

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, February 14, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Colleagues, let me welcome you to the February meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council. Given how much work you all have to do in February, and in a normal winter month, and also given the other things that are on our agenda for today, I really appreciate your attendance. Especially representatives, of course, but also all of those faculty members who are taking time from busy schedules to be with us this afternoon; this is your council too.

Announcements and Updates

I quickly want to mention a couple of announcements, and then I will go to our first item on the agenda, since we have a very full agenda this afternoon. Some of you have probably noticed that the Arts & Sciences Council website and our style of communication have been changing. I want to thank **Deborah Hill** for all of her help in working with me and others to make this work. It is in progress; we are in a transition time. Eventually the Arts & Sciences Council website will work differently. We are trying to make it something that you, as faculty, want and need to go to for vital information that is of importance to you. If you have suggestions, please send them to me or any of the members on the executive committee, and we will make sure to do that.

[I want to make] a brief note about some upcoming business. Perhaps, I cannot say for certain, but we will be having a report and probably a recommendation from the subcommittee of the Course Committee. This is the subcommittee chaired by **David Bell** on online courses. On Monday [February 11], they had a meeting with DUSs to discuss some of the logistics of the proposal that they are making. This will provide a framework, as I understand it, in which course credits might be offered for online courses for our students. This is a very important matter for council to consider, so put that on your calendars for perhaps March but no later than April. Stay tuned, you will be hearing more about course evaluations.

The committee headed by **Keith Whitfield** has reached a critical moment. [They] have been consulting with faculty about moving our archaic, way out dated course evaluation system on paper to an online procedure. There are some questions about this; I think overall it is a really positive step and it will bring us into the early 21st Century.

Next month we are going to hear from **Ruth Day** who has done a fascinating survey on interdisciplinary work of our faculty. I think the results might surprise some of you. It is very interesting, and we will have that front and center for next month.

One last quick announcement, at the end of this month or the first of March, the Dean's Budget Advisory Committee, which right now is just an ad hoc committee on the budget will meet; but we are going to transition that committee into a standing committee of the Council. Obviously not this spring that is too soon, but **Charlie Becker**, our representative from economics [who is] also on the Executive Committee will be chairing that committee.

Motion to Approve Minutes

I could say more, but I want to go to our first item, which is to entertain a motion for approving our minutes from the January meeting. You have had a chance to read them, are there any corrections or amendments that anyone has found that they would like to recommend or call to my attention for correction? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Professor Margaret Humphreys (History): I motion that they be approved.

Professor Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment) Seconded.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? Thank you, the minutes are approved.

Professor Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): Is it normal to make a copy of the minutes available?

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Normally, no, they are on the website. By the way we have now opened the Sakai website for council representatives where council documents and proposals that are meant for wide distribution will be available, too. We will make a note and call that to all of the council representative's attention.

Certificate 2.0 Program

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): I want to return to the first item on our agenda. Back in January, we heard a proposal from **Suzanne Shanahan** regarding a variation or an expansion of the current certificate program. You have had a chance to study the proposal in these last few weeks. We were at the point where we were going to hear from the Executive Committee and their review and recommendation. I believe we can then entertain a motion to accept [this proposal] or not. I believe **David Malone** was going to make that report from the Executive Committee. Let me introduce him, you all know David Malone from the Program in Education who represents the Executive Committee today.

ECASC Recommendation for the Certificate 2.0

Professor David Malone (Program in Education): Thank you Tom. In January we had a proposal to expand the current Certificate Program to include a new option, which would provide opportunities for experiential learning. I want to give an ECASC commentary on this, and I wrote down some notes that I am going to read from.

I want to begin by thanking Suzanne and the Curriculum Committee, because this proposal has had numerous drafts, and they have been very patient and have shown good leadership in working through these. Actually, this proposal has been in the works for several years, and it represents the efforts of many folks from many different schools. ECASC recommends the adoption of this proposal. Our reasoning is as follows:

I want to talk about three rationales: First of all, it is faculty driven, and grows organically out of faculty work with students. Secondly, it recognizes the need for high standards, it attends to intellectual and academic rigor, and it builds in faculty mentorship. Third, and perhaps most importantly, this proposal is well aligned with many other initiatives here on campus which involve project-based, hands-on, mentored experiential learning that integrates curricular and co-curricular experiences. I want to say a few words about that.

In a rising age of MOOCs, I think this new certificate is well-grounded in what Duke does best, and that is MERCs. MERCs are Mentored Engaged Residential Communities of Learning. Any semi-conscious person with a laptop can offer a MOOC, but it takes a very special place like Duke to offer a high quality MERC. One of the things about MERC is, whereas MOOCs present information in clear efficient ways; MERCs make knowledge murky by engaging students in all of knowledge's wonderful complexity. We think this proposal fits well with Focus, humanities labs, wired arts lab, and mentored undergraduate research, the sciences, visible thinking, our incredible study abroad experiences, Duke Engage, Duke Intense, Duke Immerse, and all of the things going on in the arts like the academic and experiential ragtime production last year. We now have about 80 service learning community based academic courses. Global Health has been out in front in terms of intentionally connecting the academic and experiential. This is just a partial list of all of the things that are going on on-campus that connect theory and practice, thought and action.

I also think, and ECASC endorses this, that there are three "I"s in this proposal. [First] is Intentionality, students have to think about this. There are timing and sequencing requirements built in that provide a safeguard. There is Integrative learning where they are intentionally connecting things, and there is Interdisciplinarity. In that way, I think it fits well also with what we are doing here at Duke. One of the things that I like best about this proposal is that oftentimes we think that students see liberal arts as a grab bag of random experiences, and this is one strategy, institutionally, to try to get students to see that the whole of a liberal arts experience is much more than just the sum of its collective parts.

Finally, ECASC believes that the structural requirements and timing sequences built into the program provide safeguards and ensure accountability and rigor. As I said, many people have worked on this proposal. I want to point out some of those people who have been working on this for years; of course **Suzanne Shanahan** of the Curriculum Committee, the godfather of coherent pathways, **Dean Lee Baker**, **Linda Franzoni** in the Pratt School, **Matt Nash** in the Fuqua School, **Charlotte Clark**, **Deborah (Rebecca) Vidra** in the Nicholas School and their Education Subcommittee on campus sustainability, Vice Provost for re-envisioning undergraduate education **Steve Nowicki**, **Leela Prasad** in Religion, the Duke Center for Civic Engagement, the Duke Service Learning Program, the Program in Education, in particular **Eric Mlyn** the director of Duke Engage and **Elaine Madison**. They have been working on a version of this for three or four years with Duke Engage in an attempt to further connect Duke Engage with the academic experience. We appreciate the work of these people.

In sum, ECASC recommends the adoption of this proposal. We believe it is a good starting point and a good strategy. Do we have a motion for its adoption?

Professor Margaret Humphreys (History): So moved.

Professor Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology) Seconded.

Discussion

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): The floor is open for discussion. Suzanne Shanahan, the chair of the Curriculum Committee, can I ask you to come forward and field questions? State your name and department please.

