

Duke University  
DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL  
102 ALLEN BLDG  
CAMPUS BOX 90029

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, September 12, 2013

### Call to Order

**Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Let me call to order the first meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council for the academic year 2013-14. Once upon a time, the Council and the committees that make up the faculty governance of Arts and Sciences used to take a nice, leisurely summer pause. This year, that leisurely pace disappeared for a number of us, and you will hear more about why that is the case.

I want to start the meeting today with a reflection on the Council's work and our deliberations from the spring. I want to say how proud I was of the Council in March and April for the care and thoughtfulness with which you, as representatives, and your colleagues in your departments, engaged a really complex and demanding topic. There are a lot of questions being asked, not just at Duke, but at other universities around the country. This is a very important moment in higher education; you all know that. You all feel the demands. Certainly we on the Executive Committee, and on all of the committees that are represented here today, know how much work we have to do. It is no different for our colleagues at other institutions of higher education.

There are a lot [of people] who question whether faculty and the institutions of faculty governance, as traditionally organized, are up to the challenges that our institutions face. All you have to do is look through the pages of the Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Education, or any of the other publications that treat on topics of current interest in higher education, and you will find skepticism about whether faculty are prepared, able, and organized well enough to meet the fast-paced change that confronts us right now.

I have to say that, from my own vantage point, the only answer that we can give is to meet the challenge and do what we as Duke faculty [members] think is the right thing to do. In the spring, in March and April in particular, I was proud of this council and all of our faculty [members] who took part in its deliberations. I had a number of colleagues, some from outside of our institution, come to me to say that our deliberations on online education, were a model of transparency, fairness, and thoughtfulness.

I urge you to go back to the minutes of the April 25 meeting and re-read them. They are a resource for all of us, and are now on our new website. Download them; they are all there for you to read. However, I would say that we have more challenges before us, because those meetings were simply the beginnings of the challenges that this council, our faculty committees, and our faculty at large are facing. Frankly, I think we are up to it. In a moment, when I outline some of the priorities of the council from the vantage point of the Executive Committee, you will realize that we have hardly paused this summer. We are picking up right where we left off and we are carrying on with the agenda that was set by representatives of the council at that time. There is a lot to be done.

### Approval of Minutes

As a first item, I would like to turn to the April 25th minutes and ask if you would like to recommend any corrections or changes to those minutes. Do I hear any corrections to the minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve?

**Steffen Bass (Physics):** So moved.

**Charles Becker (Economics):** Seconded.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** All those in favor? The minutes of the April 25 meeting have been approved.

### Announcements and Updates

In August, the Executive Committee sat down and set aside all of the many individual items of faculty business that we have to attend to, and we tried to set priorities for this coming year. Here at the beginning, I would like to outline them for you, so you know and can tell your colleagues back in your home departments what you might be expecting this year.

Our challenges are really interesting. Let me mention three main priorities that you are going to see shaping our agenda for the fall meetings of council and on into the spring. You are going to find today, when we turn our attention once again to the unfinished business of April 25 and return to online education, that this is a task we have set ourselves as a faculty to approach the issue from a different perspective. Your Executive Committee has heard that and has taken it to heart. There will be a number of things that will be outlined briefly by David Malone to show you how seriously we take the priority the council set in April on online learning and teaching.

A second priority for this year you will hear about in the coming weeks and months. Most are unaware of it, although committee chairs and committees are already aware of this priority. The Executive Committee has undertaken the task of revising our bylaws. Those of you who have been at Duke for a while now recognize, like many of us do, that the way the Arts and Sciences council is organized is out of date. It has presented us, especially on the Executive Committee, with a number of perplexing problems. You do not need to worry about them, but they are of a kind and number that makes it essential that we go back and make sure that our bylaws actually reflect what we do and what we expect of ourselves, our committees, the duties of representatives, the representation on council, and the rest. By the spring we are planning to begin to present to you a set of amendments and revisions to the bylaws. However boring that can sound as a task, it really goes to the heart of what we do, which is a representation of faculty interests and views of the Arts and Sciences and how we like to have votes expressed. That is going to be a very important task in the coming year. You will see more of this in the spring semester.

The third priority for this year, which we will be touching on at every single meeting in one way or another, is the current state of the curriculum. When we talk about online education we are talking about yet another aspect of teaching that is not comprehended adequately in our current curriculum. When we talk about Bass Connections we have added on fascinating new interdisciplinary projects and teams that integrate faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates into new explorations of learning. The list goes on and on. At the end of the spring semester, we were unable to turn to a set of reports that your faculty committees had compiled and present them to the council. These all touch on the state of our curriculum. You will be hearing much more about this. Are we ready to tackle the question of a new curriculum? Is it time to revise our Duke undergraduate curriculum? That is the question we want to address in the course of the year.

There are lots of things you are going to be hearing about, and it is not as if these are unimportant issues. Arts and Sciences is now at the center of the process of opening up the Kunshan campus. We have a committee that has been vetting courses, and there is going to be a full report to the council in November about that process. We have been pleased with the progress that has been shown there. There will be a lot more, and I am sure you will soon be hearing more, about the opening of the DKU campus. We need to pay very close attention to Arts and Sciences' support for the initial course offerings that will be premiered there.

You will be hearing from our Faculty Research Committee, which has been reconstituted completely under the leadership of Valeria Finucci, and hearing about some of the challenges they face and how they are thinking about faculty research as the committee is tasked to do. We will have faculty who are involved in Bass Connections talking about Bass Connections. We have a new ad hoc committee, and in the spring, we are going to propose that it become a standing committee. Dean Patton has requested that the Budget Advisory Committee be made a permanent standing faculty committee, and the Executive Committee thinks it is a very good idea. You will be hearing more about that as well as updates on the budget within Arts and Sciences.

### New Council Representatives and Deans in Arts and Sciences

Right now let me turn to an item of cheerful business, even if tinged with a little sadness. We have some council representatives who are retiring from their service here in the council. [There is] one in particular I want to honor right now. Peter Oertel has been the representative of the three military departments to the council for the last several years. He is not just rotating off of the council, but he is also retiring from the military. Let me read to you a text that Dean Patton wrote in honor of Peter and his service. Most of you do not know all of the work he has done for young people at Duke.

