

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL
102 ALLEN BLDG
CAMPUS BOX 90029

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, October 13, 2016

Call to Order

A&S Council Chair Anita Layton: Hello. Welcome to the second Council meeting of the year.. We will start by approving last council meeting's minutes. They have been put on the Sakai site, you have all read them. Any corrections, comments? No? Motion?

[A motion to approve the minutes was seconded. The minutes were approved.]

Update on IDC

Before going through the 4+1 program, we had an e-mail update from Suzanne Shanahan about the IDC, so I just want to talk about it a little bit and focus on the timeline and where we're going.

I just want to start with the goals. It's good to keep those in mind as we're having discussion. The goal of new curriculum includes the following. We want the curriculum to be a defining feature of our Duke education. We want the students to be inspired by the ideas and questions and use their intellectual passion to shape their pathways. We would like the students to seriously engage with scholarly research: that is a distinction of Duke's liberal Arts & Sciences education. We would like the students to be intellectually engaged both inside and outside the classroom. Okay? I would say these goals are not controversial, but maybe how to get there is what we need to decide and agree on. Yes?

So we had a framing document distributed in January. We had lots of feedback. What I want to do is to highlight key aspects of that document that the IDC committee is revising. Then I want to talk about the timeline and about what is going to happen when. Then we can discuss them.

Where are we? The feedback:

We need more structure, especially early on. Yes. Okay. There is a subcommittee formed chaired by Denise Comer to explore options for the Duke experience for the first year incoming class. That is on-going.

We dislike the expectation. My first draft of this slide, I wrote hate expectations, and then I thought, Anita, you should be more diplomatic. That's not my nature but I try. So I wrote this

slide instead. Okay. The IDC committee is converting expectations into requirements, so expectations are out and requirements are in.

You remember in the January document, students are required to have a major plus a depth in a different field? It turns out that's not very popular. So the committee is considering a secondary depth requirement that can be satisfied through a number of options. It could be a self-designed sequence of courses. Another option can be a global experience that need to also plug in some required approved set of courses that would prepare the student for that experience.

What ideas are still there? The major's still there of course, mentored research is still there. Then there is this new pass-fail proposal, so the idea is to allow the student to have X chances to make a course and a grade, poof, disappear from their transcript so they can keep their pristine academic record while exploring things that they're not so good at, like Anita and philosophy. I got a B in that. I was an undergrad. That is my B in philosophy and it stayed there.

Where are we? Where are we going? Now it's October 13th. Late October, in just a couple of weeks, we will get a memo that outlines the revised IDC proposal. Similar to what you got in January, my understanding. Then following that there will be meetings with faculty, staff, and students, and the goal is in spring, maybe January, there's going to be a more formal proposal. I put a question mark in January because how much work there is to do depends on -- between now and January -- depends on the feedback. It's somewhat difficult to gauge. Hopefully January.

You're going to have an update, a memo, by the end of the month. You are going to study it really, really, really hard and then you're going to have an opinion, and where are you going to go to get yourself heard? Well there are town hall meetings. There are more, but these are what I know, fresh off the press, two hours ago I got this information. There are additional meetings, town hall, everybody welcome. Bring yourself, bring your colleagues. There are three day sessions, one for each division: the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. There are going to be additional meetings set up, I'm sure, but I don't have specific dates and times for those yet.

Okay, so question? Yes? Question?

Frances Hasso, Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Studies: Can I see the first slide again? The goals one. Sorry, I wasn't fast enough.

Layton: Sure. These are actually peeled off of the e-mail. I plagiarized.

Hasso: No, no, I get it. Just because you said, I guess you said the goals are agreed upon, but my sense is ...

Layton: Did I say agreed upon or not controversial? I meant not controversial.

Hasso: You said not controversial. Some people are talking about bullet two. What does purposeful mean? That's all. I just want to get that on the record, that there's some debate about

how purposeful and what does purposeful mean for 18-22 year olds in the context of a liberal arts education?

Layton: That's a point very well taken. Thank you, Frances. Yes?

Reeve Huston (History): Two things. I don't know what the broad contours of the pass-fail are. You made it sound as if you can switch from a grade to a pass-fail after you received the grade? Or is it something where you make the decision at the beginning of the course?

Layton: I don't think the specifics are all pinned down. I have heard discussions. I'm not part of the committee. I'm not a regular member, I'm an ex-officio. I appear there because they have nice wine that I can watch people drink and I like to snack. A pass-fail, the discussion I heard, you can take the class and at some point you can either transfer to pass-fail or have the option of having it disappear from the transcript. I want to emphasize that's still under discussion. There is a lot of fluidity.