Professor Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): I am at the Nicholas School; I also chair the Education subcommittee of the Campus Sustainability committee. We are very excited about the possibility for this, and hope that perhaps Sustainability might be the one of the first of these out of the block should this be fortunate enough to be approved. We met with the Education Subcommittee earlier, and as a result of that I have a number of comments, which I have passed on to Lee and to David, and they may have passed further. I have distilled that to three that I would like to ask

today. I could do them in order or you could revolve back to me if there are any comments. Two of them are more substantive, and one is more editorial. What would be your pleasure?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Why don't you just go?

Professor Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): Two are related, and they both have to do with the 450 hour requirement. One of the things that I am unclear [on] is to what extent there is the ability to have things be modified by the individual entrance to this as opposed to the template. The subcommittee is interested in whether it is essential for students to participate in two separate experiential activities. Could there be one or three? I know we do not want thirty, but could it vary? Secondly, is it essential that the hours be allocated at 300 and 150? Could they have something that would divide that up differently?

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I think what we tried to do was set up the structure so that it would be a substantive engagement. The curriculum committee liked the idea of multiple different engagements, in some sense, to try to do a project through Duke Engage, and then do a research piece or put together a theatre performance. We liked this idea of multiple experiences, but to a certain extent we want each program that comes forward to come up with what makes sense. I imagine in the context of sustainability it may be fundamentally different than what comes forward in terms of civic engagement. We expect there to be significant flexibility. We had a conversation about the number of hours that equals a course. That is where the 150 comes from, and the 300 [would be] two courses. We did want them to be substantial engagements, but [we] expect there will be variation. Again, this is sort of an idea in the abstract. When it hits programmatic things, we expect there to be variation, change, and tweaking. Certainly, I think it needs to make sense in terms of the context of the program itself.

Professor Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): That helps a lot; my next question is more editorial. There are a number of places where we talk about something happening by the fall of the junior year or in the first year, and we would like to recognize that students do not all take an eight semester continuous pathway. It is a simple matter of changing that language to say, "In the fifth semester."

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Absolutely, I think that makes perfect sense. We want to build in some programmatic flexibility.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): If there are no further comments or questions, do I hear a motion to call the question?

Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies): So moved

Professor Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): Seconded.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Representatives voting, would you just indicate your vote by raising your hand. All of those in favor?

The motion passed unanimously.

Congratulations Suzanne and Lee Baker. There is an immense amount of work that has gone into that, and it is pointing the way forward in some important ways.

Global Health Co-Major Proposal

Our second item on the agenda today is one that is of great interest, and it is breaking ground in many interesting ways. One of the real pleasures and rewards in my job as chair of the council is getting to know and working with faculty from all across Arts & Sciences. On this proposal that is before us today for a co-major in Global Health, I learned an awful lot from colleagues and I have gotten to know things that I did not know before. It is a real pleasure.

Before I introduce **Suzanne Shanahan**, whose committee, the Curriculum Committee has vetted this proposal. I want to recognize **Gary Bennett** and also colleagues in Global Health. He has worked long hours, only his colleagues in Global Health know how much time has gone into it. This is years in the making, and we appreciate this work so much. It is, as you will soon learn, ground breaking in many fascinating ways.

I also want to recognize Suzanne Shanahan and the members of her committee, who worked long and hard. This is an innovative proposal for a major; it is a co-major, actually. Suzanne's committee worked closely with Gary and the Global Health faculty for a long time to get it right.

I want to acknowledge the very hard work of my colleagues on the Executive Committee, you will be hearing from them as well, who take their responsibility on your behalf as faculty members, they are your representatives after all, to review proposals in a very serious way and engage colleagues because in the end we are here to support colleagues who have wonderful programs to propose.

Having said that let me introduce Suzanne Shanahan who will introduce this proposal for a co-major in Global Health. Following Suzanne's introduction of the proposal, I would like to turn to Gary Bennett who can talk a little bit more in depth about the proposal in Global Health. Then, representing the Executive Committee, Steffen Bass and Bill Seaman will be making motion before the council. In between we are going to have plenty of time for discussion. Let me turn it over to Suzanne.

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): On behalf of my colleagues in the Curriculum Committee I want to briefly introduce today's conversation about the Global Health major. This major is one that the curriculum committee is wildly enthusiastic about. As most people know, the Curriculum Committee is not prone to enthusiasm, let alone wild enthusiasm. I think at our last conversation I actually saw Inge Walther get giddy about it, which again is saying something. Gary Bennett and his many colleagues are here, and I want to maximize their time to walk through it with you, because I

think it is innovative in a number of ways. I will be brief, and then turn it over to Gary, we will have a bit of conversation, and then Steffen and Bill will step forward with some of their perspective from ECASC. I want to highlight three points.

First, for the Curriculum Committee, the threshold for a new major is about the balance between faculty and student interest. For us, what has been interesting to see is the number of Arts & Sciences faculty who has worked on this major with great enthusiasm and alacrity, and who are very committed to this major. They are committed to it for their students, and they are really committed to it for themselves intellectually in terms of what it means for their own research. I would also like to say this is a major that has phenomenal student support. I am getting a little tired of having conversations with students in Ethics or in Sociology who really want to be Global Health majors.

I think what the Curriculum Committee likes best about this particular major is its fundamental structure. What this major does is bring together scholarship and students in the sciences, the humanities, and social sciences, in a really innovative way. I think that is different for Duke. I do not think we have a major that does such a good job in bringing those strands together. That questions about infectious disease could be studied through Shakespeare, or that we could understand community health interventions through dance is really cool. I think for me not working in the field, and for many people on the Curriculum Committee outside of the field have been really animated by the opportunities that we see it offering our students. I think that is the first point; it is an exciting intellectual opportunity for Trinity undergraduates.

Second, I think like any really capacious innovation, it will necessarily be a work in progress. This is a major that will be a living thing for some time. It is not going to be the same in six months or in a year; it will evolve necessarily, and I think that is important for us to keep in mind. One of the last conversations we had in curriculum was about this very fact. I think there are questions that people have about this major because it is different. Who will be the audience? What will be the balance between majors and minors? What are these majors going to do out in the world? Are the courses they are taking now best preparing them for that? In some sense, we are not going to be able to answer those questions until we try it. I think that we have to consider this major in the context of a continuous evolution. It is not written on stone tablets, and I think that is critical.

My final point before I turn it over to Gary is to echo some of Tom's sentiment. I want to profusely thank the many people who have worked on this. Under Gary's leadership, which has been tireless and incredibly magnanimous, I think the Curriculum Committee has grown to appreciate this group of colleagues. The level of collegiality has been tremendous. I think many people might not know that the evolution of a major, especially one that has been through multiple faculty committees over many years involves constant trade-offs. There is a lot of course trading that goes on, and I think that what has been most remarkable is that this group of Arts & Sciences faculty has always kept the best interest of Arts & Sciences undergraduates foremost in their thinking and have been magnificent colleagues. We will have Gary, he promises me about six minutes, and then we will open it up to conversation. **Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I actually want to thank you very much Suzanne and Tom. Let me start by thanking my colleagues. It has been a wonderful process over the last 12 months for me, and several of my colleagues have been working on this major for many years before that. I appreciate your efforts. Let me just talk a little bit about the Global Health major in six minutes.

