

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, April 14, 2016

Call to Order

Anita Layton (A&S Council Chair):

Okay, well I can't believe we worked together for a whole year. This is the last meeting of the year so let's begin. Okay, so, we will first approve our March meeting minutes as usual. Any requests for corrections or amendments? No. A motion? Good. All in favor? [The minutes were approved.] Thank you.

Moving on. Since this is the last meeting, I think that we can look back and take stock on what we've done with our time. These are my very rough estimates of the amount of time that we spent on different items. As you can expect, we spent a whole lot of time talking about the curriculum. We approved three certificates. We have heard from Dean Ashby -- that includes today's address. We've heard from Provost Kornbluth about DKU. We did some bylaw stuff and we heard from Dean Nowicki about advising and the Washington Duke Program. We talked about the housing program and other stuff. But even taken together, these items actually amount to a very small fraction of what the Council does, because we have a whole lot of committees that do a lot of hard work for us on every aspect of the college. I'll give you a very brief, I promise I'll be brief, summary of what each committee did in the past year.

Starting with the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee was originally chaired by Julie Reynolds of Biology, but unfortunately Julie fell ill so she had to step down and our friend Jennifer Ahearn-Dodson has really kindly agreed to step up and chair. Thank you so much and she has done a fabulous job. The committee has reviewed assessment reports from different departments. They work with individual departments to improve their assessment plan. They host the luncheons for DUSs, review grant proposals and this year they actually launched an assessment values program with CIT. If you would like to learn more about the assessment committees and activities talk to Jennifer here.

Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs): Or want to serve on the committee.

Layton: Oh yes. That too. Just let me know. Shoot me an email. Then we have the Courses Committee that is chaired by Paul Manos from Biology. This is a very hard working committee. Sometimes during the semester they would meet every single week. Why is that? Because they have a whole lot of requests to deal with. They looked at 250 new course proposals. I didn't know we had so many courses. The number must be exploding. Plus a number of requests for code revision this year. So thank you for your hard work.

The Curriculum Committee chaired by David Malone. They serve in an advisory capacity and participate in the new curriculum goals on this campus and also at DKU. In addition, they review modifications to existing majors, minors, certificates, and vetted a whole bunch of proposals for different things, including in the pipeline we've got Museum Theory, Music Theater, Sexuality Studies, Science and Society, and we will probably be hearing about some of these next year. How exciting.

Then we have the Faculty Research Committee chaired by Rich Kay of Evolutionary Anthropology. This year, thanks to generous support from Dean Ashby, we were able to extend this award to non regular rank faculty as well. So far they have awarded 23 research grants, each about \$5,000 or so, and also 42 travel grants. Keep these applications coming. We have the Global Ed Committee, chaired by Ken Rogerson. This is another very hard working committee that meets every month and reviews a bunch of stuff: the faculty-led study away programs a number of Duke-in programs and petitions for study away programs. As you know study abroad is very popular with our students so the work of the Global Ed Committee cannot be overstated.

The Program II Committee, chaired by Jon Shaw of Biology, reviewed a bunch of Program II proposals and after that they wrote the students and asked some of them to resubmit. So far they have accepted 10 such proposals.

In addition to standing committees, we also have a couple of ad hoc committees. One such committee is the joint DKU Arts & Sciences Committee, chaired by Tom Robisheaux. This committee consists of members from the Courses Committee and Global Ed Committee, plus a few faculty that have interests in DKU. So the members of Courses Committee and Global Ed Committee, they are fabulous faculty. They do a lot of work in their own committees. In addition to that, they do double duty in this one. This committee reviews and approves new courses for DKU and this year they have approved 17 of these courses.

Okay, so of course there is ECASC. This is the group that I work most closely with. We meet every other week and we talk about issues that are of interest and concern to Arts & Sciences and we figure out the meeting agenda. This year the ECASC members are Jose María Rodríguez García from Romance Studies, John Brown from Music, Scott Lynch from Sociology, Mike Munger from Political Science, Owen Astrachan from Computer Science, and Chantal Reid from Biology. These are wonderful, thoughtful, very reasonable people that I have enjoyed working with a lot. So imagine my shock and how depressed I was when I realized that four of them, four, four of them are leaving me at the end of this year. I was like, "Hello?" So there is a total of seven, I guess the good thing is I do have Mike and Owen so you know if I start doing something stupid, somebody would not hesitate to tell me.

ECASC Election

Layton: Now on to the business of electing the next cohort of ECASC members.

For Humanities, we actually have two positions but I was only able identify two candidates willing to serve so we have Carol Apollonio from Slavics and also John Supko from Music. For Carol and John the representatives should have a ballot, if you do not have a ballot raise your hand and Mary will bring you one. You want vote. I mean vote wisely because I am stuck with whomever you elect. For these two folks, you will vote up or down or you can also vote for a write-in candidate, but please make sure that person is actually willing to serve. For Social Sciences, we have one position and we do have two candidates, that's good. We have Scott Lyncg from Sociology, so Scott actually has been with ECASC for one year as a interim member when Linda George stepped down. And also Ara Wilson from Women's Studies. Natural Sciences, we have Sherryl Broverman from Biology and Dick MacPhail from Chemistry. Okay so vote for one in Natural Sciences and one for Social Sciences. Go vote and we can collect your ballots later and I will announce the results at the end of this meeting.