This is from Laurie Patton, "I want to send my appreciation for the service of Peter Oertel who served at Duke as a visiting professor and chair from 2009 to 2013. One of the things that impressed me greatly about Peter was his integration into the life of Arts and Sciences, particularly through his service on the Arts and Sciences council. Faculty felt that they could check in with him on any number of issues..." I can say that from my own personal experience, too. "...I also know that members of the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council valued his participation and advice. His mentorship of our ROTC students, his willingness to engage the larger campus, and his energy, easy-going accessibility, and good cheer will be missed..." I will underscore that. "...We at Duke are grateful for his time with us, and wish him well in his next venture." I am happy to say that Peter is staying here in Durham.

**Peter Oertel:** Yes, we are staying local for a while.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Thank you very much for your service, Peter, it will be missed. There are a couple of other representatives who are not serving on the council. Their service has ended because they are away on leave, or they are being represented by someone else in an interim period. Mark Goodacre, I am sad to say, is laying down his responsibilities as a representative because of other pressing duties. We will miss Mark, but we look forward to his service in other ways.

Those who are returning, are entirely new representing units, or who are standing in for a semester or so, let me ask you to stand. Ara Wilson represents women's studies, Karin Shapiro represents AAAS, Bill Donahue, who is the department chair, is standing in for the German Department right now, Jed Atkins is representing classics, and Hwansoo Kim is replacing Mark in the religion department. Soon we are going to have an election for a new representative for International and Comparative Studies, whose request for program status was successful in the spring. As a part of this time of the change in seasons with new people coming and old friends and colleagues rotating off and doing other things, let me recognize Dean Patton who wants to introduce to you a new Trinity College dean.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** I am delighted to welcome, and I want to ask you to join me in welcoming, our new Dean of Natural Sciences Dan Kieheart. He is a cell biologist, he holds a BA and PhD in Biology from the University of Pennsylvania, and he has published more than 80 peer reviewed journal publications. He is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and has been a member of several of the National Institute of Health's study sections, including one that he chaired. He serves on the council for the American Society for Cell Biology.

He came to join the medical school in 1992 as an associate professor in cell biology, but he saw the light and joined us in Arts and Sciences in 2000. He was appointed the department chair in 2007, and for his success and talent in being a department chair, we punished him by making him a dean. I will only add a personal note in saying that he has already proved to be an extraordinary colleague. I think he has already helped us change two policies, and he has only been here for about four weeks. Please join me in welcoming Dan.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Thank you, Laurie. I am going to mention in passing, since we are talking about colleagues coming and going in service to the council that Steffen Bass actually sat down and drew up a set of best practices for council representatives. They come from a careful study of you, and the kinds of things that we saw in the course of the last year that made for very effective representation. Council representatives, they are up on the Sakai site. I am not going to go over them here because we do not have time for that, and you are doing most of them already. I think the part that Steffen wanted to get across to everyone, and we would echo this on the Executive Committee, is that we find it is most effective when you really represent your colleagues. When you go back to your departments, inform them about council business, get their points of view, and then come back fully informed for the council, it makes a huge impact here in our meetings, especially when have proposals before us to consider.

I would also point out that what you represent is deliberately not laid out clearly in the bylaws. I think that is intentional. You are elected by your units, and when it comes to voting, I know some represent their units very literally and carefully. Others vote according to how they perceive the general interests of Arts and Sciences are, or perhaps, if you are from the humanities, how you generally perceive the interests of the humanities to be. All of these are entirely appropriate. I know members of the Executive Committee who vote one way with one set of interests they have in the Executive Committee, and they vote against themselves here in the council. It comes from thinking clearly [and understanding] that you wear multiple hats and you have several responsibilities. We would like to honor and respect all of those different perspectives, and encourage you to continue on. Please feel free to distribute those from the Sakai site to your colleagues in your departments. That might actually help them better understand what the council does and what you are doing.

### **ECASC Elections**

Let me turn now to one order of business. We do have one election to the Executive Committee to carry out today, because we need to replace Wahneema Lubiano on the Executive Committee. That leaves one place on the committee from the humanities. Each of the three divisions has two representatives elected from among the representatives who currently sit in the council. ECASC, charged as it is with nominating, not just to the committees, but also to itself, has identified two colleagues who are representatives from the humanities who have agreed to stand for election. I have met with each of them and explained to them some of the commitments that are involved in working on the Executive Committee and I can say that both of them are very willing to serve if elected. I would like to take a moment and introduce them to you so you may recognize your colleagues. José María Rodríguez-García from Romance Studies was very much involved in council affairs last year on behalf of romance studies. [He was] very thoughtful, engaged, and was always present and thinking carefully about his departments interests and also the wider interests of Arts and Sciences. Do you want to say anything else?

**José María Rodríguez-García (Romance Studies):** I think it would be a privilege to represent the humanities and also my department. I know that the issues that have been laid out as part of the agenda for 2013-14 really support the humanities curriculum. It would also affect the course offerings across the entire campus, and I think it would be fascinating to be a

part of that process and be able to influence it, at least to a very small degree. I would love to represent the interests and concerns of the larger humanities division.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** The other colleague that the Executive Committee has nominated from the humanities is our colleague and friend John Brown. John is an associate professor of the practice in music, and if you have heard him play, you know what a beautiful soul he has. John has a love of jazz and classical music, as you all know. He heads up our Jazz Ensemble, and he is the best bass player I know. John, is there anything you want to say about standing for election to the Executive Committee?

**John Brown (Music):** Good afternoon colleagues, I am happy to be considered for this post, and I look forward to serving if elected. I share in the view that we are all here to make Duke the best place it can be, so I look forward to the challenge that this will be to make that a reality.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Thank you, John. We can also entertain additional nominations from the floor. Would anyone like to nominate a colleague? They need to be a current representative from one of the humanities departments or programs. Also, that individual needs to be clear that they can make the commitment to serve. Are there any additional nominations that colleagues would like to have from the floor? In that case we will move to voting. Representatives you have a purple card and you can now exchange it for a paper ballot. I am going to ask you to submit your ballot, and Clark Bray, who is our mathematician, is going to be counting them. We will announce the new member of the Executive Committee at the end of the hour. While Shawna is collecting the ballots and Clark begins the job of tabulating them for us, let me turn to our colleague on the Executive Committee David Malone. Among the priorities we have is online learning and teaching, and the Executive Committee has been working very hard on this issue. David is going to be telling you how seriously we have taken what the council said in April.

### Encouraging Online Teaching Innovation

**David Malone (Education):** As you may recall, the council passed a resolution last April encouraging faculty to continue innovating and experimenting with online teaching and learning. Here is that resolution [on slide]. ECASC in its role as the Executive Committee has developed a plan to implement this resolution. As Tom said, much work and many conversations have taken place since last April, and we want to share this three part plan with you today.

