

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 October 10, 2013

Call to Order

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): I would like to welcome you to our second of the Arts and Sciences council meeting of the semester. I am Dalene Stangl, a professor in statistics, and I am filling in for Thomas Robisheaux.

Approval of Minutes

I hope everyone has had a chance to read the minutes from the last meeting. Are there any corrections or changes that need to be made? Could I get a motion to approve the minutes?

Margaret Humphreys (History): So moved

Steffen Bass (Physics): Seconded

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): All in favor? Opposed? The minutes have been approved.

Announcements and Updates

We have a few announcements before we get into the actual presentations for today. I would like to remind council members of the priority that we have for this semester on online courses. We are making advancements on several fronts. We had a faculty forum, and it had a great turnout of about forty to fifty faculty members. For those of you who were interested in attending but could not do so, there is a video recording available on the Arts and Sciences website. Today we will be hearing from Lynne O'Brien about other online course opportunities. We will also have another faculty forum on November 15, so if you missed the first one, be sure to get that on your calendar. We also have a commitment from our committees to take up curriculum issues related to online, as well as other conversations and curriculum initiatives that are underway. We are really moving on that on several fronts.

Finally, as the last announcement, I want to reiterate Tom and Steffen Bass's message from the last Council meeting on the importance of council representatives. The representatives have a very important role in faculty governance. We see you folks as absolutely key in communication between what faculty in your departments are thinking and linking that with ECASC as well as the administration. We really encourage the representatives to be proactive with their departments. Please take what we discuss here back to your departments, find out what they think about it, gather their questions, and make sure that we see and hear those. We really care about what the faculty thinks and we want to make sure that gets communicated deeply and thoroughly. Also, Steffen Bass put together a "Best Practices for Council Representatives." It is the good things that you are already doing, and we have put it in a document on the Sakai site. If you have not had a chance to look at that, or if you had to send your alternative representative, make sure that they take a look at that so they really understand what the responsibilities are that they are taking on.

With that, I would like to move to the presentations that we are going to have today. Many of you will remember that several years ago a group of faculty got together and put together a Linguistics major. Under the leadership of Edna Andrews, that group of faculty is now attempting to get linguistics program status. Our first presentation is going to be from Edna Andrews, and she is going to give you a brief overview of what this proposal entails.

Linguistics Program Proposal

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): Good afternoon, the Linguistics Program is already a program, and it has been since the early 60s. In the pre-'94 era it was called the interdepartmental program in linguistics, but after 1994, its official title became the Linguistics Program. Since that time it has had the appropriate officers running the unit in the major. We have been very successful in that we are budget neutral and as you can see from the materials that we have had submitted,

we have had a healthy number of not only majors and minors, but we probably average 5 to 600 students per year, which is also very healthy. We also do really well with our honors theses and the placement to PhD programs or other careers. The report that you have lays out all of the aspects of our endeavor.

As you can see, we have a very wonderful group of faculty members. Many of them are here today who have worked with us and teach in program regularly and have for many years. For the last several years we actually wanted to get in line but it was not clear ten years ago whether or not we could automatically have joint or secondary appointments because we had been here so long. Now that the deans are regularizing all of the programs, this is a wonderful opportunity to become regularized, so the linguistics program would become the linguistics program. There will not be a name change, but there are two key things; one is that secondary appointments can be made, which is desperately needed. The people who have been working so hard across departments in this major deserve the recognition. Secondly, we have asked for the ability to have joint appointments across units in the tenure and tenure track way. We are not asking for any lines, rather, it is just giving recognition to the people who are already doing the job and solidifying that for them in their own units. By the way, this has been going on for a while, for the last year and a half, and Thomas Robisheaux asked the Executive Committee, "Why now?" I said, "Actually, it is not why now, it is finally." We have talked to the chairs of the departments that house our faculty, and from what I understand no one was told that they would not be allowed to be secondary, so that is good news too.

Discussion

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): Let's open it up for questions for Edna.

Linda George (Sociology): How many faculty [members], approximately, will this involve in the secondary appointments?

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): Right now, we have sixteen regular rank and three non-regular rank [faculty members] that are core, and we also have some contracted faculty [members], so you are looking at sixteen to twenty people.

Dean Lee Baker: I would like to say the Linguistics Program has been consistently a very robust medium-sized major, and it is distinctive in its approach because it is interdisciplinary times three, in terms of the humanities, language acquisition, sociology, cultural sociolinguistics, but neuroscience and brain sciences as well. It really touches on all three of the divisions, not in an ancillary way, but in a sustained and deep way. You have also been serious about research, and have had high levels of senior theses. In terms of overall contributions to the curriculum, linguistics is second to none.

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): I do want to say that the faculty is first rate, and it is wonderful. Even though we have just been a program without being a "program," we actually do have faculty meetings, and they are very interesting events. We built collegiality anyway, and the people who are involved in the program are the best of the best. It is an honor to work with them.

Dean Angela O'Rand: I just want to clarify a couple of things. I know it is a running joke about the program, but for those of you who do not know, we have been trying to clean house in Arts and Sciences. There are legacies of programs and majors that drift along, and there are emergent protocols and understandings about who can make appointments of any kind, and linguistics has been one of these programs. It is really quite prestigious and successful, but it could never make secondary appointments. While, as Edna emphasizes, it is budget neutral, we do think that it is a strong enough program that with Edna's persuasive powers, she might be able to get a regular department to go on a joint search. The heavy foot of a such a search would be in the regular department, but when you have a strong program that can potentially attract very good people, and other departments want to be involved with hiring, we do not see any reason not to support it.

Nayoung Aimee Kwon (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies): How are these secondary appointments going to be made? I can imagine people in my department who might be interested in making these links.

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): The people whom you see listed in the self-study are people who traditionally teach courses that are cross-listed with linguistics. We would welcome people who are interested in working with the program, and as I understand it departments like yours are very supportive of having faculty who have these appointments.

Margaret Humphreys (History): I am curious about this program becoming a program. I do not think anybody here is unhappy with the proposal, but are curious about what the structure means. Do you have any primary appointments? If you have a joint appointment that person has, in effect, a primary appointment in wherever it is. It is shared with something else but there is money flow...

