

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL  
102 ALLEN BLDG  
CAMPUS BOX 90029

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

**Thursday, March 7, 2013**

### Call to Order

**Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Let me call our meeting of the Arts and Sciences council to order for today. We do not have the minutes available to review, amend, and approve today. The reason is we are working with less time between the February meeting on February 14<sup>th</sup> and today's, [which] is March 7<sup>th</sup>. The staff and I are missing a week of work and it takes some time to get the minutes in their proper order. These will be posted as soon as we have them available, and then we will have a motion for them to be corrected and approved at the April meeting.

### Announcements and Updates

[I have] a few announcements first. The Liberal Arts in China Committee has received a robust collection of course proposals for the opening of Duke Kunshan in its' first semester. I think the number is around 20 course proposals. They have begun the process of forwarding them to the DKU Joint Committee, which is an ad hoc committee of the Arts and Sciences Council. For those of you who do not recall this, in December when this began, when it became clear that the council and its committees would be asked to conduct the usual review and approval of courses, which it does for all Duke courses, the decision was taken that the fastest most efficient way to deal with this was to combine into one joint committee of the Courses Committee and the Global Education Committee so faculty members who sit on those two committees compose the DKU Joint Committee. We have a website where we are making those proposals available; those of you who are sitting on the DKU Joint Committee will soon be able, if you are not already able to do so, to read the course proposals. We will be meeting right after the spring break, and we will have a report for council at the April meeting about the selections of those courses. I think the Liberal Arts in China Committee is very happy with the wide variety of courses that are being offered and the outlines and shaping that is coming into view of the liberal arts curriculum as a whole.

Second of all, [I have] an announcement for you to watch in the very near future. As you know, there was a subcommittee of the Courses Committee that was formed in December chaired by **David Bell**; this is the Subcommittee on Online Courses. That subcommittee was charged with the task of establishing a framework by which Duke in its consortium with a group of nine universities through 2U to establish a framework by which courses can be taken by Duke students for credit. This is very different from the MOOC courses, which have captured a lot of attention. David's committee was a large one; they have grappled with the issue. I think they have gone through a lot of the really interesting issues that it raises. It is an exciting time. We are recognizing that this is also an experiment in that this will be the first time that we offer courses for credit that are online. David's committee has put together a set of recommendations, and the Courses Committee received those recommendations this morning. They have already worked through them and the Executive Committee and I have been encouraging the Courses Committee that as soon as that is available, we are going to make it available to representatives of the council. Faculty, department, and DUS interest is very high as it should be. This is an exciting time; we really do not know how this is going to work, so we look at it as an experimental period. We will appreciate representative's attention to the proposal, and we wanted to get it to you as soon as we can so that representatives who wish to take them to their departments for discussion [can] do so. We would encourage you to do so [in order for us to] get as much faculty feedback as possible. Then in April, David will come, and we will consider this recommendation, so watch for announcements and information in your inbox. I think recommendations have a very nice balance for us as we move into this experimental phase.

In April we want to put the spotlight back once again on faculty who will be taking part in Bass Connections, formerly known as Duke Ideas. This time, Andrew [Janiak] has identified one of the themes of the faculty who are involved in the initial work on this team to come present and discuss with us what it is like for them as faculty members to work on one of these Bass Connection projects. Departments, you may wish to hear how this works. I think DUSs will want to hear how this works from the vantage point of departments, and how this is affecting interdisciplinary work. Graduate students

will be involved, so we were thinking the best way to keep [people] involved and encouraging this innovation is to bring faculty before council who are actually taking part in it.

Finally, I know that the work that **Keith Whitfield** has been doing with his group that was working on an idea for online course evaluations is nearing completion, so stay tuned. I think that is very exciting and we are looking forward to that.

I want to turn to our first agenda item. Last council meeting we tabled the discussion of a proposal for a co-major in Global Health. We had an initial discussion at our February meeting [in which] the Curriculum Committee made its very strong recommendation and discussed the proposal. The Executive Committee also did so with Bill Seaman and Steffen Bass leading that part of the presentation. We ran out of time, and we need now to return to this really important proposal.

In the meantime, the question has not been stated; I said this in an email to you. Until the question is stated, the motion still belongs to Steffen Bass who originally made it. He would like to modify that proposal, and then we can have it seconded, and then we can open the floor for discussion. I would then, at that point, like to ask Bill Seaman, Gary Bennett and Steffen to stand around too [so] we can have our discussion of it. **Suzanne Shanahan**, chair of the Curriculum Committee sends her regrets; she is in Cairo today and unable to be here, but trusts her colleagues to have a robust discussion of the motion. Towards the end of our discussion, I will ask **Dean Laurie Patton** to address the council with the dean's recommendation. Steffen, if I could ask you to come forward. This does not require discussion, seconding or a vote. It is still Steffen Bass's motion to modify as he has chosen to do so.

### **Global Health Co-Major Proposal**

**Professor Steffen Bass (Physics):** This is going to be quick and easy; "I move that the Global Health co-major be approved and a review be conducted after five years by the Dean of Arts and Sciences office in consultation with Arts and Sciences curriculum committee and ECASC."

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Is there a second?

**Professor Margaret Humphreys (History):** Seconded

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Can I ask Bill Seaman and especially Gary Bennett to come forward? Steffen you can certainly stay here and answer questions if you wish. First let me ask Gary Bennett who is the lead member of the Global Health faculty who has been putting together this proposal to see if he has some comments he would like to make to bring us up to date because I know that there have been a number of faculty discussions about the proposal. Hopefully you have become better informed about it. Gary, maybe you could bring us up to date since we last met, and then we will throw the floor open for discussion.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Thank you very much Tom. We have been excited about the reaction and the response since the last meeting. It seems that a number of departments have met formally and some informally to discuss the proposal. I know I have had several conversations both on and offline with council members and the like. We have been very pleased about the reaction and appreciate the hard work and additional reviews that the council members have made. [I have] a couple of things [that I would like to mention]. We have had an opportunity over the last couple of weeks to run additional models and scenarios in very close collaboration with many of the potential partnering departments, and I think we are as confident as ever that the major that I have described at the last meeting is challenging but is possible with the vast majority of majors at Trinity. We are very comfortable right now with where we are, and I look forward to a good discussion.

### **Discussion**

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** The floor is now open for questions and comments.

**Professor Tolly Boatwright (Classics):** Thank you very much; we did speak about it in my department, and I guess we are about the oldest and the most old-school of all of the humanities departments. Some of the questions that came up were that there is one course here that is a foundations [course] in a global health humanities. Do you all [believe] the co-major in global health will be with other humanities departments, or do you think that it is going to end up being with the natural sciences? We are really interested in this.

**Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I am really glad you asked the question. Our great hope and expectation is that it will be with a wide range of departments from across the campus. [We have] intentionally constructed the major in such a way to facilitate co-majors with a wide range of departments. Let me state very clearly our intention was not for the Global Health major to pair exclusively with natural science majors by any stretch of the imagination. We hope that we have many humanities departments and students from those departments who are interested in the major. I think if we look at the data from the Global Health certificate, the primary partners at present are public policy, psychology, biology, cultural anthropology, and to a lesser extent ICS. I think those present very comfortable pairings, and I expect that if you think about the distribution of potential co-majors, those will probably constitute the largest numbers for us. Things get very interesting on the margins, so I can imagine some very interesting synergies emerging in co-major pairs with the classics certainly.

**Professor Margaret Humphreys (History):** One concern is language; it seems crazy to do Global Health without knowing a language other than English. The other is history, because there is not very much historical depth in what is here. Of course, you cannot do everything but these are aspects of what I think Duke is trying to do with this Global Health co-major that really need to be brought up, mentioned, and stressed again and again.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I appreciate that. On the issue of history, Margaret and I were just talking about this before the meeting, and we are going to cross-list her course and expect that there will be several courses in history that will qualify for the focus study portion of the major. That is extremely important to us.

I talked a little bit about this last time, but perhaps not in enough depth. Language is one of many areas in which I think we can have a robust discussion about how you could get to additional depth in Global Health. There are a variety of places in which one could go for depth. Language is certainly one, culture, perhaps quantitative science, and ethics is another. All of these are critical to global health. Our committee felt that the students have a foreign language requirement here, and so certainly at some level they will have some exposure there. For certain fieldwork opportunities, students will be advised to get additional language [exposure].

There is also this very interesting challenge where global health is both about field work and also about working in NGOs, WHO, and doing lab-oriented research where the language needs are perhaps not the same as they would be in the field. In an effort to try to be sufficiently global, but also ensure that those kinds of needs are met, that is how we got to a place where language is not a formal requirement, but is nevertheless a strong emphasis.

I should say that perhaps on the margins things get very interesting with potential language co-majors, and there are lots of potential opportunities for overlapping, particularly in the focus study portion of the major, so we expect to see that there should be many co-majors from the languages.

**Professor Charmaine Royal (African and African American Studies):** Just a comment, Gary. I presented it to my department, and the faculty [members] were very supportive. Because the department is itself an interdisciplinary department, people really saw a lot of avenues for synergies with the courses that people are already offering with the global health co-major, so [you have] a lot of support from AAAS.

**Professor Orin Starn (Cultural Anthropology):** Thank you Tom. We also discussed the proposal in our faculty meeting, and I think that there are concerns and questions about how this is going to unfold and how it will work. I think the work that went into preparing the proposal was really fabulous. This is a model for people coming together from a lot of different parts of the university and really thinking about how to try to make something new work. It felt to me in these discussions as if there is a lot of openness to tweaking things and to making this a process in which things may be modified depending on how it all works. I think the bottom line is our faculty is very positive about this.

The only other thing I would add is just from talking to and meeting students who have been doing the Global Health certificate. [These] students have been interested in a Global Health major, and a number of whom are in cultural anthropology. We actually have, for whatever reason, a lot of cultural anthropology majors who also have a global health interest. I am struck by how fabulous the students who are into Global Health are. They are smart, enthusiastic, and creative in their thinking. I think one of the really nice things about this major is that it responds to a grassroots student desire to see this happen, and what students want to happen is not necessarily always what we want to do, but in this case I think it is.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** It is always nice when those interests are aligned. In fact, you have one sitting right behind you. She is an absolutely amazing student who I featured on our slides the last time. She is a biology major with a certificate in Global Health who is doing a qualitative honors thesis on the education system in Tanzania, and is doing a spectacular job at it. She is pre-med on top of all of that. I think you are right, I am sure everyone feels this way about their students, but I think ours are particularly remarkable.

**Professor Chantal Reid (Nicholas School of the Environment):** [I have] comments on behalf of the biology faculties. Our faculty also discussed the Global Health major at the last meeting. In general, the faculty was really supportive of the Global Health major; however there were a few issues that were raised for consideration that overlapped with some of the issues raised at the last meeting.

Notably, the biology faculty was concerned with the feasibility of completing the Global Health major with the biology major as a pre-med. The Biology faculty noted it would be extremely difficult for a biology major to also complete the Global Health [co-major] given all of their requirements. Although a lot of students that are pre-health are doing a double major, the existing majors are stable enough, and it is easy to see the pathway. For a biology major, we think that it will be more likely to be a minor in Global Health for the pre-health students. For the biology majors that are not pre-health, it will be an easier path to do the global health major with clear pre-major advising; the pre-major advising will be critical. The AB Biology major will be able to co-major in Global Health.

The faculty was also concerned with the proposed course overlap, and one of the courses noted was the foundations course. We sent our issues to the Executive Committee and to Dr. Bennett, who was very receptive and met with us. He assured us flexibility so we would be able to have the co-major for both pre-health and biology majors. He also expressed flexibility in developing courses in more interdisciplinary overlap, which would be very good. One thing that the faculty wanted to make sure is that the foundations course in the natural sciences will clearly be a non-science for a non-science major and it will not count for the biology major. Those are the comments from the faculty.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** This is a really good example of the kinds of reviews that I think council members have done over the past couple of weeks. This has been extremely helpful to us. Chantal mentioned that we met with Chantal[Reid] and Paul Manos, the DUS in Biology earlier this week. It has been helpful for us to think about the areas where we there is potential overlap and we will work with you to make sure that happens.

I will say that one of the things that I think is characteristic of the work that our committee has done thus far is that there [are around] 300 potential co-major pairs in 2012 alone at Duke. If you think about all of the various potential double majors there are about 300 of them, and I think the difference in the Global Health major is that we designed it specifically

so that you could co-major with it. These are students who by virtue of their own efforts have found ways to get sufficient advising to deal with the course scheduling, overlap challenges, and all of these things. Our committee has thought about and has tried to anticipate some of those issues in the design of the major.

Chantal [Reid] brought up a couple of points that are particularly important in our process. Just to give you a very quick example, we have included in effect three elective courses that students can use to overlap with other co-majors, and we have a provision in the proposal that says students can come to us and petition a series of three courses for that overlapping. We have curated a series of potential three course sequences that align with different thematic interests in Global Health. But if a student says, "I have looked at this menu of options, but there is this other area that I am really passionate about and there are two courses in my co-major and another one someplace here that I would really like to make as my focus study." Provided that they have a sufficient rationale, then we will be inclined to accept those and that will again facilitate the overlapping process, which will ease the process of the co-major. We will be very attentive to this, and we are going to continue to work with biology and our partners to make sure that this is going well, and make the kind of adaptations that we need to make this successful.