One of the things that I think has been surprising to me and a lot of fun over the last couple of months is I have been asked several times to define Global Health. We all know Global Health has become very popular on our campus, but we have not always had the opportunity to sit back and talk about what it is. You can see a definition here, but let me point out a few key things. The first thing is that we deal in Global Health with transnational problems; these are really cross-cutting challenges that affect all of us. In fact, the "global" in Global Health refers to the size of the problems in addition to their location. Global Health is inherently interdisciplinary. In this major, we are not bringing interdisciplinarity to Global Health; we are reflecting what the field is already doing. We deal with population health concerns and also individual level considerations as well. These things are probably best explained with an example. I will give you the example of sex trafficking.

The Global Health approach to understanding sex trafficking is not just about enumerating the victims, but it is also about things like economic stability, policies that are supportive or serve as barriers to the sex trade, how language, culture, history, gender have influenced the sex trade, intervention solutions that are mounted, maybe behavioral in nature by a psychologist. Some of the more interesting interventions in this space have been documentaries that raise popular and policy attention about these challenges. The Global Health approach to these issues is broad; we deal with big questions, we deal with a lot of complexity, and these are inherently interdisciplinary. I think one of the really key considerations here in the interdisciplinary nature of this field is that scholarship emerges from the disciplines, like with other interdisciplinary studies, individual faculty members know and are known within a given disciplinary area, and they also know the common language, methods, and stakeholders in Global Health, and it is that interaction between one's disciplinary approach and their experience in the Global Health field that characterizes Global Health. The challenge for us was how do you do that at the undergraduate level? We have struggled to create a model that would adequately encapsulate these various dimensions, and so we have arrived at this co-major model.

Put really simply, students will take a ten course sequence in Global Health, and that co-major can be combined with any other major on our campus. We think that this is important because we expect there to be lots of very important and interesting synergies between Global Health studies and these various disciplinary perspectives. One of the real challenges, and I think a classic challenge for any kind of interdisciplinary educational program is how do you balance the respective interests in a given area. We can achieve depth in Global Health in a variety of ways. Some have said you must mount a very sophisticated and rigorous quantitative program, others have said you cannot teach Global Health without considering

Health and the cell. Some have said you cannot teach Global Health without considering language, others have said you cannot do it without considering culture. In fact, all of these are important, but what I think is critical to understand about Global Health is that Global Health is interdisciplinary but is not overly reliant on any one of those disciplinary perspectives. It is not like Public Health where epidemiology is core to the field. Global Health by definition incorporates these various dimensions.

In the co-major model what we have done is that we have created a model that will allow students to achieve disciplinary depth. That is another classic challenge with these interdisciplinary kinds of majors. Students will be able to get depth in a discipline, so the students for whom quantitative work is especially important will be able to maximize their quantitative abilities. Students for whom qualitative inquiry is important will be able to get that. Those who are interested in film will be able to do that in the same way that they can do today.

Interestingly, I think we will be teaching students how to think like interdisciplinary scholars. We will teach them to view Global Health problems through the lenses of other disciplines. We are also going to teach them how to work in multidisciplinary teams. Team-based work is characteristic of Global Health, and we are going to teach them how to do that, but we are also going to allow them to have an opportunity to tailor their experience to integrate across their co-major and the Global Health major. We think this will do a variety of things; some of those that you see here, but one of the things that I think is especially important is that this is uniquely Duke. We are blessed with riches in Global Health scholarship from across the university. One of the major advantages of this approach is that we will be able to incorporate that into this educational experience.

Here is the major's design. Students will start with three core classes' fundamentals, Intro to Global Health, research methods, and ethics. We have a lot of experience teaching those courses over the years. We will then move into taking three of four foundations courses. These are courses that are designed to teach students to view Global Health problems with an interdisciplinary perspective, so we will have biology co-majors who are taking classes in the humanities in Global Health and psychology co-majors who are studying natural science in Global Health. These will be four new courses; students will take three out of four.

They then move into a focus study, in the focus study sequence what we have done is to thematically align a menu of courses. These are effectively electives that are drawn from across the university, but we have aligned them thematically. Here are our initial themes, these themes that will be rolling out in the major, these correspond to DGHI's particular areas of research emphasis. These are areas in which we know we have faculty, we know we have classes, we know that we have research experience, and we know that we have good advising. Students will have a choice to choose from amidst one of these themes, but we have also included a provision where they will be able to propose a theme if they have scholarly interest in a particular area.

They will complete experiential learning, and we have great experience doing this, this could be Duke Engage, it could be our own signature research training program, it could be the public policy internship, and they will get to a training briefing and de-briefing before and after. They then do a senior seminar; we have excellent experience doing this in our current capstone. The senior seminar is an opportunity for students to learn to work in a multi-disciplinary fashion with other Global Health co-majors. They will be assigned a project of real-world Global Health import, and some of these projects that have been created in the certificate so far have already been used very widely.

Finally, as I have mentioned, students will be taking their co-major sequence alongside the Global Health major, we have built in opportunities for integration across the co-major and the Global Health major, and in fact there will be a series of very practical opportunities for students to overlap courses so that this can practically be done, but more importantly so that we can force integration between the co-major and the Global Health major. I will end with this; let me say that my colleagues and I recognize that this is an ambitious major, we know this is going to be rigorous, and there is no question about that. We did not design this major with large enrollments in mind, I think you can imagine we would have done this a little bit differently if that was our aim. We designed the major this way because we think this is the best way to teach Global Health at the undergraduate level. It is going to be incumbent upon us, because this major will not be for every student to have the minor be effectively on equal footing with the major. For many students, the major will not be appropriate, it may not be capable of being completed, and so we will have a minor which we expect will be very popular, which includes five classes that you see here. I am going to stop there and I hope that I got within my six minutes, I am happy to take more questions after.

Discussion

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): While Suzanne comes down; we thought we would give colleagues a chance to ask questions so that you really understand the proposal. It was a 64 page document that we sent out Friday, which I know you eagerly read all weekend long. At the appropriate time we will turn to the Executive Committee for their report too and the motion that they wish to introduce to the floor. Suzanne, Gary? Questions, Comments?

Professor Wayne Norman (Philosophy): Are you expecting most people to do this as a double major and major in something else as well? Would that be your typical case?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): That will be required.

Professor Wayne Norman (Philosophy): Oh it is required. So that is what you meant when you said it was a co-major. I guess that probably answers my next question, which is what sort of graduate or professional programs could people go into next? I guess it is whatever else they majored in. Are you also expecting a lot of pre-med then?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): Yes, potentially we have a little bit of data from our certificate, in fact I think I have it right here. Students, right now do a variety of things, but we certainly expect graduate study either in the co-major or in Global Health, perhaps in Public Health. We expect that medicine will be a reasonably popular program as well. Let me say that pre-health is possible. One can double major and complete a pre-health sequence; we have far more double majors at Duke than at other universities, and double majoring is challenging. That is really where the rigor really emerges. Adding pre-health to that is even more challenging, but it can be done, and we expect that that will be popular.