Recognition of Lee Baker

This is probably the last Council meeting that Lee will attend as the -- I will he needs no introduction, but I am going to say a few words anyway. Lee was our Council chair over a decade ago and he also served as Trinity Dean for Academic Affairs for the past eight years. Lee has been a tremendous resource for the Council. He has given tons of advice, support, everything to ECASC and to me personally. We really appreciate all of that. A couple of months ago when Dean Ashby emailed and told us Lee is stepping down and asked us for nominations, I said, "I have the perfect person for that job. It's Lee Baker." I actually asked Lee, "Lee can I nominate you for your old job?" You know what he said to me? He said, "Anita, you are funny." Was I being funny? No, I was not trying to be funny. I was dead serious. But I take that to mean that he said no, so life goes on. This being probably your last Council meeting as Dean if you can say a few words to us that will be great.

Baker: Thank you so much for giving me two minutes to just reflect on what I consider a real partnership with Arts & Sciences Council as well as ECASC and the many committees. I think I've served with Tom Robisheaux, Susanne Shanahan, Ruth Day, yourself. I've gone through a lot of chairs and it has just been a really great partnership in so many ways. I think it's important to sort of reflect upon the role of Arts & Sciences Council. It is this body that sort of both evaluates and approves our undergraduate education. It does not go to APC. It does not go to the Board of Trustees. It just comes and stops and gets approved right here. That's a pretty important responsibility for this group and I have found Arts & Sciences Council to be a real partner in making education with real purpose at Duke University.

In some respects, we've been doing really important work with regard to sometimes big things, sometimes little things, but doing the Neuroscience major and the Global Health major, that was pretty big stuff. I mean, those were important discussions and we worked really hard and are really transforming the type of education that we do at Duke University. There were some small things that we did, but impactful. We eliminated the class rank, that stared at every student when they pulled up ACES, something small, but that was soul crushing for so many of the students who half of them were in the bottom of the class, right? Eliminating that was something big. Something also smaller, I think important, was providing transfer credit for our students that just go abroad, visit their family and go to a university like University of Wisconsin or something else in a different country. They are not study abroad. They don't get the privileges, but that was something really important as well.

But to me, I think one of the fundamental contributions *this* group has made in transforming the Duke experience is providing a different format for our students to pursue their educational pathways. By creating this experiential certificate program that we now have in Sustainability, Civic Engagement, and Innovation and Entrepreneurship, we have really enabled our students to seriously integrate their co-curricular learning with their sort of tradition academic learning. It's a game changer for Duke. We are leading the country in this space and I am proud that we worked it out slowly but surely through this body.

I am just very, as I sort of reflect upon my many years, all the deans I've worked for and all the council chairs, you know being able just to see the growth and development that our students have had in the types of programs we've done, the types of curriculum tweaks we've been doing and the small but big curricular enhancements that we've done at Duke University, I'm just really proud. I keep saying "we" because it takes a team effort and it really is the Arts & Sciences Council that makes the final decisions and I thank you for your leadership in this partnership. Thank you very much.

IDC Update

Layton: We will miss you. Okay. What can we do? Curriculum. We are going to have a brief update on IDC from Susanne, but before I give her the stage I have a confession to make. I will admit that when I look at the curriculum, I have a selfish motive. I will tell you what that is. This is my selfish motive. Some of you know who she is. If you don't I tell you who that is. That is an angel. That's an angel. This angel used to be a very small angel and I loved her from the bottom of my heart. When she grew older, I took her all over the world, including to Hong Kong which is where I grew up.

Now this angel is big. She is taller than me even when I am wearing heels she is a head above me. She has blue hair as you can see and she is a nerd that loves Doctor Who. This angel's name is Laura and she is my daughter. She is 12 years old in seventh grade. She loves school, do you know what her favorite subject is besides math? It's French. She loves French. I don't speak good French at all, but she loves French. She hates cheese but she will eat cheese if it is French cheese. She has a deal with me that I promise that I will take her to Paris and the rest of France and in return she is going to take French every single year from her middle school to high school all the way to college. Speaking of college she wants to come to Duke. Sometimes I will imagine her running around campus as a student, mostly trying to avoid her mom, but maybe she will ask me, "Mom, why am I taking these classes? Where do the requirements come from?" I will tell her, "Well Laura, several years ago, Mom was involved with this council thing and we decided to..." But I don't know how the story ends. You are going to decide how the story ends, so let's make this a good story. Let's work together and produce a curriculum that we are all proud of and a curriculum that can make Duke the best place ever for my angel Laura and all of her friends. Yes? Now we have Suzanne.

Suzanne Shanahan (IDC Chair): I just want to say, I don't know where this ends either, so if people are expecting that punch line today it is going to have to be in another time. Thank you, Anita. It is great to have a chance to give a sense of where we actually are and where we are not. I also just wanted to take a tiny minute to thank our hero Dean Baker, who has been such an extraordinary resource on the IDC, both in his wisdom and his insight, but he is the most affable cheerleader for our endeavor. It is just been extraordinary to have someone who is always buoyant and who does everything on the (inaudible) with such alacrity and every time I use that word I think of Dean Baker. Every time I see a bow-tie, I will think of you, and we know he will kind of continue to be a huge resource for us as we go forward.