Part one is that ECASC recommends that the Curriculum and Course Committees be tasked with these four tasks [on slide] seeking input from the broader Arts and Sciences faculty. We think it is very important to reach out and try to involve as many people as possible to develop curricular policy recommendations, to make periodic updates to the council this semester, and in January be prepared to make a report to the council on their policy recommendations.

I want to stop here and recognize these two committees. Everybody in this room is familiar with John Brown and it has often been said that he is the hardest working man in show business. These two committees, course and curriculum, are our hardest working Arts and Sciences committees, with all due respect to other committees. They meet weekly for hours, and I would like to recognize Suzanne Shanahan, chair of the Curriculum Committee, Susan Wynn, the co-chair of the Course Committee with Cary Moskovitz, and members of the course and curriculum committees that are here.

We have intentionally put a slash between these two committees because there are many issues to be addressed in terms of policies, and we want to make sure that the right committee is tasked with the appropriate issues. We are going to ask the wonderful Dean Inge Walther, the associate dean of curriculum and courses, to work closely with Suzanne, Cary, and Susan to sort out which committee is best equipped and most appropriate to work with which particular issues. Some of these issues are issues that you as members of the Arts and Sciences council raised, such as the number of online courses that can count towards a degree. Right now, there is a thirty-four course credit requirement. Also, the number of non-Duke courses that can count towards a degree, and the criteria for credit for online courses. Currently, our traditional or typical courses are 150 minutes long for fourteen weeks, which is about 2100 minutes a semester. What are the criteria or best practices for credit for online courses? Are the procedures and processes for approval of online courses going to be the same? We are going to ask the Course and Curriculum Committee and Dean Walther to help us sort out these issues during the semester with as much input as possible from the broader faculty.

ECASC has tasked itself to coordinate the gathering of information, identifying resources, and, most importantly, facilitating conversations that will, as the resolution says, encourage the highest quality of online learning courses. This semester, we are going to organize a series of conversation workshops with faculty speakers who are currently engaged in experimentation, innovation, and assessment of online learning. We are going to gather information from our peer institutions, and we are going to ask some university offices, such as the Center for Instructional Technology, to assist us in gathering information about platforms and approaches to online learning. I think CIT has put an enormous amount of effort over the last several months into an examination of issues such as platforms. We are going to request, if there is any money left at all, that there be a mini-grant program to encourage innovation, and ECASC will report back to the Arts and Sciences council on these activities.

Finally, we need the council representatives to survey their departments. We need more input as to what the faculty need to make this happen at the highest level, and what they want. We need you to not only gather that information, but report back to the council when we have these periodic discussions, and report it directly to the standing committee.

Our first faculty forum is here, “What is happening in online teaching at Duke?” Denise Comer, Ronen Plesser, and Orin Starn are going to be there talking about their work. That is going to be on Friday, September 27 in Perkins, and we are going to have some refreshments at all of these conversations.

That is our plan for this semester moving forward. We hope in January, that Suzanne, Cary, Inge, and Susan can bring forward some policy and guideline recommendations, and all of this information we have gathered on resources and faculty needs can be put together into a comprehensive plan to bring in January to the Arts and Sciences council for their approval.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** David, thank you very much. We have a very full schedule, and this is not meant as a proposal. You have already voted for this, so ECASC is just acting on what you asked the council to do to encourage innovation and experimentation in online learning. Are there any questions, comments, or advice, because we need to be helping our colleagues in all of the departments figure out what they want and need to do.

**Wayne Norman (Philosophy):** Are those slides on Sakai?

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** We will make them available on Sakai. I am not sure I like a meeting where I feel like I have been asked to do a ton of things, and everybody else who is a representative here has been asked to do something new, too. We will be providing you with some guidelines and support as you go back to your departments. There are different kinds of information that are needed, but above all, we are going to count on you as faculty members to figure out what it is that you and colleagues in your units want to do, and what kinds of courses and platforms [they want], if any. Tell us, write it down, discuss it, and we will be gathering this information as we go along this fall.

### Course Evaluations Online

There is one other item that I am putting on our agenda for today. We are not going to vote on it, although it does require our vote. This involves the questions for course evaluations. At long last, we are prepared to move the process of course evaluations online. This is something that has been underway and has been discussed for a number of years. Dean Lee Baker has been at the center of it, as this is one of the things that he and his office are responsible for. There have been a number of meetings with colleagues, advice to Lee and his working group, and to Keith Whitfield because Keith has the university platforms that will be engaged on this. There have been pilot projects done from last year, and there are reports from that.

Lee, Keith Whitfield, and Steve Nowicki have drawn all of that together into a background report, which is available to you on the Sakai site. I hope you have read it and realize the kind of work that has gone into it. Let me emphasize one thing, if I could separate things out clearly for us. Traditionally, the faculty of Arts and Sciences have decided and approved the questions that we ask students and ourselves on course evaluations. Traditionally, we have not been involved in the platform or medium by which this is done, whether it is paper ballots at the end of the semester, or no paper, or whether it is online. What is asked of us is to review and approve the questions, and those have been made available for us.

Matt Serra, who has worked so hard on this project, has taken the questions with all of the comments that faculty have been making for a number of years to clarify them and make them clearer. There are other aspects of this presentation when it goes online, which I think will be easier to see when you see it displayed online as opposed to screen shots on a document. I would like for you to discuss [this] with [other] faculty [members] and see if the questions are appropriate. There is going to be a faculty forum held; the Executive Committee is organizing one at the end of September to discuss the questions. This was already done with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies on Monday, and Lee Baker was there among others, including Matt Serra and all of those who have been working on it. I will be doing the same for the faculty at large, so bring your questions and concerns. I want to put this on our agenda now and we will return to it at the October meeting. For now, let me see if there are some questions or comments. Lee is here, and he can answer some of the technical issues that are involved in this.

### Discussion

**Bill Seamen (Art and Art History):** Just to clarify, can you speak to the issue that not everyone answers every question? It is more specific by department, as I understand it. Is that correct?

**Dean Lee Baker:** It does look a little daunting flipping through all of that. It is not by department, as much as mode of inquiry. If you have only one mode of inquiry, for example, EI or CCI, then only those pop up, so you will not be asked [questions] for writing or research. For those of you who chock your classes with as many codes as possible, they will be longer, and the students will be asked [questions] for each one of those modes. If you have none, and there are many classes that do not have any, they will have [evaluations] that are just the first part. They populate based on whichever modes of inquiry you have attached to the class. We think this is going to be great, because many of us have inherited courses that have modes of inquiry but have shifted [their courses] and they are really not an ethics class anymore. Hopefully, it will be obvious, but maybe it will not be, and they will say, “This really isn’t achieving the learning outcomes

of an ethical inquiry or STS,” and maybe they will drop it. It will be a good way for faculty to see if they are indeed achieving the learning outcomes for the particular curriculum codes. I think that is a net positive.