Professor Margaret Humphreys (History Department): If a student wants to do study abroad the start of their junior year, on top of all of this and be pre-med, is that possible? How does it mix with other offerings?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): We have modeled dozens of possible situations, and the simple answer is that it is possible for a student to have a study abroad experience and to complete a pre-health sequence. It is easier to do that with certain co-majors than with others, and this really emphasizes the important role of advising. As you will see in the back of that sixty-four page document we spend a lot of time explaining our advising plan, because a lot of this will come down to individual students' situations, and it will be incumbent upon Global Health majors to get good advising early.

Dean Lee Baker: Summer study abroad is also a real possibility and something that is important as well.

Professor Chantal Reid (Biology): I have a clarification question on the three out of four foundation courses. Are those going to be selected to be different from the student major to compliment the major or is there going to be some redundancy? What are the measures in place for that?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): That will vary from student to student. Students have to take three of those four; it is possible that one of four may be cross-listed in that student's co-major and department. We think that is good, and it is an opportunity for students to build integration across the co-major and the Global Health major. With three out of four it is very unlikely that you will get any more than one as a possible overlap.

Professor Chantal Reid (Biology): How much overlap do you foresee between the two majors?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): This is heavily dependent on the co-major that is selected. We have run a variety of models and it is possible in some cases to do four courses, but we think that is highly unlikely to happen. Most likely it will be two to three courses with most co-major situations, and that is what we are pretty comfortable with.

Professor Kate Whetten (Sanford School of Public Policy): I am a population health researcher, and I have been involved in these discussions for a long time. I just wanted to say as someone who has been involved both in population health research and in living and working in low income marginalized communities for much of my life, including almost a decade in low income countries, that it is exciting to be here and be a part of this. I want people to recognize how different this is from a Public Health major or if this was being developed in a school of medicine. If our goal is to educate students who are going to try to reduce health disparities around the globe and improve the global health, that having the theatre majors who can create plays around why we have increases in cancer in our communities and understanding good research so they are using best evidence in that, and dancers, documentarians, and journalists who can work with counterparts in Kenya, Cambodia, or other places to get the message out to people, it can have such a greater impact on the world. It really emphasizes two things that are so important to Duke and to me. One is the learning and the service to humanity where they are able to take the learning, whether in history or whatnot, and apply it to something. That passion that students have so they are able to have their liberal arts education and focus in areas that they are really passionate about is critical to me. As they go on, whether or not they end up working in global health, if they are bankers, leading NGOs, or they are in law, medicine, or business, I really believe that having had this co-major will influence and will have broadened the perspective that they have on the course that they take.

Professor Dalene Stangl (Statistics): I know you have worked hard on trying to build different models so that students from humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences can work this co-major in. Is there any way that those models could be made available to the Arts & Sciences council? So as the Arts & Sciences Council goes back and talks to their departments they could actually share those models with their faculty, so that they could use those in forming their decision?

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): Of course.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): If you could get that information to us Gary. Some other questions or comments? I want to be sure that colleagues understand this major. Those who have worked on it I think are on the inside now and understand it inside and out, but I can understand colleagues wanting to have more information.

Professor Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): This is an incredibly impressive document and I just want to thank all of you guys that have been a part of it. The fact that you have run through these scenarios in the back, and all of the different pieces of it, it is incredible work.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Any other questions?

Introduction of Steffen Bass (Physics Department) Bill Seaman (Art, Art History & Visual Studies)

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Let me invite to the floor my two colleagues on the Executive Committee, Steffen Bass from Physics and Bill Seaman from Art, Art History, and Visual Studies. They are going to bring you in to the perspectives of the Executive Committee and its recommendation of support, and also put a motion before us.

ECASC Recommendation

Professor Bill Seaman (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies): I am in the unique position of being both on the Curriculum Committee and the Executive Committee, so if you can imagine that life. I am very honored; I have followed this proposal, looked at it very carefully, and had many interesting discussions surrounding it. It is a unique pedagogical vision, a groundbreaking intellectual initiative, and it fits well with trends in undergraduate education that stress interdisciplinary research, which is highly relevant to society at large in terms of the global perspective. It has the potential of enabling exciting new forms of interdisciplinary education, and I think this is very exciting in terms of many different kinds of departmental cross-overs. It makes an excellent argument for educating interdisciplinary teams with strong intercommunication skills and bringing together different high level skill sets. It provides coherent pathways for undergraduates to plan their education with the support of early and ongoing advising, and really clear advising is going to be very important from both the individual departments and the co-major. This furthers our efforts to promote integrative and intentional learning trajectories over a chosen sequence of courses. It represents a new approach to a major; a chosen co-major requirement, which focuses interdisciplinary research and study. The major is fully housed within an institute, and will contribute directly to the larger vision of Arts & Sciences. It is really exciting; this initiative grows out of faculty, teaching interests, and student-driven passions contributing to the social good, which is very much on point here at Duke at this time. It responds to identified needs by faculty, and is faculty-driven as I stated earlier. The co-major has been highly vetted, and has gone through a series of iterations taking many different factors into consideration, so I feel very positive about it. Now I give you Steffen Bass.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I had the pleasure of serving first on the Curriculum Committee, and then once the Curriculum Committee was done with this proposal, [I] actually moved onto ECASC, so I have also had plenty of exposure to this proposal. The very fact that you have two people talking here will give you a sense of the seriousness of the discussions we had, and some divergence of opinion as well.

Let me first start out to say that, and I am tooting the same horn as every other speaker before me, the Global Health co-major has the real potential to be a truly interdisciplinary co-major. That is something very exciting; having said that, concerns have also shown up both on the curriculum committee and on ECASC later on. I will briefly walk you through these concerns and as you go back to your departments to gather feedback from your constituency about this proposal, this is something you may want to think about and ask your colleagues about.

If you look at the requirements listed here, there is clearly a bias towards the social sciences and a lack of offerings in the natural sciences and the humanities. The question for a truly interdisciplinary co-major of course is whether this is not a missed opportunity. The next question then is, and that harks back to what Dalene was suggesting, whether the pathways for majors in the natural sciences or in the humanities to co-major in Global Health are feasible. Does a major in physics, for example, [which] has a very rigorous program of courses to work through in the natural sciences, actually have the freedom to take all of the requirements needed for this co-major in a realistic way? On paper, everything can be made possible but in practice it could be a different question.

Then there have been concerns voiced about the current requirements for foreign language proficiency. After all, we are talking about a global topic where students will be exposed to different countries and cultures, which are best understood in the context of speaking the language of that country and culture.

Last, but not least, something which was close to my heart are that many options that are currently open for students in the Global Health co-major for fulfilling their quantitative studies requirements may be suboptimal for teaching skills necessary for actual quantitative work in Global Health or Public Health related fields etc.

Having weighed the pros and cons, and having had some very animated discussions and feedback ECASC is coming to a recommendation to you. That recommendation is pretty unanimous, and that is for the approval of a three year pilot of the Global Health co-major. During the pilot, what we wish to do is collect data to fill in the blanks that Suzanne laid out; things that we do not know that we need to understand better to optimize the co-major. That would be where do the students come from who co-major in Global Health? How do students fulfill their curricular requirements for language, quantitative studies, etc.? Pre-major and major advising; once we go into the real world away from a theoretical makeup of courses that can lead the students to the co-major, how does this work? Are there stumbling blocks that we may have not noticed? Then, of course, down the road once we have people actually graduating; [we] do exit interviews and get feedback on how the students feel about the co-major, its' design, and its' feasibility. What is the placement upon graduation? Where do the students go from here that have this co-major?