I also wanted to kind of give a general thanks for the Council and to each of the departments who have over the past several months really engaged seriously with the tentative framework we outlined in January. The department feedback was really very tremendous and we have been methodically going through it over the past month or so. The departmental feedback and the many individual dissents we received, those were also superb, and lots of online and offline conversations we've had. We've also had now, I think it was about eight or nine, faculty led lunches with faculty from across campus. I think these were really a robust set of conversations that for the committee were helpful in that we were trying to thing how do we put these different views and perspectives together, so that has been just really, really important. For us, I think whether people liked the curriculum outline, whether they loathed it, whether they were nice in their comments or not nice in their comments, it is in fact all very, very helpful and I think that's important to note. I think in March, Gary noted many of the specifics that had emerged and have emerged over the past several months. I think many of these were things we anticipated, maybe were hoping would not emerge but did. "Over the last three meetings in particular we've been systematically going through them.

Just to super quickly recap, a pretty consistent theme is, "So what's with expectations? Do you really mean expectations? Do you really mean requirements? What's going on there? Wouldn't it be better just to require everything?" The notion of multiple depths, kind of the two orange and green trapezoid, I think a number of people thought a more simple distributional model might make sense. For many people the Duke experience, that first-year course, it's kind of like "what for? Why?" Other people liked it, but weren't really keen on the notion of themes. We've heard a lot about requirements of language and writing. There was a lot about advising and I think folks heard from David Rabiner recently. I think he is being very creative in thinking through things. That is not really our space – Steve Nowicki and David are working really hard there. So lots of consistency across thoughts.

I think where we are in fact having greater challenges in reconciling the different feedback we've received is that it seemed that our faculty think about what the students can and should do pretty differently. I think there are a number of faculty who imagine a curriculum that really should be something fairly prescriptive. There are other faculty who think the curriculum should be much more open ended and then there are folks who are kind of in between. I think reconciling that tension is where we have really been spending a lot of energy and effort. How do we reconcile those different views?

That said, I'd also like to note three things that have emerged in conversations largely with folks, many of lunches, etc., that I think were new ideas that did surprise us somewhat. The first is as I think I've said in every discussion about the curriculum, we approached this revision where the major was in fact a sacred cow. I think when we came to departments that was the first thing we said. "We are leaving your major alone." Interestingly there has been a lot of thought about, "well maybe we should take this opportunity to consider the major differently." This has been something that was unexpected and interesting. There have been several conversations where the suggestion that the 10 course limit should be reduced. Maybe we want to think about departments offering majors that have differential numbers of requirements, some far fewer, others for students who want to pursue Ph. D. in field. How do we think about the major as taking less degrees of freedom and really being consistent with the notions of liberal arts?

I think the other place we have heard interesting feedback is around the notion of the Duke experience, Duke 101, this particular course. I think lots of folks were challenged by the idea there could be this format. People really liked the idea of more intimate seminars. There was a lot of disconcertion with the notion of that there would be a unifying theme, but how do we think about a first-year experience differently? Interestingly, a number of people have suggested that one course is not in fact enough. Maybe what we need to do is think about models that are thematic clusters a la FOCUS so that folks not doing FOCUS have a similar experience. Remember partly what we were trying to achieve in that course was putting different epistemologies in the dialogue, which I think we all know folks who have taught FOCUS, students who have been in FOCUS, this is really one of the jewels of the Duke undergraduate experience and how might we imagine those opportunities being broadened for students and if we have this nifty model, what can we learn from that in thinking about first-year experience? It's both the objective of putting these in dialogue, these different ways of thinking, theoretical bodies, and then also providing some sort of common experience for students. So there has been a lot of interest and thought there.

I think a final thing we've heard in several conversations again a bit of a surprise, is the idea that maybe 34 courses is not in fact enough. This is oddly something we've heard from some faculty, from many students, from various alums, etc. If you imagine any curriculum as an optimization exercise and you have 34 degrees of freedom, maybe part of problem is you need more degrees of freedom. This is something where there have been several champions of this idea and several people have been horrified by the notion that when you look across our peers we're about right currently. I think it will be sort of a

departure from where folks are now. I will also say that while we require 34 credits for graduation, the average student does close to 36. So again, something new that folks have put out there.

So where is it we are going from here? I am a really idealistic person and that is an important caveat to the next moment. I think in a perfect world, and I am looking to my committee members so they will keep nodding, is that we will actually come back in early fall with something that is a proposal, that has taken on board the different feedback, trying to reconcile the points of difference and bring it back to you all for consideration and an up or down vote in the fall. That's the optimistic view. I think it depends on how much energy we can rally over the summer but that is the mission. There you go. Yeah. What that will look like still largely TBA. So I can take a couple questions.

Steve Nowicki (DVPUE): I would like to just make a comment for the record. I think the committee has done a lot of fabulous hard work and the end is not clear but I think we really, as a faculty, should appreciate the extraordinary work, both the initial ideas and the acceptance of feedback that you've done. I and I am sure all of my colleagues are very thankful for the amount of effort you have put in.

Shanahan: I know on behalf of the entire committee because this has been a slog at various points, we appreciate this. But I do think for us what has been so exciting is the engagement of the faculty. We really do need it, love it or hate it. The people are saying what is meaningful to them and what they would like to be taught and what they would like teaching, it's just an extraordinary moment. I think it's a cool thing for us.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): As I understood this was supposed to be a three-year process of this duration and we the faculty didn't get a look at this until somewhere around the end of last semester, beginning of this semester, so that have an up-or-down vote in the fall seems quite a short runway.