**Professor Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy):** From Public Policy we are very supportive of this. Steffen, I appreciate the change, I think that makes a lot of sense. One thing to think about for the future that has come up in some conversations was advising. You are not really a type of department, so your faculty [members] move back and forth between other appointments. Think about how to spread that out; you do not want all of your majors going to one single advisor. They want access to the faculty and the minors, too, would have that. One of the comments that came up was to think about how you divide up the advising and what that means for the faculty who you assign them to.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** That is a good point, absolutely.

**Professor Bill Seaman (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies):** On the advising, also [ensuring] the DUSs from the co-major departments have a really good knowledge of the program may be very important, so maybe even making a brochure or something.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Absolutely, right now we are planning brochures, websites, and I will be doing a road show. [We] will make sure that people are sufficiently informed.

**Professor Margaret Humphreys (History):** First, our department was so busy doing other things that they had no strong feelings about the Global Health co-major. As I think about advising and I think about all of the time it has taken to get our history major presented in the STORM report in a way that reflected that yes they had met this and that requirement of the history major, and it all has to do with how a course is coded and secret things that happen inside the computer system. As you say, "well, we will say there are three courses can include one that maybe one we had not thought of before," have you thought ahead if these students are really going to enroll in the fall [have you thought about] how STORM is going to see your major and list it to help your advisors see that these students are meeting their requirements?

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** We are going to accept new registrants in the fall, and that will give us a sufficient amount of time to manage some of the technological details between now and then. An alternative would have been to start in several weeks, and I think that our concern was that did not allow us enough time to do the work of preparing DUSs, advisors, and pre-major advisors sufficiently for this kind of enterprise. We will be spending the next couple of months making sure that those things are in order and Dean Baker assures me that we can get that done.

**Professor Frances Hasso (Women's Studies):** We have a lot of ICS majors who do the global health certificate and we support the project. I do think this last question is not going to be easy to solve, because we know it really well. The technological systems that are in the background that have to do with the registrar, STORM and ACES, they are not well suited for this kind of project where there are many departments involved, and we really still do not have a solution for that. I think that piece is harder than you think.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I appreciate that.

**Valerie Konczal (Academic Advising Center):** I actually set up the advisement reports, so I feel like I need to address this, and we will be talking. We have all of the majors up except for ICS, and many of them have been very successful. Some of them take more maintenance than others, but it is because we are trying to respond to each department. In ICS, for example, they wanted to see who was teaching a particular section of each course every term, because the course might not be truly meeting the objectives of Comparative Global Education. It is not the type of thing where we can say this course always works. That takes a lot of manual intervention and it takes a lot of coordination between the department and us. We have some other departments where each department wants to have an advisor determine with an individual student what their focus study will be. That cannot be automated. That is information that has to be shared, so that is a lot of back and forth, but we have actually been very successful being able to keep up with that. We actually hear a lot of compliments about the report. I am not saying it is perfect, there is no doubt about that, but I am not foreseeing a huge problem with this one. The problem is when you want to change requirements according to who is teaching.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I appreciate that, and I look forward to spending a lot of time with you.

**Professor Charlie Becker (Economics):** Gary, I certainly appreciate the work that you and your committee have put into this, and there is a great deal to be said for it. It is the opinion of the majority of the faculty in Economics who are interested that the quantitative studies requirements are not sufficient, and my hope is that you will revisit that in the future.

**Professor Bill Seaman (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies):** In terms of the kind of education and the team based structure, maybe [you can talk about] how that relates to his question, because I think you answered it for the Curriculum Committee in a very cogent way.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** We spent a long time talking about this, and most of us who are up here have spent that time. Let me say that we do not doubt that quantitative education is important. I think it is becoming increasingly important, and I do not think there is any question about that.

The challenge for us, to get back to something I said earlier, is that one can pursue depth in global health in a variety of ways and areas. Unlike other disciplines, Global Health is not reliant on any one area. It is not public health that is overly reliant on epidemiology and biostatistics. To that end there is quantitative and qualitative scholarship in Global Health. Our committee felt that one of the advantages of this co-major model is that it plays to the students' strengths and interests. Students who are Economics majors will get the rich quantitative training that they get today, except that in our model they will also combine that with training in Global Health. Psychologists who currently get advanced quantitative training will still have that and will also get training in Global Health.

To get to Bill's point, we think that kind of model is advantageous because increasingly what we are seeing is that the complexities of global health problems are clamoring for team-based science. The days of an individual scholar working in his or her office alone on a single problem are gone, and in Global Health we have a team-based orientation. If you ask any of the global health faculty in the room, most of us on our projects have extremely interdisciplinary research teams and that adds to the richness in our work that we want to try to replicate for our students. You will see that in a variety of places in our major, particularly the capstone, we are not only teaching students to create this interdisciplinary link between the co-major and global health, but we also allow them opportunities to learn how to interact in multi-disciplinary teams.

What we are hoping is that the quantitatively inclined students will work with the qualitatively inclined students as they do in real world global health scholarship in practice and come to solutions through those multi-disciplinary interactions. In that way, we are hoping to create an educational model that reflects where the field is. We do that trying not to exclude any one area or another, but to try to embrace the richness that we think can be offered here.

**Dean Peter Burian (Dean of the Humanities):** I wanted to say that I am seeing something wonderful here today that is rare, if not unique, which is that members were asked to go back and talk to their departments, and they did. They came back and we have had a really terrific discussion. The whole idea of you as representatives of your departments to this council is that you will go communicate to your faculty and you can see how well it works. This is a practice [that] I want to applaud, and I hope it carries on even without explicit direction. Thank you all very much.

**Professor Chantal Reid (Biology):** [I have] one quick comment to follow up on the advising part. I think the pre-major advising is going to be critical, because once we get them in the major, they already have in place what their course is going to be. For the natural sciences you need to start early.

**Professor Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience):** We totally agree, in fact we are trying to create an innovative approach to this very challenge. Some of you know about the global advisors who are now called the Directors of Academic Engagement who I just think are really wonderful models for pre-major advising. Part of our budget includes a part-time Director of Academic Engagement who will work with students who are interested in global health who will be trained specifically to be able to deal with these kinds of things. The students who will be most successful in a major are those who are able to establish a sound long range plan early. To that end, we are working with Dean Baker's office and Beth Fox to try to put together a model where students can get together with this Director of Academic Engagement, who is specifically wired to work with our students, to put together a long range plan to make them successful. I completely agree with you. That is going to be a work in progress, so I would just say to council members and DUSs in the room, as you encounter our students and this pre-major advising model, if we are fortunate enough to go forward, please give us feedback. I think that we will continually be tweaking this pre-major advising piece because we know we need to get it right.

