

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 10, 2016

Call to Order

Anita Layton (A&S Council Chair): Welcome! I can't believe this is March. You know what it means? It means we have one more council meeting and we are done. Let's get moving. I'm so happy today. The first item we have today is to approve the minutes from last month's meeting. It's been on Sakai. I'm sure you read it. Any request for amendments or corrections? No, then I need a motion. (A motion was received and seconded.) Okay. Good. All those in favor? Okay, good.

Bylaw Revision

Layton: Then, moving on, by-law revision. It's here because I realize all of a sudden that we haven't voted for a long time. It is always also good to clean up our by-laws a bit. I found this paragraph on this person called the Executive Secretary, whom I have never met, and probably has not existed for a few years. Apparently, the secretary is an Arts & Sciences faculty member who will come to meetings and do the minutes. Nobody wants that job so Tom hired a student to do the minutes. Now, students are or can be reliable, except during mid-terms and finals. I know we don't have a student here at tenting time. So I decided to seek professional help and I send the minutes to an online transcription service to take care of it. Mary helps a lot. I think you did one or two of the meetings. She also cleans up everything. Bottom line, this position has not really existed for a long time and probably won't ever again. Let's take out the paragraph, like this. Objection? Anybody want to volunteer to be the secretary?

Steve Nowicki (DVPUE): Well how much is the stipend?

Layton: I have no idea. I don't know, Steve. I have never met this person.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): I have a question regarding record. Few people are going to read the whole transcription of the meeting and obviously there are certain key decisions involved, yes's, no's, resolutions. Will there be a condensation? Is it possible for someone to make a condensation of the key points for the record?

Layton: I think on the web, we say what has been approved, so very briefly on the Council website. Every month, we say the decision, in point form.

Ruth Day (Psychology & Neuroscience): There was an Executive Secretary from the beginning of this body until quite recently, actually. It was always a faculty member who wrote the notes. When I was chair of the Council, we did experiment with students doing it and so on. It wasn't just their unreliability at

certain times, but they didn't understand all the issues and then, sort of related what Randy was saying about the votes and so forth, the feeling was that we needed to continue to have somebody, a faculty person. But doing the actual transcript was very burdensome. I support the idea of going to something like another way of doing it, like your online service but I really think that some faculty member, such as the chair, should review and shape. I wound up doing that even with the faculty member.

Layton: I totally agree with you. Let me tell you what happens these days. The content of this is sent to an online company who charge, for a fee, and they send back a document which Mary then goes through and cleans up. Then, she sends it to me. I read through the whole thing. Yes, I do. I'll make whatever necessary corrections that is needed. That version is then posted. Okay? Any other question? Yes?

Day: I just wanted to comment that that position originally had other duties as well. That person used to do a lot with elections and so on but now we've gone to electronic and other means. It wasn't just a transcription position early on. It's fine that it can disappear now.

Layton: Good. Additional question? Volunteer to be the secretary? No questions? Do we have a ballot? Do you want to do a voice vote? Let's do a voice vote. I need a motion.

(A motion to use a voice vote was seconded. The Council then voted to remove the passage about the Executive Secretary.)

IDC Update

Layton: Moving on. The curriculum is next. All right. Earlier this month, a number of departments have submitted their responses to the new curriculum. Not everybody did. Mine didn't. A lot of departments did submit their responses. Can you guess who was the first one to turn in their response? Anyone? I will give you thirty seconds. If anybody get me the right guess, I will buy everybody beer in the April meeting. Thirty seconds.

Audience guesses: Writing Program, Library, English.

Lee Baker (Trinity College): Slavics.

Layton: Yes, Slavics!

Baker: I think I'm an insider.

Layton: He cheated so everybody can have their alcohol in April. We will miss you when you retire, Lee. Anyway, the responses have been posted on Sakai except for those who did not want us to post their comments. If you have studied those comments, you will appreciate how diverse they are, which is maybe what you expect. Where's the fun if we all agree? In any case, I'm sure that the responses are going to generate further discussions. I just want to remind you of the many channels that you have available for communicating your inputs to the IDC team.

Okay, so Suzanne is not here this week so we have our wonderful Gary Bennett here to talk to us about this thoughts on the process and to answer some of your questions. Gary, thank you.

Gary Bennett (Global Health): Thank you, Anita, for calling me wonderful. I was thinking of volunteering to be the Executive Secretary, if I didn't have to stand up here today. Good afternoon everyone. I just wanted to give a really quick update about the IDC discussions. I think as Anita mentioned, Suzanne is currently in the Middle East. I've been nominated to talk a little for today's

discussion. Although, I want to say that our committee's been meeting recently, regularly over the course of this semester, with the exception of the last two weeks. We've taken a bit of a hiatus as we've been waiting for some of the feedback to come in. Our plan going forward is to discuss ... Our first discussion as a committee, to review the feedback, happens next week on the 25th and shortly thereafter we will be developing a response to the feedback.

Let me just say, perhaps on behalf of the committee, it's actually kind of easy today, I was watching the debates last night, and it's easy in this current environment to be quite cynical about political processes. I, for one, was pretty excited to see the level of engagement from the departments in providing responses to the IDC's concept framework. On both sides of the issue, I think the comments have been, at least in my quick review, have been extremely well-reasoned and will be very helpful to us, as we begin the process of considering them for the next phase of the document. I think the Curriculum 2000 went through something like 227 revisions -- not that many, but pretty close. I hope we don't have to go through that many, but our plan is to start thinking about that next week.

I'm happy to take a couple of questions this afternoon. Actually, before I do that though, let me say that we have been having regular office hours over the last several weeks to meet with interested faculty to discuss the draft proposal. We are having a series of lunches that will be scheduled after Spring Break. I think that there is a handout up here that describes the schedule for those lunches. I encourage you to attend those. They'll be led by interested members of the faculty and many IDC members. That would be an opportunity for more elaborate discussion on key issues. If there are any questions that I can take now, I'm happy to do so.

Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy): Speaking as someone who's been tapped to lead one of these sessions, I'm sure I'm going to be asked the question. How do we move from this generic but extremely imaginative plan, to a concrete program that students can understand, incoming? Is there a trajectory that you can identify the major stations of, now?