Layton: Can you speak up?

Shanahan: She said that she understood this to be a three-year process and so an up-or-down vote in the fall seems to be a short runway. Certainly if people are not comfortable doing that in the fall, right, as we've said we will follow in your lead. I guess from the committee's perspective we are trying to keep it rolling, trying to be optimistic, energized, but we will follow the faculty's lead. If the faculty is not ready there will not be a vote.

Janan: So how do individual faculty express that?

Baker: Wasn't the three-year process two years of planning and then one year of implementation? Or was it three years of planning and then the fourth will be process?

Shanahan: If we stick to the three years, we would have to vote no later than this time next year, and this may take longer than that. I think the last, the February meeting, I said that we could all be here a couple years from now. I think we are going to see how it goes.

Janan: But going back to my question, how would faculty express the idea that this was premature if they felt that way?

Shanahan: So I think there is a couple of things. We will continue to have conversations in this forum. We are going to have departmental meetings and I think there will be an additional set of forums in the fall as well so there will multiple opportunities for people. But we will have something more substantive on the table in the fall.

Mark Chaves (Sociology): I know the committee is thinking of this as one whole thing, one up and down vote. One thought that I've had is it has occurred to me that there are pieces of this that are separable. It's possible that one could imagine working out the details really well on one piece and achieving [crosstalk 00:31:27] more or less can consist with one piece without the other pieces so one could imagine anyway that more staged process where there are different pieces coming at different times. Is that something you are pondering or are you fully committed to the whole thing?

Shanahan: I think this is something that every other meeting we discuss: whether there are elements that we would put forward as separately or not. I think we really have to agree as a whole whether that makes sense. Because I think you are absolutely right, at this point we do not know what would make more sense.

Layton: Okay, thank you.

Deans' Address

Layton: Now this is what you came here to hear. Dean Ashby is going to talk to us and inform us of the progress we have made toward the three Arts & Sciences strategic things. What are those things? Excellence, Leadership and Mentoring, and Diversity.

Valerie Ashby (Dean): Thank you so much for the time and meeting today Let me just start off by joining the Lee Baker fan club. What I'll tell you is that when I took this job, I think I said this before when I was here in the fall, that the best gift that Laurie left me was the Dean's staff. Amazing, amazing group of people. I knew it on day 1, but on whatever day this is, I am 100% sure. The only thing that she didn't tell me is that I was going to lose Lee Baker a year from now. I also nominated Lee Baker, but that didn't work out, but I wish it would have. I can't tell you the breadth of what Lee does. You know it better than I do. You've known him over the years. But what Lee does for me is creatively problem solve in a way that is beneficial, it's always, he comes in and he says, "I have a win-win." I absolutely love that. There is nobody like him in this realm for sure. He's not going anywhere, but he is certainly going to be missed in the Dean's office.

What I wanted to do is just bring you up to speed on the kinds of things that have been happening over the last year. What I'll say is we've been really busy and in very good ways. You heard the three strategic things that we mentioned in the fall. I'll tell you what's happened. I was here in September and interestingly enough those were the things in September and today they seem even more relevant to me. Since that time we started off and visited -- I think at this point I had visited 30 of the 32 departments in Trinity. Which has been fantastic to go to your faculty meetings and to meet you and to hear your concerns and to talk to you about what is happening in Trinity. That has been fantastic.

In that process, I'll tell you roughly where we are on those three things. On the theme of Excellence, I want to talk first about Arts and Humanities. When we started talking the theme of Excellence, what we were saying is that one, in the college what we found was variable excellence and we really wanted to take a look at how we could actually increase the excellence across the board, have more consistent excellence across our departments. We also started counting excellence and describing it in a way that we all know it to be, in the way of research, teaching, and service and really trying to put an emphasis on the entirety of that in our faculty.

In the Arts and Humanities, I'll just hit some pride points of things that I think are really moving us forward as far as excellence is concerned. This is Rick Powell's area and we are working as you know, we are moving forward on the approval of new PhD. in Computational Media, Arts and Culture. That's jointly administered with Art, Art History & Visual Studies, Literature, and FHI which is I think a fantastic move forward.

We are working closely with Scott Lindroth on the Arts and particularly we are thinking about how we can actually raise even more so the visibility of the Arts as we move to think about opening this new building. We want that to be a big deal. Not just the opening of a space, which is fantastic, but the question is how do we highlight all the excellent work that is going on in the Arts as we are opening this new space or thinking about opening this new space. We are starting to work diligently, I don't see Purnima in here or Tommy, but on an MFA in Dance which I think is going to be thrilling.

Also I'll just mention here, Rick Powell, of course, is stepping down and Gennifer Weisenfeld is coming into his place. You saw the announcement on that, so I am thrilled to have Gennifer. But it's a sad day for me, because I am telling you, I met Srinivas on day three that I was here and the moment he stepped in the room and sat down with me I thought, "Uh oh something is getting ready to happen here." I knew I was going to be better when he left that room. I mean, what I learned from him in the first three seconds I thought, "Oh my goodness. You are an extraordinary human being." And so Rick stepped into that space for this year and it has been a pleasure to work with Rick. What you may not know is that Srinivas let me meet with him every chance that I could, I just wanted to hear, just sit down and talk, teach me about what you are thinking in the Humanities. It was, the first time I met him I said, "Can we do this every time you are available?" It was fantastic. He gave me meeting after meeting after meeting to just hear his thoughts and I was better every time I talked to him. It's a sad day. I am grateful for Rick and I am grateful for Gennifer who is going to step into this space. I think we will continue to move forward in great ways in the Arts and Humanities.