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): I learned my lesson on that one just last week. I thought that joint meant joint, but I was wrong. I think Angie tried to clarify that, so a joint appointment means that, budgetarily, you would have your foot in another place. Even if we have joints the way that the deans have signed off on this, if you were joint you would not be primary joint [appointment]. Maybe they should explain it.

Margaret Humphreys (History): You can only have tenure in one department. If we [in the History Department] make a joint appointment then some money comes through History, even if it is just a quarter, and then three-quarters is in the primary joint [appointment department]. Can you have a joint appointment with no money in the second department?

Dean Angela O'Rand: A joint appointment as envisioned by linguistics is that of the four courses that a person teaches, two of them, following some memorandum of understanding, get taught primarily in another department, though they can be cross-listed in linguistics. It is just a matter of adding resources to a program.

Dean Laurie Patton: I think the distinction is between salary and teaching. The salary remains in the department, but the teaching load would be partly in linguistics.

Bill Seaman (AAHVS): Can you talk about how it will positively affect your ability to get grants?

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): That is a wonderful point. The fact is that if we have faculty who can self-identify as being affiliated as secondary appointments or joint with the linguistics program, when we do apply for other kinds of external grant money, we have a real presence. It is very hard to be a grant getting unit if you are only virtual. There are people who work in you, but none of them are officially affiliated with you. Also, given our deep ties with cognitive neurosciences I think there is a bright future along that path, and the sociolinguistic path has a lot of potential.

Dean Laurie Patton: We will probably vote on this next time, but I did want to suggest to folks a couple of other bigger picture virtues of this. Now that we have established that joint is joint and a program is a program, which I am very pleased about, we also might think about where linguistics as a field is headed. Universities of various kinds tend not to look with favor upon linguistics, and when budget crunches happen, linguistics, in the past two or three decades, has been one of top things on the chopping block. What I love about this is that we are, in an interesting way, by virtue of what we are already doing but shaping it slightly differently, moving in the opposite direction because we see the connections with the emerging areas of cognition, neuroscience, and globalization. That is another big picture reason why this could make Duke distinctive in a tough financial era of all of higher education. I wanted to make sure that point was made.

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): I will close this discussion with a few comments. Those of you who know the cast of characters on ECASC know there are not very many proposals that come across our table that we do not see downsides of and discuss vigorously. This was one where we do not see any downside. At the same time, we are going to try to be consistent with our policy of introducing new proposals in one meeting, giving you a chance to go back and talk to your departments, and let us know if we have missed things. We plan to vote on this at the November meeting. With that we will move on to the next agenda item, which is the online course evaluation. I hope that most of you, either through a DUS meeting or through the faculty forum that we held earlier this week are up to speed on what is going on with this proposal. [I hope] you have had a chance to look over the new questions that are up online. Today we will be looking at what those new questions are, and you will have a chance to discuss that. To lead this off Matt Serra and Dean Baker are going to speak.

Online Course Evaluations

Dean Lee Baker: I will start with some framing comments. As you know, for the last two years both the students as well as the faculty have been slowly but systematically looking through our old paper course evaluations. We have been moving in a conservative way with regard to thinking through the questions by not changing them much, but changing them a little to reflect and map onto our modes of inquiry and areas of knowledge. That was an intentional decision because we were focusing particularly on moving from paper to online.

One of the big drivers [for this change] is the carbon footprint and the sustainability. With 20,000 pieces of paper plus another 2,000 envelopes and the papers to call off the majors it was a big environmental footprint. That was the real driver [for the change] with the understanding that with the questions, people have really sincere, well thought out, and robust theories about whether you should start broad and go narrow, lead with this particular Likert Scale, should this be three instead of two, and should the students have a thumbs up. The [changes with different] iterations of well-meaning, smart people can go on for a long time. The committee understood [this and] did not feel comfortable making aggressive moves one way or the other. I recognize we lost an opportunity to redo the form and the format. Hearing faculty feedback over the iterations over the last few weeks, but more importantly over the last few years, I really believe the actual questions should be a matter of faculty governance, with veto power from the deans, but the driver should be from the faculty. I am not exactly sure which committee that would be, maybe Assessment or Curriculum, I will leave that to ECASC to decide, because that is where it would best be served.

Once we go online, here is the cool thing. When we move to the e-evaluations, the reporting is more robust, and we would get the initial feedback on these slight modifications of the questions, then the faculty have some real data to say, "This question does not work at all," to feed to the faculty committee. Then we can change it relatively easily, because we do not have to go to the printers and we can just change the form. We would not want to make radical changes year after year, but I can imagine after a one calendar year circle, we would get a form that we all would be comfortable with that is not too long or short and that gets us the information that we want.

In a sense, the proposal is to approve the conservative changes in the questions that we have today with the understanding that more robust thinking, both critically and intentionally about the overall format of the survey will be referred to faculty governance that can in due time come up with the proper questions. What is not up for a vote is the actual medium. If this vote goes down and is not affirmed, we will use the old questions, including "Do you use email?" and some of the other hokey questions. We would just throw the old questions up because we are committed to moving online for the carbon footprint and the sustainability issue.

I wanted to frame that in terms of the perspective from which I was coming from. It has been a team effort, and there were many people involved. The DUSs, several committees of Arts and Sciences Council, ECASC, Matt Serra, Keith Whitfield, Steve Nowicki, and a number of student representatives over the years have been involved in this, so I want to affirm that this has been a team effort as well and mark that you may have questions about the format itself, but ask that

you approve this with the understanding that moving forward we will let the faculty governance select the questions. Inge Walther has also been very important in this process. Matt has a very quick PowerPoint presentation to highlight some of the differences and show you that there is going to be a much more robust reporting ability. We will really be able to have deeper, more sophisticated analyses of your courses. That is really for you more than the deans, and we want to empower each and every faculty member to have good information, and good comments from the students so that you can improve your course.

Matt Serra (Director, Office of Assessment): I only have a couple of slides just to highlight some of the nuances and enhancements that the development committee did to the old questionnaire, and they are pretty straightforward. You all remember the lovely pink form and I know you will be sad to see it go, but it is gone. We will no longer be using this; we are committed to going online, and the system has been built. This is where the students will go, which is the same place they go for all of their information about their courses: ACES. When a course becomes ready for evaluations, at the top it will say "evaluate" and they will click on that, and go in. They can do it all then or save it and then submit it. That [on slide] is a snapshot of part of the form.