Bennett: No. No, I wish I could. Did everyone hear the question? The question was whether there were ... I had some ability to try to identify how we might move from this draft proposal into a concrete document that would be easily digestible by students. I'll say that I still think we're in the phase where we are creating. We're thinking about how to imagine the structure and that ... How are we doing? That draft proposal was truly a draft and we will be considering feedback from the faculty and re-imagining that over the next several weeks. I think our initial plan was to try to bring something before this body in the fall. Presumably, we'll be meeting over the summer to bring more structure to the document. I don't think it would be fair for me at this point to give any more of a concrete timeline.

This process has been very organic and we've had well over 200 meetings in the last 18 months. I'll say that even though we haven't had 200 drafts of this curriculum, we certainly have had at least as many permutations in our meetings as a committee. I would expect that on the basis of the feedback that we've received from the faculty, we'll have significant opportunity for more discussion about what this should look like.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): I was wondering if there's been any more discussion or detail about the Duke 101 course? Are you kind of putting that on the back burner while you flesh out the ...

Bennett: Yeah, I wouldn't say that we put it on the back burner but we certainly have not added additional structure. There's been great input by faculty, by a variety of faculty, who have proposed ideas for structuring Duke 101 in a more robust fashion. There have been, I think in the number of the departmental pieces, there were recommendations for how we might add additional structure to the Duke

experience. We have not yet sought to do more with that until we have a chance to review the departmental feedback. I will say that we will be creating a subcommittee that will be specifically charged with pulling together that plan. That much, I can say to you.

Franzoni: I would like to request that there be a Pratt representative on the subcommittee because, if it's going to be Duke 101 for all students, we need to be sure that it works for Engineering.

Bennett: Absolutely. Couldn't agree more.

Franzoni: Thank you.

Frances Hasso (Women's Studies): I read the consolidated document and I have a certain analysis of it. I wonder how you all analyze it because the way you framed it today, you said both sides of the issue. I was impressed with the initial draft. I was really impressed with, like you, with the departmental responses. I was wondering how you evaluate it because it seems like people are ... There are a lot of issues that are being raised with the proposal.

Bennett: Yeah. Let me say, we haven't had a chance to talk about it as a committee. One of the things I value the most, Frances, about this committee is that it has been decidedly non-partisan. I think I've said that probably so many times at this point that it's becoming a refrain. I, for one, would like to retain that, so let me not give my opinions about it. I will just say that I have been personally, was extremely pleased at the level of input. I will say one thing though and that is that in the 200 or so meetings that we've had and in the conversations that we've had with interested stakeholders over the last 18 months, a lot of the issues that were raised in departmental feedback emerged through that process.

One of the things that gives me comfort is that our committee has considered many of the issues that were raised. One of the things, though, that I think that, at least in my view, that the department have done is, it's always helpful when some of those issues get amplified and when we get a sense of how those issues might be distributed across the campus. One of the things that I think our committee will have to take on is we'll have to revisit a lot of old discussions that we've had over the last 18 months and we have the benefit of having a better sense of where those issues emerged.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): You said there's going to be a subcommittee on what Duke 101 would look like. Is that based on the assumption that there will be a Duke 101? It seem like you're already thinking of how we implement it, not should we start ... Has the faculty philosophically accepted that this could happen?

Bennett: Yeah, the Dean will take his prerogative.

Baker: So the idea is that we at least sort of put together a trailer or what it might look like, which then could be voted down. We thought we could bring some of our expert teachers in and try to sort of mock up something that then the faculty will actually know what the look, the feel, the pace, the credit, I mean the real specifics. That in itself is a component of the curriculum. That's not implementation at all. It's going to be like a sub-proposal because that's a big component and we thought other experts than what we have on the committee could do a better job at that, including bringing someone from Pratt. Then, you'll have a better idea of this is what that component will look like. It's a planning.

Bennett: To add to that, I think that one of the primary criticisms that we've heard, I think particularly articulated from the Thompson team was that the vision for that class was not particularly well executed.

Frankly, that wasn't our intention. Our intention was not to design a course and again framework. To Lee's point I think ...

Baker: We'll get learning outcomes hashed out.

Broverman: There's inherent tension, if you get too far down the pipeline, too far off, they'll say, "What are you going to do?" I understand it, trying to find that middle ground.

Bennett: Yeah, and I think faculty opinions about that course will depend a lot on what it looks like. That's where you totally raised a reasonable proposition.

Catherine Admay (Sanford): Gary, I'm interested, I've been holding little meetings myself, with Public Policy. I've heard that, of course, the issue is always the details, like what is the difference in secondary fields, certificate people who feel like will children's policy be considered different from policy. In addition to that, a little group of us were talking about whether there's a formal way for students to be consulted. Not where they have to decide to come forward to you talk to your office hours or go to one of these lunches. It's not likely, really. If there was some formal way for you to convene a focus group of students who would come in the first year. I know a bunch of my kids would love to do it. Some in their senior year, so people who've got some experience of what this curriculum look like. Just so you can get some student perspective on what we're doing. Maybe hear some things that we're just not thinking about at all from their perspective.

Bennett: I completely agree. One of the things we've done is that we've had frequent meetings with students over the last 18 months. We've met with DSG several times, we've met with the graduate and professional students. We've met with representative groups of underrepresented minority students. We've met with a wide variety of student stakeholders on the campus. Tara, the newly elected DSG president, has been an extremely important part of this process, both in our committee meetings and inbetween meetings on campus as we're walking across the quad.

I'd say that we've had robust student input, I imagine, in my own view you can probably never get enough. I have no expectation that that would stop going forward. I guess I would say both to you and other faculty, if there are specific student groups or student interests that you think we need to hear, please let us know. We have structured luncheons, we've structured breakfast meetings, meetings at The Perk. Things that might be able to diminish some of the inherent power issues that might emerge in those kind of conversations. We've been thoughtful about how to structure those in a way that would make them more welcoming to students. If you have ideas about how we could do that, I know that we would be interested in hearing more about that.

Matory: I might suggest that alumni also be told, and I think I speak to the same issue more comprehensively, if some kind of concerted evaluation of what has worked in the existing curriculum and what has not worked from the point of view of all parties.