In Social Sciences, I am only going to hit some highlights of things that have happened this year. Many more excellent things have happened and certainly the faculty have published numerous books and received several awards. In the Social Sciences, I am going to focus on the junior hires we have made because I think there are some pretty critical junior hires. We have two folks in Econ, Mathias Kehrig and Brian Weller, who are outstanding. We hired one person in Political Science, Daniel Stegmuller; two in Psychology and Neuroscience, Sara Gaither and Elika Bergelson; one in Sociology, Tyson Brown; and one in History, Adam Mestyan. I mention these young people because one of the things that we are doing differently around our junior faculty hiring is that the dean and the dean get to meet every junior faculty hire which is wonderful. So I had the opportunity to meet these young people, to hear their thoughts about teaching, research, and service and how they see themselves leading at Duke in the future and their research. In that crowd, I will mention that there are a couple hires there that are really awesome, not only excellent, but are addressing a few of our diversity needs. Two of those folks are African American scholars and I am proud that we have moved forward in some of those hires.

In the Natural Sciences, I'll highlight a couple of things here. I'll pick on Computer Science for a moment. In Computer Science, we are working on curriculum changes. Several of our science departments are working on curriculum changes as far as our initial introductory types of classes and how we are teaching it, more active learning techniques and engaging our students. Computer Science is now on board with this and we are working collaboratively also with Electrical and Computer Engineering to actually reconfigure the first couple of courses in Computer Science. This was actually based on a gift from a donor that we had who wanted to see more engagement of our students in the first and second year but also focus on women in Computer Science. This is a real focus of this gift, which is great when the gift matches your own vision and desired. When people have a gift and they want you to do something you

don't want to do that's money you want to snatch up. But this was money we were happy to take. We are working on the curriculum in Computer Science and on those classes, making them have more application earlier on, making them really engage students in a way where all students persist longer, but certainly where women persist longer and there is data on this obviously that we are following here.

There's also a component of this piece of this Computer Science work that we are doing that is an internship program in Silicon Valley for women in Computer Science, matching them with our alums who are women in Silicon Valley who have been quite successful. This summer will be the first summer for this Women in Computer Science internship program that will happen in Silicon Valley. That is exciting. It builds on efforts that Laurie really started by hiring Ingrid Daubechies in Math for women in science. We continue to support those efforts for all women in science. Sally adds to this by starting this Quantitative Sciences Initiative, where we are looking to strengthen that part of it where we have pockets of expertise but we are really trying to codify and raise the visibility of the quantitative sciences of Duke in a way that makes us a leader nationally and internationally in that area.

I will mention as far as the undergraduate piece is concerned and Lee Baker, we have successfully implemented this four-year dean model and we also have hired four new deans that really represent not only excellence but our commitment to diversity, so that is an exciting area also as far as excellence is concerned.

Switch gears here to talk our second strategic goal, which is around leadership and mentoring. This was a place where I mentioned to you before where I was surprised at Duke that we did not have any version of faculty leadership development, professional development, support for our leaders, identification of talent, growing our young scholars to be leaders although the room is full of leaders, but we did not have a mechanism for that or support for the people who actually do this kind of work. We have been working on that and that is leadership/mentoring. That gets put into one bucket because while we didn't have a leadership initiative, we also had variable mentoring across the departments. I could go into one department and talk to faculty members getting great mentoring and another one that was getting nothing in the same department.

That variability is everything that is against excellence, which is the first goal. Our faculty are our core of the excellence. They are that core and so we made this investment by hiring and in some cases we were saying, "Good luck with that and we will check in with you in six years." That's not a way we typically invest in anything that really matters to us. The mentoring piece, I will talk about that first. It has been an excellent pleasure doing the mentoring piece. If you are an assistant professor and you are in this room you have probably been to one of the mentoring sessions. We had six of these in the fall by division. If you ever are having a bad day and we are having one of these meetings, you wish you could come, let me tell you. So, by division all the assistant professors sit in the room, so all the Humanities assistant professors, all of the Social Science, all of the Natural Science, and they meet with their dean and also with Kevin Moore and with me. They ask every and any question that they could possibly want to ask that they would never ask you. They would never ask in a faculty meeting. They may be afraid to ask their senior colleagues. All questions about APT, how do you handle various relationships, how do you run your group, why does Duke do this way, why does my department do this this way? And so we are able to have a confidential and I think really helpful conversation, and we did six of those, two per division in the fall, and in the spring we decided that we would actually put all of the assistant professors regardless of division together and we did two of those. We just held the second one yesterday. It was amazing because when I asked them which version did you like? They said, both, which was fabulous. They said we got great information by division, but I love hearing what my colleagues are doing across campus and what their experiences are and this is helpful to me also. We will continue to evaluate that and continue it in the fall with our assistant professors.