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** There are so many innovative features of this co-major, [including] one that we have not discussed explicitly. I think it is appropriate to turn attention to our Dean's perspective on this co-major proposal. We have an institute that is going to be sponsoring a major within Arts and Sciences, and this involves a partnership between the Global Health Institute and Trinity College of Arts and Sciences. If it is okay with Dean Laurie Patton, I will ask her to come and address the council about her views on the proposal that is before council.

### **Dean's Recommendation**

**Dean Laurie Patton:** In the dean's office, we get proposals for majors and minors on a regular basis. And we do not always endorse them. Sometimes we turn them back because they are not developed enough. Sometimes we talk with faculty members proposing them because they may not have the student or faculty or administrative support that we think they need. And then there are major proposals that are not only innovative, but they represent years' worth of planning, conversation, and experience in supervising students. That is the proposal you have before you.

Let me elaborate on its intellectual merits. First merit is a large scale one. The global health is a co-major -- an idea that assumes that the field of global health is potentially relevant to any of the current majors we offer here at Duke. But "relevant" is perhaps not strong enough; in fact it must be integrated with and leverage the core principles of other disciplines. This is a major whose nature is to be interdisciplinary-- not in the sense of sequentially disciplinary, but in the sense of integrating two fields. We have always been good at interdisciplinary research. We may have even pioneered the establishment of it at the university. (Although I do think we need a new word.) But we have not done as good a job up

driving such interdisciplinary into the curriculum. The global health major is one major step toward that curricular goal. And as a co-major, it does so by protecting the other disciplines even as it engages with them.

The second merit is that it continues to reconfigure arts and sciences relationship with the institutes. The global health institute will help arts and sciences run the major, as does Duke Institute of Brain sciences help run neuroscience. But in that MOU, and in the modus operandi of the global health major, the Global Health Institute is working for and on behalf of Arts & Sciences. In other words, we now have an answer to the question, "How can you get an Institute to work for you?"

The third merit is that the Global Health major is the result of thoroughgoing process of faculty, student, and administrative consultation. There has been widespread input from across the three divisions to make this major happen. The members of the faculty committee worked for a year developing it. The same faculty leaders worked with the deans, and incorporated their significant feedback. There was a discussion of the major within the global health institute's board. And finally, there were several sessions working out the possible budget implications for the partnership between global health and Arts & Sciences.

Fourth, and relatedly, it has gone through an equally thoroughgoing process of faculty governance. The curriculum committee worked for several months this past semester to refine it within the context of the Trinity College curriculum. ECASC has also reviewed it and discussed it with a thorough give and take and its endorsement is both positive and rigorously thought through. And my office will stay in close touch with those taking the major and those in charge of the major; we will make the review efficient, and any improvements nimble. We will be paying particularly close attention to the need for strong advising that has been raised by many faculty members here today.

In conclusion: I see it as my first obligation to respond to faculty and support faculty in their work. I also have an approach to academic change based on the principle: "Proceed as way opens." We know that as the way opens, we will continue to change and improve and tweak the global health major. The question before us right now is "Are we ready to proceed?" We have a major that works with all departments and, at the same time, it protects the disciplines. It is one of the first of its kind. It is less expensive than we thought. It already comes with a well-planned administrative structure. It makes Arts & Sciences a leader at Duke, and Duke a leader in the nation and in the globe. So my answer is, "Yes, we are ready to proceed." Thank you.

### **Motion to Approve the Global Health Co-Major Proposal**

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** I want to echo what Peter Burian has said about the work that council representatives have done with their own departments. When a representative speaks on behalf of an entire department it carries a great deal of weight. We all benefit here at council when we have that input. I have Margaret Humphreys to be recognized.

**Professor Margaret Humphreys (History):** I would like to call the question.

**Professor Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology):** Second

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** The question has been called. Let me restate the motion, we are voting that the Global Health co-major "be approved and a review be conducted after five years by the dean of Arts and Sciences office in consultation with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council." The vote is for council representatives only, guests and other faculty members who are listening in, observing, and participating in the debate may not vote. All of those council representatives in favor would you indicate your vote by raising your hand.

**Approved.**

**All of those opposed? 1**

**Abstentions: 1**

**The motion carries. Congratulations Global Health!**

### **Introduction of Ruth Day**

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Our second item of business follows on closely with the topic we have just discussed, and the interdisciplinary co-major we have just approved and that is the discussion of what interdisciplinary research actually means to you and your colleagues in Arts and Sciences. Everyone here at Duke uses this term all of the time, and maybe it has become so normal for us that we can now enter into that very comfortable time in the history of a language where we use the same term but understand different things by it. Ruth Day has conducted a survey of the Arts and Sciences faculty about exactly this issue. I do not think she needs any introduction to this council, since she was council chair these last three years. I am delighted to turn the floor over to Ruth, who will be presenting the results of her study on the models of interdisciplinary work that Duke faculty [members] study.

### **Multiple Models for Interdisciplinary Work: Results of a Faculty Study**

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Good afternoon everyone, I am delighted to be back from my sabbatical hiding place to see you all again. The topic is models of interdisciplinary work: the results of a Duke faculty study. Interdisciplinary: when you hear that term what comes to mind? One thing that often comes to mind is a team or a

group of people sitting from many different disciplines, discussing their work, and creating something new. Here we have a chemist, a musician, and a legal expert and together they are conjuring up something new and exciting. That is an image that a lot of people get, but is this the only model for interdisciplinarity? This study was designed to answer this question. [Here is] the term again, “interdisciplinary.” Another reaction that often happens is what do you mean by interdisciplinary? Is that a good word? Should we be using it? This study was designed to answer this question as well.

Let’s briefly look at the study itself. People went on the web, clicked on a link that we provided, saw our logo, and then were told this was for all regular rank faculty in Arts and Sciences, both those who do and do not conduct interdisciplinary work. That was in the cover email as well. The goals of the study were to provide information about the extent of faculty involvement in interdisciplinary work, alternative interdisciplinary models, the rewards and challenges of interdisciplinary work, and when disciplinary work is preferable.

This was sent to all regular rank faculty [members], which includes tenure track, PoPs, lecturers, and research professors. We had thirty-six percent of replies, so over one-third of everyone did respond. I would like to thank all of those who are here and elsewhere for doing this.