Bennett: That's well said. Absolutely, and we certainly have met with the Board of Trustees and some of the most notable members of the Board are alumni members. I take your point for having a proper conversation with alums, it's a good point. Mainly where we're particularly at, I'll say just a word about that. The Board, particularly the alumni Board members have been particularly vocal about what kinds of features would be the most of interest particularly from the private sector and from folks in that perspective. That's a, at least for me, it was a perspective that was not one that I would have been able to bring to these conversations.

Matory: It's a little scary to spring on them. We're all worried about the vocationalist direction of the academy. As long as they understand that their input isn't dictation, they should be forewarned, so their expectations aren't too great about how much we're going to follow their flow.

Bennett: I'm looking at the other members of the committee, I think my experience in speaking with them, and of course this is a selection issue, is that most of them were fierce proponents of liberal arts model and could speak quite clearly about the value of liberal arts for most of the potential career possibilities, particularly those in the private sector.

David Malone (Education): There had been some discussion at our last Council meeting about the conversations that are on the yellow card having an area of focus. I don't see those on here. I didn't know if that was something that we weren't going to attempt to do now or ...

Bennett: They may not just be on there, David, I'm looking ... We can tell David Steinbrenner...

Rosenberg: I have received no marching orders either. Neither I nor Tom Nechyba. We had assumed, I think, that we would be open to an agenda mapped by participants.

Bennett: Thank you, that's helpful. I know some of them we expected to have a topical consideration, I'll check on that.

Malone: I appreciate that a lot of the feedback has been aggregated and it might be helpful, I don't know if it's possible to have some of the outcomes of these conversations represented on the Sakai website and other types of meeting that are occurring. If we can have one central location for a lot of the thoughts that people have about the curriculum.

Bennett: That's a great idea David. I wish we had done that from the meetings that we had last year as well. It's a good point. We can bring that back to the committee.

Layton: Okay, well thank you Gary.

Undergraduate Advising

Layton: I think we all agree that for any curriculum to be successful we need the support of an excellent advising system. I heard that Dean Nowicki been busy coming up with a plan to improve our advising system. I want to note that the IDC and the advising upgrade are two separate initiatives. Basically, I would say that any improvement to the advising system will be super beneficial whether they're going to revise our curriculum or not. I think we are all very eager to learn more about your plans, so Steve the stage is yours.

Nowicki: They're not my plans, I want to explain that a little bit. There's a big our there, o-u-r. But first, actually, our IDC people were modest to not point out the feature story in today's digital Chronicle of Higher Education was about the challenges of curriculum reform and two institutions that were doing really important, interesting, novel things and doing it right, even though they're still in progress. I know that our colleagues in Cambridge are really delighted that they were able to share the stage with Duke as being one of the two institutions that were highlighted. So you should check that out, it's a long story on-line.

The goal of what I'd like, or I should say our goal. I'm going to bring David Rabiner up here, our director in the academic advising center in a second, is to provide you a review of where we were and where we are and where we're going. It really isn't me, it's a bunch of people. It isn't just now, it's been going on for a while. I'll try to make that clear. Where we are going, of course, is going to have to be fine tuned depending on where our curriculum goes. So this will be a work in progress for a while, in fact, maybe we should be a work in progress.

The drivers of this are not a new curriculum. Actually it goes back a number of years ago, three or four years, maybe five years ago when the Trustees, in their wisdom, looked at data from things like the COFHE senior survey and said advising doesn't seem to be doing very well at Duke or anyplace else and we should do better. Fair enough. I think another driver, in terms of how we started to modify things, came out of our last accreditation process. With the SACS organization, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, where we had to, as we do coming up in just a couple of years again, write a quality enhancement plan, and one of the features, what are we doing with advising evolved out of that. Then, even more recently, Steve Asher in Psychology and Neuroscience, led a committee through a set of discussions about advising on all levels for about 18 months. The Asher Committee report and that report is available on my website, on Steve Asher's website, I'm sure a number of websites.

So there really has been a lot of thought that's gone in to this. Like any big thing, it takes time to really move things in a new direction. We are, I think somewhere now really moving in that new direction and this is a place where we want to hone, expand, improve and then actually get the word out.

The take homes: the basic structure of what we're doing right now, can fit a new curriculum. It might need to be modified and fine tuned, but I don't think that where we are right now is something that we would necessarily have to fundamentally throw out. All though, if the faculty say we need to do that, then we need to do that then.

Second take home: Actually, advising isn't as bad as we thought. Now maybe because of the work we've been doing over the last several years, as David Rabiner has been looking at the data, we're doing okay. We're doing better than we were before. Whatever we're doing now is starting to move in the right direction.

Then if there's a third take home, it's for all of you faculty to leave this room today and say, "Boy, I want to do more advising." Remember, "I want to do more advising."

I want to tell you what we used to do, which is very positive. I'm going to try to do this very quickly. Although I was told I have a half an hour, I see we have a whole hour left so I'm tempted to take the time to give you what I think is a bang-up lecture about oxidated cross-correlation. I give one of the best, so I'm hoping that I can get that in here.

Like most schools tied to the traditional college advising system, what we used to do is, when a student walked in the door, she would be assigned ... By the way, I'm throwing in the academic deans here and you'll see why, because it's really all an integrated piece of supporting our students work here. They would be assigned an academic dean and they would be assigned somebody we'd call a pre-major advisor. I never liked that word because it's defining something by an absence, but that's what we called it. When the student declared a major, she would be given a different academic dean -- we've all heard about this from Dean Baker -- and also be given a different academic faculty advisor in the major, that offset there is intentional and I'll get back to that. There were some problems with this.

First of all, relative to the dean, and this really was Lee's bally-wick to work on. A lot of the students who have issues and bring them to an academic dean, those issues arise in the first or second year, but they carry through in the third and fourth year as the student is trying to catch up, meet requirements, deal with hold issues ... and so the problem is that this continuity in the dean, that the new dean assigned when there was a major, might not have personal knowledge of that student's circumstance.

Another concern from the faculty and student's point of view is that often, for these first-year students and second-year students, they actually develop a strong mentorship relationship with their advisor. I just signed off on three of my advisees, very close, and they wanted to stick with me. Now, I can't actually advise the student who is now going to declare a public policy major, so of course, she needs an advisor in public policy. It would be nice if she stayed in touch with me, so that was a concern. That is a concern that came out very strongly from the Asher committee report.