We also started in the spring with mentoring of our associate professors. That is fascinating because these are people with tenure. We are talking about those tenure track associate professors and we met with those who were in their first three years. We did that based on some data and also just conversation, really just understanding that that is where people are having a hard time. You go through all of this. You run, and run and run. You have tenure and now what? The clock goes away. Your protection goes away as far as we have protected you from all of this service, it goes away and you are tired. Maybe your grants are about to go away also, if you are a grant-based person. These people also, it is documented that they have the lowest morale of all three because that transition is hard. Maybe you didn't experience that if you are in this room, but several of them did. We had a couple of the associate professor meetings. We didn't do it by division. We did do it by division, I take it back ... so we had three by division. We just asked them what do you need? How would you like to see us support you? They all had, by division, every division was different so we will evaluate the data we received from them, that feedback and we will put something in place for them also in the fall.

As far as the leadership piece, we also did this with the chairs. The chairs had not been meeting in any regular way together. They usual met at the beginning of the year and that was it. We met with chairs monthly, which was fabulous. I need to hear from them, we have ideas about things that we want to do and we ran that past the chairs as a matter fact the way that we ran the associate professor mentoring was totally inspired by the feedback the chairs gave us as to how we should approach them. Plus they didn't share best practices with each other and I hope they feel more supported from us, so that they have continuous feedback and support on a monthly basis. That also will be evaluated over the summer and we will see what happens as far as what that looks like in the fall.

Then finally on the leadership side, also on the leadership side, we will do a thorough evaluation of a couple of programs around the country that are leading in faculty development and professional development. There are some examples on our campus. There is the (inaudible) program that is in the School of Medicine. There is work in Kyle Cavanaugh's office that is more professional development, more staff focused, just some things that we can learn there. We also tried to get feedback from faculty to really see what it is that you would like to see us do going forward to support you. Now as far as I am concerned what I don't want is to first to grow great people and then for them to decide that the only that they can do the next thing that they want to do is to go somewhere else. Sometimes that will happen but it should not happen because I did not provide what you needed and/or support you as you were growing in your careers so that you could be everything that you wanted to be right here at Duke, if that is your choice. That is all in process.

The last thing I'll talk about is diversity. You guys have heard me say this 100 times. It is the very definition of a liberal arts education, so we don't ever debate the value of diversity. It's how we educate our students on purpose. We value that breadth of thinking and so we see diversity as directly linked to excellence. Period. Learning the most from whom you have the least in common, you've heard me say it 100 million times. Interestingly enough I was here in September and we said diversity is important in September. A lot has happened since September. People have told me, "Wow, this was some year for you," and I said, "yeah it really was." A lot has happened. The good news is that we were already there. We didn't have to scramble and think about "is diversity something we are going to focus on now because of an event." No, it was already a priority.

Here is what has happened. We have the Trinity Diversity Advisory Committee, which is faculty and staff -- I just highlight that it is faculty *and* staff because that is a really important component for us. We have staff representation there. They have been meeting since the beginning of the spring semester every

other week. They are starting to now narrow down into activities in how they would like to see us move forward. They are working on three areas over which Trinity has any version of control. Sometimes people want me to make world peace. I love that idea but I don't actually have that under my control. The charge for the committee was think about Trinity's perks, Trinity's mission and the things that we can do no matter what. We decided to focus on the topics education, conversations, and communications. The educational piece could be everything from something that might be in the curriculum and/or not or outside of the classroom. In that is things like our implicit bias training which we are doing now for all faculty. I offered implicit bias training to all the staff, there are 93 staff members in Trinity, voluntarily. I offered it in November this is the training that Ben Reese does, and 80 of them have taken it voluntarily. We require actual implicit bias training for any of our search committee, so if you search for a faculty member you must take implicit bias training. The question is what other types of educational conversations or workshops -- I'm not sure -- what is the educational piece going to look like for faculty, staff, and students in Trinity. The second thing that I will tell you about the TDAC is that they will continue to work over the, they won't work over the summer, I'll work over the summer, Dean's staff will work over the summer and we will be talking about what are the actual specifics of that plan.

Around the diversity issue, we also have a student committee. That student committee has 17 students and they will actually be meeting for the very first time on Friday and we will have a couple of meetings before the end of the semester. They too will be thinking about education, conversations, communications. I'll back up and just say, on the conversations piece, the focus here totally ... So, first of all if you were at a forum in October and November, whenever that happened, three people sitting on a stage talking to 1,000 is not a conversation. It was meaningful and it was necessary, but that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about what are the ongoing conversations that we should consistently be having around this topic with faculty, staff, and students and what is the structure that we put around that to make that happen.

Then on the communications piece, it is different than conversations for us. When we talk about communications, we are saying, so for example some of the things I'm telling you here you don't know, that means there is poor communication. When I run into a student out here and they say, "Dean Ashby, you said that you were going to be in conversation with us." I say, "I've had eight million with your colleagues. They didn't tell you?" Right. They said -- this is a quote -- "They tell us about the parties but they didn't tell us that they were meeting with you." So it is incumbent upon us to communicate well what we are doing because otherwise people will either make up their own narrative or assume we are doing nothing. So we are going to try to think about how we communicate. You've seen a couple of those communications from me. By the way, we've been sending those to faculty, staff, and to students. Two or three times a semester, not to overwhelm you, we will update you on what is Trinity doing, not just on the topic of diversity but generally because we really need people to be engaged and in the loop.