Josh Sosin, Classical Studies: I'm an interloper here. Maybe we'll learn in more detail in November, but I have a question about the feedback: dislike expectations, response: convert expectations to requirements. That's a little ambiguous. I think I heard in discussions of the original proposed framework both dislike of expectations per se and dislike of the things that were articulated in the expectations. Could you clarify, do you mean that the expectations as written were converted into requirements or that their content was reformulated and that was converted into requirements? Because those are two different things and substance.

Layton: Yeah so Josh, I wish I knew the answer to your question. I don't know. My understanding is there is a bigger vote because I have seen the expectation, the prose, the description for each expectation being revised. I know some of them have been revised and I also understand that we are converting the expectation to requirement. Exactly how I don't think there is a 100% decision on it yet. I will have to ask you to have patience for 18 more days. Now is the 13th, okay? End of October, 31st, 18 more days. We can count on all our phalanges. Yes?

Huston: Process. Are there going to be other forums besides the divisional town hall meetings?

Layton: I hope so. I hope so.

Huston: Yeah, because those sound great but they're awfully big and ...

Layton: Yes. Yes. I certainly hope so. I hope that there can be deep discussion with specifics at the council meeting. I hope there will be smaller meetings. We're still working these out. Like I said, I got this information just a couple hours ago. I am sure there will be more.

Inge Walther (German): I'm assuming that if one's teaching at the time your division is meeting, you can attend one of the other divisional meetings? Because you're humanities, you won't be barred from the social sciences?

Layton: No! No! If anybody say no, have them call me. I will walk you in the meeting. Yes you can go! Definitely.

4+1 Program

Layton: So now the 4+1 Program. Please welcome Provost Kornbluth and John Klingensmith

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): I won't be too long since you all have gotten the document. Where this came from was a number of different schools have asked about 4+1 programs and we already actually have 4+1 programs on campus, in the engineering school, for instance, where they're controlling their own curriculum. They've already got some 4+1 programs. This came up maybe almost two years ago and I charged a committee that Keith Whitfield actually chaired, to just come up with an evaluation of 4+1 programs and think about what it might mean for the university. Just a couple of comments and then John, who was deeply involved in the committee, can say a few words about it as well.

The motivation for this was not really to grossly expand the number of students in Master's degrees or anything like that. It was twofold. One is there are some programs, Master's programs, that really feel that there are top quality Duke students who are really interested in their programs, and they do it as a way to attract students who are really interested into a Duke Master's program rather than going to a Master's program elsewhere. That's one thing. The other thing is I view this as part of the overall discussion on the expense of Master's programs for students who want to get Master's degrees. Frequently, students get a Master's degree, the goal obviously is some particular career goal, not necessarily people who on their way getting their PhD, although there are people who are interested in trying out a Master's as a first step. For the students who view that as a terminal degree where they really feel they need it for a job or they want it for their career path, Master's degrees are expensive. They may not always be going into a career that's going to earn them a lot of money and we wanted to think of a way that we could expedite students getting a Master's degree within the framework of their university experience and not have to pay as much money to do it.

Now you can say, "Well why don't you lower the cost of Master's programs across the board." Good idea, except we don't have the economy to do that. In any event, that was the thinking behind it. So John and I got together, and really was talking about logistics. Now one logistical comment is that I talked to Nan Jokerst, who is chair of Academic Council, about what the approvals process for something like this would be. Maybe it's influenced a little bit by the fact that Nan's in engineering that already has these programs, but she said, "Well these are already existing programs, there is no approvals process. It really falls to Arts & Sciences to decide whether they want the students in Trinity to be able to participate in these things."

I will say that the Sanford School is doing a small pilot, even though there are students that came through Trinity, they're only doing it with their own majors. They're basically thinking about their course work but if you're talking about the possibility of folks coming from any major and doing a 4+1 program, the question is, is there really an approvals process? I thought here we would at least just have a general discussion of the things that are raised by the paper and you may all want to discuss among yourselves and think about what approvals look like.

Now, one thing, since I see Sandy here, is there's going to be financial tension here. To me, it's a non-starter to take any tuition away from Trinity. It's not going to take away from the eight semesters of payment to Trinity. It's a savings to the student in the way that graduate school winds up getting a bit less and maybe the program gets a bit less, but the students are spending less time doing the program, and so that, to me, seems to be a reasonable thing. It's also not an issue of greatly expanding teaching capacity, because as you'll hear today from the folks that are interested in a global health 4+1, we're not talking about a vast expansion or a new Master's program, we're really basically talking about probably adding a handful of students to some of the Master's that might offer this 4+1 program.

