a checklist where you check things off instead of a liberal arts curriculum that inspires you for life. Those who are working on the curriculum review know my own personal view, which is a constant voice for me and is probably one of the most radical voices you will hear. I tend to look at a curriculum not through the metaphor of a matrix, but through the metaphor of a pallet of paints of many colors. You have to have skills that are inspired and taught by masters. You have to practice a lot, but when you mix colors you often create something entirely new that your teachers never thought about. This is something that can inspire you into life. I think of a liberal arts education as providing you

with the ability to mix the colors and paints in a way that will guide you into careers, help you find meaning in your lives, and help you make a contribution to society. I am not sure that our checklist mentality enables us to do that.

I have two final points about this. ECASC has talked about this at length for three years now, and I can promise you that the structures we have set up and continue to reinforce and bring into play with this process will be faculty driven, and faculty led. They will be approved, reviewed, and discussed ad nauseum, because some of you will get bored with these discussions, but in the end you will own it. I will have more about that very soon. Finally, the executive committee's job is to guarantee that the process is open and transparent. We will ensure you and your colleagues have chances to take part, participate, listen, learn from, and contribute. It is going to take some time and your patience may run thin, but listening to 620+ colleagues who all have their own views on the curriculum and what is needed will take a lot of patience. We may share parts of the curriculum, but we don't yet have a shared vision for the whole of the curriculum. My hope is that we will develop that shared vision, so even if you may not see something there you wish to see, you can embrace the whole and make it your own.

I have one last thing before I leave the stage about some other things that will be coming your way. There are a new set of courses being proposed for the Kunshan campus. As you know, Arts and Sciences is the gatekeeper for the courses that are offered at DKU. That committee will meet again next week to review the next set of proposals. We have some interesting issues in this transition time to creating a university that may be standing on its own in a few years. In the meantime, these are Duke courses and you faculty members should know the DKU joint committee is there to review and approve every course that is offered there, because that is our brand and our Duke education that appears on transcripts. In addition, ECASC has just approved a review of the plagiarism sanctions. That grew out of a concern that came to the executive committee in the spring that our plagiarism sanctions should be looked at again very carefully. You will be hearing more about this very soon. There is a three committee faculty group that will report back to council about their findings and recommendations if they wish to make any. Finally, we have some old business to return to, as we did not complete our deliberations on the course credits proposal from the curriculum committee. We will return to that as soon as David Malone and the curriculum committee is prepared to come back to the council and renew our discussions.

Traditionally, in September we give center stage to the dean of Arts and Sciences, which is entirely appropriate since she is our leader, after all. She is here to report to us on developments that hold interest for all of us as faculty members, and she is here to tell us what her priorities are and how wisely she has spent the money that has come through Arts and Sciences. We have in Laurie Patton a dean who listens very closely to the faculty. Laurie, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you once again to council.

Dean's Address

Dean Laurie Patton: I am delighted to be starting the fourth year of our journey together and the first year of our work with new provost Sally Kornbluth. In the first three I have used the terms integration, adaptation, and innovation to define how we think about 21st century undergraduate education. And we have redefined those terms three times. Integration was finding a meaningful place for our knowledge in the world (year one), and doing so without over legislation (year two). In year three, we focused on the integration of our curricular initiatives, such as the global health major and certificate 2.0.

Adaptation was turning on a dime in terms of intellectual and life and career choices and to move across spheres of activity with equal parts rigor and joy (year one), and do to so without overreacting (year two). In year three, we defined adaptation specifically in terms of financial sustainability, and we have come a long way toward that goal.

We defined innovation as finding new laws of information in addition to those of nature and society (year one) and doing so with a keen eye to tradition (year two). In year three, we defined innovation in a curricular way—both making a faculty-owned environment around online courses, and developing a new kind of course—the signature course—which we are launching this year. In our fourth year together, the integration, adaptation, and innovation will focus on the curriculum, about which I will say more in a moment. I also start each address with a historical figure from Duke. As we move toward building a new architecture for the curriculum, I thought it only appropriate that we have as our historical guide the figure of Julian Abele. Julian Abele was the architect of three major buildings on the Duke campus, in fact probably many more. He was a fascinating, cosmopolitan character—one of the first known African American architects to work on major buildings in the United States. His partnership with Horace Trumbauer, for whose firm he also worked, was also an extraordinary example of collaboration. In addition to building in stone, he also worked with many different kinds of materials—watercolor, lithography, etching, pencil; in wood, iron, gold and silver. He designed and constructed all his own furniture, even doing the petit-point himself. And as this multi-purpose designer, Julian Abele can inspire us with a kind of aesthetic vision for guiding us through the curriculum. The curriculum, too, is a kind of working in multiple media, from scientific study to artistic performance. And Julian Abele also could not be easily categorized. He was always immaculately dressed, and he would wear a suit even for a walk on the beach. He was a patron of the Philadelphia orchestra as well as the University of Pennsylvania football team. Our curriculum, too, defies easy definitions. And its complexity is part of its beauty as well as its challenge for us in 2014.