**Wayne Norman (Philosophy):** About the modes of inquiry, what is the origin of the actual wording of the questions for each mode? Have these existed for a long time? Who reviews them over time?

**Dean Lee Baker:** That is a good question. I think the memo documents the actual process, but we have had several faculty committees that have gone through a number of iterations and have discerned those. It was not necessarily me eyeballing them, and maybe Inge can help out with that as well. There have been several committees, including some students who were involved in some of these committees.

**Dean Inge Walther:** I can answer where the language came from; it was directly from the original Curriculum 2000 report. Nobody knows this, but when the Curriculum 2000 was developed, the objectives and learning outcomes for each mode of inquiry were specifically stated. We reduced the language a little bit and made it a little clearer for students, but it is still not generally known and that is a problem. If we do wind up keeping these modes of inquiry, we will really need to make sure that the faculty is more aware of what the objectives are for each one. That is where it came from.

I also wanted to say that many other changes you might see in the rest of the form are similar to what our old forms were, but some of the things were a little more fleshed out. There was a general feeling on all of these committees from the faculty and the students that on the current forms, the content of some of the questions were not that helpful to faculty, so we thought fleshing them out a little bit would be more useful. Any revisions that came were made with the intent of making these more useful to faculty for improving their courses and to students. The final thing I wanted to say was that the request for the mode of inquiry additions came from the students, so they were very interested in being able to give feedback on the modes of inquiry and areas of knowledge.

**Wayne Norman (Philosophy):** I am looking particularly at the ethics one, because all of the courses that I teach are in that discipline. If people who taught courses in a discipline that had these codes were unhappy with the wording of the questions, or thought that they could be improved, is there a process for that?

**Dean Lee Baker:** Right now, we are collecting all of the feedback and we will discern that. I do not know if we have an exact process, but we will definitely incorporate feedback, particularly if they are small changes. We had a number of great suggestions in the DUS meeting, and we will develop a process. This can be because it is online, and we do want to at least make it an iterative process. We know we are going to have to adapt, and because it is online we can change it. We can have one year of experimentation to say, “this question isn’t working,” and revisit it the following year. We will have a process for incorporating that, so do not hesitate to send me feedback.

**Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies):** I have a silly question. My handout begins with page four, so what is part one?

**Dean Lee Baker:** Part one is yours. Professors also have to fill out a form, so this is what I am trying to achieve. I do not think it was incorporated, but we will put that on the Sakai site.

**Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies):** I see a difference in the wording between the appraisal of learning for general education objectives and all of the modes of inquiry, which are evaluated in terms of how much this course contributed, and so on. Page five does not word it that way, so it appears to me that the students are actually trying to decide whether the course does that, as opposed to how much they learned to understand fundamental concepts, and so on. It is purely semantics I think.

**Dean Inge Walther:** We will try to fix it.

**Dean Lee Baker:** We have a faculty forum where we can really dig into some of the specifics. This is just introducing it. I want to give a shout out to Matt Serra, as well as Keith Whitfield and Steve Nowicki. Their team really worked hard on this and the technical background in terms of putting this all online, going through different vendors, and deciding to do it home grown. That was not insignificant. We appreciate them moving this forward, and hopefully we will get this done for this semester. That is our goal.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Thank you very much. The spotlight of the September meeting traditionally falls on our dean, so I would like to turn to Dean Laurie Patton. Having been council chair for just one year, I have had the privilege of working with her on so many different things. I can tell you how fortunate I feel, and a lot of the faculty feel, to have her as our dean at this particular moment. So many different pressing and important issues are on the agenda of Arts and Sciences, and we have a dean whose background is in faculty governance. She listens an awful lot, and I do not know where she gets the energy or the time for all of that. My experience is that Laurie Patton’s agenda grows out of listening and working

closely with faculty members. She has been very supportive of all of us on the Executive Committee, and it makes my job a whole lot easier. Here before the council it looks like we agree on things, but what you do not see are all of the times around tables where we disagree about things. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Dean Laurie Patton.

### Dean's Address

**Dean Laurie Patton:** Thank you, it is wonderful to be here with you all again. Before I start, I realize that there are two other brief introductions I would like to make of new folks who have joined us as leaders. The first is Inge who, as you know, because you probably got an announcement about her change in responsibilities, is going to be helping us with online and with our wonderful and vibrant learning lesser taught languages initiative. We have already gotten two requests to join from other universities; and [she will help] with some of our Arts and Sciences Council committees and the work that they will be doing in a much more active fashion. I want to ask you to join me in congratulating Inge in her new role.

I also want to welcome Wesley Hogan, she is our new director of the Center for Documentary Studies, which has a very vibrant relationship with Arts and Sciences; it is very much a part of the arts world here at Duke as well as part of the historical reflection that we all want to do more of at Duke as well as Duke community partnerships.

Welcome to the academic year 2013-14. As you know I begin each Arts & Sciences address with a figure from Duke's history. This time I am beginning with three figures—the Giles sisters. They were the first women to be educated at Duke. As the story goes, in the 1870's they insisted on an education like the one that their brothers were receiving, and they petitioned several professors at Trinity to grant them that education. Almost everyone refused. One law professor finally gave in, and then others followed. The sisters soon were learning in a kind of peripatetic way, after hours, with a number of professors who decided to give them tutelage. Eventually the Giles sisters were granted a degree, and the Winston Salem Herald reported that it was "a highly unusual event" for women to receive a college degree. They went on to get a graduate degree in teaching, and founded Greenwood College for Women in South Carolina. At Duke, they had a building named after them. In the 1930's the students in Giles Hall wrote the sisters a letter to thank them for their persistence in building the foundations of their own education. I think this will be a year of remembering the Giles sisters in that we, too, will be thinking through the foundations of our own education.

When I arrived in 2011, I gave three definitions for the keys to a liberal arts education in a research university in the 21st century. Integration -- finding a place for our knowledge in the world; adaptation- responding to life circumstances and educating for a world we cannot now imagine; and innovation: finding laws particularly in information in addition to those in nature and society.