Now you could imagine if there was a 4+1 MBA or something, you might get a different response, but we're talking about [inaudible]. I should make a distinction, the reason John should say something about this, is that the 4+1 in the professional world is obviously a little bit different from what a 4+1 program is doing for graduate schools. As far as I know this is the only program that's come forward in the Graduate School, right?

John Klingensmith (Associate Dean, Graduate School): There already are some.

Kornbluth: There are some?

Klingensmith: Pratt.

Kornbluth: Oh those are Graduate School programs, I didn't even realize that. I thought they were professional.

Klingensmith: Nicholas does too.

Kornbluth: That's a professional one, that's not a Graduate School one. Anyway, so the notion would be that, I wanted to just discuss it a little bit. Maybe John can say something and then really just to hear what folks think about this. Then Mary Story is here from Global Health to just talk a little bit about the program that they're interested in. Again, it's not to vote on. It's really just to have a discussion and then think about where we go from here in terms of is this the place we want to go and how do we move on that? Because these folks have been really patient. It's been a relatively long process to have a general discussion. John, why don't you say a few words and then Mary, and then whoever wants to talk about it.

Klingensmith: I'd like to tell you a little bit about the thinking in the report that you got from the committee. This was a committee that was chaired by Keith Whitfield who was the vice provost for academic affairs. The committee members were Lee Baker, Alison Rabil, myself, John Klingensmith, Mary Story, Linda Banko, Linda Franzoni, and Chris Freel. These are mostly people in the Provost's office who are associate deans, but it was a good committee anyway.

Collectively, we approached this with a couple of premises or things that we really felt were essential even going into a discussion about that. The first one is that anything we designed, we wanted to make sure it did not in any way undermine the quality of the Duke undergraduate degree, that the value of that degree can't be compromised by developing any kind of accelerated

master's program. The second one, the flip side of that, is that we also wanted to design a mechanism that would preserve the integrity of the master's programs that might be participating in this. Those were probably our two key principles.

One thing that Sally already alluded to which is already the case, this is already water under the bridge, is that in 4+1s, which have already been approved at Duke in the case of Pratt, as Sally indicated, there's already been an agreement that was brokered by Provost Lange that all of the tuition during the period before a student receives his or her bachelor's degree goes to the undergraduate degree rewarding institutions. In this case, Trinity would not have any less tuition than it receives already from a student participating in one of these programs. That does mean that the Graduate School in turn does receive less tuition because instead of having a minimum of at least three terms for a master's degree, you now would be talking about probably two, if it's a three-semester program, or possibly three, if it's a four-semester program.

I think a rationale for why that's acceptable to the Graduate School is that these are students that would not be staying at Duke for a master's otherwise. These are mostly students, these will be our star students from your undergraduate majors, minors, who would be choosing to extend their studies for an additional period of time to get that master's degree in addition to the bachelor's. These are not students who would have been enrolled in one of our master's programs anyway. In that sense it's a win for the Graduate School as well. It's also a win for the bachelor's programs themselves very importantly because our Duke undergraduates are as good as any undergraduates anywhere who are coming into master's programs. If we can retain some of our very best talent here in our own master's programs, that's obviously to the benefit of the master's programs as well as to the students.

Let me just very briefly talk about some of the highlights from what we resolved. Firstly, in regard to advising, we felt that students need to be made aware of what we would call accelerated master's programs very early during their period here at Duke pursuing their undergraduate degree. I want to distinguish between 4+1 programs and what the committee decided we should call accelerated master's. That's because even though by slang we're calling them 4+1 programs, that implies a certain almost guaranteed timetable for completion for this arrangement, and we want to get away from that. What these things will allow is that the period of time taken to achieve the master's degree will be reduced probably by one semester, but not necessarily just one year. The onus is going to be on the student to maintain a pretty rigorous course load and academic requirement to be able to meet the expectations of both the bachelor's and the master's degree. Not necessarily achievable by all students in one year.

The students should be made aware of what it's going to take to be in the accelerated master's program but not actually enrolled in that program until they apply in most cases in their senior year. At least the scenario we envision is they would fulfill things like the GRE exam requirement in, say, the summer before their senior year. They would then apply to the master's program of choice that has an accelerated master's program, be admitted under the same criteria that any other master's candidate is admitted, but then only be provisionally accepted until they complete the baccalaureate requirements. Once they receive the baccalaureate degree then they would be assuming that everything went well. They're still in good academic standing such then they would be formally admitted to the master's program.