Financials

And speaking of collective, or collaborative, genius—I begin, as I always do, with our financial situation in which our collaborative spirit has been an exemplar for other schools at Duke as well as more broadly. I will be briefer this time because you all received my financial update letter a few days ago, and I want to spend more time talking about our collective work together on the curriculum.

As you may recall, we began fiscal year 2013/2014 with a budgeted deficit of \$2.8M, which we then worked to address by increasing revenue and closely watching expenses. I am pleased to report that we ended the 2013/2014 fiscal year with a surplus of \$92K, thanks to better than anticipated returns from the Annual Fund, Global Education and Summer Sessions. This is no small accomplishment and I want to thank everyone for contributing to our success.

I particularly want to thank our Annual Fund team, led by Office of University Development Assistant Vice President Jennifer Cameron. Here for Jen are development officers Randy Garcia and Betsy Gentry-Bumm. Using several new outreach strategies, her team raised an extraordinary \$1M more than their original budget goal. Global Education, led by Executive Director & Vice Provost Amanda Kelso, had higher than projected enrollments and we benefited from \$557K in budget deficit relief. And finally, the Summer Sessions program, led by Associate Dean and Director Duke Continuing Studies Paula Gilbert, ended the year with additional net revenue of \$376K. Please join me in thanking them now. They are the key to attaining financial sustainability while maintaining extraordinary Duke standard programs.

I also want to note the successful launch of three new masters programs (MS in Statistical Science, MA in Historical & Cultural Visualization, and MS in Economics and Computation). Please join me in thanking the faculty and staff who made this possible. While faculty have developed these programs to enrich our graduate offerings, the new net revenue from these programs contributes appreciably to our financial sustainability overall.
For Fiscal Year 2014/2015

You may recall that last summer, the whole school engaged in intensive budget planning aimed at moving us towards financial sustainability. With the support of our departments, programs and academic administration units, we were able to permanently lower our overall projected budget deficit by more than \$4.6M. In addition, we were successful in finding \$700K of one-time funding to further reduce the budgeted deficit to \$1.2M for 2014/2015. Going forward, we are exploring opportunities to generate new net revenue by increasing sponsored research that provides facilities & administrative (F&A) return to the school, expanding and enhancing continuing studies program offerings, and potentially launching several additional new masters programs. We have also optimistically raised the fundraising target for our Annual Fund to \$18M and will continue to be creative in thinking about summer session, continuing studies, and global education enrollments.

I want to touch base finally on the Trinity campaign. We have raised \$294.2 (~68% to goal), and a reminder that while it takes some time for some of the gifts to kick in, those endowments will help us financially in the future and the programmatic funds are helping us balance our budget now. We have raised \$98.1M for financial aid—a huge portion of our budget as you saw from the pie chart. We have raised \$54.2M in faculty support (including sponsored research from non-governmental sources,) \$69.1M through the Annual Fund, and \$54.7M in programs such as DukeEngage, Focus, Financial Economics, advising, and the career center. We have also done \$18.1M in other areas such as capital, bequests, and unrestricted gifts that are not part of the annual fund.

Faculty Hires

We also continue to support A & S departments in developing strategic visions for planning faculty searches. You may recall the faculty salaries are the single largest expense for the school, and that faculty renewal is an ongoing and vital part of sustaining a top tier research institution. I want to turn now to our ongoing focus on those faculty hires. We have hired just over 100 new faculty members over the last three years, and those hires have contributed greatly to the quality of our faculty. I am very pleased with what we have accomplished while balancing opportunity against financial considerations. Our overarching goals are to keep the number of faculty searches less than the projected number of faculty departures, to hire junior faculty in place of senior retirements, and to identify additional resources for faculty searches such as endowments or grants. Here is a list of our new faculty hires, and I am delighted to say that they represent the best in sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.