After a three year pilot period, the Global Health faculty, the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee and ECASC will review all of the data that we have collected, see how things worked out in practice, and then bring this co-major back

to you for final approval and make this go beyond the pilot. I would like to open the floor for additional discussion and feedback.

Discussion

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Colleagues I am mindful of our time, and I am going to ask your patience in staying until five or maybe ten after five. I am very sorry about that. Provost Lange asked if he could have some time with us today to talk about the DKU delay. I really wanted to put him on the agenda, and also to introduce to you Mary Bullock and Nora Bynum. This is likely to mean that we are not going to get through all of the questions right now, but I think we can start for a few minutes. Gary and Suzanne, would you come up here because there may be more questions. Any one of you may be the right one who could answer some questions.

Professor Chantal Reid (Biology): I have a quick question of clarification. I really liked the proposal, but I am looking at the recommendation and the three-year pilot sounds like a good idea, but are three years going to be enough if you want to do exit interviews for major or student placement after graduation?

Professor Bill Seaman (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies): I think the idea is that it would be three years, but it would be looked at in an ongoing way in terms of the exit interviews.

Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): In fact, if you take a look at our assessment plan, we actually proposed to continue collecting these data. As you can see from our experience with the certificate we have been collecting these data for a long period of time, so this is standard operating procedure and we will continue to do that.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): On our faculty, the global health faculty is really good at self-assessment, better than many other departments I know, and I think we can trust them to be very assiduous in collecting this information for us. I think we will have time for two more questions or comments. I am sorry to cut our time short.

Professor Margaret Humphreys (History): I am just unclear about what three years means. Does that mean one cohort of students who are sophomores, juniors, and seniors or you are going to have somebody be a sophomore when the pilot ends, and that is over for that student, there is not a major for their junior or senior year. That is what I am trying to understand what three years means?

Dean Lee Baker: It would be about tweaking it, but if indeed we want to sunset in general the way we do this is we get everyone out who is declared. We would not just say, "Ah, you are done find you have to go find something else your senior year." We have an app for that for the college in terms of that.

Professor Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology Department): It is also a co-major, so they have another major.

Dean Lee Baker: We would probably then walk them out somehow, but we have done this with certificates and other things.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): I think we have time for about one more question.

Professor Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): I would be happy to call the question. Can we vote on the three-year pilot?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I would like to ask for the representatives to have the opportunity to bring this to their departments first. This is something that has solicited a lot of questions, and I think you would be doing the council and the constituencies a dis-favor if you short circuit their ability to comment on this.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): There can be a motion to call the question if two-thirds of representatives can approve it, and that is not open for discussion if there is a motion to call the question. It takes two-thirds to approve, and we have twenty-three representatives, which would be sixteen. I do not hear motion, yet, and I saw some other hands. Were there other questions? Let's take one more question then.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): No, but we are telling you that we recommend this to move forward with the three year pilot, but what we are telling you is go to your departments, gather the feedback that once you come back you make an informed vote for your constituency, but ECASC recommends approval.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): One more comment, and then I think we need to move to our next item on the agenda.

Professor Deborah Jenson (Romance Studies): Could we get any history on the numbers of majors that have gone through this particular pilot and departmental process, despite the fact that there have been members of I think virtually all Arts & Sciences departments involved in different moments of the proposal of this major.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Can you restate the question? I think it is not clear.

Professor Deborah Jenson (Romance Studies): Is this a procedure that we have a history for through the Arts & Sciences Council, in other words requiring a pilot and apparently universal departmental vetting.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Let me ask Dean Lee Baker if you could address this.

Dean Lee Baker: No there is not, but perhaps there should have been, or perhaps this could be a policy moving forward. That is not a bad approach in general to take a look at that. In general we have that for certificates where every five years they are reviewed and we ask the question do we sunset them or not? Majors just go on and on, so this might be a good precedence to set.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I would also like to add that Academic Council has for masters programs instituted three-year pilots, for example for the one at DKU, the MMS, so this is not the first time.

Professor David Paletz (Political Science): I share my colleague's dissent about the three-year period, I would like it to be longer, but I would point out that it does not say when the three year period begins nor does it say how long after the three-year period expires that the evaluation will be made. There is a rather subtle outlet there.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Do you want to address that question?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): My understanding is that if we come to a positive vote at the next Arts & Sciences Council meeting, this co-major will be on the books for this coming fall, and that is obviously when the three years would start. Whether the review would be concluded at the end of these three years I think is not full, so it would probably continue until the review is concluded, and then we will make the tweaks.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): We are running about ten minutes over our time for this particular session, and I apologize for that. Our council agenda is filled up very quickly; I wish we had more time to continue this discussion now, but out of respect for our guest Provost Lange and Vice Executive Chancellor Mary Bullock and Vice Provost Nora Bynum I think we need to move to a discussion of our last item on the agenda.

Provost Peter Lange: Owen made a motion, and I do not want to interfere with normal procedure. If Owen made a motion, should we vote on it?

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): It would be a motion, but the motion to approve a three-year pilot has not been formally made yet.

Professor Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): I made that motion.

Professor Tom Robisheaux: It was not seconded.

Dean Peter Burian (Dean of the Humanities): It is perfectly possible as a matter of parliamentary procedure that a motion be introduced and seconded today that is then to be voted on at the next session, and that might be the quickest way to do this.

Professor Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): I second Owen's motion to vote today.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): There is no discussion of a motion to call the question, we have twenty-three representatives of council present, it would require fifteen and one-half members for a two-thirds quorum to approve this, and go ahead and hold a vote. Members only, would you indicate your support for this proposal to call the question now by raising your hand. We are voting on whether to vote today. Those of you in support of voting and having question called and voting to vote, please do so now.

6 motion fails

The floor remains open. Let me then turn to Steffen, would you introduce the motion, and I think Peter Burian has made the right recommendation to us that we have this motion on the floor for representatives to consider, we will come back to this as the very first item on our next agenda, and I would appreciate a motion to second this motion and then we will turn to our next item on the agenda.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): The motion reads that the Global Health co-major be approved for a three-year pilot, after which the Global Health faculty, Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee and ECASC will review the co-major, and bring the improvements for review and approval to the Arts & Sciences Council.

Professor Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): Seconded.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): The motion is now on the floor, and we will table it and return to it at our next Arts & Sciences council meeting. I want to apologize to our guest for running over today. There is a really important item that we want to turn to now involving the announcement of a delay for the opening of the DKU campus in its first semester. I just want to explain why the Arts & Sciences Council and the Executive Committee moved so quickly to put this on our agenda. It is because now that the Arts & Sciences faculty is bringing forward proposals, fifteen to twenty of them are currently being reviewed by the Liberal Arts in China Committee, they will soon be going by March 1 to your committee, the DKU Joint Committee for a standard review and approval process of these courses. They represent the fact that we have maybe fourteen departments of Arts & Sciences who are in one way or another interested in and committed to. The Executive Committee felt very strongly that we wanted to invite guests from the Liberal Arts in China Committee and Provost Lange to come and address the council and field questions and comments about the delay. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Provost Lange and Vice Executive Chancellor Mary Bullock, we would have brought [her] to council eventually to introduce her, it is wonderful to have you here as our guest, and you also know Vice Provost for DKU and China Initiatives Nora Bynum. Peter, the floor is yours.