There was a section that said “About You.” We did not collect any names or department affiliations, but we did ask people to indicate their division, position, tenure-track or not, and number of years at Duke. In terms of the reply, here are the numbers of faculty in tenure track, non-tenure track, and those who did not declare. Most of them were tenure track, but there was a good solid number in non-tenure track and a few did not identify themselves. In terms of the divisions, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities, there was about an equal number in natural sciences and humanities, and somewhat less in social sciences. As for the number of years at Duke, the average was 14.5, but ranged from 1 to 42 years, so it was just about as good a distribution as you can get.

Now the results: An early question was, “About what percent of your work is interdisciplinary?” There were categories that people could check; they could check one that said “none”, “1-25%”, “26-50%” and so on. We asked them separately for their teaching and their research, and here are the results. This is the percent of work that is interdisciplinary. As you can see for teaching, it was above the category level for “25-50%” and for research [it was] even higher, pushing up to “51-75%.”

There was a lot of interdisciplinary work going on according to the people who replied. Here are the same data broken down by the number of faculty [members] who checked off these categories. There were some faculty [members] who had a modest amount of interdisciplinary work, and for these faculty [members], they did more of that interdisciplinary [work in] teaching than for research. There were other faculty [members] who [conducted] more interdisciplinary work overall. They had a preponderance in their research relative to their teaching, but [there were] still quite a [few in] teaching as well.

We asked about what interdisciplinary topics they were working on. There were three different places to do this, and we got so many [responses]. It is such an interesting rich mix that the whole list will be provided in the final report. I will give you some examples. From religious experience in east Africa, neuro-ethics, gender in the biblical world, medical cognition, biogeochemistry, eco-toxicology, and teleology. People would then indicate which disciplines they had combined, and it was breathtaking to see all of these.

The heart of the study was about interdisciplinary models. A lot of people did not have pre-existing models, so it was hard to ask in a free report [style about] what model they would use. Instead, we gave people models, defined them, and asked “About how often do you use each?” Again, they had a rating scale, this time from “never” to “very often” in terms of frequency of usage. One of the ones that we asked about was the one I showed you previously, the group interdisciplinarian, and we gave a definition. “If you are a group interdisciplinarian, you work with experts from other fields on problems of mutual interest.” Another one was for the individual interdisciplinarian, where “you are an expert in more than one field, and combine them in your work. You may talk to other people in those fields, but you do a lot or most of it yourself.”

There were a lot of other models as well, you can see along the bottom [of the slide] here. [There is] not only group and individual, but here are the rest. Cross-disciplinarian, “you cross over to other disciplines sometimes to get information or perspectives.” Multi-disciplinarian, “you are an expert in more than one field, but do not combine them in your work.” Single-disciplinarian, “you work within a single discipline.” Non-disciplinarian, “you work on problems without regard to discipline.” Then we always have a category for “other” because you cannot anticipate everything.

You might think for yourself, which ones you think will be used most often among Duke faculty [members]. Here are the results for group interdisciplinary work. It is very strong, between “sometimes” and “often” people are using this. For these other two, the “individual” and “cross” are they going to be higher or lower? They were even higher than the typical model that people think of or talk about when they talk about interdisciplinary work. This one, in particular, was a big surprise, at least to me, and to many people I have talked to about this. I would like to mention that back in 2005 I wrote a tiny one-page proposal to the office of the Vice Provost for interdisciplinary work. It was Cathy Davidson at the time; she had [some] end of year funds and [she] provided a little bit. Part of it was to put out a flyer and do a pilot study to ask within some departments [if] people were individual interdisciplinarians. It went, but it was hard to dig people up and have them admit [this]. I think the climate at Duke has changed a lot, and also our methods for finding out about this have improved.

Going back to the results here, what about the remaining categories? Those are the top ones, and over here [on the slide] they are little bit lower, but the single disciplinarian was strong. I was glad to see that, because it would have been

too bad if the only people who responded to the poll would have been those doing interdisciplinary work. We wanted a wider range of people, so that was good. Then we asked about the advantages of interdisciplinary work. Since this was open response, I will come back to that later when I show you what all of those looked like.

The next one was more quantitative in the way we collected the data. We asked “What are the challenges in doing interdisciplinary work?” We gave [them] a bunch of categories to think about, obtaining funding, publication, conference presentations, support of discipline-based colleagues within your department or discipline, finding colleagues with similar interests, identifying relevant knowledge from other disciplines, acquiring knowledge from other disciplines, and promotion and tenure down here at the bottom of the screen. For each one of these we asked people “How strong is each challenge for you?” There was a rating scale you can see across the top [of the slide] from “very strong” to “none.” Then there was a place to write comments for each one of these. Keep in mind what the different topics are; they are now shown at the bottom of the screen in this graph, and we are going to plot the results.

Here they all are together. The number one challenge was in funding for interdisciplinary research, and close by was publication and also getting acceptance from discipline-based colleagues. I put a star over here because it is a little bit below publications, but it kept coming up in other comments. This is only the response to how strong this is a problem for you. But it kept coming up time and time again in all of the different comment areas of the study.

Let’s get to comments, the last set of things I will show you before the discussion. There were a lot of comments. There were [many] opportunities here and we got 705 of them. They were eloquent, illuminary, and occasionally pesky and annoying. They were all over the map, and I am just going to show the number of comments that we got. This is really the number of people who commented in each of these categories. As you can see, people had a lot to say about the advantages of interdisciplinary work. Many were very convincing, and some were a little bit militant about it, as if we could not find out anything from disciplinary work, but that is another matter. I have the other [topics] that were very high with a lot of comments marked here: advantages, other challenges, how to make interdisciplinary work easier and when disciplinary work is preferable. Those are the ones that had the most comments, and I am going to show you a selected subset of them.

How did the subset of comments get selected? We examined them separately by topic, and then to get it unlinked from individuals, I alphabetized [them] by the first word. Then I picked some that would fit on the screen and gave a diversity of views. In the report, I think they will be categorized by theme, because there were themes that kept coming up.

The advantages of interdisciplinary work were some of these [on the slide]. They were usually not surprising, but they were very strong. “A better understanding of a phenomenon...”, “Actually knowing what I am working on...” that was very interesting. That person went one to say you can work on something in one discipline, but you do not really know until you take a proper look. “Always interesting and challenging”, “Helps me look at disciplinary issues in a new way”, “Enhanced quality and usefulness in research”, “Avoids tunnel vision,” “Narrowness of talking to a tiny audience of specialists”, “Answer broader questions and study more complex problems”, “Solve complex problems”, a lot of times the word “complex” came up.

We asked “What would make interdisciplinary work easier?” Here are [some] sample responses: “A more adventuresome academic publishing sector less preoccupied by traditional monographs.” This next person gave a lot of actual suggestions, which would fill up many screens. They started out by saying, “If you attend one or another distinguished faculty event here at Duke, you are astounded at how interesting, and indeed vital, the work of the faculty is across the divisions and almost all of the schools. The central administration needs to ask such faculty, and as importantly their younger colleagues what they need to keep at it...” They went on to say, “The support system was not adequate...” This person had a lot of suggestions that I am sure Dean Patton and others would like to see.