What has changed? One of the big things is that you no longer have to put in who the faculty member is. You do not have to put in that six digit code. All of that stuff has gone away because it's already in the system. There are three parts that are very similar to the old form. The enhancements we were trying to do were to refine the questions to get a little more information and meat. In the overall appraisal, the only thing we added was something the students really wanted and that was if they would recommend this course to another student. In the course characteristics we have added more fine grained questions about the quality and meaningfulness of the material, assignments, and structure and organization of the course. These are just fine-grained nuances to give better information.

Within instructor effectiveness, [we ask] about the knowledge of the subject, clarity, and preparation. Again, it is just a little deeper level of information to give faculty so they can ask where they can make improvements. The second section is the self-evaluation section, which we have really beefed up in this version. Before, we asked how many hours they spent outside of class, and that was about it with regards to a self-evaluation. Now we are asking them what their motivation was for taking the course, and there is a laundry list of things that they can check. How much participation or engagement did they bring to the table? Were they participating in lecture or in the discussion? Were they engaged in class? Even thirteen years ago this was a discussion on if we should ask them what grade they expect to get, so this time we are doing that.

In the appraisal of learning, we still have the college level learning outcomes that we are asking them to judge, but now we have added the modes of inquiry. Questions specific to the modes of inquiry that are attached to that specific course will be looked at and responded to by the students. If there are no modes of inquiry, we ask the students if they think there should be, so they can comment on that. In each of these sections, there are self-expanding comment boxes, so there is even more room and space for students to make comments, and from the pilots we have run, we are seeing that. [There are] much longer comments. I am just going to throw the items up there, and we will open this up for discussion.

Dean Lee Baker: We are beginning with no carrots and no sticks, so we are just going to do it straight, almost as we have it now. What we are hoping and expecting is that you keep the same ritual or you keep the same approach where right after thanksgiving you take fifteen minutes out of class to do course evaluations. Tell them why this is important, and to bring their computers or share one, and actually take class time, like we do now, to fill that out. With the pilots in particular the faculty that did do that same had the response rate as we have with the paper form because students will swap a computer or they will take the time. It does take time, but if students just bump into it in ACES or we just send reminder emails we have evidence that response rates go down. We want to ask you, whichever way the vote goes, to say this is the expectation. We have an aggressive roll out schedule in terms of advertising in the chronicle, and we are trying to get an advertisement on the Duke stone wall in front of the library. We are sending out a message to parents in the newsletter so we can get it out there and so people can have conversations, and we are going to email faculty. I think we will roll it out successfully, but again, I think the key is to keep the same look and feel of the process in your own classroom.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): I agree. One of the benefits of the new platform is your ability to make that decision. You can do it in class, which we recommend, or you can remind them. The distribution on feedback and the response rate we got on the summer pilot was basically tri-modal. The people who did it in class had a near one hundred percent completion [rate]. Those folks who reminded the students a couple of times and engaged in the process had around fifty to sixty percent response rate. Those that did not engage the process at all, did not remind students, and did not do anything had around zero to twenty percent [response rate]. It is clear that the faculty is very important in getting students engaged in the process. The students love it. They are more confident in putting their response in the ether than they are on a piece of paper, and they are okay with the confidentiality issues. They find this much easier than the tedium of filling in bubble sheets. We do have a report on the Sakai site on the feedback from those two pilots.

Discussion

Steffen Bass (Physics): I think the change makes a lot of sense, however there has been a concern that every one of those very good and well-meaning questions that you add of course adds to the length of the questionnaire, which at some point may lead the students to saturate in terms of what they are doing. At some point it was mentioned or advertised to us that down the road individual departments would have opportunities to customize this form to some extent, which would help departments cull out things they do not consider to be that important for them and shorten the form. Is there a timeline for that?

Dean Lee Baker: It is a little long, but it is almost three evaluations in one because we want to evaluate the course but we are also using this to evaluate college based learning outcomes, which is all of the modes of inquiry. We do not necessarily want to get rid of those at this point, because we think that has value and it helps us in reaccreditation as well as looking at the use for the department and how it is helping the overall major for the departmental evaluation. That said, we are going to turn this over to faculty governance, but it probably will not shrink that much more. We would not want physics to have one and math and chemistry to have a completely different one and music have something else. That said, we are thinking about adding or having more fine-tuned departmental level questions or even individual ones, because you can imagine asking a particular one for a class. We are recommending now to work with Matt's office to do a supplemental evaluation if you have specific questions, but that is even more, so that is not great. I am going to turn to Ed Gomes who can help us think through the long term, and how this is going to grow over the next few years.

Dean Ed Gomes: I have been working with the team. The SISS office is the group who is going to be managing through this interface the ability to have some customization for the faculty members. We do not have a timeline because quite frankly we do not really know what the faculty is interested in doing, and whether they want to add specific types of questions or if they want to be able to remove and add sections from a list of questions that they might want to choose from. There are a lot of different possibilities, so there really is not a timeline until we can figure out exactly what the faculty thinks they might want. We can analyze it, set it up in the test system, and run it through some possibilities.

Dean Lee Baker: Right now, we are just trying to move what we have online.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): If I could add that right now, we are not only testing the form, but we are testing the technology. The technology is more flexible than paper and pencil, but it is not that malleable. We see, in the next iteration of this, having a standard set of items that would be across the entire college, but then each department or program would have a subset of questions that the faculty could draw from and add. Engineering is moving that way, so Linda I do not know if you would like to comment on how you are setting up yours.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt School of Engineering): We do not have any modes of inquiry, but we do have department specific learning outcomes, so we are repurposing that part of the form. We have substituted the general education learning outcomes for ABET accredited learning outcomes, so they are just slightly reworded, but it communicates effectively as comments to all of us. After that when the modes of inquiry [questions] start, we will switch to BME or other specific questions.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): One other thing I might add is the feedback we got from the students in both pilots. [They said] this was much quicker to do, and it took them less time even with lengthier comments.

Margaret Humphreys (History): Is there a window when they can do it? When does it open and close? I would not want them filling out after the final when they are pissed off.