Duke-Kunshan University Update

Provost Peter Lange: I am glad that we have clarified that this was at least a mutual invitation. I want to thank you for inviting me. DKU is a high profile strategic initiative of the entire university, and it is important that we be as responsive as possible to faculty interest, that we educate the faculty as much as possible about its character, and that we are responsive to concerns. It is in that context that I come today joined by Mary Bullock the Executive Vice Chancellor of the DKU campus, and Nora Bynum who is the Vice Provost for China and DKU affairs.

I am going to try to keep my presentation fairly tight, probably a little tighter than I intended. It has four pieces, it has a strategic overview, because I think some of you have not seen such a strategic overview in the past, and it has some details of the program, it talks about the construction, which is the issue perhaps most recently on people's minds, and it talks about the finances.

Let's start with what DKU is: a collaboration between the city of Kunshan, which is funding all of the construction, Duke University and Kunshan University, which is one of the top universities in China to create a new joint venture entity: Duke Kunshan University. The slide outlines the steps that have already been concluded, including the successful achievement of the preliminary or preparation approval. We actually had a debate in Academic Council about whether the

word “preliminary” and the word “preparation” referred to the same document. I can assure you here, as I did there, that they do refer to the same document.

We will shortly be submitting the establishment approval to understand the relationship between the two. Think of it this way, in the preparation agreement, we promise to do certain things curricularly, faculty-wise, buildings, administration, etc. The Chinese, I think not entirely unreasonably, I would well-imagine having just listened to the debate on the global health degree that you can understand this. The Chinese reasonably say, “That is what you promised, but are you actually going to do it?” The establishment approval is later down the road when they say, “Now we have enough confidence that you are actually going to do it, that we are ready to let you go ahead and do it.” This is about a foreign institution coming in to a country to educate its’ citizens, and so it does not seem entirely unreasonable if at the same time we have to recognize that China has a fairly formidable bureaucratic structure.

This is just a quote from the president, which outlines what we are trying to do at DKU; it really is designed to bring bright students together in an entirely international, if you want to use that context, and to prepare them to deal with the world’s problems. That is actually what the Chinese want.

What are our aspirations for DKU? It should be an open educational space in which we develop new modes of education [that we can] bring...back to the Duke campus as well. Let me give you one example. We are experimenting at DKU with shorter more intensive teaching periods. So rather than having four fourteen-week semesters, we are going to have two courses taught for seven weeks more intensively, and then two additional courses taught for seven weeks more intensively. The total amount of “seat time” will be approximately the same, but the style of teaching will be different, the opportunities to teach will be different, and there are things that we might learn and then think about how we could bring those back to campus.

We will have through our campus there, the teaching, and the reputational effect, substantially improved access to what is a rapidly growing and very talented pool of students, I think we are all aware of that, and increasingly also a very talented faculty. It is a long term prospective. It is not, “what we can get in the next two years?” It is, “what can we get in the next ten to twenty years from undertaking this strategic initiative?” We also have a great number of faculty who are engaged in research and teaching around core problems that are global in character, but that are particularly intensely felt in the Chinese context, given both the rate of growth and the scale of the country. Think of energy, pollution, climate, and Global Health, just to take [some] that are very central to our campus. So the idea is our faculty will have a base from which to study these problems for themselves and in interaction with their students both from the US and from China.

It is also a very intercultural space, as I will come to in a minute. We expect to have about 50% of the students be from China and about 50% from the rest of world, including a very substantial number from the United States. This will be a deeply intercultural experience in and outside of the classroom, because it is a residential campus. We see this first move as an advantage as there are only two schools really. There are no schools of our level of standing in the global education world establishing themselves in China in this way; NYU would be the only one which is close. NYU is the only other one of our level of stature which is trying to build programs there, and the NYU program looks rather different.

What is Duke’s role? Duke’s role is outlined in the cooperative education agreement, which is the document we submit for preparation approval. It is written here what our role is to be and what I want to stress here is that as you see in this text, it underlines [that] Duke is entirely charged with the academic leadership of the enterprise, the selection of faculty, the identification of courses, the set of requirements, and the admissions of students. Any of those things is fundamentally under Duke’s control. The structure of the board assures us that the Chinese want us to bring a western liberal arts approach to teaching. That is what they know for the kind of global leadership role that they are going to need over the next several decades, and that they recognize is coming. That is the hole or the void in their educational system as it is currently constructed. They are seeking an infection of this western liberal arts tradition, and the highly interactive classroom environment that we normally create in our world that is very distant from most of their teaching. They want us to bring that to them, and create a model for that, as well as training a relatively modest number of students because the campus will not be huge in that style.

There has been an ongoing and very important discussion about academic freedom. I just want to underline again that in the document which we submitted, and which the ministry must accept if we are to go forward with this enterprise, and have already accepted without comment and without any objection in the preparation approval which we had, we linked these fundamental principles of academic freedom to academic quality. We do not believe that we can deliver a high quality education if we do not give our students and our faculty [members] [the right] to exercise these principles of academic freedom.

In Phase One there will be a variety of programs, graduate degrees, undergraduate semesters, research centers, and non-degree and training programs. Here are some of the things that are already underway; I am going to come back to some of the undergraduate things. We have been ramping up the undergraduate experience. The undergraduate input over the last few months [has increased] with the great assistance of Dean Patton and the Liberal Arts in China Committee, LACC, because we had everything else but we lacked that committee, so Dean Patton kindly filled that void for us. They sent out a response, a call for proposals, and this will give you a sense of the diversity and breadth of the proposals that were submitted. This indicates the different units that submitted course proposals. They did not submit them as units; we are just not listing all of the courses or the faculty members here, but faculty members from all of these units’ submitted proposals. Those proposals are being reviewed by all of the appropriate committees, [first] the LACC committee and eventually will

also, as Tom indicated, be going, where appropriate, to the other Arts & Sciences committees. Some of these courses are already in existence, and some of them would be new courses.

Obviously you do not want to [simply] create a set of courses. It is not just a list; it is a curriculum that we are striving for. In the early phases obviously, because we are in part dependent on the supply that our faculty provides, we cannot meet this full range, but this is the kind of liberal arts curriculum that we would like to put in place with multi-disciplinary approaches around the different courses designed to be well-tailored to that mixed intercultural audience sitting in China that the program is appealing to. This curriculum is obviously in development, and it is illustrative, but it gives you a sense of what Vice Chancellor Bullock, Dean Patton and her committee, Dean Lee Baker, and everyone else are all working on advancing.