Others talked about “We need standards to judge the merits of interdisciplinary work...” There was an interesting comment that a number of people have experienced “Arts and Sciences and medical center interactions are hampered by the medical center’s lack of reciprocity in returning in directs to Arts and Sciences on grants that originate there.” A number of people brought that up, and it is a serious problem. Another person said, “A transparent metric for APT committee”, and “...recognition and respect in home departments for work done in collaboration with other departments and entities because currently it lies entirely at the chairs’ discretion.” There was a lot of discussion about [how] chairs can make a difference to be encouraging or discouraging. The final thing this person said [was] “He is never around.” [That] was frequently heard regarding faculty with joint appointments, so that is a problem.

We did ask “When is disciplinary work preferable?” Most people said it depends on the topic, problem, so on and so forth. There were other things too, “Analysis of data from a given experiment”, “Mentoring graduate students on a research project in a given department” because their next job post-doctoral will most often require this, and a focus on a given discipline. Some people said things like, “It is the basis for all interdisciplinary work.” You cannot do interdisciplinary work unless you are well-grounded in at least one discipline. There were a lot of [comments] about graduate training, which came up a lot. There were a whole bunch of people who said I cannot think of any reason to ever do it. The particular comments were “I am by definition interdisciplinary, so none”, “I cannot think of any”, “It is more important to have a deep understanding of the rules and standards of at least one discipline.”

I believe the last category is comments about other challenges. It is a good thing asked [this] because there were things came up that might not otherwise have come to mind. Sample responses were, “A lot of support, financial and institutional, center around big centers or clusters that in fact had detrimental effects on grassroots efforts...” That was a view shared by some, but not all. Another one [was] “At Duke, recognition of and funding for interdisciplinary work is reserved for those who collaborate with other Duke colleagues. I seldom collaborate with Duke colleagues, thus I am

invisible on the interdisciplinary landscape of campus, even though professionally I am known for expertise in three very distinct disciplines.” Several people said things like, “Carving time away from disciplinary homes is a challenge.” There were a lot like the next one, “Colleagues do not always support it.” This person was long tenured, so it was not a matter of tenure. There were some comments about communication among interdisciplinary partners, concluding again with “convincing disciplinary-based colleagues to admit graduate students in my areas.” That combines two parts of it, and there were many more, these are just what would fit on a screen.

To bring this all together, we do not have all of the answers here, but we have a lot of information. I hope that the next time that you hear the word “interdisciplinary” you have more of a response like this. Instead of “what do you mean? Aha! There are multiple models, they are being carried out here at Duke, and it would be good to know more about them and know how to support them. Questions? Comments? Thank you very much.

### Discussion

**Professor Bill Seaman (Art, Art History, Visual Studies):** I wonder if APT might move to a model where they have ad hoc committees that are formed to deal with interdisciplinary research?

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** There is an idea; I do not know if you said that on the polls, [because] I do not know who anybody is, but I will try to remember that and put it in as a suggestion for the council. That is a very interesting idea; I do not know if there is any precedent for that.

**Professor Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** As usual, faculty [members] are innovating on cells, and pushing the envelope. Some of the structures within the university will take a while to catch up to what faculty [members] are already doing. For example, coming up in a few weeks is the Arts and Sciences Council research grants, and those are binned by natural science, social science, and the humanities. I am in the natural sciences but doing a lot of work on cognition and education, and I am going to be reviewed by a chemist, physicist, or a biologist. I am saying it is the kind of thing that we fall back on. The same thing a few years ago we had a conversation with student faculty scholars. We have students doing amazing scholarship, but then they have to be nominated for awards within their discipline. I think it is critical that we keep in mind how our structures are, and how to get them to reflect the actuality of what students and faculty are doing.

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** Maybe we will have to think about, discuss, and think through four structures, the three divisions and interdisciplinary, which can overlap with some of those. A number of people brought this up that there are different standards for identification of really good work that is solid yet innovative. That can cut across a lot of things.

**Professor Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** We need to try to break down those bins when we do the evaluations, and even putting out the announcements for fellowships, research, and various things.

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** We have had a lot of innovation and support for new interdisciplinary work recently, largely through Dean Patton and many other initiatives, like Bass Connections. Some are set up, there are centers and other mechanisms, and there is at least the individual interdisciplinarian model that has not been known, and I do not think there are initiatives around it.

**Professor Frances Hasso (Women’s Studies):** I could not tell from the table what percentage of the faculty said that all of their research is interdisciplinary and what percentage said all of their research is disciplinary?

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I could go back to that, but I cannot give you the answers directly in terms of the numbers, but it was stronger for people who said they were all interdisciplinary. I can do that break down in the report since you asked. I will be happy to do that; there were not as many that said they were not interdisciplinary at all, but it was a good healthy number of people. I will take the data and get the graph up. If you have any other comments or questions, I am on sabbatical, but I am still [ruthday@duke.edu](mailto:ruthday@duke.edu) and I do answer email.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** [I have] a comment. I think these suggestions about changing the structures are really helpful. Thinking about an interdisciplinarian as a representative for different Arts and Sciences Council committees is a great idea. The fact that individual interdisciplinarian is such a strong model for us is a really interesting piece of data. It would be interesting to get some sense of the dimensions of that. What kinds of interdisciplinarian and across which disciplines are the strongest? It would be very interesting to look at. I also wanted to remind people in terms of group interdisciplinarian, we have changed one of our service awards to focus on a team in the spirit of collaboration that I want to foster, rather than a single person. That is a very exciting focus that we can use to feature interdisciplinary [work] in a group sense. Finally, please do share comments not only with Ruth and Tom, but also me because there are little tweaks that we can make that do not take much time, but make a big difference in addition to the big ones.

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** I did want to comment that one of the most exciting things was in my last year as chair of the council, Laurie set up these Dean’s lunches for faculty. She is systematically inviting twelve faculty to these lunches and the focus is on interdisciplinary work, especially interdisciplinary research. All of last year I was a co-host, and now I am a guest with Tom as well. It is very exciting to hear from faculty and a broad range of views on interdisciplinarity. When you do get your invitation to the Dean’s lunches, it is worth your while. It is not just about the food.

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Ruth, will this report be made available to the council in general?

**Professor Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience):** When I was chair, we did this in consultation with ECASC; we said that we would send this to the entire faculty. I will provide that in due time.