As we turn to our hires for the future, I want to remind you of our criteria for faculty hiring. We share this with you every year and we will continue to share this with you so that you see what we struggle with as we keep working with departments on their strategic priorities. Our searches are allocated to assure opportunities for renewal across departments. They are strategic—those who ally with departmental development plans and opportunities for departmental rankings advancement. We also try to respond to serious teaching needs; we focus on continuations of pending searches; we look at interdisciplinary hires that advance big research questions of departments. And we try to continue the “unfinished business” of diversity; build faculty strength in global arenas, especially Asia. Here is our list of approved searches for this year, based on our assessment of these criteria I just named.

Trinity Initiatives

Let me turn now to the Initiatives we began with when we started our journey together in 2011. I am pleased to say that all of them—both short term and long term—are thriving. Scholars & Publics is a beehive of activity, with over 30 events where Trinity scholars and researchers interacted with and reflected on their publics. We have also made great strides in diversity in the sciences—with key hires of women and minorities in mathematics, statistics, biology, computer science, physics, and most spectacularly, in chemistry. We have hired 7 people overall with a focus on Asia or Asia-related areas, but we need to make more, and are working hard on an exciting staggered cluster hire in the study of China over several years. We are particularly focused on comparative study of Asia, or Global Asia. We feel this is the right way for Duke to grow in the future.

Divisional Initiatives

I want to begin our discussion of Divisional Initiatives by asking you to join me in thanking in person the extraordinary work of Srinivas Aravamudan who as you know has stepped down this past summer as Dean of Humanities. As I mentioned in my letter to you this summer, much of the new signature that Duke has in the Humanities is due to his leadership and creativity. And while we will miss him as our Dean, he will continue to do three full time jobs instead of four. He will continue to run Humanities Writ Large, the Consortium for Humanities Centers and Institutes, and the new Mellon grant which I will say more about in a moment. Let's pause for a minute to give our extraordinary colleague a round of applause.

I also ask you to join me in welcoming two new deans—Linda Burton, the James B. Duke Professor of Sociology and Rick Powell, the [John Spencer] Bassett Professor of Art History. You have already read about their distinguished scholarly careers and intellectual visions that made them perfect candidates for leadership roles at Duke, where the scholar-administrator model is the key emphasis. They have already hit the ground running with new ideas and different energies and all the good things that a change in leadership in an organization can bring. We are delighted to have them here.

I also want to turn to the accomplishments of the individual divisions. In the Natural Sciences, thanks to the work of faculty and key administrators, working together, we have received a substantial Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) grant in science, technology, engineering & mathematics (STEM) education. To increase student success in STEM disciplines, particularly that of Underrepresented Minorities (URMs), highly selective research universities must think in a much more deep and multifaceted manner about STEM education: we must develop a data-driven model for understanding how faculty perceive and experience teaching, how students perceive and experience learning, and what kinds of educational experiences in science gateway courses can be created for the best 'high-impact' engagement of all students, including URMs. To achieve these goals, Duke will launch the COMPASS (Collaborating on Mentoring, Persistence, Assessment, and Student Success) Project, an integrated suite of complementary efforts designed to align and realign engagement readiness of STEM educators and students. Our project will focus on students and faculty, spanning multiple departments and creating a community of STEM learners and research practitioners.

We continue to make progress on our partnership with Pratt in our new building, which combines labs and classrooms for engineering and key specialized labs for our table-top physics group. Although we have a long way to go, we have raised \$2M toward this goal—far more than I ever thought possible when it was just a wish and a prayer in 2011. In addition, we intend this building to have classrooms and auditorium for new methods in science learning to support our great strides in inclusivity in STEM teaching and learning.

I am also thrilled to share with you that, under the leadership of scholar and former dean Angela O'Rand, Duke has received a major grant from the National Institute on Aging to expand the core of Center for Population Health and Aging, housed within SSRI. Expansion of our research faculty has permitted substantial intellectual growth in this area. While CPHA's traditional strength is in biodemography, it has integrated researchers from other related substantive areas—specifically life course analyses of physical and mental health and general wellbeing over the life span and intergenerational studies, including the transmission of health and longevity. While much research here employs widely used, large scale nationally-representative datasets and will continue to do so in creative ways, CPHA also has an unusually large number of unique ongoing longitudinal data collection efforts that support and integrate these three substantive areas. It has received a \$2M grant to do just that.