Last year, I modified those terms in the following way: integration without over legislation; adaptation without overreacting; and innovation with a keen eye to tradition.

This year, I want all of us to be as dogged as the Giles sisters and focus on how each of these traits needs to be indexed to a specific project; a specific task that we must do together. I will say more about these tasks in a little while, but let me begin by saying that I have extraordinary confidence in our being able to fulfill these tasks because of what I have encountered in my first years with you here at Duke. In the past two years, we have launched or achieved almost everything I had hoped we would do, and we have completed many of those things in two years what I thought would have taken us five. I will not be able to touch on everything we are doing, but I want to highlight a few things.

Together we have hired 48 fantastic new regular rank faculty members in all three divisions, including seven who have been hired but will not begin their appointments until the next academic year. You have understood and embraced a vision for a university more publicly engaged, slowly dismantling its ivory walls, so that all knowledge might be understood by our neighbors as well as our guilds. In the humanities and social sciences, we have also begun to work together to create a focus on Asia, and are working through strategic hires to think comparatively, beyond the area studies into a new analysis of regional interactions and interdependencies. We have worked together in both dramatic and in subtler ways to transform science departments to reflect the diversity of talent waiting to learn and grow intellectually, and be cultivated and trained, in the undergraduate and graduate populations, as well as in the professoriate.

It seems this vision of adaptation, integration, and innovation has resonated with all of us as a community. Let me now begin, as I have in the past, with adaptation, and frame this year's task of adaptation with the phrase you are now familiar with--financial sustainability. If adaptation in the classroom is trying to anticipate a world we can only barely imagine for our students, then financial sustainability should be a key form of adaptation for ourselves as an institution. Financial sustainability will indeed allow us to continue to research, write, and teach at the level that we have come to expect of Duke University.

As I wrote to each of you about a month ago, the exceptional news is that we balanced our budget for this year. Given the external budgetary pressures upon us and our continuing battle with faculty size, this balance is a huge accomplishment. Remember we have four big issues bearing down upon us: increases in financial aid, loss of SIP funds, fewer faculty leaving and retiring, and a decline in F & A's. As a reminder to those who are new, F & A's stands for facilities and administration, or overhead, from sponsored research. [These are] all constraining our ability to hire in the abundance that we did in the first decade of the 21st century.

Here is a breakdown of the budget for this academic year. As you can see [on the slide], we are anticipating a shortfall that we will have to actively manage in collaboration with the departments. It is only through vigilance on both fronts of reducing expenses and finding new forms of revenue that we can find balance and budgetary equilibrium in the years ahead.

We closed the previous fiscal year, 2012-13, with a balanced budget through your efforts, your patience, and your resourcefulness in finding new revenue. I want particularly to single out the offices I have now come to imagine as the heroic triumvirate which helps us through the nail-biting season of July every time: the Global Education Office, which established new programs and helped us with end of year revenue; Continuing Studies, whose new and expanded programs in Summer School and Programs for High School Students made all of the difference; and the Annual Fund, which performed 600,000 dollars over our budget.

I want to acknowledge Amanda Kelso, our new director for GEO, as well as Margaret Riley, the retiring director of GEO. I also especially want to thank Paula Gilbert, who is our stalwart and resourceful director of Continuing Studies. I also want to thank Hank Woods, our Director of Annual Fund whose talents have led him to be snatched by Fuqua, Stephanie Wheatley, Director of the Youth Alumni, and Matt Cloues, who is the Senior Assistant Director for Alumni Giving. I also want to welcome our new interim director of the Annual Fund, Jen Cameron. These areas of financial growth are all trajectories that we have been pushing on, and your collaboration and engagement have been essential.

We are going to keep working on those areas for the future, but in true Duke style, we are not stopping there. What will it take to get us to long-lasting financial sustainability? We are developing even more new programs in Continuing Studies and have hired Carl Melle as the Director of New Program Development. I hope to be inviting faculty to engage with him over the coming year.

We continue to work to increase sponsored research, and have hired Carmel Lee as the Director of Research Opportunities to aid in proposal development. We are exploring seven new master's programs with the departments, and we are increasing the number of transfer students to return more dollars in tuition revenue. We have also set our goal for the annual fund even higher—at 17 million dollars, and there are several new programs in the pipeline for GEO that will build on the educational excellence and creativity that has become GEO's hallmark.

Most importantly, I want to thank everyone for their work over the summer on budget strategy and planning. I have been impressed, and at times even moved, by the degree to which everyone has stepped up. We know that for most departments it has not been easy because we are already very lean as an organization, but you have shown creativity and an understanding of the collaborative iterative budgetary process that we are embarking on. We know that you are in the midst of conversations about your proposals to us, given the large amount of comparative and trend data that we have provided to help inform your thinking. We have heard that these data have been helpful to you and we will be providing it now on a regular basis. I want to reiterate here what I have said last year: our administrative offices were no different and were subject to the same targets as everyone else. We have reduced costs and several of us have also returned a portion of our salaries.

With regard to the budget, as a faculty member, I can imagine that you might have the following questions: If A & S is being asked to reduce expenses, how can there be so many new buildings going up? How can the campaign be doing so well and it not be helping? How can the economy be recovering and it not be helping? Let me address each of these questions.

First, how can Duke afford so much building activity across campus? The building projects—particularly West Union and the library, were negotiated as gifts several years ago, before our particular challenges to A & S presented themselves. The money was given for these purposes and was unavailable for any other. They both support liberal arts education and hence A&S fundamentally---they are both, in different ways, spaces of one-on-one interaction and transformational learning.

Now, let me address the question about the campaign and our current budget situation. You may recall from our discussions last year that most of the gifts we are receiving now are ones that will be vested in the future—usually several years from the time that the gift is made. Furthermore, the gift is made over several years in installments. As a result, their effect on the budget will not be immediate, but they are absolutely essential for long-term financial sustainability.

Finally, the economy is doing better, and we hear from the provost's office that this may have a small but positive impact in fiscal years 13-14 and 14-15, two years that we have anticipated to be particularly difficult for A&S. But the Strategic Investment Plan or SIP funds, as they are called, are still not at the level we need them to be, and thus we cannot and should not depend upon them as A & S has done in the past. A reminder again, that we are the largest beneficiary of Provostial funds of any unit at Duke. Rather, we need to be developing, as we have, new sources of revenue. I want to state at this point that discussing "revenue generation" for a non-profit educational enterprise should not be a taboo. Revenue is not profit that goes to shareholders. Revenue is value that gets immediately reinvested and shared in the ongoing educational enterprise. Through revenues, we will keep the quality of our education at the highest level of academic excellence, and we have the structures in place to do exactly that.