Dean Lee Baker: For this semester, it will be November 25.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): What we were shooting for was to stay as similar to the old way as we could, so it would not seem too dramatically different. We will probably open it up two to three weeks before the end of class, and we will end it on the final day of classes just like we did with the paper and pencil [evaluations]. You will be able to return your reports around a little faster, but you will not see your reports until after your grades are submitted.

Karin Shapiro (AAAS): I know that we will be able to manipulate the data, so will we be able to do it ourselves working out how freshman found a course as opposed to seniors, or will we have to work through your office?

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): The new reporting software we are using is called tableau, so you will go into the tableau website, and by virtue of your rights via your web authentication, you will see your report, or if you are an administrator, you will see other reports. The report is a dynamic report, that is, it allows you to filter the data on several different aspects. For the faculty, we have set it up so you can see what the first years thought of your course, and the second, third, and fourth years, so you can filter that out. You can also filter by majors, non-majors, and class standing. This is the thing, once we get some feedback from the faculty on what you want to see and what will be useful, then we can develop that and give you more access. You can also download this data into Excel or any other format to do further analyses, and you have instant access to the comments, so you do not have to pull them out of a drawer and read them. The comments will be right there.

Chantal Reid (Biology): To follow up on Margaret's question, is there a way that the faculty can have some control when the portal opens so we do not have students filling it out before the end?

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): Right now we are going to keep a standard window, but we are looking at that for the future, not this coming term, but the following term. We would allow faculty to control when they open it within that prescribed window. It will have that capability; we just have not gotten there yet.

Jerry Reiter (Statistics): One of our department's concerns was with the length, which is the same issue. It is not just the response rate; it is the quality of the response. The literature in the survey methodology says the longer you make something, the lower the quality of the response rate. We are particularly concerned with the mode of inquiry. Some of our courses have multiple modes of inquiry. So we can imagine, say, if QS were towards back of the modes of inquiry, by the time a student gets to QS, they will have essentially punted on it. It could impact the information that we get, so have you thought about that? Will we be able to change the order of the modes of inquiry questions, or anything like that?

Dean Lee Baker: These are exactly the sticky questions where we had faculty input, but there were strong arguments on both sides. For precisely this reason, I would like to place this in the process of faculty governance, so that with time, research, and real discernment [this can be solved]. It can be a political process, but hopefully experts on form development

and the research [can figure this out]. There are going to be just as many people arguing for not just a longer form, but having one form instead of three forms and the like. This is why we are asking you to approve it now with this said, and with the understanding that we move through the process of faculty governance to a form that not every department is going to like, because I am sure statistics is going to be different than music, but there would be enough of a common denominator.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): I can speak a little to that Jerry with the feedback two pilots. In the first pilot we tested as many permutations of that as we could, with no, two, and three MOIs and the students' perception was that it was still shorter, they went through it faster, and the ratings were actually more circumspect. All of the ratings came down a little bit, so they were giving it a little more thought and not just checking off all five's. We have tested about 60 courses in both pilots.

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): I was hoping you could talk about the level of anonymity that these will have. I thought it was especially interesting that individual faculty could sort through the data, but I have one first year student in my class, so anonymity is out the window. What are the controls for that?

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): We are going to keep the same policy where [numbers] under five will not be evaluated unless asked. The students understand that this is no longer anonymous, but it is confidential. They are okay with that, and they much prefer putting information in the ether than they do on a piece of paper. They feel more confident and secure in doing that, because they are different people than we are. We have talked about putting a block on the filter if that is possible that will not let you drill down beyond a certain point. Also, this will be post-grades, so even though you might know who that is, unless they take another course from you... Hopefully people are not that vindictive. Reading through the comments, I think Jennifer might speak to this, because she read through every comment that she got in the pilot this summer, and I do not think she found one negative or non-constructive comment.

Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): I have one quick question, once students start the evaluation and complete it in class, can they re-open it?

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): Once it is submitted they cannot.

Dean Lee Baker: They can save it, so they could go up to the last one, save it, and complete it sometime.

Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): I could imagine a situation in which you are trying to figure out how much time to budget in your course for this, and some students are slower and would like to have more time. You would not want to allow twenty-five minutes but it would be sad not to get their data. On other hand if you told students if they do not finish, they can save it and finish it later, you could end up losing a lot of people who forget to go back and do that.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): That is something that we will look at, we will look at the data and see about non-completions. They did say it took them less time, so I am guessing if you budgeted ten to fifteen minutes to do this, you would be golden.

Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): There is no autocomplete or automatically submitting it in at the end of the period?

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): Not right now. We may be able to do that, but we have not explored that.

Jennifer Hill (Office of Assessment): I am working on the reporting features. In the SISS form, both the ACES form for students and the STORM faculty form for course instructors have a default where it automatically saves anytime you move through the questionnaire. There is a save button to reassure users that they are, in fact, saving their work, but as soon as they move between the questionnaire the responses are saved, and eventually we will get it out in the raw data, at which point, we make an analytical decision on whether to include those data.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): From the students who did not complete the process in the pilot, the main reason they gave for not completing it was they forgot to do it.

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): There were a couple of questions that were posed by my colleagues. The first was about the modes of inquiry and that a lot of students and faculty do not remember or know [these codes] especially if you are teaching class that someone else taught before. One of the questions or suggestions was that could it be when you log in to your class, only those modes of inquiry are actually available.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): That is the way it is. Only the modes of inquiry associated with that course will be presented to those students.

Dean Lee Baker: If there are no modes of inquiry, and we have some, it asks, "Should there be?"

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): Some students think their class is not an EI, so will it be obvious for them that they need to fill out these that these are the modes of inquiry, and not think they can skip this because it is not relevant.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): The text above those questions says this course is classified as an EI course, as such it has these following [characteristics], so it is given, if they read it.

Dean Lee Baker: This is why we wanted the same look and feel, so you walk them through it and explain that you are only going to get this or that. There is a little education that you can do as a professor.

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): I have one last question about comments being posted. I know you mentioned that there were not necessarily inappropriate comments, but in the event that there is an inappropriate comment how will that be filtered? Will that be filtered? Who will make those determinations? If it does get online and posted, how does that work if there is someone who feels that this is unfair? How would that process work?