I will say a couple more things about diversity and then I will stop and you guys can ask me whatever questions you would like. I mentioned to you the two hires we were able to make in Social Sciences around supporting diversity. I also mentioned the Teaching for Racial Justice pilot. This is with FHI and financial support from Sally, so thank the Provost Kornbluth for this. It was a pilot program for about 20 faculty members from about 10 departments, I think, I may have the number too big. It's really thinking about how to establish a culture of inquiry without fear in your classroom on various topics. By the way, it doesn't matter if you are teaching biology or if you are teaching art history. You have a diverse classroom. How do you engage that classroom? How do you even do self-assessment of your own attitudes so you can understand your assumptions when you are in that classroom?

We are getting the feedback and the data now it seems to be pretty positive from the faculty that were in the pilot, and the question is, do we want to expand that to more faculty and how we would actually do that? TDAC, this diversity committee, will talk more about that. We also I should mention -- and Lee Willard I am looking here -- about the HHMI faculty collaboratory, which is wonderful. This has really put the focus on the science courses and it's teaching science, trying to think about how you teach science to all students. This is with active learning pedagogues, so there are various ways that we can approach this diversity thing that we are talking about.

The last thing I'll mention is that we are partnering well, I think, with Student Affairs. I am excited about this. Working with Larry Moneta and also the Provost's Office, we have had I think six to eight meetings with the concerned student groups who read demands in the second forum. There were three student groups, African American students, Asian American students, and Latino students, and we are in ongoing conversations and moving things forward in a way that is really positive. The students know that we are listening because we are responding and to me that is a conversation. Their biggest concern is are you going to stop talking to us at some point? The answer is "Why would we do that? No. We're in." The things that you are talking about are our priority. The question is how do we help develop more for the benefit of all of our students. Those have been exciting conversations and more people should know that we are having those conversations. That speaks to the communications piece that we really need to work on.

Okay so I think I'm at the end here, and the thing for us is that excellence is the same and is not different than really focusing on the leadership/mentoring piece. You can't have one without the other and certainly if you are not thinking about diversity you are not as good as you think you are. If you haven't really opened yourself up to all of the possibilities of different ways of thinking and different experiences we can't be as good as we can. All of that is where we are heading and I will stop there. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have.

Lynn Smith Lovin (Sociology): Originally the Quantitative Science Initiative was going to include both the Natural and the Social Sciences, and my understanding that certain people evolved in some of those committees did quite a bit of work to come up with interesting and exciting ideas in Social Sciences so that at some point the decision I believe at the Provost level was made to concentrate on the Natural Sciences. Maybe you can fill me in. I know that wasn't necessarily your decision, but if you can fill me in on the rationale of that restriction of the program and also why it was changed after people begun... I wasn't one of the people who did the work, but I know that some people did put a lot of work into it.

Ashby: So this question has been asked of me twice in the past two days and I haven't looked at Sally's face in that time frame. I will be able to say more about that because it doesn't run through me. We talk about it a lot. I'm not sure. I had this question asked by someone in Political Science who I think walked through a similar process and then at the end it didn't quite work out for them. I don't know; I will find out more information about that because what I don't want is for us to do -- let's just say I was on an NSF career panel, 100 proposals were submitted and only three were funded. People spend a lot of time, so I want to make sure that that is not happening and there is clarity around what the Quantitative Sciences Initiative is going to be. My sense is that it's an ever changing program, so I will have to find out more about that.

The one piece that I will say and I didn't mention, one of the hires that I'm excited about, it's not particularly in a Social Science department. It's actually the only hire that's been made so far, it's Peter David Hoff. Those of you in the audience may not know who Peter Hoff is, but a lot of his work has implications in the Social Sciences obviously, but he is not going to sit in a Social Sciences department. Actually a part of his hire is being owned specifically by Econ for the reasons you might guess.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): Just a follow-up about the Quantitative Initiative which I realize does not run through your office, but it relates to hiring in general. We had a large long discussion about it in the Biology faculty meeting. When you have target of opportunity hires, which is what this is, basically where there is not an ad. We ask people think about their networks. We ended up with three white people, because when you are asking people to think about their networks people say, "Oh well he gave a great meeting, we had a beer." So the whole target of opportunity process tends to skew away from where Duke is moving. We talked about this very exclusively in a faculty meeting. We keep saying we want diversity which means we should be able to grow young talent in new people but with target of opportunities, there are fewer women in full professor, there are fewer minorities in full professor, and it seems to be a divergence in policy and then in the implication, the way we structure the hires is not getting to where we want to be.

Ashby: That's a good point. I appreciate that. A couple things I would say: The folks who are actually making the final decision, it's a fascinating process the way they've actually set it up. It's not like any other faculty process. You basically generate your person, you deliver it to the committee, they deliberate and they decide if they are going to allow you to hire this person based on whether they think it fits in the Quantitative Initiative. I think it's pretty critical for that committee to be thinking about where we are going in the sciences as a whole, not just for the quantitative piece, but the fact that we actually are trying to build women in the sciences. There are fewer women at the top level in the sciences. That's feedback that's worth sharing for them to consider, and I don't think they are anti-junior faculty, but I need to emphasize that that could skew.