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Thank you very much Ruth. We have one last item on our agenda for today. It gives me great pleasure to ask Dean Laurie Patton to come forward with the Dean's Corner and bring us up to date on a lot of the activities that are going on in her office.

### Dean's Corner

**Dean Laurie Patton:** I am so glad we started this tradition; it makes me a little less anxious about getting the word out to people about all of the stuff that is going on. I have about five or six items that I wanted to give you brief updates on. The first is that the Advising Committee, the task force on advising, led by Steven Asher with help from Dean Lee Baker has met for the first time. We are very excited about where we are moving with that. We are now in the process of developing working groups on key themes for advising, which will include perspectives on all four years. We want to think about an all four year model. How have we responded well? Have we responded well enough to the review of the overall advising we have been given from a couple of years ago? Dean Beth Fox has done an extraordinary job in working through many of those concerns. All of the people are very engaged in thinking about and moving forward with new models.

In addition, we just completed a review of the pre-professional advising offices. There was some really interesting feedback from folks there. The team was very wisely chosen by Dean Baker and others to be graduate advisors to incoming students to the graduate schools, business, law, and medicine. How are we doing from their perspective, given that they are on the receiving end of our students? They will be sending us a report in about a month. Please send any comments or thoughts that you have about advising to Steven Asher or Lee Baker. They are receptive and we are open to number of different models. We also want to emphasize that it will be data based. We are employing the services of a post-doc who is going to be continuing the studies that Steven Asher began on academic engagement to drill down on more dimensions of academic engagement so that we can come up with a uniquely Duke model.

Second, many of you have already been at a number of different budgetary presentations that look at the overall university situation in terms of the budget and some of the challenges that we face. I always like to get Arts and Sciences council a little bit of information in advance. I will be sending out a letter to the entire faculty and staff in the next couple of days that is basically a recap of what you have already heard. We are now developing a timeline for how we are going to work with these challenges in Arts and Sciences in what I have called my financial sustainability movement. I wanted to share with you a little bit about that, and remind you that the principles are departmental choice and sovereignty around this and a rich menu of options for the ways we can think about moving forward with financial sustainability. I will be sending out a second letter that details all of this, so what I am telling you now is going to be in a further letter in about a month.

The way we have developed it so far is we are required to submit a balanced budget to the Provost by March 19. That looks possible without a loan from anywhere, which is amazing, but it does require that we call on a lot of our reserves in various parts of Arts and Sciences. We will have to push our own reserves down to about one million. If you only have one million in reserves with a budget of 330 million that is a scary place indeed, hence the financial sustainability model. By March 19 we will be discussing that with the provost.

By April 15 we are going to be preparing data profiles for each department. We have hired Tom Mann who regularly works with our office to do that. [We will be] developing a target for each department, which is a range based on the individualized profiles that we are going to be doing for each department and what they think they can afford and what will be the least painful and most productive. We are going to be drafting communications to be sent to the chairs and directors after April 15 to talk about what those targets are, and then inviting them to come in and talk with us about how we might move forward with that.

By April 30, we will be scheduling FY 14-15 budget meetings beginning May 1 and ending August 31. The key question that Alex Rosenberg asked, which I think is important to communicate to you now, is will this replace the budget meetings that usually occur in February or during that early spring semester? The answer is we hope so as much as possible. There may be lingering questions and concerns that we may need to check in about, but we are not interested in having two full length budget meetings. Because of our really serious need for financial sustainability, we want to get out in front of Academic year 14-15 as early as possible to continue to get our collective hands around our concerns.

Just a reminder, we are also at the end of our three year cycle for calculating graduate FTE's so we are going to be meeting with the graduate school to talk about that. If you are a department that has increased over thirty-three percent in the last ten years in terms of faculty lines that would be a place where we might, not unreasonably, ask you to think about reducing a tad. If you have increased your graduate FTE's by thirty-three percent, [that would be] another place where you might want to think about that.

We are really at the very preliminary stages. As you know, my mode of communication is always to communicate more and earlier, which means that there will be things that are preliminary. This is one of them; we have not worked out all of the details of this at all. I did want to give you an overview as early as possible. By September 20 all of the budget proposals will be due in from departments and units. The meetings will consist of the chair, the divisional dean, the business manager, the DUS, the DGS, and anybody else who wants to come. We will be asking them to go back and talk with the department about what seems feasible. A reminder; if your department is in a state where you do not feel that you can make that decision, handing it back to us is one of the options and we will do what we can.

Finally, by October 15, we will get back to you about how those proposals look. It should be obvious that we are designing this to be a tailored, collaborative, and I might say an extremely labor intensive process, but very much in the spirit of making a collaborative effort to make this affordable and doable for everyone.

Third, I wanted to say more broadly [that] it is amazing because every single dream that I have had for doing educational initiatives of various kinds, and even one that I had deferred until the next lifetime has already started at Duke. The main task force now is to keep these going and keep them affordable.

One of them, of course, is an initiative in Public Scholarship, which is headed by Laurent Dubois. I just wanted to give you a brief report. The the initiative will be launching next year. He began with an Arts and Sciences wide faculty seminar on public scholarship led by Mark Anthony Neal, [who is] himself wildly successful. Based on that seminar, next year, as the inaugural year, he is going to be showcasing an initial reception, which we really encourage all of you to come to. [There will be] several different displays, one of which is scales of education, which is examining the link between Duke and Durham schools. Second [is] platforms for public, [which will be] examining new initiatives on the part of the library and journals to think in new ways about how we disseminate scholarship. Third is community research, exploring the ways in which community-based and community-driven research offers us new ways of thinking. [Fourth is] digital spheres, which showcasing the possibilities for scholars working through blogs, social media, and so on.

He is going to be work on two collaborations with the Thompson Writing Program, particularly with Cary Moskovitz and the reader project working towards creating a space within Duke's broader online platform to showcase undergraduate blogs and writing. Also with Jennifer Ahern-Dodson collaborating on a series called going public that showcases the work of various faculty at Duke who have been active in online and digital forums. There is a lot there; it is very exciting. Laurent is wildly enthusiastic about this, and I have to curb him because every time he gets a suggestion, he takes it up and runs with it.

The fourth thing, I am delighted to let you know that the Lesser Taught Languages initiative is signed. We are waiting for the University of Virginia to get us their syllabi. We have started a consortium that is almost budget neutral in lesser taught languages, which is one of the things that I think is key to globalization in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. How can we do this affordably and collaboratively with other universities?

We have started a small consortium or partnership with the University of Virginia; Princeton is waiting in the wings. We have to get Princeton off of its slightly recalcitrant querulous place to join us. We hope they may join us soon. We will be offering creole, which is a language that we traditionally offer, to University of Virginia students and possibly Princeton students if they want to play. The University of Virginia will be offering us Tibetan.