There are three different scenarios by which this could happen as far as courses taken as an undergraduate transferring to the graduate, or being applied to the master's degree, to make this all work. One of them already exists and that's what already exists with Pratt and the Graduate School, which is that a student in his or her senior year spring semester takes some courses on the undergraduate transcript and some courses on the graduate transcript. They're dually enrolled in the undergraduate and graduate. That actually is the cleanest approach and works well in many senses, but with the huge caveat that was a deal breaker to the committee, and that is that, in that scenario, they are no longer eligible for undergraduate financial aid. We don't want to design programs that are only accessible to the rich kids who don't need financial aid. We want to design programs that are equally accessible to everybody. We want to preserve the ability of students to have undergraduate financial aid all the way up until they have their baccalaureate degree.

That left two models on the table. One of these is where students would take some courses while an undergraduate that they don't need toward their undergraduate degree, for the baccalaureate degree. 34 credits at Trinity. But that any surplus courses could then be transferred after they've already graduated to the graduate record. Let's say they were able to take two extra courses that they didn't actually need toward their Trinity degree, those could then be transferred to their Master's degree after they've already graduated. That's an approach that works well.

The third possibility is to actually double count a very small number of courses, maybe two or three, that would both simultaneously be undergraduate degree, well I shouldn't say simultaneously, toward the undergraduate degree, but then after they graduate apply those same credits for the same courses toward their graduate degree. We can talk about the merits of both of those scenarios, but importantly they both allow undergraduate financial aid to be maintained. We also recognize that there's probably not a one size fits all for every program that might want to have an accelerated master's. What might work well for economics, if they wanted to do one, might not necessarily work well for global health. We already know that they want to do one.

I will say that in my role as associate dean for academic affairs in the Graduate School, there's probably at least eight units that have come forward that have said they would love to develop some kind of accelerated master's program and we're going to hear from one today, which is global health. This would be one particular scenario by which this kind of program might be developed. Probably each version is going to be a little bit different. The committee recognized that we probably can't just assign a single set of guidelines that will regulate how every one of these programs looks. We want to preserve these principles of the quality of the undergraduate curriculum and experience not being undermined and preserve the integrity of the master's degree. Mary, maybe this is a good time for you to ...

Kornbluth: I'll comment about what you're saying, John, which is this conversation is not completely disconnected from the IDC conversation because when I attended the meeting last week of the IDC committee, there was discussion about how many courses will be required going forward. That could potentially impact how many courses can roll over, what will happen in double counting versus not. So there may be constraints introduced in the IDC that will morph what will happen in an accelerated master's program. There's nothing to be done about it now because you won't have decided on that, it's just worth keeping in mind.

Mary Story (Associate Director DGHI): Well thank you. I'm Mary Story and I came here, it will be three years this January, in Global Health and Community, and Family Medicine. I spend all my time in Global Health, and I just have loved the passion and the energy of the Duke students and I really love being part of the Duke faculty and the whole Duke community. It's been a really positive experience.

I want to talk about what we've been thinking. I'm associate director of academic programs within Global Health. I want to talk about how we've been thinking about an accelerated program and how it would work. Before that I just wanted to spend just a couple minutes about our pathways in our program. We have an undergraduate major and minor. We also have a Master's of Science in Global Health that's through the Graduate School. We do not have PhD program but we have a doctoral scholars program so that would be for any doctoral candidate in any of the PhD programs at Duke that has an interest in global health. We also have medical programs.

Our Duke global health major was launched on major/minor was launched just three years ago. Gary Bennett was the director of undergraduate studies that spent a lot of time developing this program. You can see that currently we have 116 co-majors and 135 minors. Currently we have 250 majors and minors in global health and David Toole is with us today as the director of our undergraduate program. It's been really interesting that there are currently over 30 co-majors, majors in other departments across Duke that are majoring, co-majoring, so the five largest co-majors are in biology, public policy, psychology, international and comparative studies, and cultural anthropology. These comprise 70% of our co-majors, but we also have majors in dance, history, romance studies, so it's very interdisciplinary, as is global health.

Our Master's of Science program was started in 2006. We're in our eighth year. This was the first Master's of Science in Global Health in the country. It is one of the top master's programs in global health in the country. Our focus is very much on research training, in giving students the skills to really go into research fields. Many of them with the master's degree -- which is becoming more of an entry-level requirement for a lot of the positions in global health, public health, population health -- they become research coordinators, study directors, and are really able to start at a higher level and better pay.