We have also launched a new initiative focused on the social, political, economic and cultural dimensions of uneven and inequitable access to resources, opportunity and capabilities. Launched in July, and headed by Sandy Darity, researchers in the Duke Consortium on Social Equity will address the overarching social problem of general inequality and explore disparities and conflict associated with group-based identity such as gender, race, ethnicity or religious affiliation. The team will particularly focus on the construction of group identity and nationalisms at the social and individual levels, and to the cultural products such as visual arts, dance, literature, and music that result from and that critique inequality.

In the Humanities, we have made several significant strides. We have appointed a Humanities Director of Academic Engagement; we have had a conference funding program; we have new humanities open house for interested students, among many other new initiatives. Humanities Writ Large continues to thrive, giving out grants to a wide variety of emerging humanities networks, partnerships with other universities, and helping us with key strategic hires in these areas.

In addition, I want to announce a new grant from Mellon: \$1.3 million, 3.5 year grant exploring the futures of the humanities disciplines in light of the interdisciplinary growth and development of recent decades. Here, our grant partners include all of Duke's humanities and interpretive social sciences departments, along with other non-departmental centers and units.

Key programs include monthly public symposia, faculty seminars and working groups, and a collection of online position papers. Our fall 2014 activities include 2 PAL-FHI Seminars ("Whose Kafka?" and "The Contemporary Novel"). Discussions with departments to configure potential seminars are underway. And a CFP for non-departmental working groups is circulating with a September 15 deadline for submission.

These are extraordinary stories, typical of our faculty. And I have no doubt I will continue to share similarly good news with you in the future. However, I want to pause here to send a broad message to all faculty that the Dean's Office strongly supports your search for grants and other forms of support for your research. Our F&A's, Facilities and Administrative income, which is overhead from federal and some foundation grants, has been declining. This is partly because of the larger funding climate and sequestration. That changing funding climate is real both in the federal realm and in foundation support. However, we should be submitting a far larger number of grant proposals in relevant fields than we

are. Our submission rate is essentially flat at a time when it should be ascending. So I want to make a strong plea to make use of our wonderful staff members who are here to help in just this area—the first of which is Carmel Lee. As the Director of Research Opportunities in Arts & Sciences, Carmel Lee is here to help particularly with respect to our most fundable fields. She has already held one workshop that was heavily subscribed and will be holding two more in the coming months of the semester. Please contact her office for more information on this. Beth Eastlick in the Office of Foundation Relations is the person who shepherds all our exemplary grants to Foundations in this area, including the several Mellon Grants that we have received. We need to do more in crafting/submitting/ producing fundable proposals—plain and simple.

We realize that funding climates vary widely across the three divisions in Arts & Sciences and our strategies need to honor those different environments. And we will support you even more in this collective goal. We are currently looking for strategies to mitigate research shortfalls as well as other incentives and support mechanisms to help faculty with this work. And we have a great new partner in Larry Carin as Vice Provost for Research, who with Dan Kiehart, already has come up with a great set of proposals to help us in this arena. Please stay tuned for an announcement about programs to address this issue. Funding is always positive. Period. More funding is even more positive.

Curricular Initiatives

For our curricular initiatives this year, I want to mention that we have followed up on a wish from last year, and launched a series of Signature Courses—courses that combine the best of Duke’s virtues. These courses focus on the exploration of compelling challenges or “big questions” of our time. These courses—taught by our most renowned scholar-teachers—highlight Duke’s particular strengths in promoting active interchange among faculty and students in the humanities, natural and social sciences, arts, and engineering. Signature courses are designed to integrate curricular and co-curricular engagements, and to foster the skills that prepare students for life-long learning. Drawing explicit connections between the past and present, these courses provide students with an informed analytical context for understanding significant social, cultural, political, or scientific issues, events, or historical moments.

In addition, after a robust faculty led discussion last year about the various forms of online learning last year, we are sponsoring more creative forms of online that serve to increase the liberal arts focus of Trinity College, not decrease it. Those include more work in the flipped classroom modality than ever before. They also include a suite of courses that join teaching partners at Duke and another university—whether it is a global partner in Asia or Africa or South America, or a research partner with whom we are teaching our latest research project. More faculty are helping further Duke’s public outreach in teaching non-credit MOOCs than ever before, 14 courses ranging from copyright law to sports and society to bioelectricity to composition. But even these courses are being repurposed in the service of the small classes at Duke, deepening the liberal arts focus that will always be Trinity’s signature.