What is faculty engagement? We have had a lot of faculty engagement, and I know some of you are feeling like you did not know anything about this. I have to tell you that these are all of the committees that we are working with, and have been working with on a regular basis. In response to a question about whether we have been interacting with the faculty, I have to tell you that Nora Bynum, who is really spearheading this, has made twenty-six different presentations or discussions with faculty groups since September. I have met both with the Academic Council and with the deans on several occasions, and then there have been lots of individual discussions. I think to the extent that there are faculty who feel that they did not know or were not informed in part is less our fault than a breakdown of the structure of governance, which happens frequently. It is not unique here, where there is a lot of communication to the representatives, but very little communication from the representatives to anyone else. Dalene in a way what you suggested today, although I would have loved to see the Global Health co-major approved today, but that [comment] about filtering back down to the units is something that does not happen very often. Faculty wake up in a sense when they hear something that concerns them, and then they say, "Well I never heard about this!" We have been using all of the representative structures, I do not want to be defensive here, but we have a set of structures in place, and we have tried to use them with great intensity. Sometimes these little break downs happen.

I will just go quickly. There is a Phase Two and a Phase Three that will come. Phase Two does not start for five years after the program starts, so there is a long phase between undergraduate programs that are semester-long or yearlong and any kind of degree program, which will come in phase two for undergraduates. There is leadership in place; you were already introduced to **Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Bullock**. There is also **Liu Jingnan who is the Chancellor, the formal president of Wuhan University, and a member of the Chinese Academy of Engineering**. [He] is an extremely eminent scholar and is deeply committed to this project with his time, intelligence and knowledge of the Chinese system. I am the Provost at Duke, so at the moment [I am] the chair of the Board of DKU.

This is the hardware of the campus. I am not going to review this with you, but this is what is being constructed. This is a big campus; [it] is 750,000 square feet. There is an academic center and a conference center; this research center building will be built later. Back here are dorms for students, back here is a faculty residence, and back here is a service building, which services the whole campus. This is the pond in the middle, which is an architectural feature. This is a complicated architectural design for the Chinese to do. They have not regularly done a campus like this, and this is part of the challenge we have had with regard to the construction.

Let me turn to the construction. As you are fully aware, even on our own campus, any construction project requires some balance of time. How fast do you want to get it done, the quality and the cash to do it? This is a particularly complicated project; it requires a cross-national cross-cultural engagement of two partners in which one of the partners (i.e. Duke) is driving the quality discussion and another one of the partners is paying for the project. That makes things complicated, and that means that you can have break downs. Especially remember, this is not just that if you want that political economy of the project, but then there is the cultural economy of the project. You put the two together, and things happen. In fact, over the course of the last two years things have been happening. Very briefly we began to have some signals that the ability to meet those three goals: time, quality and money in the way that we had initially anticipated in the project might not happen.

Increasingly that seemed to be happening, until it reached a point where we were concerned enough about it that we sent a rather monitory letter on behalf of my colleagues to the city of Kunshan saying that we had these concerns. They responded extremely well to that letter. They have changed the leadership of the project from the standpoint of the oversight of the construction, which is really driving the construction, and they have put much more political weight behind assuring that the construction meets the quality standards that we expect. In the course of doing that, we had the substantial suspicion, which we did indicate to the appropriate governance committees of this university, that we might still have a further delay. We did not choose to announce such a delay until we were certain that it was going to happen, [and] until we had worked with the new partners that were now guiding the project. That happened in December/January, and resulted in the announcement which has set off a bit of the concern here. I believe that we are in a much higher degree of confidence about the completion dates of the project today than we were six months ago, but it is six months later than we anticipated.

Now we come to the finances, which I believe many of you also have as a concern. First of all, it needs to be recognized [that] no excellent institution of higher learning lives only off of tuition. Think about Duke; 17% of the revenue that Arts & Sciences spend every year comes from the endowment. Then there is an additional piece that comes from gifts and [another] piece that comes from research overheads. A substantial piece here at Duke, 6 billion dollars of endowment, nonetheless subsidizes that education. If you took our "sticker price", our actual cost of delivery of the education that we provide is probably 40-50% higher than our sticker price tuition, not to speak of our discounted tuition.

We are raising money for Kunshan. Of course as you can imagine it is going to be a little easier to raise money when everybody else has the same confidence that the project is going to be completed that we do, because the donor is going to say, "until I actually see the thing, I am going to tell you that I am interested in giving money, but not necessarily giving the money." Our investment is about 38 million dollars over eight years. That is the investment of about 5 to 5.5 million dollars a year. This is an investment in Duke as well as DKU, and this is important to recognize. When we send a faculty member to teach at DKU that faculty member's replacement here on campus will be funded 50% by DKU, because all operations are funded 50% by DKU and fifty percent by us. There is a return to the campus of expenditures we make on faculty at DKU. We have already started to be able to hire some excellent faculty in some of the areas where we have had the highest degree of confidence.

What have we spent to date? Last year we budgeted 5.4 million dollars of expenditures under the original budget plan, of which we as Duke would have spent 2.7 million because it is half. We actually spent 550,000 dollars, of which 275,000 were ours. This was because the project has been slower in getting going. This year, because we are ramping up, the budget was bigger. The actual expenditures projected are lower, and of course our share is again lower than projected. It will be around 2 million dollars. I want to stress this; this does not include the oversight funds, which are separate but are related to the construction that we are paying for out of capital funds of the university, and therefore not funds that could be used for support of the academic enterprise.

Here are some recent questions; I thought I would give you a little perspective. The big question is: Arts & Sciences is a little squeezed right now, the dean has been telling us this, she has been enlisting our help, our salaries might not be growing quite as fast across the whole university as we would like, and we are hearing about the need to rebalance SIP. Is this really due to the fact that we are spending all of this money in China? I have heard this not only behind the veil but actually to my face. First of all, where are the financial pressures coming from? I think you saw a presentation of this; the financial pressures are coming from a very large deficit in financial aid to support our need blind financial aid program, and the need to realign SIP, that is the Strategic Investment Pool, because we have been subsidizing SIP out of reserves and we can no longer do so. I would remind you the subsidy of SIP through reserves has meant that the schools have not had to pay costs that they otherwise would have had to pay.

Let me give you an example. In order to allow the school to pursue a strategic priority of the university, we say, "Here is a professorship, but for the first year we will pay 100 percent out of SIP, the second year eighty, the third year sixty and so forth." When the downturn happened, we could have said, "I am sorry, you were expecting three more years of that to be paid for SIP? Well, we can no longer afford to do that because the SIP revenues have gone way down, we are going to make you pay for it in 2008-2009." Instead, the board agreed that we would have this bridge. Some of you may remember that we had a long discussion about the bridge that would come from reserve funds. That enabled the schools to thrive over the last five years in a comparative context, hire lots of people that we otherwise would not have been able to hire, and start interesting and excellent programs or expand the ones that you as a faculty have endorsed. That is where the squeeze is coming from.

Third, what does Arts & Sciences get from SIP? Just to get the context here, remember the number I told you before, around 10 million or a little more as a subsidy. Over the last five years Arts & Sciences has received 62 million dollars of direct investment from those central strategic funds that have enabled lots of good things in Arts & Sciences. DKU, as I said, accounts for about 10 million dollars. That is on a base of 360 million of planned SIP expenditures over the next five years. You might say there are a lot of things in that 360 million that we do not care about. Not entirely, but to put it in perspective, of that 360 million about 121 million is for debt service. That includes buildings like the French Science Center, which I believe we are supporting through central funds to the tune of about 40 million dollars. If we were not doing that centrally, the debt service on that building would have to come to Arts & Sciences. That would be something on the order of 3 to 4 million dollars a year, which is substantially more just for that single building than we are spending on this major China initiative that is a strategic 20 year initiative. It is important to remember the proportionalities here.