Another concern is that this difference between when an advisee declares a major and when they might actually need an advisor in their major, could be a matter of months, if the student goes and studies abroad, as they sometimes do in the fall of their junior year. It might not be for a year, so that was an issue.

Then a final issue, in some ways the biggest issue for we faculty, and by faculty I mean not just regular faculty, I mean faculty, administrators and other high level staff get involved in this important advising role, is that it's very hard for the average faculty person, average faculty, staff, me, to know everything there is to know given the complexity of our current curriculum and the co-curricular opportunities that are part of the students' education here. Whether it's DukeEngage or how to engage in study abroad, you name it. It's really hard for a faculty to justifiably say, I'd like to advise, but I can't be a good enough advisor because I can't know everything.

Okay, so what have we done. Well, what Lee has done is start it by, again, an academic dean and now we have actually changed the decanal model so that when a student is assigned a dean when she comes in, she sticks with that dean for her entire time at Duke. I think that's great and that's done. We're doing that for the first year now. We're also working on a mechanism to allow that first advisor ... by the way, I would like to have us start calling it a college advisor, that is what that person is, for all four years. Now that relationship might wane, it might go away, it's up to the student if they want to stay connected. This is largely just coming up with mechanisms to help foster continued relationship, whether that's a software solution do that you can still see your former college advisees, even though they now have a major advisor, or other mechanisms to help social interaction. It's up to the student and the faculty if they want to maintain that.

We still need to have an advisor in a major area, what we need to do, and this will be the work of Lee in his remaining few weeks, he'll get this done, or Lee's successor, is to make sure that we get a connection fostered earlier. Now some departments do this already, so this is possible and we'd like to do this. We just need help to department think that out.

Now the most significant innovation has been the creation of a professional advising cadre whose job is different from the college advisor or the major advisor in a couple of ways. First of all, deans and advisors have caseloads, right? I have a number of advisees, they're my advisees, they're my caseload. These professional advisors -- and we call them DAE's right now which is short for Directors of Academic Engagement, a name that I think we're going to be moving away from, depending on what they come up with -- don't have caseloads in the same way. They may have constant relationships with students, but the students reach out to the DAE's and the DAE's are specialized in particular areas: global and civic engagement; we have a DAE that's specialized in the Humanities, we have a DAE that's specialized in the

STEM area. We only have six of them now. The experiment has shown it's value and we need to increase these. How many? Let's get back to that in a second.

Then the last, really key thing is to enhance -- I should have added to this -- not only enhance recruitment training and support for all the faculty or faculty-like advisors, but to help define their role, so that the faculty member who's an advisor knows that they have particular roles to play, some of which are transactional, right? They will push the "eligible to enroll" button, they need to know when drop/add is, they need to know the basics of the curriculum, hopefully much of which is conversation. What do you want to get out of this place? Why do you want to study philosophy? What do you hope to accomplish in this area? Right? So that you have a conversation that is about the big picture here, what a student is trying to get out of Duke.

I think that's all I was going to say before I turned it over to my colleague, David Rabiner, to talk a little bit more about advising as it's happening here. Why don't you take it away David?

David Rabiner (AAC): I'm David Rabiner and I'm in my first year as the director of the Advising Center and I'm a faculty member in Psychology and Neuroscience, I'm one of the Trinity College deans. That's the Academic Advising Center, the AAC. That's our building there over on East Campus behind Brown Dormitory. At the moment the Advising Center staff consists of myself as the director, right now we have five DAE's but soon to have a sixth. We're searching for a sixth one now. Then we have four administrative staff.

As Steve just mentioned, what the Advising Center does is we essentially coordinate academic advising for students from essentially before they arrive in the summer, until they declare their major in their sophomore year. Who advises? Right now, we have over 250 faculty and staff from across the university who volunteer to serve as advisors for our first- and second-year students. About 25 percent of our advisors are faculty, broadly defined and the balance are staff from across all units, from the Medical Center, from Athletics, from the Bursar's Office, from Financial Aid, from really all over the university. Each advisor takes between three and 12 incoming students each year, so the caseload for an advisor will be, at any given time beyond the first year that they did that would be between six and 12 students, although advisors can certainly opt not to take on new students in a particular year if they just don't feel they have the time for it, they can just finish up with their sophomores.

Starting this coming year, all the advisors first year advisees will be living in the same residence hall, so they'll be supported by the same academic dean. We're trying to develop these kind of smaller advising communities, given just how many advisors we have. A recently as about six, seven years ago, we had about 110 advisors. Now we have over 250, my guess is we'll be at 275, 280 next year. That growth occurred because directors before me decided that requiring people to take 12 incoming students each year, was just too big a load and it really precluded many faculty who wanted to advise from advising. That was one reason to reduce the number. Also, with a smaller number of advisees, it certainly opened the opportunity for the advisors to spend more time with each of their advisees. We will probably need to recruit, I would say, between 50 and 60 new advisors this year. Before you leave, I hope that you'll take a flyer that I printed out that explains what's involved. I hope you will seriously consider joining us.

As Steve mentioned, the role of academic advisors is really quite broad. Some of it, yes, is transactional, but good advising -- and the advising that we really hope happens with increasing frequency -- is really multi-dimensional. Advisors, of course, help students to think broadly about their academic and personal goals: what they want to get out of their time with Duke?; each semester to think about the courses that they're planning to take and why those courses?; what interests them about those four out of several thousand that are available to them to choose from?

Advisors do help students understand what the Trinity curriculum requirements are and hopefully what the rationale for those requirements are. Advisors help students think about different potential majors that they're considering, and help them through the major declaration process. Tomorrow is actually the deadline for our second-year students to declare. We probably will see, I don't know my guess is, probably about 500 students will be stopping by the Advisor Center tomorrow.

Advisors, hopefully, can really help students understand the value of connecting with faculty and help them develop ways to do that. That's not something that comes naturally to many students, they need some help with that and advisors can offer that. Advisors can help students learn and connect with the incredible number of opportunities that are available here, and help put them in touch with other members of their advising network, like deans, like DAE's, with them all, so help them with that.

Then, sometimes as you know, our students struggle, sometimes quite significantly, both academically and personally and to be alert to that and connect them with the resources that they need to help them should those needs arise.