I also want to update you on the work of the faculty committee on advising, led by Steve Asher and offices capably led by Beth Fox. After a great amount of dedicated work last year, the faculty committee has made some great recommendations, and Steve Nowicki, Lee Baker, and Beth Fox are working hard on several components to our already robust and exciting advising program. These include an increase in the number of Directors of Academic Engagement (we are now up to six), deeper training for all advisors, more engagement with faculty advisors, better transitions from pre-major to major advising, and moving to a voluntary four year advising model. In collaboration with Steve’s office, we will be keeping you updated throughout the year.

And finally, a reminder that the Global Study Abroad semester has opened at DKU, with 62 undergraduate students, six courses being offered by Duke faculty and a wonderful address about the classical approach to beginnings by William Johnston. Nora Bynum will be joining us in October to give a full report of the semester’s opening, and the progress on the campus to date.

Curriculum

I want to spend the rest of my time on a single topic—the inauguration of what we are calling the big-tweak in our curriculum. Let me begin with some context. When we first started thinking about Curriculum 2000, it was the mid-90’s. The Internet was still big news. We made an evaluation in our class assessment form that said, “Do you use the Internet in your classes?” Then, the Internet promised a future that was both different and the same than the Internet future that we have now been living into for the past decade and a half. Under the leadership of Steve Nowicki, we have focused on a tweak in 2004. His work in the mid 2000’s, what I like to call the “roaring aughts,” reduced the complexity of the original Curriculum 2000 and, in so doing, increased degrees of freedom (or, conversely, made the curriculum less constraining). Previously students were omitting whole areas of knowledge (largely math and foreign languages), and this revision gave a structure and expectation of what engagements students needed to have to prepare for a 21st century life. But that was ten years ago and in 2004 we did not have Duke Engage, Duke Immerse, Certificate 2.0, Winter Forum, and Bass Connections—five significant curricular changes that have had impacts that we are only just beginning to study. In the meantime, we had fewer students going on study abroad; fewer students who had significant Service Learning Experiences, and fewer students who did two or more things, such as a double major, a major and a minor, following the national trend. We also were not grappling with the effects in the larger educational environment of online learning—whether those are MOOCs, online degree learning at other universities or at the masters’ level at Duke.

Last year was the silent phase of our thinking. And that included our asking the A & S Curriculum Committee to think about diagnostics—what was working and what wasn’t. That query resulted in a series of informal reports over the last year and a half, which can now help us launch the more formal stage of our investigations. They felt that much of our curriculum was working well, and a major overhaul was not necessary. However, they had clear concerns about how the

curriculum might be working in the 2014 pedagogical and scholarly environments. As they wrote to us, some significant simplification and functional enhancement would both lend greater coherence to student pathways and make it easier for students to participate in important new pedagogical initiatives such as Bass Connections, Experiential Certificates, Online Opportunities, University Course, DukeImmerse, etc. So first: less is more. Second, a smaller more focused set of competencies should be prioritized over a more extensive set of limited exposures.

Third, majors should be a more not less significant element of a student's portfolio. I also asked the Course Committee to answer the question: "What is a Course?" They raised essential questions about how we might need to rethink certain key issues in light of our current educational environments which include new forms of global education, new uses of online learning platforms, and new forms of pedagogical practice: how might we therefore rethink contact hours, flexibility of course timings, and the relationship between course duration, student effort, and course credits. The three points I am going to outline below as part of the charge to the committee are based on responses from faculty in these informal conversations during this silent phase. They are the beginning of an iterative process that we hope will take us to an entirely new curricular place.

We also began to think about process, particularly over the summer. The major commitment I want to articulate here is: In consultation with students, faculty own the curriculum. Faculty author the curriculum. Faculty revise the curriculum. This is a fundamental point that we need to proceed from and end with.

In that spirit, Tom Robisheaux and I have been working throughout the summer to put together what we feel are two extraordinary committees. We have appointed an Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee (aka the Big Tweak Committee), with representatives from all the divisions in Arts & Sciences and two administrators ex-officio who are closest to the curriculum on the ground. That committee is chaired by a great leader for all of us: Suzanne Shanahan. We are thrilled that she has accepted this role.

We also have created another key committee, an Advisory Committee who will be consulted every step of the way. These comprise key faculty members who are known for their curricular innovations, for their extraordinary oversight, for their robust sense of the common good, and who are leading faculty members in our partner schools in undergraduate education.