Broverman: That's been the case in the past. That structure of asking faculty to self identify colleagues to hire doesn't necessarily get you the widest net and we are missing critical people.

Frances Hasso (Women's Studies): I have a question about you mentioned the staff and diversity. I was sort of wondering given what's been going on in the last month on campus whether any of what you are talking about relates to... because then you said 91, so I thought you were thinking of staff expansively. I wasn't really sure what you meant when you said 91 people, so I wondered what is happening in relation to the labor staff, student, faculty questions. I would appreciate that.

The other question I have is really about the status of ICS. There are many, many faculty who are working behind the scenes and it's really not clear what is happening to the program. It is also not clear the degree to which the Trinity is committed to the program in a way beyond the commitment contingent of labor, so given that this is the undergraduate global studies intellectual program, crossing a number of departments and languages, and we value international and the global, it would be really great, you don't have to do it now, at some point to get some sense from you as the Dean of Trinity Arts & Sciences where you see ICS in that. I don't want to put you on the spot. You don't have to do it now.

Ashby: Well let me speak to the first question around staff because I want to make sure I understood all parts of that question.

Hasso: You talked about these, it was about communication, conversation. You said that there are these things that are happening and you talked about diversity and you talked about staff. I guess given what's been going on around us in our classrooms, students are rioting. Various things are happening. These are major concerns for many of us. I wondered if staff for you meant the lets say "Non-" which staff do you mean?

Ashby: Okay I understand now. So Beverly, who cleans upstairs in my building, that's who you asked me about. I know exactly to whom you are asking about. The degree that I ... so here is what's in my wheel house. Here is where we talk. I am horribly concerned about every staff member on this campus and I am not talking about the staff who might be in this room. I am talking about the staff who basically are invisible but who are keeping this place going, the grounds staff you know, horribly concerned, and that also is directly tied to diversity just by the very nature of who they are. My part in that as Trinity Dean is to express that concern and to weigh in on making sure that those staff are appreciated and/or compensated in ways that are fair. This is a Kyle Cavanaugh kind of discussion; it is at that level.

As far as the other staff, the 93 other staff in Trinity who could be in this room. We will engage in conversations with those staff in the faculty, students, and staff piece. What I'm curious to see and hear from TDAC is how do we address the other group of staff. Do we? How we do that? How we support those staff who we are looking at every day who are not necessarily in the professional ranks of staff. I don't know the answer to that. It's really concerning to me, first of all because they are human beings. Two, because the university is built on their backs, and three, because those are people who are engaging with our students in a supportive way who often when they can't talk to us they'll stop and talk to that person, especially some of our underrepresented students. How we make sure that we give voice for people who are less powerful is really important, so the committee will think about -- I'm pointing at Janie because she is on the committee. Janie's is on every committee. We will think about what that actually means, the what if, what should, how could, Trinity support that version of staff that is critical.

As far as the professional staff is concerned, I am all over my chairs and faculty colleagues that you better treat your professional staff well. That's not even an option. We also have actually, you know there is not a lot I can do about professional staff salaries, but we have supplied to every single chair -- and I want more of them to take me up on this -- funding so that you can do something appreciative for your staff. You'd be surprised how much it actually matters. I can't change your bottom line every month, but how is it that you can actually show appreciation to your staff in a significant way on a consistent basis and we will provide the funding for you to do that. All the chairs have to do is request it. That's high on my list and I hear you. I am not sure how to effect that other group of staff just yet.

As far as ICS is concerned, I love ICS. I love ICS students. I tell Dean Baker all the time when I travel and I talk to students and faculty around the country, our students who are different places around the country, say what's your major? I say, is this a setup? They all say ICS. There are not that many ICS majors, but I tend to run into them. It's an incredibly valuable program. Lee and Linda have done yeoman's work on this. They have really been working all year as you are aware to really think about what is the structure that is going to stabilize that with the reality that it is not going to be another department. Right? There are programs that are not ever going to be, I won't say ever -- today there is no funding for that to be a department. The question is how do you make that a stable entity with good faculty leadership, good mentoring for the POPs that are in that program, good advising for the students that are in that program given that what I'm working with in the bank, and that is the hard part. I don't think it's impossible. I think we are almost there. I am going to follow my deans here who are brilliantly leading me on this and my hope is that we can have this resolved sooner rather than later.

This falls into that ... It's fascinating, I've got 650 faculty and when I look for strong leadership for any entity it is not trivial. It is not trivial. I mean literally bargaining with the last 12 chairs, it was like pulling teeth. That's not okay. We've got really wonderful people here who are quite capable and for some reason some versions of the service are not attractive. Now I get it; not everybody is going to love being a chair like I did, that's just a sickness that I have, but there ought to be more enthusiasm about the leadership piece for people who would be really positive outstanding leaders. Getting people to really step up into

that, knowing that they are going to be supported is a really big deal. Speaking of great leaders, I've got two, Linda and Lee, we will follow them and we will get there.

ECASC Election Results

Layton: Well thank you. Thank you so much. I now have the results for ECASC: so for Humanities we will welcome Carol Apollonio and John Supko, surprise, surprise. For Natural Sciences, we will welcome Sherryl Broverman from Biology. For Social Sciences, Ara Wilson from Women's Studies. I look forward to working with all of you.

Now I think that's it. We conclude the last council meeting of this year.