What is actually required of advisors? For new advisors we do have our formal training in August, there are multiple dates to choose from, certainly, but we do ask new advisors to come to one of those trainings. We have a big meeting, a convocation of advisors, the Monday of orientation week, where we update advisors on things we think is important they need to know. We have discussions of topics that are quite relevant. Last year, being Dean Ashby's first year, she was welcomed to Duke by Coach K, which was exciting.

During that first week, you would have a group meeting with all of your advisees, essentially you are the first person to welcome them to the academic community of Duke. Then, sometime later in that week, before classes begin, you would meet individually with each of your advisees to begin to get to know them, establish your relationship, start to talk with them about what their goals are for the first year. They'll have lots of questions about their courses, whether they're in the right courses or the wrong ones. How do they do this, that or the other thing?

We ask advisors to record a summary of their meetings with students in STORM, which is the online record keeping system, so that when you meet with them again, you can refer back to what you discussed the last time. Certainly, when students get in to some kind of difficulty, when they need to go see their dean for one reason or another, just having access to those comments, that history of that student as seen through either the eyes of their advisor, is really important and helpful.

Each semester we ask advisors to attend a one-hour training on some aspect of advising practice that they are interested in. We offer about 12 to 15 trainings per semester. We had one this afternoon on goal-focused coaching and how that can help advisors in their practice. We have them both on East and West, so we can try to make it relatively easy for people to get to.

Then, in the student's second year, our advisors will meet with their student in the fall for spring registration and then again in the spring for major declaration.

So the number of required meetings is minimal. We strongly hope, wish, encourage that advisors will connect and reach out for their advisees in between those meetings. Try, if you've seen your student for 45 minutes during orientation week and then not again until November when it's time to meet for registration, developing the strong advising relationships that we would hope occurs for all of our students, that's going to be tough to do.

How do students feel about advising? When students declare they're asked to complete an online, anonymous survey about their experience with academic advising. This is based on about the first 550 surveys ever completed in this current declaration cycle. You can see that nearly 80 percent strongly agreed or agreed that their advisor helped them think about their overall educational goals. I'll say, that doesn't mean that 22 percent either strongly disagree or disagree, most of them were neutral. For all of these questions, there were fewer than five to eight percent of students who actually disagree.

Eighty seven percent felt their advisor was knowledgeable about their Trinity requirements, which is a good thing. Seventy one percent thought that their advisor helped them understand the value of a liberal arts education here at Duke. Over 90 percent felt that their advisor was somebody that they felt comfortable speaking with. When we asked students to rate the overall quality of their advising on a poor, fair, good or excellent scale, 80 percent reported that it was either good or excellent and 20 percent poor or fair. So there's plenty of room for improvement, but that's not so bad.

Nowicki: Let me interrupt and say that this stands in contrast to what I was told several years ago that advising is terrible. Now it doesn't mean there isn't more improvement as David said, we want to improve it, but obviously, at least as the students are reporting themselves, they feel like they are being served better than we thought.

Rabiner: So why advise? Your colleagues can certainly say it better than mine. First quote's from Carol, who's been a fabulous advisor for many years, "Advising is a rewarding way to make a difference in students' lives. Advising has exposed me to the astonishing wealth of student experiences at Duke, the unique pressures and opportunities they face on a daily basis and the amazing varieties of courses offered here. Through advising, I have been able to connect in meaningful ways with the community, not only with students, but also with faculty and administrators. This is one of my most rewarding experiences at Duke."

From Mark Goodacre in Religious Studies, "Everyone at Duke should be involved in advising." They actually wrote these, I did not. "It's the best way to connect with students and to understand the people and practices that are at the heart of Duke. I don't think I really understood what made Duke students tick until I had become a pre-major advisor. In short, it's a great way to connect with colleagues, to work with students and to be a major player in what makes Duke great."

Then from Andrew Janiak in Philosophy, "In shaping their own liberal arts educations, it is essential that students receive guidance from the faculty members who teach their classes, run their labs and make their educations possible. With advice from a Duke faculty member, students will be able to envision how their various courses, plans and aspirations can be fit together into a coherent whole, thereby crafting an education that reflects the wide diversity of intellectual interests and approaches represented on the Duke campus."

I do think that really for faculty advisors, I think most all of them would say that it really helps them in their classroom. They have a better understanding of what their students' lives are like, the challenges they face, the pressures that they experience and, as I said, we would love to have more faculty involved in advising and are knee deep in trying to recruit now for next year. I hope that some of you will choose to get in touch with me and I'd be happy to come meet with you and talk some more and hopefully get you signed up.

Nowicki: I'm going to add a testimonial. I was just talking to an advisee of mine who just declared a major a day early. This was a student, a first-generation student coming from a very, I'll say,

economically challenged family and came to Duke and was slaughtered the first semester as might happen. I worked with that student and I've been talking to that student; deans came in, it was very helpful, and this kid is flying high now. Declaring a major, really confident of what he's doing and that's the satisfaction. I feel like that was a personal touch. He is just one person, but I think that that's really, in a sense, embodied in it, and I'm writing a statement for you David. Are there questions? Yes Randy.

Matory: One, I'm tremendously encouraged that I hear a clear articulation of two problems. One, how to advise students on what the requirements are and how to fulfill them as a technical issue. The other is, the bigger picture of what their goals are, where they're headed, why they're taking a particular set of courses, et cetera. It's important that those two issues be involved in advising. I'm going to utter my usual Cassandra point of view, and that is, the iconography of education suggests about student life, that when they get home to their dormitories with their fellow students, they're not talking about classes, they're not talking about grand intellectual vision or where they're going or how their coursework helps them achieve overall goals. They're talking about checking off boxes, how to get credentialed as efficiently as possible, et cetera. So as I kept hearing the word "advisor," I kept also thinking the word "mentor." The people who tend to be remembered from the faculty are just the people students that came almost accidentally, who convincingly and as people through interactions, not in the classroom, but outside the classroom, at cocktail parties, wherever, become role models of a vision of the world. Not too many students find that and find that role model useful in figuring out what classes they're going to take, or associate their classes with a bigger vision. I'm wondering if you could somehow institutionalize mentoring rather than advising? Which the students will always ...

Nowicki: Let me begin to answer that, with the graph that I've prepared to help answer that. Then I will call on my other favorite Cassandra.

Rosenberg: No Cassandra here.