We've been thinking about the last three or four years about an accelerated master's in global health, and this has really been as a way to really retain some of our best and strongest students. Many of these global health programs that are starting up throughout the United States, so there's a lot of competition. A lot of the places where our students want to go are places that we think because we have such a strong program, we really would like to retain here. There's been a lot of interest among Duke undergraduates. In this current class, we had 10 Duke students with undergraduate degrees at Duke apply into our Master's of Science program. That's 10. All were admitted, 7 attended, and 4 of these have either a co-major, a minor, or had a certificate in global health. What we're also finding, since our program was started, is that about 40% of our incoming class every year is coming directly from their undergraduate programs. These students in the accelerated programs would really fit in very nicely.

We see many benefits of an accelerated degree program in global health. Both the Provost and John have talked about some of these. We see it as a potential to really deepen undergraduate learning and relationships with faculty mentors. It really helps position students for a competitive job market in global health and it would also lower the overall cost. For Duke and DGHI, we see enhanced ability to retain the strongest students, to broaden their interdisciplinary reach and it's also consistent with Duke's goal to enhance graduate opportunities and reduce graduate debt.

When we were thinking about what would this really look like, we really have spent a lot of time thinking about how we can properly integrate seniors in their senior year into graduate activities and yet also really being able to preserve the quality of the undergraduate experience. We feel that we've come up with a program that would address both of those goals. We see this program, as the Provost mentioned, as very small. We're talking about five to seven students, even really gradually building up to that over the next four or five years. We'd start out maybe with two or three students, but this would be about 15% of the overall cohort of master's students. We also feel that this would take a lot of very careful advising, and that the advising would have to occur early on. And we have, that also a lot of the students are interested in, a FOCUS cluster on global health that Sherryl Broverman directs, so there's a lot of interest in global health among Duke students. We also could help ... I think we have the advising capacity within global health. We also have a lot of our majors and minors that are participating in experiential learning activities. Our majors have to complete an eight-week field experience at the start of the major. In the master's they have to do a 10-week field placement. These field placements are really in low-income countries or low-resourced communities in the United States.

I was talking to a student this morning, a new master's student that just graduated last spring at Duke. She was saying that she had been on ... we have a student research training program, and 37% of our majors have participated in what we call the student research training. She had been to Honduras with Dennis Clements, one of our faculty members, and she said she was so excited about that experience that she really wanted to continue into a master's program in global health. We also have [inaudible] program, an independent mentored, independent study with faculty and research, so we feel that the field experience would also relate that, that the undergraduates have, would pull out some of those best students, as well as identification by faculty of students in their classroom.

We find what would work best for us would be to have students applying their junior year. They would be reviewed by our regular graduate admissions faculty. This (slide) just gives you an idea of what our proposed curriculum would look like. We would really be trying to target some of our majors and minors. The majors in global health have to take 11 courses and our master's program is also 11 courses or 38 credits. Before in their junior year they'd be taking fundamentals of global health, global health research methods, and global health ethics. Then they would be taking probably their GRE in their junior year and they'd be provisionally admitted to the master's program in the Graduate School, but that's contingent, they wouldn't be fully admitted until they graduated from their undergraduate degree.

In their senior year, they would need to take four undergraduate courses, two each semester, and then in their graduate year, that plus-one year, they would take two, well in their senior year they would take two graduate courses, the remaining undergraduate courses. They'd be taking four

graduate-level electives, which would really help deepen that undergraduate experience, because these would be 500-level courses. In their plus-one year they'd be taking the remaining graduate level courses and then they would be doing the field research experience right after they graduate for eight weeks after their senior year. Then in that plus-one year they'd be taking the remaining graduate courses and also writing their thesis.

This is the last slide. It gives you an idea of the research pathways for the master's. We feel that because of the student research program, Bass Connections, DukeEngage, that students get excited about research through this. It can lead to their, if they want to graduate with distinction or their honors thesis. We also have in global health majors have to do a capstone. It's a team-based research project that could lead into their field work in their master's thesis. We really have thought about our various pathways that this program for five to seven of really some of our top students that really want to go into global health and that this would be a way to retain them here.

Our faculty, they discussed this at several of our advisory meetings and education committees and there's been, I'd say at least in general support for the overall program.

Kornbluth: It's important to tease out here that when we discussed this, not this particular program, but it's a general question, is if you don't double count okay, then students are sort of making a choice maybe between a minor and doing the accelerated master's, right, in terms of their total courses. If you double count, then it's less of an issue because they could apply those courses to both, correct?

Story: Right. So if we were able to have them double count, we would like them to double count two courses. That's six credits that they would be taking in their senior year. two of the courses in their senior year that would then ... The problem then is that if we don't double count, they would be taking in their plus-one year three to four classes each semester and having to do their thesis at the same time. Which they could do but it would make it really tough. Double counting the two courses, and these would be optional courses that they could take in their senior year. Also I'd like to introduce, we have Melissa Watt here, as well, who's director of our master's program, and David Toole, who's director of our undergraduate studies and both have been actively involved in these plans.