It is extremely important to all of us in A & S that we keep financial communications open. I have written to the college about our financial situation and our strategy in several letters last year, and we held both a campaign and a budget-related forum. As part of our collaborative budgeting process with the departments and programs, we have shared more comparative information with departments than in the past. We have also activated the Budgetary Advisory Committee, headed by Charles Becker. I have recommended to ECASC that this be a standing committee for A & S, and I hope that they will accept my recommendation.

Adaptation, then, is a central element of our approach to financial sustainability, and as an institution we are exemplifying for our students the skills that that we are also teaching in the classroom. Remember that adaptation without overreacting is essential. Unlike other universities, we are continuing to hire, even if it is at a slower pace, and we are

asking departments to build on their excellence in ways other than the simple growth of faculty. We continue to work on proposals together in A & S that push our educational programs in new directions.

Let me turn to integration and the educational programs that might help us address that theme and our tasks for the year. If integration is finding a place for knowledge in the world, then we need to do a lot of integrating in A & S this year. Last year we adopted the Certificate 2.0, and the Global Health co-major. These are two pieces of our curriculum that will take time and patience to integrate. In particular, we want to track how and why students are making choices in the Global Health co-major, and we will be working with DGHI to do so. Now that we have the template for Certificate 2.0, we will be ramping up the experiential component of several of our offerings, and we hope launching new ones, such as in Innovation & Entrepreneurship, as well as many others.

Last year, we also approved the first slate of courses for the first phase—a semester of study at Duke Kunshan University. This is an essential first step to establishing DKU, as liberal arts came more quickly to the fore in this enterprise of DKU than we expected. We now have over twenty A&S faculty ready to teach in the campus, and more faculty waiting in the wings than we can actually accommodate. We also embraced more open conversation about Kunshan, and we will give regular updates about the progress there from Mary Bullock and Nora Bynum, at least once a semester. With the seven-week course module in place, teaching in Kunshan will be quite attractive for Duke faculty who will have more flexibility in their schedules during the time they teach there and in the rest of the semester when they are not. In addition, the Liberal Arts in China Committee will be moving forward in planning for phase two--the liberal arts curriculum. We welcome all forms of input into this process, particularly as we move toward DKU becoming established as a separate but affiliated university. We will be reading and thinking about this question of liberal arts, talking to liberal arts leaders from China, and after a year of intensive study and deliberation, we will be working on creating a faculty-led committee to create this curriculum over the summer of 2014. We will do so in partnership and consultation with the Arts and Sciences Council.

Another key issue of integration is advising. Under the able leadership of Dean Beth Fox, we have more faculty advisors than ever before in contact with our students. And as I mentioned last year, we have a faculty led Advising Task Force, chaired by Psychology Professor Steve Asher, to continue to push us to the next level on integrating advising into the entirety of our four year curriculum. Last year, as a way of underscoring the intellectual weight of choosing a major and the importance of that transition, we established the ritual of Academic Homecoming, which was a real success and one that we hope to refine this year. In the task force, we are focusing on developing the theme of academic engagement—an idea put forward by Asher in his research with Duke students and part of a report widely shared throughout the campus. As you may know, academic engagement focuses on a student's intellectual commitments and explorations as a key indicator of our educational success. We are developing several models of the next steps in advising in the task force and will be moving forward on one by the end of the year.

The theme of integration would not be complete without a mention of Bass Connections. I encourage you to check out their new website, which is now up and running, with 35 new research groups. I have an advisee in the Education and Human Development group, and the possibilities for her own research have expanded greatly as a result of her membership in this group. The challenge for A & S will be to make sure that departments are supported in this endeavor through Bass Funds. We will work with the office of the Vice Provost of Interdisciplinary Studies to make sure that communications are clear, opportunities identified and disseminated widely, and most importantly, that departments are supported. I am delighted to report that A & S is in the lead in terms of the number of Bass Professorships raised; we have already closed the gifts of two chairs that will be housed in our unit and we are working on a third.

I also want to touch on the theme of the humanities, which was a topic of vigorous discussion last spring. You all know that under Richard Brodhead's leadership, we now have a national report on the state of the humanities and interpretive social sciences. My guess is that his brief comments on the Colbert Report will have more of an impact on our reading and viewing audience, but suffice it to say that Duke remains a leader in the national, and now global, dialogue. As a humanist, I have been an enthusiastic participant in these conversations.

We can continue to address some of the concerns of some faculty last year. In Humanities Writ Large we will be working on directing more funding to departments to help them achieve their strategic goals. We will be working to establish long-term seminars, where our humanities departments, most of which are among the highest ranked in the country, can remain visible as leaders over long periods of time. Long term investments can also be seen in the presence of eleven American Council of Learned Societies fellows, who are now integrated into many departments in the past two years, and in some cases, are now tenure track professors at Duke. In addition, we will be making presentations to pre-major advisors to make sure they are fully aware of the strength of the humanities at Duke as they guide students in their classes. Many may not be aware of DEMAN, a weekend that connects alumni in arts and humanities with students interested in those career paths. We also continue to sponsor, as we have for the past several years, Blue Devil Days that emphasize the humanities. We will be making sure all humanities faculty know about these established traditions of outreach to young humanists, and working to make them even better. If you take both first and second majors into account, we have about equal student representation in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, and we need to build on this strength, which I think is a distinctively Duke strength, and make it more visible to ourselves and to others.

I would also like to challenge us to think about the role of historical reasoning in our curriculum—historical reasoning as it belongs to all of us, not to any specific department. I see it all around Duke: how important it is that visitors to Allen Building see the new exhibit about the Allen Building Takeover in 1969, and the lessons it taught the community

about diversity and administrative relationships. I see it in the fact that the statistics department is celebrating the history of Bayesian statistics at a major conference this year as a way of highlighting its own history and moving the department forward. If it is true, as Carl Becker suggested, that “every man [and woman] [is] his own historian” then we should educate our students to think as rigorously about time, memory and the past as we can. This is not for the dean’s office to legislate; the curriculum belongs to the faculty. But I do hope we can begin to think about it as a part of a Duke education in some new ways.

All of these point to the continued key role of the humanities and interpretive social sciences at Duke, and Duke’s role in humanistic leadership both nationally and internationally. We have already mentioned some of the plans for Humanities Writ Large in interdisciplinarity, and our Populations Studies Initiative in the social sciences has integrated the efforts of faculty across the campus to apply for a NIH center grant in the Demography and Economics of Aging and will be hosting a prestigious speaker series this year. We also have been working in a deeply interdisciplinary way to think through STEM questions of making our own educational environments more vibrant for all students in the STEM fields, and we have some wonderful grant proposals going in the sciences as well.