Nowicki: Well then I will be disappointed. Take a look at this. I think visually, and with apologies if I got it wrong. I did this yesterday. I think it's important to realize that as we think about helping our students with a curriculum, and I hope I answer your question, there are really two dimensions to curriculum. One dimension is how specified that curriculum is. How much freedom, how much flexibility, how much exploration are students allowed to do within the curriculum? Then another dimension, which we sometimes conflate with the first dimension, and I'll show you why it's a mistake to do that conflation, is how complex it is to understand the curriculum.

Duke, at the moment, has a, let's say, fairly specified and somewhat complex curriculum. We might debate how far it is on this axis, but it's somewhat complex and that complexity is part of the issue we're addressing now because, we understand that our faculty and our students have a hard time explaining the point of that complexity. That's what led to the IDC's whole generation of ideas. How can we have a curriculum that our students understand?

Just to help understand the axes, we might put Brown or Amherst in this corner. Very few if any curriculum requirements and it's easy to understand. If you don't have any requirements, it's hard to have a hard time understanding it. But it's a mistake to assume that everybody's on this axis. Consider, for example, St. John's College. St. John's College has the most highly specified curriculum as possible. This is St. John's College in Annapolis or in Santa Fe. You come in and you know what books you're going to be reading for the next four years. It's a classic, specified great books curriculum. It's not that hard to understand. It's easy, you know what you're going ... Now you choose to go to St. John's because that's the mode of education that you're looking for.

As Duke thinks about its curriculum, I believe that the IDC's motivation is to move in this direction on this axis. To give more flexibility, more exploration, more ... Fewer things that students would have to check off, just for the sake of checking it off. That doesn't necessarily mean that it will be less complex to understand. One would hope we come down to maybe a little easier to understand and may be as hard to understand, hopefully not harder to understand. The reason I bring out these axes, is that this is the axis that drives the percentage of transactional versus big-picture conversations, that an advisor/mentor would have. The more it's hard to understand the curriculum, the more the advisor is put in to a position of being the person that student goes to because she needs to say, how do I check this box? It's thinking about this axis that we have to think about when we say, where do we find the balance. We're putting our faculty in a position where they're not driven to always be transactional. Where there is the space and understanding that they should also be having the non-transactional conversations and I'll add, not shown here. This is why we have created, in support of advising, the full-time professional advisors, now called DAE's, because those are people who do specialize and they don't know everything about everything, but those are the people that the faculty can say, you know what? This is great, I think your idea about connecting global health with rural development in south Asia is fabulous. I think you should go and talk to somebody about some details about how you make that work. I'm happy to have the conversation. Now that doesn't mean the DAE's are having just transaction conversations. They're also, hopefully, not gridded on just transaction, but they're in a place where they can have those detailed conversations, that help the students move away from it being purely transactional in their own minds. Now as a whole, that is a goal and we're not there yet. But first I have to call on Alex.

Rosenberg: Now, this is a brilliant visual which expresses the most pressing issue that faces the new curriculum. Here, the response for Randy is, what we want out of a curriculum is something that is so interesting and attractive to prospective students and so stimulating to current students that when they go back to the residence halls and talk to their fellow students, they're not talking about checking off boxes. They're talking about the curriculum.

Nowicki: Yes, that is the hope. I would like, Anita, if I could, the record to show that Professor Rosenberg referred to something I did as brilliant.

Inge Walther (German): I just wanted to pick up on something that you said about advisors being mentors. We've had a lot of discussion about that in the IDC committee as well. Also, I believe in meetings I've been in about advising that we are thinking. We would like to move more faculty to advise but also to be rewarded for advising. To think of advising not as a service but as part of their teaching because advising is mentorship and that is very connected to our goals as teachers. I think there will be some discussion, there has to be some discussion also, how to see this as part of faculty work load and [inaudible].

Reeve Huston (History): My question is about the full-time advisors because not all of the people in my department are happy about this. So how many of these do we have and what's their caseload going to be, what kind of training will be there for them...

Nowicki: Well, they're full-time professionals with some sort of advanced degrees if they're in the Humanities, it might be an MFA, we have PhD level people doing this. With apologies for you who know the history, the notion of what are now called DAE's came from the quality enhancement plan, which was about increasing global opportunities in the Duke educational landscape. Part of that quality advancement plan was to say, it would be good to have full-time professionals that students could use to connect their global experiences, whether it's DukeEngage or study abroad, with their curriculum, because of the notion that many students will just basically see their global experience as something else. Right? "I'm doing my Duke degree and now I'm going to take a semester off and just do something else." That's not inherently a

bad thing but we would like to see more students say, “I want to go and study in this culture, this place, because it helps me with the arc of my thinking in history or classics or whatever.” It became very clear and in that QEP, we proposed adding three such people. It became very clear in the first year doing this that it was hamstringing those people to say, “No I only talk about this, because you know DukeEngage is about civic.”

So it became clear that we should say to them, it's okay to open up your envelope, not to everything, but now to basically global and civic, and that's where it was for a while. Then, a few other opportunities came along. The Humanities Writ Large grant, that Srinivas Aravamudan landed, had funding and we thought it'd be good, he thought, we thought that it would be good, actually to have a DAE who really specialized in the Humanities. So that grant funded that.

We know we need to work on STEM issues, especially with STEM retention for under-represented groups. We, I say “we” generously – I'm the PI, Lee Willard wrote the grant to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. In that we added a stem DAE, Nyote Calixte, who is now doing a fabulous job.

That's where we are now. How many DAE's or whatever we call them in the future will we need? That, I think, is an important open discussion. Let me say how I would think about it, but it's not my thinking. I would think about it in terms of, how does the role of those professional advisors need to evolve as we continue to think about advising in support of the curriculum. That's a discussion that will happen over the next year or so. The role can evolve and that will determine who some of those people are. They're probably not going to be stamped out in any particular way. We'll probably always want to have a range of kinds of backgrounds and how many we need.

If we stuck with the current curriculum, when we first started talking about this, off the cuff I said, we probably need like 10 or 12 of these people. I thought that based on not caseload but appointment loads. How many hours are there in the day? How many times can we meet? There were a lot of students wanting to meet with these DAE's and we looked at it and said, well, we probably might get it to maybe a dozen.