Karen Shapiro (AAAS): I have two general questions about this. Number one, the Provost suggested that this needs to be discussed in conjunction with the IDC. I see it in two ways. One is that one of the impulses between IDC was to get away from super specialization and I wonder whether this will actually end up promoting it further, rather than to encourage students to take a much broader look at the undergraduate curriculum and to encourage them to do things that they would need otherwise as an undergraduate? The other way in which I see it related is actually to Anita's flip comment about her B in philosophy. The point is that in fact this 4+1 then becomes the way in which you mark better students from not-so-good students because you can be at this pass-fail and turn your B into this pass then to really mark yourself off as a better student you're now doing the 4+1. I think that becomes really problematic. Are we just moving the goal posts? Those are one set of questions I have around IDC.

The second would be is in research. My understanding, and I'm an historian, but if I look at say Pratt and for example, their biomedical engineering course, they're doing two semesters of courses and then a semester of research, which is really substantial research. It seems to try to squish this into your master's in one year or a bit of your honors or capstone. Is that not going to really undercut the value of having clearly significant undergraduate research experience and then further research and developing that in a master's program? Two different questions. One about its relationship to IDC and the second about what happens in general to research.

Story: David, did you just want to address the first one?

David Toole: I think both the things you said, Karen, are things that have come up in our own faculty discussions. I think they're both really good concerns. Relative to the IDC in part, I don't know because we still don't know what IDC's going to do, but in terms of your general point that the idea is that we're not trying to create some professionalized people, that is a legitimate concern about a program like this. My own view of that is the global health major, the more I thought about it as the director of undergraduate studies, is really the major in the liberal arts. In my view this is actually continuing another a year of liberal arts education because of the fact that the global health major is itself so interdisciplinary. Yes, there's some specialization in that, but I think it's a mistake to think of our master's degree at the moment as professional. It's not. I mean, we hope we give students opportunities for jobs, but it really isn't a traditional professional degree.

Shapiro: Okay, I mean is there ... As you were saying, is getting some students [inaudible]?

Toole: I see that as a slightly different question in terms of who are we picking, that who gets admitted into the program? How are we selecting them and how are the students positioning themselves to get selected? Again, we talked about this in our faculty, we see this as basically we planned a small number of students and we're going to know those students because faculty members are going to encounter them early on in all sorts of ways. Whether they did a pass-fail course and they got it expunged on the transcript, I don't think that matters because the students aren't going to be picked up on their grade point, they're going to be picked upon their relationships with faculty across two or three years. That's one way to look at it.

Kornbluth: I have another comment on this, Karen, which is we tend to make programs [inaudible] we think about the student body at large. My feeling about this is you told me about a handful, there always are groups of students who may have identified a real passion early, really want to do this, and I agree in general that we don't want to disincentivize students to explore broadly, I just think that in some cases it's justified. It's the same conversation we had about students doing research in a lab in their freshman year. There are just some students who should, who really want to do that. If they were saying they wanted, or any of these programs wanted to try to recruit 50 students, I would start to get worried. I think about it more as an exception, what you're saying, that our principle in general should be to broaden people's exposure. But if a student identifies really early that this is what they want to do, then enabling it is one way to look at it.

Story: I think students can still opt to do the two year program, so they wouldn't have to go into this accelerated program, but there are some students that I think early on know they want to do this.

Frances Hasso (GSF): Can I ask a question in the same spirit? I wonder if we or you have kids who are a possibility but a student wouldn't do 4+1, I know it might be one and a half, exactly after graduating? Meaning, students are under a lot of pressure. For example, if you're now talking about GRE in the junior year, there's an intensification on an already stressful situation for a lot of students. If they're doing honors in their senior year ... Basically practically speaking, is there a way for a student who is interested in this, who fits all, that they were a Duke undergrad, and they take a year off from graduate school. They do 1 or 1.5 after a year. You might require this for the global health accelerated master's. You might prefer that they just swing right through. But as a teacher and a parent of somebody in this particular situation, yeah there's a benefit to actually taking these really intensive exams after you finish honors. I just want to see if it's linked, that if you really have to do that right now.

Steve Nowicki (DVPUE): Let me just follow Frances' comment because there's also socioeconomic reason for that. Because I do appreciate and I think it's critical that you don't want to take away undergraduates' financial aid in the senior year, but our student on aid are not going to be able to necessarily go and start paying graduate tuition in the next year, so there are also students who may want to join the workforce for a year or two to earn the money that would then allow them to bank some of that and not have to do it fully on loans.