Dean Lee Baker: At this point, the comments are not public at all. The idea is that the faculty will get more comfortable with their own comments, so next year at this time, perhaps, when you opt-in to have your course evaluations made public, the comments will be also. Right now, the opt-in, opt-out issue is exactly the way that it is right now. If you opt-in to have your course evaluations made public, the comments will not be there. We are going to give a year for the faculty to read the comments, get familiar with them, and then enable and empower the faculty [to share them]. At that point we will have to find a way to scrub the really inappropriate ones, but we are not there yet.

Matt Serra (Office of Assessment): When we did our due diligence and we looked at a lot of canned products that are out there, many of them had some sort of scrubber to redact comments, but many of them did not. There are programs that you could layer over this that would look for certain letter strings and filter those out. We are not there yet.

Dean Laurie Patton: I have a quick comment about comments. Those of us who work with narrative and ethnographic data use a number of different programs to sort those data into interesting categories and come up with interesting conclusions. It might be useful in pedagogical reflection, so providing opportunities for the faculty for that reflection to aggregate the narrative data that we get through the comments [could be helpful]. Perhaps in the future, [we could] use some of those programs to think about what is going on in our classes.

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): With that, we are hoping that the faculty has had plenty of time to talk to their departments after the faculty forums or the DUS meetings. Does the faculty feel ready to vote? If so do we have a motion [to proceed]?

Steffen Bass (Physics): I move that we proceed with the vote on the reformulated questions for the online evaluations.

Margaret Humphreys (History): seconded

Online Education at Duke

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): I want to introduce our next speaker. We have Lynne O'Brien with us today to discuss some of the continuing things that are going on with online courses. I think all of you know Lynne O'Brien, but in case you do not, she is the associate vice provost for digital and online education initiatives. She is going to give us an update on some more things that are going on here at Duke with online education.

Lynne O'Brien (Associate Vice Provost for Digital and Online Education Initiatives): Thank you for the chance to talk with you this afternoon. I would like to take a quick look back at last year and some of the things that happened here at Duke, and then we will look at the things that are happening this year and hopefully [we will] have time to hear your comments and ideas. One of the things last year was that there were a number of faculty [members] who taught massive open online courses, and as a reminder these courses are ones for which there are no tuition fees charged, there is no credit, and there are typically very large enrollment numbers, because there is no barrier to enrolling in courses. There are also very few barriers to exiting from the courses, so the number of people who complete all of the course requirements tends to be low. On other hand, across the eleven original courses and the two courses that were re-taught last year, you can see there were over half a million people who participated at some level. In some cases minimally, but in the case of 25,000 [people] every quiz, assignment, paper and so forth was completed, and many people along the way did large sections of course, even if they did not finish all of the parts.

Some things that I thought would be interesting to this group were that of the first eleven courses, five were from Arts and Sciences. Almost half of those who participated across all of those courses were enrolled in one of two courses, both of them humanities courses, Denise Comer's English composition course and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong's course in philosophy called "Think Again: How to Reason and Argue." This [slide] will give you an overview of some of the places where the students who have participated in the Duke MOOC courses were living. You can see from here that about three quarters of them were from outside of the United States and about thirty percent were from countries that the US State Department refers to as "developing countries." China had a relatively low rate last year, but it is likely to be higher in the coming year because within the last couple of weeks, Coursera, the platform on which we are delivering these courses, has recently made an agreement with an internet provider inside of China to make it easier to stream and access the materials from inside China. Some reasons for the low enrollments in Africa have to do with limitations on both electricity and internet access there.

Let me back up a little bit; because these are non-credit courses, the population tended to be older than the typical college age population we have here at Duke. They were in the twenty-five to fifty age range, and many of them already had degrees. That could change this year, because ten state systems have partnered with Coursera and a number of state university systems have partnered with another MOOC provider, so we are more likely to see introductory courses and things that are closer to the kinds of courses that you would see freshmen and sophomores taking.

It was not all about MOOCs last year; there were quite a few interesting things going on, and some things that are moving on into the fall. We had quite a few faculty [members] who taught courses using online materials or activities, but not necessarily in the MOOC format. Some of them use their MOOC materials to flip their courses, which is a source of much interest across the university these days. Mine taught a course online for credit this summer for Duke students using synchronous tools that allowed her students to interact directly in real time.

Many of you have heard of the partnership between Duke and the University of Virginia to exchange teaching in some language areas where they might not enough enrollment at one school, but between the two of them they do. All of these [on the slides] are links, so you can click on any of these if want to read the article behind each of them. Similarly,

Dave Beratan in Chemistry is teaching a course across three different sites right now. Across the whole range of online activities last year, we, in the Center for Instructional Technology, met with almost 100 faculty [members] who had an interest in doing something. It might be really small or ambitious.

Here are some of the things that I think we learned last year. By being an early participant in Coursera politics we had an influence over the policies, their technology, and the development of their platforms, so that was very helpful. We were able to participate in some funding opportunities because we were moving along very quickly and early, in fact we had one gains grant last year for the writing composition course. Keith was notified recently in the most recent round of gains funding to assess online courses, and Duke received grants for two assessment projects. Quite a few campus courses have been impacted through the experience of teaching the online courses. Duke is recognized as a school that is trying new and interesting things, and as you saw from the slide with the countries, we certainly have had more people from around the world [who are interested], not only prospective students and alumni, but people who had never heard of Duke before.

Let's take a look at this year. Looking at the MOOC world, we have ten new courses under development in addition to re-teaching most of the courses that were taught last year. A number of them are in Arts and Sciences, and some are in areas where we did not have any courses last year, so by the end of this year every school except one will have at least one faculty member teaching a MOOC course and will have that experience to share with their other faculty. Beyond the MOOCs we have a couple of other things going on. Two courses are trying out the 2U platform, but only with Duke students, and they are doing it for courses here at Duke. They will get a chance to try both the platform, and to some extent the teaching models, which are a little different, because in most cases they are not doing all of the activities online. That will give us more information, which I know everybody wanted after last spring.