As I close the discussion of the theme of integration, recall that last year we redefined integration as integration without over-legislation. In all of these tasks, whether it is humanities’ central role in our curriculum, advising and academic engagement, the global health co-major, or certificate 2.0, or creating new learning environments in the STEM fields, we need to pay rigorous attention to process so that bureaucracy does not overtake intellectual intent and rigorous educational trajectories. At Duke, we are better at this than most, but it requires constant vigilance.

Let me turn now to the theme of Innovation—particularly as we have defined the theme as innovation in information: We now have an initiative, iiD, led by many faculty in Arts & Sciences, and our former dean of natural sciences Robert Calderbank, that will support research projects as well as undergraduate and graduate education. Our Bass Connections theme of technology, society, and culture, also focuses on this question. These two are very much aligned, and will help us with key educational and research initiatives in questions of Big Data—which is one of the central challenges and inspirations of our time.

The questions of information, data, and curricular initiatives lead me directly to address online learning. As Tom Robisheaux also mentioned in his letter to faculty, we would like to pick up exactly where we left off. Several things are true about our online discussion. Our debate was impassioned and complex. We need to separate out several issues, and we need more time to think things through, department by department. As you know, I myself thought it was worth moving forward with the limited pilot for participation in Semester on Line. But as I also stated last year, faculty considerations, deliberations, and conversations are far more important than any particular platform and should be central. It was clear to all of us that we needed more time and an open space of exploration. And of highest priority to me is to work with faculty to continue to innovate in the classroom and to reflect on and assess their experiences.

Building on our motion at the end of our conversations last spring, it seems we need to do several things: this will be the year of intense exploration. First, we need to find out what we are actually doing as a faculty of Arts & Sciences. Second, as we proceed with this inventory, we need to find out what works and what does not and in what kinds of disciplinary environments. Third, we need to work department by department to consider what forms of online innovations and what critiques of online innovations are relevant to each field of inquiry. Fourth, we need to refine the policies that we worked so hard on last year, and do so through the regularly appointed Arts and Science Council committees. Fifth, we need to find out from students what their knowledge and expectations are about online learning in their education—not to cater to their expectations, but to shape them in relevant ways. We have a questionnaire going out them next week.

As a result, I propose proceeding with all of these conversations in a year of intense engagement around this issue. I have enthusiastically accepted ECASC’s recommendation that David Malone laid out for us, separately from any discussion of any particular online platform. I am happy to partner with CIT and others to create a mini-grant program for online learning to start this year. I am concerned that we remain engaged as a whole faculty on this issue, even though we may disagree and have different perspectives on the value of the large varieties of online education that are out there and that exist in Arts and Sciences at Duke. Those who are critical need to hear from those who are supportive, and those who are supportive need to hear from those who are critical. That is what we should be doing as an intellectual community. Engage with each other, and not split off from each other. Finally, in the interest of faculty dialogue engagement, we need to keep a constructively critical eye on this debate, and make sure that liberal arts goals are always front and center in this rapidly changing landscape.

My challenge to all of us is to lead. We have critically engaged Coursera and the flipped classroom in a variety of degrees and ways in all divisions of knowledge in A&S, and we have become national leaders in these areas. In this next stage of engagement, wherever it may take us, let us remain leaders.

Also in the spirit of innovation, we are beginning to move forward in the area of what we are temporarily calling Marquee Courses. These are larger courses that provide both an introduction to a way of thought as well as a common intellectual experience. We are still in the initial stages of this conversation, but some things can be said. They could be developments of courses that already exist, to broaden their reach, or they could be developments of an entirely new course. Such courses could be offered by a single department or several departments. We have begun conversations with many departments about mounting these classes, and the Dean’s office will provide support in their development. We will be sending out a CFP for proposals in order for A & S to support faculty working on these courses and getting the message out to students. We hope to launch several of them next year, so stay tuned.

Recall that we defined innovation as innovation with a keen eye to tradition, and the Duke approach to online and Marquee courses should be grounded in the best traditional values of liberal arts learning. That is what it means to be critical and visionary at the same time.

A final word about faculty governance and best practices: as you know, since I came in 2011 we have put in place several new customs that create more conversations between faculty and different offices in the administration. We will continue with Open Faculty Forums and ongoing workshops for Chairs. We will continue with regular updates from my office at every A & S Council meeting, and I will continue with letters from me every few weeks.

Two further points are necessary here. First, I came to Duke because of its strong tradition of faculty governance, and I am delighted to work with it to become even stronger. We are in the midst of a large maelstrom of change in higher education, and we are leaders in that change as well as champions of traditional educational values. That means faculty governance is even more important than ever. That also means that council representation is even more important than ever. Communication back to departments about issues raised in Arts and Sciences council is essential in getting the word out, and we need to continue to improve on that front.

Second, in the midst of such changes, a collaborative and collegial dialogue between administration and faculty governance is essential. Since being at Duke, one curious thing has emerged: I sit as an ex officio member of ECASC, and we have discovered a vibrant and productive working relationship. The fact that the Dean and ECASC get along should be read for what it is: that we argue well and we both agree and disagree. The additional fact is that, because of this productive working relationship, we will propose things together. That does not mean that ECASC is the “arm” of the administration. It could in fact mean that the administration, and this dean in particular, actually agrees more often than not with faculty sentiment and thinking. Because we are first and foremost a community of ideas, I do not actually care where ideas come from, top or bottom, as long as they are debated, criticized, and refined. The phrase “top down” is not credible to me when it comes to ideas; we all know some of the undesirable results when we criticize ideas solely on the basis of their source. But the critique of “top down” IS credible to me when it comes to the implementation of ideas, and I will always work with you to make sure that dialogue is vibrant and implementation is as it should be.

Finally, I will be visiting every department all over again beginning in the spring. I want to avoid the pattern of the obligatory visit of the first two years and then staying in the office for the rest of my time with you. Tom Robisheaux and I will also be charging every Arts & Sciences committee this fall, as we have begun to do last year. These all seem like excellent ways of staying connected and engaged in a constructively critical dialogue. We will be talking about the Course committee’s report in answer to our question, “What is a course?” We will be working with the Curriculum Committee in identifying challenges in our present curricular structure, given all the options present to students. These are key conversations given the changes that are going on around us, and will be looking at many other concerns as they emerge and as we live into them this year.