Story: We also in Global Health cover the last semester of tuition and we also give students \$7000 to do the field experience and so many of them are in low-income countries. I'm not familiar with any 4+1 programs in all of our peer institutions -- many of them have 4+1's in public health and global health -- I've never heard of that model of maybe deferring for a year. They might have to start paying financial aid for their undergraduate for that one year when they're out, so then we might actually be better for them and we give scholarships. They'd be eligible for scholarships. That's partly why we wanted them to apply in their junior year. Our average scholarship, what is it Sarah, about 30% that we provide?

Klingensmith: It might be worth just saying what Graduate School master's tuition is. It's approximately \$25,000 per semester, so it's not cheap.

Lee Baker (Cultural Anthropology): My question is two questions. One is in my experience or looking at MA programs in general, not just accelerated ones, is that there is a trade off between increasing master's thesis and decreasing senior thesis because faculty just have so much bandwidth that they're giving during the thesis, that's one less senior thesis that they can do a time. My other question is can our undergraduates pursue realistically a senior thesis if they're studying for the GRE, or just took the GRE, have two graduate classes per semester? Is there a plan to enhance undergraduate research in a 4+1 model so they are deliberately or is it maybe some senior thesis won't be done? They'll be doing preliminary research for an MA thesis?

Story: We have among our majors now, as I said, 37% participated in our student research training which is a team-based model. Many of those have turned into honors thesis. Also with

the Bass Connections, 28% are in DukeEngage, and we have 16% that do faculty-mentored independent research. They could be building on those experiences and so many are already doing undergraduate research to really have their honors thesis on that topic but then go back, like the student may back to Honduras, the one that's here, to really build on what she had done there with their student research teaching. I think because we have such a strong research structure already for our major in global health, that it could be easier to have it linked to their master's thesis.

Baker: I'm just saying be mindful of those tradeoffs. The second question is maybe to Sally. Would the dean of Fuqua or the Law School get into this game, saying the MSS program could be in 4+1, or could early admission to law school and cut the tracks, our students would really want to

Kornbluth: Could I say that they wouldn't be interested in this? No, but I will say that's why the question of when the approvals are, etc., and what the gate-keeping function is important because I think approving this in the Graduate School doesn't -- if there's approval -- going forward with this in the Graduate School doesn't necessarily set a precedent for that. In other words it's a whole separate question. In my mind, those programs, there are places that do for instance seven year medical or seven year JD. In my mind those things are better thought about -- if we ever thought about those -- as an admittance program to a consolidated program so a little bit more likely than an add on at that point. I don't know, I haven't heard that question being asked by those schools, but it's certainly out of the realm of possibility that they would ask it down the road.

Shapiro: I just want to follow up on the Lee's question here. Is the general idea that we will approve these one by one, much as we approve the various certificate programs on an endless basis for the last couple of years? Maybe it's not big picture and it's just ad hoc? Is that what's going to come for us or is this general sense or we're going to shift to a 4+1 model and we're going to rethink this?

Kornbluth: That's part of the reason to have the conversation, to tell you the truth, because there is no approval process in place for already established programs. You're talking about students taking a path through the undergraduate and master's degree where this master's degree is already functional and approved. There's no established process, which is part of the reason for having this conversation.

Ron Grunwald (Biology): I always thought of 3+2 program in the School of the Environment. It's an undergraduate program.

Kornbluth: Right, but it's not a Graduate School program, it's a professional school program. It's the same as the Pratt school ones. What would I like to see to avoid what you're saying is to think about not just this program but the broader principle of whether the notion of accelerated master's programs is something that Trinity students can participate in. Now there are many variants for admission, right? You could say, "Yeah but you can't take more than X percentage of your class doing that so we don't wind up huge numbers." Or there have to be certain whatever admissions criteria but there's no process that I know of to do that, it's sort of in question.

Shapiro: Is there a review of the (inaudible) programs that have gone ahead without?

Kornbluth: Yes, so I have to say when I talk to people in Pratt for instance, they're like, "What's the big deal?" That's why I was shocked when I talked to Nan, she was like, "So what? We've been doing this for years. It's great for the students who want to do it. It's not huge numbers of students, it seems to be successful." It just hasn't been a point of contention, to be honest, in the other settings. I don't know, Emily, what's the story on ...

Emily Klein (NSOE): I was just going to say, because they're a professional school, they're not thinking in terms of the impact on the liberal arts zeitgeist a little bit.

Grunwald: But Emily the Environment 3+2 program is Trinity undergraduates. The graduate program is in the professional school but the undergraduates are at Trinity school.