Our charge is simple and comprises the "Three points/Three years" principle. And, as mentioned above, it is based on the informal conversations of last year, between A & S, ECASC, Curriculum Committee and Courses Committee. We want to clarify and, if necessary, simplify the logic of the curriculum. We want to create more opportunities for exploration and creativity in the curriculum. In light of our interdisciplinary work together, we want to rethink our vision for disciplinary as embodied by the curriculum.

And in answering these concerns we will take three years. A reminder: it takes 1.5 years to do a certificate—and that is only 10 courses. So we do need to give ourselves some time and engagement as we proceed on this "Big Tweak." Our proposed time frame will comprise diagnosis in year 1; the development of proposals in year 2; official discussion & voting in year 3.

In addition, our intention is to keep things light, rather than mandate a major reform. If we had mandated a major reform, then we would all be carrying this heavily. But I want there to be a frame in which we work together in a more creative and engaging way, and yet if there is a big idea that emerges from this committee, we move forward with it. I would welcome it and endorse that big idea. So this frame gives faculty the ability to carry things lightly AND have big ideas at the same time.

Here is our charge to the committee: The Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Chair of the Arts & Sciences Council of Trinity College charges the Imagining Curriculum Committee to examine the state of the curriculum and make revisions. The committee's revisions should respond to three key questions: In its present educational context, can the logic of the curriculum be clarified and simplified? Does the curriculum have a capacity to draw out and challenge students' curiosity and creativity? Does the curriculum have a capacity to reap the full benefits of the disciplinary and interdisciplinary work of a research university?

Here are some of our further questions. Are we taking full advantage of vertical integration, undergraduate research strength, and interdisciplinarity that has now become a Duke signature? Are there ways we could integrate those strengths more into the curriculum itself? And are there ways to reimagine disciplinary? Are we confident enough in our disciplinary activities that we could, in fact, rename our disciplines? If we could re-name each of our departments with a more accurate title of our current work, what would it be? Other schools are known in part for their curricula—a distinctive core curriculum, a particular approach to distribution requirements. With our curriculum engaging these three further strengths of undergraduate research, interdisciplinarity, and vertical integration, we could create a signature that is truly distinctive and well known for its creative, rigorous, student-centered thinking. We could adapt to the complexity that is a particularly 2014 form of complexity; we could integrate levels of learning to deepen the sense of discovery in our individual students; and we could innovate by providing new opportunities for our students to push themselves without focusing on checking the box.

Here is the process, worked out in extensive discussions with ECASC, Suzanne Shanahan as chair of the Curriculum Committee, Tom Robisheaux and other faculty involved in the review process. First, it is a highly iterative one, because that is the administrative style of our offices in A & S, and it is how we work so well with ECASC and Arts & Sciences Council as a whole. The Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee, the core committee, will be meeting once a week. Second, the work of the committee will be data driven, working with our offices of institutional research and some

data analytics faculty who have volunteered to collect information on key curricular questions, such as how our students make their way through the curriculum, what course choice and major choice have to do with each other, changes in patterns in study abroad, and so on. Third, the Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee (IDC) will be listeners in several different ways. They will be coming to departmental meetings to hear what faculty members have to say about the curriculum from their disciplinary perspectives. They will be attending and listening at Director of Undergraduate Studies meetings. And they will be listening at chairs' meetings in each division. Both Arts & Sciences Council and the Dean's office will be sponsoring open faculty forums on these questions. And, as you have heard from Tom, those of you who are Council representatives will be vital to this process: listening to colleagues and bringing faculty views to Council. We will continue to do this throughout all three years.

And finally, the Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee will be working closely with its faculty advisors on the Advisory Committee. They will meet regularly with the Advisory Committee—twice this semester and three to four times in the spring, and then regularly over the course of the next three years. The Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee will report in on its progress to date and get constructively critical feedback on all of its ideas and proposals.

As you see, our process is highly iterative. That means tolerating ambiguity and anxiety while things are in process. Suzanne, Tom, and I want a Duke undergraduate curriculum that faculty shape, understand and embrace. We want you, the faculty writ large, to be reflected in this curriculum, and the curriculum to reflect what faculty care about. The process will require a robust and capacious sense of the common good, not a narrow interest in defending a particular piece of that curriculum but a concern about what is in the best interests of the college and the students. Two thirds of the faculty members that are currently at Duke have come on to the faculty since our current curriculum was created. We need to think together again, as a community, to create new focus and logic for a curriculum that is working well, but in our new context, could work even better.