It is not the case that no SIP money is going to DKU. There is certainly SIP money going to DKU, it is a strategic initiative that the Academic Council has supported, and that we have all supported. It is a strategic initiative that we are committed to. The amounts here are not what are causing the strain in the Arts & Sciences budget. That is the end of my planned presentation, if you have other questions for me, Mary, or Nora, I am happy to answer them.

Discussion

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): I am going to ask colleagues [to stay] for 10 minutes or so. If you really have to go, please do so quietly. But we do have some questions and I will give a chance for Mary Bullock to come forward. If you have not had a chance to meet Mary, I really encourage you to do so if you could catch her in town. We could not have a more ideal person leading this initiative in China. She also changed her schedule, she was supposed to be in the air right now and she is missing Valentine's Day dinner with her husband for us tonight. Mary did you want to say something or would you like to field questions about the delay?

Mary Bullock (Executive Vice Chancellor of DKU): I am happy to respond to questions, and I am delighted to be here.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): First of all, I would really like to thank Peter for that comprehensive update. I am very happy, and I would be even happier if we could get that about once a year.

Provost Peter Lange: We could do that, just not once a month. The last one was six months ago.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I have a question and a comment, or perhaps it is two questions depending on how you wish to respond to the comment. The comment is on when you laid out that document of academic principles, including

internet freedom, which was signed by our Chinese partners; I would like to voice a suspicion that the partners who signed the document may not be the ones who can guarantee that overarching authorities may be willing to adhere to some of those principles.

Provost Peter Lange: Was that a question?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): That was a comment unless you wish to refute.

Provost Peter Lange: I have not said that we can guarantee that these principles will be met. I have said that these are the principles that we will pursue. As we said in the Academic Council enumerable times, even in your presence, when we pursue those principles we expect that if there are violations, we will engage them. If those violations are such that we believe that they violate the fundamental tenants that we put [down], we will withdraw from the project. In fact, as the project develops more, our leverage to enforce those principles actually goes up rather than down.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): Thank you, that is good to have in the minutes.

Provost Peter Lange: Those comments are in the minutes of at least three Academic Council meetings, so there is a little bit of redundancy.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): To my actual question, there are multiple funding streams that go into Duke's contribution to the strategic Kunshan investment, and there have been some concerns raised that funding streams, for example from the business school, who was one of the primary drivers initially in the Kunshan project, may not be materializing to the degree as anticipated or budgeted. Could you comment on that, please?

Provost Peter Lange: That remains to be seen. We are not at the stage where the business school has been asked to actually start up its program. We have a plan with them; it is possible that they will not meet the budget we had for them originally, but time will tell. If they do not then we will find alternative sources for that. There are lots of variables that are not yet fully known. We do not know how many students will take the program, what tuition different students can be charged, and therefore we do not know what the return is. We do not know what the faculty will cost, for instance with respect to some courses we anticipated a higher faculty cost, and we are now recognizing that the cost of those courses may be lower than we anticipated. There are a lot of moving variables in the equation.

Professor Margaret Humphreys (History): I do not know anything about the structural details article of DKU, but we have all read the article in the Chronicle, and it is hard to tell whether we are talking about buildings whose walls are going to fall down, or buildings whose doorways are not as wide as American codes would say. In other words, it is so vague what is wrong and how much has to be torn down and re-built again; I wonder if you could speak to what these quality issues really are.

Provost Peter Lange: I would be happy to do that. No, the walls are not going to fall down. No, the fundamental structural character of the buildings is not in question. What have been some of the issues? [I will give you] an example. In the course of putting in the ductwork in one of the buildings the firm that was doing the construction decided on its own to put in that ductwork in way that would be extremely comfortable for me, but not very comfortable for him [David]. The result of that is we had to go in and tell them to tear out the ductwork, and put it in the way it was in the drawings, which was at a ceiling clearance that was compatible with what the drawing said, and was of the quality that we expected. That is an example. It is not about the building falling down; it is about whether it meets our quality standards. Now, we did have disputes with them where we gave ground. Architects love doing everything to perfection, especially with somebody else's money, so there was an issue of what kind of stone should be used to face some of the buildings. In the original drawings, the stone was an imported stone, and it had a very particular hue. At certain point, Kunshan pushed back and said, "We would prefer not to do that." It was about 3 to 4 times as expensive to get that stone. The stone we could get in china is a slightly different hue, and there was a long debate. The architects said, "Oh no, this is absolutely the way it has to be. We are doing this at a cultural distance, etc." Eventually we recognized that we did not really need [it], from the point of view of the quality of the building, but that was a serious delay. I have given you a couple of examples, but there are many more.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): We can take five more minutes for questions and comments.

Professor Charlie Becker (Economics): I am not sure if this is for Peter or Mary, but I have been reading Chinese applications to graduate programs day and night for the past couple of weeks, and one of the things that has really struck me has been this emergence in top Chinese universities of these so-called experimental or league colleges. I was wondering, and I have two questions, first is are you all engaging or planning to engage with them, and related to that is that, and I saw that Global Health is now linked up with Fudan University, which is a very top university, what are the other top universities on the horizon with whom there are joint programs?

Mary Bullock (Executive Vice Chancellor of DKU): I can answer that. One of the great things about this undergraduate semester program is that we actually have to work with Chinese universities to have agreements with them to send their students. Students need to make sure they get the credits. We held a meeting in January of about eleven top Chinese universities in Shanghai from all around China: Tsinghua, Fudan, Sun Yat-sen, Wuhan and we had a number of universities that could not come who expressed disappointment that they could not. We spent a day with them going over the plans for this undergraduate semester program. We learned a lot, we learned that of course we are going to have to pay attention to credits; we learned that costs will be an issue, but we also sensed their excitement and a sense that the timing might be just right. Just as you have been saying, these schools are beginning to have looser curriculums; they are beginning to introduce liberal arts components. Fudan has a wonderful general education program; I visited Fudan and talked to their people about their general education program. I just sent a brochure to Laurie to use with the China Liberal Arts Curriculum Committee, so we are engaging those schools. In the next three months Chancellor Yo and I will be visiting as many as many of them

as we can. He is so excited by the proposals that your faculty [members] have submitted, and he says that he now understands what is going to be different about a Duke curriculum. These are not elementary courses, these are highly interdisciplinary, and they are cutting edge. I look forward to presenting these to the universities, and to working with them. We do plan to engage them in a lot of different ways.

Professor Tom Robisheaux (History): Any other questions? We could take maybe one more. Colleagues I want to thank you for your patience today. [I have] one request for you as you leave. On two separate occasions today, representatives you have been urged and asked, and I will now prod you to consult with and inform your departments, especially about the DKU update so that faculty are better informed and also about the Global Health proposal. Thank you very much, especially Mary and Peter, thank you for being here.

Meeting Adjourned