We have a faculty fellows program underway in CIT for other faculty [members] who are interested in trying the model of having students use more online materials outside of class so that class time can be made more active and engaging. There is some planning underway for developing an online writing course for this summer, and I will put in an early plug for an event coming up in November. Al Filreis from the University of Pennsylvania, who taught a modern poetry course in the massive open online format and was able to build a very strong sense of community across those students will be coming to Duke and giving a talk about that. One more thing, [this is] an early alert that within the next two weeks we hope to have out a call for proposals for a small number of additional online projects this year. [We are] looking to do things that will be different from what we did last year, so for people who are interested in a MOOC type course, we are hoping that people will propose things that have a different format, push on some of the things that have been less successful, or try something new within that format. For people who are interested in exploring online courses for Duke students, we would be looking for models that are a little different and help us remain innovative.

We are in the process of revising this website, but the call for proposals will be posted at the online.duke.edu site and we are trying to reorganize this site to better highlight the sections of it that we call faculty voices, where the Duke faculty has posted feedback about their experience in teaching those courses so you can get to those things more directly. Are there things people would be especially interested in trying this year or learning more about?

Discussion

Linda George (Sociology): I have a more general question. What is this group going to do or be involved with in regard to the future development of online courses at Duke? In other words are we just going to bring back comments from our fellow faculty members, or are there specific things this group will be looking at or thinking about?

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): The Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council has been working with several of the committees, such as the Courses Committee and the Curriculum Committee, who are looking at a lot of the underlying issues related to this as well as other educational initiatives. Most of it will be working through that, but by all means go back and talk to your departments, bring us questions and issues that they have, and we will do our best to get them working in the right committees to discuss this.

Linda George (Sociology): One of the reasons that I bring this up is because I am a novice here, but I have already had questions from people in my department about investing in this kind of endeavor, [such as] the time it would take to do it well, can you know you are going to repeat it, and those kinds of things. In other words, what should go into the thinking of a faculty member with regard to what the structure is going to be in the university? How can they think about whether this is a good investment of their time and energy? I do not know where you get such information.

Bill Seaman (AAHVS): The forums are made for that; the first forum was devoted to MOOCs, and it was very fascinating. They went into depth about how much time they spent on doing it. It would be really important for those people to come to the next faculty forum, because they can ask all of those questions.

Lynne O'Brien (Associate Vice Provost for Digital and Online Education Initiatives): That is certainly one source, but you are also welcome to refer any faculty [member] to the Center for Instructional Technology. They meet and consult with faculty members' questions all of the time, and we have all of the information from the faculty [members] who did this last year, both the Duke only version and the MOOC version. We can not only share what we have heard from them, but put them in touch directly with faculty [members] who are doing this, so if they want to talk directly to a colleague [that is available].

Linda George (Sociology): So there are opportunities in both MOOCs and Duke courses?

Lynne O'Brien (Associate Vice Provost for Digital and Online Education Initiatives): Yes, we are working on both things. A number of departments have asked me to come out and talk with their departments come out. I am happy to come out and do that. I also believe we have a number of faculty [members] who have agreed to come out and talk with their colleagues in their departments.

Dean Laurie Patton: We are encouraging all of the chairs to hold discussions about online learning, because we feel that it is really important department by department for conversations about online [education] and how it impacts fields, teaching in particular sub-disciplines, and so on to be at that level. We have several faculty [members] who are ready and willing in the different divisions of knowledge to talk about their experiences and what the upsides and downsides are. I also want to take this opportunity to spell one thing out quite clearly, which is that a couple of folks have informed me that people are nervous that they should not experiment with online or that we are not going to be moving forward with online. I want to make sure we say loud and clear that we are really interested in making sure that we move forward with online, as I said in my Arts and Sciences Council address. We would like to support faculty as much as we can on this given our inevitably limited resources, and we want to make sure that it is driven by liberal arts concerns. As I said, it is not a question of going online; it is a question of improving liberal arts learning by virtue of online technology.

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): There have been questions, and I have no idea where to get the information, about copyright and intellectual property. For example, it looked like [there were] almost nine million video downloads, so [that was] one of the concerns depending on your field, what types of video clips, or what examples you are using. Where can we find information to provide to my colleagues about how that intellectual property, copyright, or anything can be somewhat controlled?

Lynne O'Brien (Associate Vice Provost for Digital and Online Education Initiatives): You should distinguish between the open online courses and closed courses that would be taught here at Duke. The copyright regulations are different if it is a closed Duke-only course versus a wide open course. We have an attorney here at Duke, Kevin Smith, who works on intellectual property issues, and we also have an intern who is working with him and the online course support team to help the faculty around individual questions. On the massive open online courses, the faculty [members] who do those understand that the materials they create and produce are going to be shared openly. If you want to limit downloading, and you do not want anybody to use your materials, then you should not distribute them in the open format, but for knowing whether or not you can use someone else's materials or things like that, we have a number of people who will meet with a faculty member to help them figure that out.

DKU Update

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): Thank you Lynne. I would like to report that the course [evaluations] approved with nineteen yes's versus three no's, so that will go online with the new questions. The last presentation today is going to be from Nora Bynum, the Vice Provost for China and DKU initiatives. She is going to give us an update on what has been happening in DKU, so this is an informational meeting, but it is also an invitation for you to continue the dialogue about what is going on with DKU and how the faculty will be involved. This is just the beginning of the discussion, and she will be back in December to continue giving us updates as this moves forward.

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): Good afternoon. Today I would like to give you an update on some of the key topics about Duke Kunshan University (DKU) starting with our establishment approval, which we received in September. [I will give] some updates on finances, construction, academic freedom, a program update, DKU faculty hiring, and something we will start today is talking about marketing and recruitment, which I will talk more about in December.

For those of you who may not remember, DKU, or Duke Kunshan University, is a collaboration of Duke University and Wuhan University in China to create a new joint venture university in Jiangsu province in the city of Kunshan. You can see [on the slide] the city of Kunshan in the middle between the cities of Shanghai to the east and Suzhou to the west. It is connected to each of them by high-speed rail. [I have] some basic reminders and important things about DKU. DKU is a separate legal entity and not a branch campus of Duke. Campus development is proceeding by something that we have been calling from the beginning as step by step, in other words, we are not trying to start a university that has 10,000 students right away. We are proceeding in a more incremental manner. Phase I of this effort includes the first five years of instruction at DKU.