In the last three years we have done extraordinary things together. We are on the road to financial sustainability, and we did it collaboratively. We have become a true national leader in creating an inclusive environment in the sciences. We have deepened the university's relationship to its multiple publics. We have begun to focus better and differently on Asia. And we have hired 100 extraordinary faculty. Among so many other things. So let us do even more. Let us imagine the Duke curriculum together.

For some, Julian Abele in all his complexity was not imaginable during his time. And yet he, and others around him, imagined the possibilities for himself and his talents nonetheless. The first African American graduate at the Department of Architecture at the University of Pennsylvania, and the first to become a chief architect in the firm of Horace Trumbauer. Lithographer. Woodworker. Silver worker. Etching artist. Like Abele, we are architects of our intellectual futures as we imagine a new version of the curriculum. Like him, we use the artistry of multiple media to get it done. Inspired by him, I invite you to join us in this next phase of the collective genius that is Trinity College.

Discussion

Tom Robisheaux (History): Do colleagues and representatives have any questions or comments?

Michaela Janan (Classical Studies): I am wondering if you could make available on the Arts and Sciences website the names of those on the committees?

Dean Laurie Patton: We can go back, as well. Let me read off the names: Liliana Paredase in Romance Studies, Sheila Dillon in Art, Art History, and Visual Studies, Mohammad Noor in Biology, Anita Layton in mathematics, Lynn Smith-Lovitt in Sociology and Women's Studies, Gary Bennett in psychology and neuroscience, chaired by Suzanne Shanahan. There is also Tom Robisheaux, Lee Baker, Inge Walther, and Matt Serra.

Michaela Janan (Classical Studies): These will be up on the website?

Dean Laurie Patton: Absolutely. Let's also look at the ad hoc advisory committee. There is Lamonte Aidoo, David Bell, Thomas DeFrantz, Owen Flanagan, Michael Hardt, David Malone, Richard Newell, Gunther Peck, Ronen Plesser. The students are Lavanya Sunder and Ray Li. The ex officio members are myself, Tom, Amanda Kelso, David Jamieson-Drake, Keith Whitfield, Linda Franzoni, Beth Fox, and Steve Nowicki. The idea here is to have a robust conversation, and in addition, I am hoping that the Imagining Duke Curriculum Committee will check in not only with the advisory group, but also with the Arts and Sciences council on a regular basis. The members of the committees and Suzanne are going to be visiting all of the departments and DUS meetings and we will be regularly reporting every two to three months what we are thinking about, so there will be a lot of conversation. Suzanne, would you like to say a few words as well?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): The IDC committee has yet to meet; we will meet for the first time next week. I think one of the things that we have already agreed upon is that our first task is to talk to faculty about what they think the issues are and what their perspective is on the curriculum. I think a huge part of our work is initially going to be outreach to get a sense of how folks are thinking about it, who else they know who has ideas, concerns, questions etc. I think there will be a lot of information gathering from faculty. We really want any faculty member who wants to chat to reach out to us. We will be inviting people continuously to our weekly meetings and we are happy to come meet you on your own terrain as well. We want this to be as collaborative as humanly possible.

Michaela Janan (Classical Studies): You mentioned that you might want to rename departments. Are you speaking of dissolving departments and refiguring them?

Dean Laurie Patton: Not at all. I just want to make sure everyone knows that is not the plan and never was. I would never change departmental structure unless the faculty in that department want it. It should be abundantly clear by now with the

evidence from the last three years that I am not interested in doing that. I'm glad you raised that issue and gave me the opportunity to say that.

Ara Wilson (Sociology): I just have a correction: Lynn Smith-Lovitt is not a secondary in Women's Studies. I don't want it to seem like Women's Studies is represented on any of these committees, because it is not.

Dean Laurie Patton: Thank you for that correction.

Recognition of Faculty

Tom Robisheaux: There is one more very brief item before we break and have some refreshments. A few weeks ago, I asked chairs of faculty committees and members of the executive committee if they knew of any colleagues who are ending their service on committees, or in some other official capacity on behalf of the faculty, that they felt had shown exceptional devotion to the faculty. It was a very interesting group of names that came back to me. Service on committees is usually thought of as an obligation and a duty, however, I think of it as helping other colleagues and freeing them from the onerous responsibilities of governing the university on behalf of the faculty. Later on you or other colleagues will come and fill those other shoes. A vibrant faculty governance depends on the examples that we all have before us of colleagues who have taken on extraordinary responsibilities, and there are some who do it in ways that you will always remember. Today, I want to honor three colleagues who are ending their committee service to Arts and Sciences this year and moving on to other things.