As you know, I like ending on a high note. Campaign progress has been better than expected. Colleen Fitzpatrick, our Associate Dean for Development, has been an extraordinary partner in this process and I would like to ask you to join me in thanking her now. We are now at 226 million of our 435 million dollar goal—more than half way there, and we still have four more years to go. We are tracking at a higher monthly rate of donations than expected for this time in the campaign.

Here [on the slide] you can see how we are doing relative to our campaign buckets of financial aid, the annual fund, and faculty and programmatic funds. Again, we are just slightly more than half way towards our campaign goals. I will continue to make development a significant priority and be on the road much of the time this coming year, because it seems to have yielded results.

Even more happily, many of our key gifts last year focused on faculty positions. Here [on the slide] is a list of our faculty positions that we have been able to raise from donors, as well as some other key programmatic gifts. We will be announcing a couple of major gifts shortly. We have now raised thirteen endowed chairs to be incorporated into several different departments across all divisions in Arts and Sciences. As mentioned above, these chairs will not be vested immediately, they will be absolutely key in achieving strategic intellectual goals as well as financial sustainability over the next decade.

Let me return to the determined Giles sisters. Like them, we are tending to the foundations of our own educational practices in the midst of a changing environment. My new dreams for Arts and Sciences are like theirs-- having to do with a uniquely Duke approach to the structural, foundational shifts that are happening all across the landscape of higher education.

My dream for us is that we find a way to maintain our eminence, without infinite growth of faculty but a wise use of resources. My dream is that we have science departments who want to be in a liberal arts environment because they know and need the literature program; that the economics department knows it is a better university because it benefits from having a superb department of music, and that such knowledge is more than lip service before a budgetary request. Rather it is a form of leadership that informs strategy and engagement and the educational vision of every department. My dream is that we transcend our guilds even as we are the highest exemplaries of those guilds. That we find new imaginative ways to replenish our core disciplines that also cross disciplines. That we find a new vision and set of practices of interdisciplinarity – and I think it is very much time that we also find a new word.

Our economic reality is shared by everyone who travels in the landscape of higher education. Yet unlike many others, this reality has not stopped Duke’s growth into eminence; even as we continue to catch up from 2008 and struggle

with a new way of working together in the absence of strategic funds. In the midst of all the changes swirling around us, our rankings have grown, our selectivity has increased, and our departments continue to rise in people's estimations and expectations. More people are giving to Duke, and want to give to Duke, than ever before. More faculty want to stay at Duke than ever before. We are rigorously engaged in revisiting and reshaping foundations for new forms of education that exemplify old values. The Giles sisters, going from professor to professor in the twilight after the appointed hours in the early years of Trinity College, would want us to do the same.

### Discussion

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Laurie, could I prevail upon you for a couple of minutes to see if colleagues would like to ask you questions or make comments? We can also continue that over refreshments in just a few minutes.

**Bill Seamen (Art and Art History):** Along with STEM, there is a very large movement to adding arts, so it would be STEAM instead of STEM.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** You notice that I did not go fifty minutes this year, I went thirty minutes, but the problem with that is that there was a lot that I was not able to talk about. STEAM is a wonderful new initiative; Keith Whitfield has been a leader in this, and Bill is a major faculty member. It is about adding the arts and looking at ways with which we can integrate science and arts in all sorts of new research projects, as well as pedagogical projects. I believe there was a CFP that went out about this.

**Keith Whitfield (Psychology and Neuroscience):** There was a summer steamy challenge that you could see online and see the unbelievable creativity of our students. Starting this fall, there will be a STEAM challenge, which will be a larger one with a 10,000 dollar prize for the student project. This is in collaboration with Kathy Davidson, whose haystack approach towards this has been the driving force. It is a very new and different way of thinking about student challenges.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** Get in touch with either Keith or Kathy from haystack because it has also gotten a lot of national recognition. We do cool things at Duke so we become, almost inadvertently, national leaders, and we are at the forefront in the STEAM area.

**Ron Grunwald (Biology):** Dean Patton, with regard to the fun pie charts from development, where do we expect to be in terms of the Duke forward campaign at this point? Are we where we expect to be? Are we ahead of the curve?

**Dean Laurie Patton:** Colleen can jump in and say some things because she has a lot more experience, but we are ahead of where we should be and we are tracking in a very good way. We are in a place that is not unexpected, even though it is positive.

**Colleen Fitzpatrick:** If you drew a line from the beginning of the campaign to the end, and the money came in consistently, we would be ahead of the curve. What happens at the beginning is that you *are* ahead of the curve, so we launched it last fall and we are in a good place. We need to keep that momentum because there will be a point at which we have hit the doldrums. The fact that we are ahead now is great, and we need to keep ahead. Quite frankly, what we do in Arts and Sciences is bring in a lot of high six-figure and seven-figure gifts, which sounds like a lot of money, but to hit 435 million you also need a few eight-figure [gifts] and we only have one of those so far. That is where we need to keep challenging ourselves to find that next eight-figure gift. If you have any recommendations, talk to me later.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** Let me just add a couple of things. One of the great things about working with Colleen is that she is very strategic in her thinking. Where Arts and Sciences thrives in its donations is in the 25K to 500K gifts. One person cannot go to every single donor who can give 25K, but you can have lots of parties all around the country where the dean, or other leaders at Duke, talk about Duke's vision and the development staff follows up.

We are doing two things that are very strategic this year. The first is that I am doing a lot of those kinds of events that will focus on that donor group in particular. We have also been very clear with the upper administration as well as the development office that we need one of those big gifts. It would be particularly helpful for us to focus on financial aid, and we are thinking about an initiative within the campaign that focuses on financial aid. President Brodhead and Provost Lange are aware of this and our need for this, which is also good news. What particularly surprised me about this past year was how many people wanted to give professorships. You all remember the Gary Trudeau cartoon where the person is sitting there with his cane saying "I want to give a building!" We need more people with a cane who are saying they want to give a building, but the professorships have been extraordinary. It was not what I was expecting; I was expecting that to be a harder thing. I am very pleased about that, and I very much enjoy doing this on behalf of Duke University, and I am going to be doing it full throttle over the next four years.

**Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Laurie will be able to stick around for questions. As you leave, let me make one announcement. There has been a very close election, but the new member of the Executive Committee will be Professor

John Brown from the music department. John, we look forward to working closely with you, and for the rest of you, look forward to some communications from me and ECASC.

**Meeting Adjourned**