DKU is governed by a seven member board of trustees. Duke has three seats while Wuhan and Kunshan each have two seats. It takes five votes or a unanimous vote to pass most things, so you can see that in this structure, Duke cannot be forced into doing anything, but we can be blocked. With the establishment approval of DKU, we will be having the first official meeting of the board in November. This is something that I think is often forgotten, which is that our target audience is fifteen percent PRC (People's Republic of China) students and fifty percent international students, including Duke students. As I mentioned, our establishment approval was granted in September. This means we are able to begin recruiting and accepting applications for admissions for programs that will begin in the fall of 2014.

This is the Phase I financial update. I think the key point is that the projected financial picture for DKU has not changed substantially since we brought it to the Arts and Sciences Council in February and March of the last academic year. This means that Kunshan is paying 200 million dollars or more for the construction of the campus. This is quite a sizeable investment for the city. Duke and Kunshan are jointly responsible for operating expenses in the first five years. Duke's operating contributions are estimated at approximately five million dollars per year for eight years, which

[includes] three years of start-up and five years of instruction. The good news is that the delay in opening DKU means that Duke's expenditures for the first and second year of start-up were lower than projected, however the bad news is that the delay also means that Duke's construction oversight is lasting longer than we originally anticipated, which will increase oversight costs, although we do not have the exact figures yet.

In terms of construction, which is another issue that we spend a lot of time thinking about in the DKU project, we have had a Duke project manager on site since March of 2013, which has greatly facilitated communication and coordination of the project. We have a more realistic, albeit very tight construction schedule that is now in place, and the delivery of the buildings is now scheduled for the summer of 2014, which is quite soon before we begin offering classes. In first semester not all of the floors or classrooms may be ready, but there will be fully sufficient facilities. Most of our programs are relatively small in the first semester, so we should not have any trouble. This is an artist's rendering of what the campus will eventually look like. There are five buildings that are currently under construction, and the innovation center, which is down at the bottom here [on the slide] will be about six months longer than the other buildings in being ready to be occupied. This is a happy day, because you can see on the left [of the slide] the artist's rendering of one of the academic buildings, and on the right [of the slide] you can see what the building actually looks like at this time as of about a month ago. This [on the slide] is the service building, which is one of the key buildings for first phase, and this is the DKU staff in front of the service building.

Let's talk a little bit about academic freedom. We have brought to the council before our fundamental principles of academic quality at DKU, and that includes the rights and responsibilities of faculty members, students, and the free flow of information. These fundamental principles have been reiterated in the DKU articles of association, which is a public document in China, in other words, [it is] published on the web and available to all. I have to say that during the entire process of our application, as we have said before, we have not received any negative feedback on any of these fundamental principles by which we think DKU must operate, either from our partners or the Chinese government. However if you have been listening to the news, you know that there are some issues as well. In particular, there have been some recent strictures announced for Chinese universities and some incidents, such as the Beijing university professor who has been threatened with being fired for things that he said while he was on sabbatical in the United States. These are definitely things that we have to pay close attention to.

Our Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Bullock will be monitoring the situation very closely on the ground. She will be reporting to the Duke provost, with the provost reporting to the academic council, including an annual report and others on campus as needed. We would definitely like to see more dialogue about academic freedom on campus, as well, and I have been in conversations with the chair of the Global Priorities Committee to see if they will take on this issue, much as they took on the issue for a global vision for Duke this past year. I would also like to let you know that a student organization, DEAN, which is the Duke East Asia Nexus, is planning a panel on academic freedom, which will take place later this fall.

Amid all of the cautions, I would like to report some bright spots. This is Wuhan University's announcement of our establishment approval for DKU. You can see [on the slide] that they refer to stronger promotion of academic freedom. Just yesterday we had this news from the chronicle of higher education, "Top Chinese universities sign a statement including support of academic freedom." I have provided you with the link to the full document here, and we can certainly send this out. It is very interesting, and it is signed by a group of nine universities in China, a group of universities in Europe, the United States, and Australia. It speaks very clearly about the modern research university, and in particular, the importance of academic freedom. We are very curious to see how this all plays out in China, but clearly, it is not all bad news. Finally, from someone who has been in the classroom, this is one of our Duke students who attended Fudan University this past summer. As you can see, in her "Chinese Media and Politics" class they talked about a number of potentially very controversial issues, and had very open discussions with their Chinese professor and with the students.

Returning to programs, I just want to reiterate the three phase approach that we have talked about before. Phase I is to focus on graduate programs as degree programs, and non-degree undergraduate programs in the first five years. In Phase II, there will be undergraduate degree programs and new graduate-level and research programs. The gradual expansion of the university will continue in phase three, which is somewhere between twelve and fifteen years out. This is a representation of the programs that we will have in Phase I. In terms of graduate degrees, we have management studies from Fuqua, a master's of science in Global Health, and we have a program in medical physics that is in the midst of faculty governance, and hopefully it will be finished in time for us to recruit for the fall of 2014. We have a couple of other graduate programs where we are just beginning discussions with the various units, including one in bioethics and on in environmental sciences and policy. In terms of undergraduate programs, as I have mentioned before, undergraduate programs will all be non-degree in Phase I including our global learning semester.

I want to thank the Arts and Sciences Council for helping us to develop a system by which we have course review and approvals. This is the system that any new course that is proposed for the undergraduate program currently goes through. It includes going to the China Faculty Council and the Liberal Arts in China Committee, which are both faculty committees, and then it goes to an ad hoc joint Arts and Sciences committee which has members from the Course Committee and the Global Education Committee. They have now approved twenty-four courses that could be offered over the next three or four years at DKU. Here are some of them [on the slide]. As you can see, these courses span the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. There is also a cluster of global health courses. These are not all of the courses that have been approved, these are simple the ones that will be offered in the fall of 2014 and the spring of 2015.

One of the things that you must have noticed is that there are names of Duke professors underneath all of these courses. That is ten to twelve Duke faculty [members] per semester who have agreed to come teach at DKU, which we think is great, particularly in terms of presenting our highest quality faculty as we open up the university. It also seems clear that this is unlikely to be sustainable for any period of time as those people have teaching obligations back on main campus. It is also the case that we think DKU needs to begin to build up its own faculty, which will be to support the global learning semester in Phase I. We are proposing to initiate searches for five non-tenure track but Duke quality DKU faculty [members] over this next year, and position costs for these faculty [members] are embedded in the DKU budget as has been presented and discussed with the academic council and the board of trustees, so these are not new funds.