First off is Scott deMarchi, who was unable to come today. If you have been part of any new curriculum initiative in last five years, you know Scott. He has been a lion on the curriculum committee, which is intellectually one of the most challenging places in the Arts and Sciences. It is there that proposals are brought by colleagues. You will find Suzanne, who is now stepping aside, and other colleagues on the curriculum committee engage your proposals in a thoughtful way. They want to see it work and support you if you are trying out something new. Scott is a skeptic with a heart; he will engage you and never let the issues go. He will wear you down and then support you to the very end. He is one of the most stalwart members of a committee I can imagine. I am sad to see him end his service, but he is continuing on in the political science department as a DUS. I cannot imagine a better example of a colleague who cares so much about the curriculum, students, and faculty. I am sorry he could not be here to hear this small recognition.

The second colleague I want to honor and recognize is David Kraines, who is in the math department. I first got to know David in the early 90s on the Duke advisory committee and selection committee. David is a mathematics professor who wanted to bring into the committee his interest in mathematics to identify talented young people, which is not easy to do. Over the years as David has moved quietly from one committee to another, I have seen him spread his broad umbrella over young people and bring them along. When the courses committee, which meets every week or two in the course of the academic year, needed a colleague who had experience and expertise in teaching quantitative skills, David stepped forward even though he was in the process of retiring. He wanted to see this work carried out. David is one of those great trees that leaves many seeds growing beneath it.

Finally, from several different quarters I heard a deep and moving wish to thank another colleague. I now turn to my colleague on the executive committee José María Rodríguez-García for this special recognition.

José María Rodríguez-García (Romance Studies): As we recognize Srinivas Aravamudan's work as Dean of the Humanities, at ECASC we thought it was important that we take a moment to get to know him better as a scholar-administrator, an educator, and an exemplary campus citizen.

Many in this room, especially those who call the Humanities Division of the College our "mother ship," have marveled at Srinivas Aravamudan's accomplishments as a scholar of eighteenth-century English and French literature, the cultural and political history of slavery and war, postcolonial studies, the contemporary world novel, and literary theory as a whole. He's been the very embodiment of a professor of the humanities who, having become Dean of the Humanities, continued to inspire colleagues and students as a prolific and transformative author in his chosen fields of research. As a champion of the interdisciplinary humanities – challenging us on the faculty to rethink the "disciplines" as a category of knowledge – he was at the helm of the John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute from 2003 to 2009, the year of his appointment as Dean. His signature program is fittingly called "Humanities Writ Large," a Mellon-funded, university-wide, multi-year initiative which through 2016 seeks to integrate the humanities, the arts, and the interpretive social sciences within larger structures of knowledge. It advances further the student-centered approach to the instructional part of Duke's mission through a new understanding of collaborative teaching and research.

Like many of you, I've served on committees directly appointed by our colleague, most recently his Dean's Call for Humanities Proposals last spring. I will never forget the example he set as a gentle and inspiring colleague in that setting. I remember expressing reservations regarding a proposal by a new colleague in a small field in the arts which had experienced little change over the past two decades. Srinivas gently pointed out to me and the committee that what I saw as a possible weakness was, in fact, precisely what made this proposal attractive: with the support of faculty from the more established fields, our young colleague in the arts could create something bold and exciting – something which would in turn energize students and teachers alike in his own academic unit and beyond. This empathy for teachers and researchers in small fields, whose efforts at contributing something new and distinctive are not always appropriately recognized, was particularly inspiring. It confirmed my long-time impression of Srinivas as a welcoming and generous colleague, deeply supportive of others, able to reach out and encourage other colleagues' careers. Through such support, often invisible to others, he has been inspirational in fostering pluralism, diversity, and inclusivity. An engaged listener, Srinivas has

touched me and many other faculty with his inimitable way to make everyone's opinion count and make each of us feel included in the decision-making process.

On behalf of ECASC and of this Council, I thank you, Srinivas, for your intellectual generosity, collegial warmth and support, and for the insightful leadership shown in multiple endeavors and initiatives.

Tom Robisheaux (History): Let me now invite all of you to join us for our reception to meet new colleagues and talk about the start of the new year. Thank you very much

Meeting Adjourned