We are going to be thinking about other languages including Turkish, Swahili, and Uzbek. We are very excited about this, and I want to thank Lee Willard, Lee Baker, and Inge Walther who have really stepped up and done an extraordinary job of getting this through. Gil Merx is the major person that has pushed this through as the director of the international center. We will keep you posted and there is going to be some publicity around that.

Fifth, I want to report on hires. We are delighted to say that even in this extremely scary budgetary climate we have made some fabulous hires including a major hire in sociology [who is] joint with AAAS. We have a wonderful young associate hire from Northwestern in Theatre Studies. We have a wonderful cluster of hires in chemistry and also a couple in economics. In our Asian hires initiative, we made one Chinese hire in AMES, and we are in the midst of a South Asia hire. We made a wonderful hire of a Chinese historian in history. Probably the foremost young woman mathematician on the market today is coming to join us at Duke as well as a young woman philosopher. Robert Calderbank has left but I want to make sure I shout out to him; in the last two or three years out of the twenty-two hires that we made in the sciences, thirteen of them have been women or minorities. I am really pleased. That seems to be yet another dream that is coming true, but we have to keep very vigilant about that.

Finally, I am continuing to go on a positive up note here. Fundraising has been on a very good trajectory. Unfortunately, I am frustrated that I cannot report to you on the actual numbers because the ink is not dry and we are still in the midst of paperwork. I can tell you that I have been extremely busy and people have been extremely responsive in this early part of the campaign. Everyone tells me that this cannot last and there is going to be a dip, so I am warning you there probably will be. But I will say the closest Trinity friends have been very generous, and most of that generosity has been in support of faculty and faculty lines, which again, because of our budgetary situation I have to use on budget relief. Still, it has been an extraordinary response. Since I cannot give you numbers, I will tell you that I have been to Dallas, Greenwich, New York, Atlanta, Delhi, Kuala Lumpur, and Shanghai. At each one of those cities, there have been several productive conversations. I hope I can make myself clear. At this point, we still have four and a half more years in the campaign but out of our 450 million dollar goal, we are very close to reaching 200 million. I am psyched, keep going, go Duke!

### Discussion

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** I want to see if colleagues might have a question or comment for Dean Patton.

**Professor Frances Hasso (Women's Studies):** Number two was the early budget meetings, right? What did you say the dates were?

**Dean Laurie Patton:** We are going to be thinking about our own internal target for getting what looks like a sustainable and least painful budget based on your very specific data, so that is for us.

**Professor Frances Hasso (Women's Studies):** But you have meetings with chairs? This is very technical question, but what if there is a switch in chairs? You are doing this in the summer, so I am just wondering what this will look like.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** We will work with you, so there will probably be incoming and outgoing chair [at the meeting]. We will try to get both on board; that is usually what we do in transitions particularly if there is an interim chair and that is what we will be working for. By the way, I should mention Frances presented to everyone on ICS being able to hire

independently Professors of the Practice and that was approved by the Board of Trustees. I wanted to make sure everyone knows that. Congratulations!

**Dean Lee Baker:** I forget what you call the technical word for this data-driven budget analysis that is zero line...the approach we are going to be taking with the chairs in terms of thinking through the budgets. Can you explain a little how that is going to work? If the data is looking good, what role will this data play in these budget talks?

**Dean Laurie Patton:** We are going to be looking at a number of things. By the way, please let us know if there are more things that you want us to consider for your department or any department. It includes the number of faculty, and we are going to be looking at the trajectories over the last five and ten years. It includes the number of students, majors, and enrollments for the last five and ten years. It includes students per faculty member for the last five and ten years. It includes grants and the department's dependence on grants. Those are just some of the data.

I remember when I was only a faculty member when you felt like sometimes deans that were not terribly clued in would apply a single rubric to one department. We are trying to do the exact opposite of that as a way of honoring where each department is. There will be things that we will think about. For instance, we have not developed these fully, but [we are] thinking about modest incentive systems as well. [For example] five graduate lines equal one professor in certain fields, so maybe if there is a return of a single faculty line, we could add one or two graduate lines. The budget savings actually gives you a sense of something else that you can work with.

This is very preliminary, so I am not announcing any absolute trade-offs yet, but we are going to be talking with each department. The other thing that we are going to be doing in advance is a set of things that we think could work for you. We are going to be doing a lot of the work in advance, so that it does not feel like you have to do it all yourself. It will be a holistic review of the data, and it will show between five years and ten years back so that you understand how we are thinking about your own history over the last ten years.

The other important thing is I have gone to every department and those conversations have been really good. After both of the department that I have gone to, I have gotten great suggestions from people. I should mention retirements are absolutely key. We are at a point where we are at our lowest number of projected retirements over the next five years ever in the history of the college. That is great; we are also at our highest level of retention, which is great. People want to stay and they do not want to stop working. The bottom line is that is one of our biggest of the three financial challenges. That is going to have to be part of the conversation as well.

Those are all of the different things, and the most important point of this conversation is you could say actually I think your holistic analysis does not include this element, so please include it. Then we will go back and say now we have included it, here is what we think. The other really important thing is there is this worry that suddenly we are going to be bringing out a lot of Excel sheets with pencil budgets and computer budgets, but we are not going to be doing that. For instance, we will be giving you an overall number for the overall amount of all faculty salaries in your department. We are not going to be inflicting pencil budgets on you. If you want to review the pencil budget because you feel like it is inflated, we are happy to do that, but we do not want to inflict that kind of work on you. Rather, we want to share the details with you.

### **Final Announcements**

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Before we adjourn, I want to thank council representatives from several departments in particular who have worked hard these last few weeks. Charmaine Royal, Chantal Reid, and I know that Orin Starn, Charlie Becker, and Steffen Bass from physics have been consulting with departments. It is a model for how the council can work, and I think the council is much richer in its discussions of important matters in faculty affairs. I would encourage all representatives to do this. Thank you very much colleagues.

**Dean Laurie Patton:** I am sorry, Tom, both of us meant to mention that the Budget Advisory Committee headed by Charlie Becker has met for the first time. We have already had some good conversations about the next steps, and we are going to be working closely with the budget advisory committee as we move through the financial sustainability. There will be lots of Arts and Sciences Council input as a result.

**Dean Lee Baker:** I want to publicly say that your leadership over this global health major has been stellar. You insisted that we deliberate, put the brakes on me and others to think about it, and you were right. The outcome is better, and I think the deliberations through the departments, the discussions, and the way you handled a tricky situation was stellar. I appreciate your leadership.

**Professor Tom Robisheaux (History):** Thank you Dean Baker. The council is adjourned.

### **Meeting Adjourned**