If a new curriculum adds roles to DEA's, like one such thing I know has been discussed is that if there are expectations that need to be approved and one is worried that that approval of that expectation is not something we can leave in the hands of the faculty, I'm not saying I agree with that statement, I'm saying that's the statement out there, then perhaps that's a role that could be added to that professional advisor, maybe. That might increase the number.

I will say one thing though. I know that ... I've heard there's a concern, reading through the notes, that there's a trade-off between faculty member and professional advisors, administrators. I can't imagine how that trade-off could work. It ain't my budget. This is Dean Ashley's budget that determines faculty size. My role to the extent there is ... my administrative role, to the extent that there is a need to increase the number of people who are in those positions. I need to find new resources. It is not coming out of the Arts & Sciences budget, no way it could. I am an Arts & Sciences faculty member and no way I'd want it to. This is where philanthropy comes in. We have, at the point that Lee Baker is landing this, we have had a philanthropic donation come in to support one of these DAE positions. If we can articulate the beauty of this system and that is going to take longer than we want, because the sands are shifting with the curriculum. I think that I can go sell this. That's a lot of what I do, is go and sell things. Financial aid, support through advising, what else? Physics building.

Rabiner: Just one thing, following up on what Steve said. There are some schools, I just came back from a COFHE conference on advising, there are schools like Columbia, University of Chicago, that rely

exclusively on professional advisors. They'll have 35, 40 people, faculty don't advise at all, certainly not before the major... I think at Columbia, not even in the major. They have caseloads of 300 students and they're responsible for essentially everything to do with that student's progress. The DAE's here are really folks who really supplement in a very, very powerful way, the work that any of us who know inevitably far less about their areas of specialization, in terms of all the opportunities here that connect students with. They're really helping students look at things in a big-picture way and are able to take that big picture and get down to the nitty gritty details that they have that our advisor before will not possibly.

Nowicki: I would deeply regret diminishing the role of faculty in advising. Deeply regret that. So the notion of professional advising cohort is in support of making faculty advising manageable in a complex environment.

Malone: I really want to thank Professor Matory for making the distinction between advising and mentoring because I think with the new curriculum, it's going to require a significant increase in the number of mentors that are available to students. Just reflecting on my own experiences as a pre-major advisor, each year I get 12 first-year students. I would imagine that maybe a fourth of those I become a mentor to. Maybe just three, I don't know what happens the other nine. My relationship with them is more transactional: "I need to register", "I need to declare my major". It seems like, with the new curriculum, or the framework that we're currently thinking might work, that there's going to be a need for more transformational mentoring rather than just advising. I'm leading up to commenting on your, you made a comment earlier, Steve, about holistic, integrative, advising. It seems like this mentoring happens in many other places other than the four categories you listed. If we start thinking about athletic advising, mentoring that happens in cultural centers. All the Student Affairs things, Faculty in Residence, CAPS ... If there was some way we could get a greater whole of out all these parts. I know with the new curriculum, or the proposal, one of the things that I really like about it is this effort to more deeply integrate the outside-of-class experiences and bring together Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in some ways, some symmetries that have a ...

Nowicki: You know that's something I've been working on for eight years now. If I implied that advising should somehow be siloed from other things, I certainly didn't mean to. My thing is that every student we would like to find a mentor, actually every student I'd love they find that mentor in the first semester at the latest. A beginning mentor. It might be the academic advisor and it might be one out of four. It could be your FOCUS instructor, it could be your seminar instructor if we continue a requirement like that. It could be an academic dean, it could be any number of people. What we want is for everybody to see themselves as a synergistic network so that if the moment of mentorship happens, and it's with a psychological, somebody from CAPS, that person understands that aspects of what might be happening next would be best done by this person, this person, this person. You're really upset because your parents told you that you needed to be a doctor and you never wanted to be a doctor and you're doing terribly in your courses not because you're not smart, but because you just don't want to do it. Part of it is going to be a psychological connection. Part of it might be something that comes from working with the dean. You're going to have to drop a course. We don't want that to be purely transactional either, we want the dean to be listening. And then there may be that there is someone who isn't an official advisor, but someone you just know as a faculty member, who's the right person to talk to about ... you know, you thought you were going to be a doctor when you went to college and now you're an art historian. How'd that happen 20 years ago, or something like that.

I think we want to have the advising center working as best as possible within the specific realm of advising and mentoring as it connects to the curriculum, but really be one node of a network with connections that our students can find.

Malone: That's what I liked about your comment a more holistic, integrated system. Very quickly, I work with all these sophomores now, they're going to be in your office tomorrow making their long-range plans. But yesterday I met with one who has made straight A's since he's been here at Duke. But he says to me, he took a course with Scott deMarchi and that Scott deMarchi told him that, before he leaves Duke, he should find at least one faculty member he could have a meaningful, mentoring relationship. So the student says to me, "How do I do that?" For some students it happens more naturally and then other students I think are really challenged in it. It might not happen just by chance.

Rabiner: One of the more discouraging statistics from that senior anchored survey from a couple of years ago was, somewhere around 25 percent of graduating seniors, I think this was two years ago, essentially reported that there was not a single adult that they had encountered, in their four years at Duke, that they felt had a meaningful influence or impact on them in any way. About 25 percent. That's a lot. Ideally that would be ...

Nowicki: And this is why we create programs and continue to create programs like FLUNCH or not my program but Duke Conversations created by Gail Powell and her colleagues as students, or the Chautauqua lecture series for first year students. These are all opportunities to allow students -- I like to think of it as putting useful obstacles in front of students so that as they come in here, and we put things in front of them that they're going to bump in to, and if we put enough of those then there, we'll change that from 25 percent to 5 percent.

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): I've been a pre-major advisor for close to twenty years now. One of the things I thought was really interesting is this encouragement that you might try to get that pre-major advising or college advisor relationship to last longer. The ones that I have last longer are the ones who come in already interested in a field similar to mine. So I was a little concerned, I don't think that you're going backwards, but this idea that oh, advisors students all live in one dorm, because that to me, I take from my relationships, has very little to do with my relationships with my students. It's much more important that they feel like I'm a really great resource for something in natural science. I know I get a lot of biology students, not a lot of Af Am because they don't know that it exists. Maybe because they love lemurs and that kind of match, those are the folks ... I have a student graduating now that I knew before they even walked through the door because they're excited about that area. So that would help me develop a long-term relationship, possibly become their major advisor after pre-major advising. I'm sure that's not practical all the time.