[I have] a little bit [of information] about the process of faculty hiring, and we want to bring this to you now, although this process has not started. The provost, in consultation with ECASC, will establish a Duke based DKU nominating committee to oversee the disciplinary searchers, which will [consist] of one chair and five Duke faculty members. The nominating committee consults with and makes recommendations to the DKU faculty appointments committee, and this is a committee that is actually specified in our articles of association. It includes five Duke faculty members, two Wuhan faculty members, and two DKU faculty members. They will make recommendations on the final candidates to the Executive Vice Chancellor, Mary Bullock. Disciplinary areas, regardless of which direction we go in the future, are things that we need for the global learning semester at present. They include modern Chinese history, US history, American studies (broadly defined), modern Chinese language, environmental science and/or policy, and economics.

[I have] a couple more bullet points that have come up in our recent discussions with faculty members over the past few days and questions that they had. The DKU faculty will not have teaching affiliation, unless this is expressly negotiated by departments and programs, which is encouraged, but not obligatory. DKU faculty governance is something that is very important, especially to the Executive Vice Chancellor, and is something that will be considered in detail in this coming year. In the interim to these more formal policies, all faculty [members] who teach at DKU will be considered DKU faculty for that period of time.

One of things that we have been doing over the past few days is stepping back and asking ourselves [about] this step-by-step approach. What is the value of Phase I? What can we learn from it? Some of the things we have come up with is that this gives us the knowledge to build the DKU faculty over time. We can learn from the global learning semester about the design for our eventual undergraduate degree program. We can search for more and better ways to provide opportunities for Duke and DKU faculty engagement in this process, and similarly, provide opportunities for Duke and DKU student engagement.

One of the ways that faculty members are engaged in DKU at Duke are by a number of faculty committees. There are about forty-five people in these three committee here [on the slide]. The China Faculty Council, the Liberal Arts in China Committee, and the Global Priorities Committee, which does not deal exclusively with China but more with global perspectives. In terms of students, we have been working closely with the Kunshan Student Advisory Council, which is a group of twelve undergraduate and nine graduate Duke students who have been helping us on things such as outreach within the Duke community, student handbook content review, orientation, and co-curricular activities. We anticipate an increasing role for the KSAC in this coming year. As Dalene said, I will be coming back in December, and I am going to give you more of an update on our recruiting and admissions at that time. I just want to point out the website www.dku.edu.cn where you can find all of the information on the programs. Here [on the slide] is a quick preview of what our website looks like and our recruiting materials for the different programs. I want to emphasize that one of our main focus points this year is working on designing the student experience at DKU to make sure that as we open this new university, the students have a quality experience. [There are] ten months until it opens, and there is a lot that needs to be done between now and then. These are some of things that we are working on the most at this time: marketing, enrollment and program delivery, infrastructure planning, the faculty hires that I referred to, and our continued program planning. That is a very brief update.

Discussion

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): Thank you, Nora. [We have] some time for a few questions.

Steffen Bass (Physics): What tuition and enrollment levels do you need to stay within your budget parameters, and what tuition levels have you been granted by the Chinese government?

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): We have not finished the process of tuition pricing. It was impossible to proceed with that until we had establishment approval; however we have been conducting visits to the pricing bureaus for the past year. We think we have pretty good support for our graduate tuition pricing at the level of an international tuition, as long as we provide substantial scholarship support to the PRC students. The undergraduate tuition is much more variable in terms of being across the board in China, but we have tried to make our financial models fairly robust to different levels of tuition. Clearly, this is something we need to have settled very quickly. [In terms of] enrollment for the global learning semester, we are aiming for one hundred students in each of the two semesters. [For] medical physics, because it is a small program [we are aiming for] fifteen, global health is fifteen to twenty, and MMS is probably forty to sixty [students].

David Malone (Program in Education): First of all, that was an exceptionally clear presentation, so thank you for that. I have two quick questions; one is [about] the academic calendar. Will that parallel Duke's calendar, or given the

cultural differences, will the calendar be different? Secondly, you mentioned that fifty percent of the undergraduate would be PRC, so what is your sense of where they are going to come from. Are they going to be full time students in other universities, since this is a non-degree program?

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): As we are starting out, we have decided that the best way to attract PRC students is to work directly with their home institutions and try to form collaborative agreements with a number of universities in China. It does not mean we would not accept a student who applied as a singleton, but our main focus is going to be working with intuitions to help them help us find the best students and nominate them. We think that will make the process go much more smoothly. The fall academic calendar is very similar to Duke's lunar. The spring academic calendar because of the Lunar New Year is much more complicated. We will not begin the second semester until after the Lunar New Year, which can be anywhere from mid-February to the first of March, which means the semester will probably go into late June.

Linda George (Sociology): Do you anticipate that Duke students will be there from the beginning participating in this program through study abroad or whichever mechanism is going to be used as a vehicle for Duke students to participate in this university?

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): Duke students have many options in terms of a semester that they can spend abroad. One thing I can say is that at the study abroad fair we had in early September, we had sixty people sign up at our booth for getting more information about DKU. Getting information does not mean signing on the dotted line, but we viewed it as a good reaction to the program in general.

Linda George (Sociology): Is there a number you would like to have?

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): We are saying ten to fifteen would be ideal. We would like there to be enough of a cohort, but not so many that they would completely overwhelm the class.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): This is a very complicated question but I would like to ask it in a brief way and get one sentence from you. I see there is a lot of oversight in terms of academic freedom, but I am wondering if you could tell us what the oversight is in terms of financial management based on some news that I hear about business in China.

Nora Bynum (Vice Provost for Duke Kunshan University and China Initiatives): We have hired a person as our controller and our chief financial officer who is a United States citizen, speaks Chinese, and has been working at the Shanghai American School for the past ten years. He has an ideal combination of skills and the connections that will be needed to conduct a clean operation in China. Everyone knows that is our firm commitment, certainly that is something that we have seen from our partners from the city of Kunshan as well. They have a strong commitment to this.

Dalene Stangl (Statistics): With that, I would like to thank Edna, Lee, Matt, Lynne, Nora and the council for all of their input today. I look forward seeing all of you in November.

Meeting Adjourned