Rabiner: It's not. There's certainly going to be efforts made to match within residence hall.

Nowicki: Residence halls are big, they're 200 people. There's a lot of biology majors in any one residence hall.

Rabiner: We did take a look at this question of, how does the strength of the match between what students report their interests are coming in and what their advisors interests are. Does that seem to have any association, at least what students report about their experience with advising? There's a lot of effort that's been made to try and make those matches. I swear to you we looked at this across 8-900 students and the relationship between the strength of the match and what students reported about the quality of their experience in advising was as close to zero as it could possibly be. Not a shred or hint of any association.

Scott Yakola (HWPE): As a pre-major advisor, college advisor for 15-plus years, I want to ask for their thoughts, yes. And I find that interesting that there isn't that connection because I've found in my role as a pre-major advisor, which has been very rewarding, that's why I still do it, those students that I have some

connection to are the deepest ones I end up with and they're the longest ones. General Ed, I just met with a senior who was one of my pre-major advisees, earlier in the week. I'm not her advisor anymore but she's wanted that relationship. So I think it goes back to something we were talking about earlier, meetings ago. The whole first gen thing. Finding more ways to find connections and if you can find those connections, I think you help jump start that ability to create deeper or more meaningful ones. Maybe increase the percentage from three out of 12 to five out of 12. I think that helps, if you can make those. I don't know if that's been discussed but I think when we went to that a few years ago of like what are your interests, I find it more rewarding when I can talk interests that I know. I don't know organic chemistry. I don't know biology. You want to take marketing and finance and sports and all that, I'm with you.

Nowicki: I think as David says, Dan and his staff try to do that as much as possible. It was remarkable to find out that there wasn't the expected relationship. That doesn't mean we shouldn't do it anyway.

Yakola: The other thing that I was going to ask you and I don't know if it's been discussed. That mechanism from when they declare their major to being assigned their major advisor. Has there been any discussion about that mechanism? To me, it's very complex.

Rabiner: That's a bit messy, it's all over the place, across different departments in terms of how that occurred.

Yakola: If I could create an emoji to send to a student and say, it's not right. do it again. You have all these 20.24's listed, you have 55 classes and a 64-word essay. To me, I think that fine, you tell me you want to be an econ major, great. Sign up on that, get assigned an advisor in that and start talking about what you're going to do at that time.

Nowicki: That's the connection that I tried to allude to. Really, we need to work in partnership with Lee and Lee's successor, because that does fall to the units who support the major to say this is how it's going to work. It's going to work in econ different than it's going to work in classics. They have to figure that out.

Yakola: I think that makes it better for us being able to advise them because I think for some, it leaves a taste in their mouth that, David didn't know anything about this major I'm going to pick. Then you ask them to fill out that survey about how good you were.

Hasso: The 20 or 25 percent, I was curious if we can get more information on them? Are they, for example, are they more likely to come from particular divisions? That's one way. Or are they more likely to come from particular socio-economic demo ... Are they more likely to be first gen? Are they more likely to be students of color? Are they disproportionately women? I would be more interested ... Are they disproportionately women in a male dominated field? I just wonder ...

Nowicki: We should look at that. That's really a very good point. That will help us understand how to close the gap if we don't think of it generically.

Admay: David, Steve, I've been an advisor now for a year and a half. One of the reasons why it's just a whole ton of work and also, a lot of it is very valuable, is that, I end up being a mentor to all of them. I have to tell you that's just incredibly a lot of work. Not only do you get those transactional questions like, should I withdraw from my class? Then, if you do that right, you have ... I met with one of them last night at 11 o'clock about, what's that really about, what's with dropping the class. Right? You take these very simple questions and it ends up in an hour conversation and that's everything and you've got a huge caseload, and it's like ahhh.

Rabiner: That's one of the reasons why the change was made so that advisors could choose to take far fewer than 12 students. Yeah, to really do a job that you feel good about, with 24 students at a time and yeah ...

Admay: But the real question I want to get to you is this idea about ... You seem to feel happy about the fact that there's not a relationship between the match between the student advisor and how well that advisor does. That is the function of the student deciding how well that advisor has done. I'm wondering if you've thought a little bit at the meta level about how students go about deciding whether his advisor has done a good job? I'm telling you that my students, what they want, is high levels of responsiveness. "Admay, I'm freaking out, I don't know which class to drop. Which class should I take? I like live and sleep there." What archaeology class might be of interest to you versus ... It's insane the level of responsiveness they want.

Rabiner: Let me first say, I'm not happy about the fact that there is no relationship, it's just that there isn't. Part of what you're saying is we need to do a better job at the advising center about conveying to students what are appropriate, reasonable expectations to have with their advisor. What role, what things their advisor can do and can help them with and what they can't. The experience that all advisors have of a student who shows up and says, tell me if you think I should take History 227, when you're not even in that department. If you were, you'd probably still wouldn't know that much about the course. We'll really have to educate students about the role of the college advisor and the ways that they can help them and how they can connect them to other people, to get those kinds of specific questions answered so that they don't come in expecting, really miracles and then wind up feeling ...

Nowicki: One idea that came out of the Asher committee report, which I like, and which we haven't had time to act on is, and you may all be familiar with something we call the Blue Book? This is a book that's sent to incoming first-year students the summer before they arrive, that is a distillation, really boiled down to here's the essential stuff you need to know and do to arrive at Duke. How do you get housing? How do you register for courses? Stuff like that. There's a lot of discussion amongst all the stakeholders to really bring that down to the gist so that this is just the essentials. The suggestion was, that there should be a follow-on, Blue Book 2, that we give to students in September, after they've landed and after the rush is all over that would include a bunch of things but one of them would be, this is what your advisor does, this is what your dean does. We wouldn't want to put that in Blue Book 1, because they're going to forget all about it. We give it to them on an as-needed basis. I think this is a really good idea, it would be an interesting discussion. What would be the essentials that you'd want that student to have once they've landed and they've gotten their feet on the ground and now there's another bunch of critical stuff for them to know in advising and the curriculum and stuff like that would be what would be in there. Thank you everybody.

Layton: Thank you David, thank you Steve. That's it for today, I will see you in April and I will bring the beer.