Kornbluth: Yes, that's right. They tend to be majors in the Nicholas School. They are Trinity students ...

Grunwald: They're Trinity majors and therefore subject to the same liberal arts expectations.

Klein: I should also say there isn't, I don't know what the latest number is but it's probably one every other year or something like that.

Kornbluth: Exactly. Exactly. I guess your point Ron is that it's already happened without being a huge [inaudible]. I don't think there was ever any official approval.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): Well I was just going to say that there is one difference between Pratt and Trinity and that is the AP credit policy. In Pratt, we allow students to AP out of a lot more than two things. They are already accelerated when they come in with their math and their physics and their chemistry APs, so that acceleration is already started with our students.

Kornbluth: Do they have more credits than the two or ...

Franzoni: Yes, we count more than two.

Kornbluth: Okay, so they might have 8?

Franzoni: Yeah they might have 17. Our only restriction is you can only use two social science or humanities APs because they've got 8 of those too. They can count all the math and the chemistry and the biology and da da da. The one thing you might consider for a student that was going to do this accelerated would be for that student, would Trinity, this would be a question for you all, would you count more APs than two for a student that wanted to accelerate through the global health? Maybe they could apply or petition, I'm just saying that's something you maybe want to touch on.

Layton: Okay let's have the last couple of questions before we move on.

Grunwald: On a similar vein where this is different from other Trinity paths is the co-major requirement for the undergraduate major. I'm sorry I came in late, maybe you said this already. Does this assume still the standard expectation for co-major and then have you, surely you've thought through and we add on an additional four professional school courses in the senior year in addition to the requirement for a second major, unlike an ENV major for example, which would presumably be an ENV major alone who would then take on the professional school courses.

Story: That would make it currently, especially if we couldn't double count, it would make it tough, very challenging for co-majors. They could be a minor. That's five courses instead of the 11 ...

Grunwald: I'm sorry, this allows for graduation as a minor in global health and then ...

Story: They could be a minor, they could be a major, they would not just be limited to majors or they could have taken the other prereq courses and have done an experiential learning.

Toole: If you look at the undergrads that are currently applying from Trinity into our master's program, about half of them are not coming as a major or a global health minor. They're actually coming outside of the global health completely. We would imagine, we don't know, but we would imagine some of those students would come from other majors.

Grunwald: Again, forgive me, because I came late. So the structure of the undergraduate expectations are consistent with what you would expect for a minor? It doesn't require the ...

Toole: Yeah I mean we expect that they'll come in, by the time they get to their senior year they've taken their three core courses. Actually only two of which we think of as the minor. More or less, yes, that's right.

Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience): We were talking about accelerated master's programs and being driven out of Trinity, but there are already other accelerated master programs that are coming from the professional schools. Something came up about Law before. In the Law School there's a diverse joint-degree program, so they accelerate the master's within the context of the law degree. So up until recently instead of just the three year law degree or the three year plus a summer, and then some adjustment in the coursework and people would have a master's in our Trinity departments. It's quite wide spread, there's psychology, political science, there are six, eight, 10 of them. I just wanted to point out that any proposal that goes forward for 4+1 or whatever we're going to call it here, accelerated master's, we need to coordinate and take into account these other types of accelerated master's programs.

Kornbluth: I think the questions have been really good but I'm still not getting a sense of whether you all think there's an approval process involved in this of any sort.

Baker: In some respects the 4+1 is an admitting program to existing master's. We're really not messing with the Trinity degree.

Nowicki: There is one point, Lee, you've been away for too long. You've forgotten. The Trinity rules allow a student to go half time as a senior in the second semester. This would essentially have them be half time in both semesters of their senior year if it followed that. That would be a variance from what Trinity normally allows.

Kornbluth: Unless you don't count, in which case they're not part-time at all.

Baker: They would be full-time students if they elect to be full-time students and they can take up to six graduate/professional school courses anyway as a Trinity student. In some respect, they can just opt to take graduate courses in their senior year ...

Grunwald: It's a credentialing issue for the graduate program. Because in effect, if that's the case, then they're taking graduate courses towards the undergraduate degree, and then double counting those graduate courses towards the master's degree and the question is whether that's kosher.

Baker: With the graduate school, not Trinity.

Mike Merson (DGHI Director): SACS has already approved a lot of these inside SACS-accredited universities, I can tell you that.

Klingensmith: Can I just make a comment about that? Dean McClain of the Graduate School wanted, before these issues were discussed at the level of the Graduate School, she wanted to know whether Trinity faculty were comfortable with this idea. That's critical. That's the first step. Then the Graduate School issues can be resolved secondly.

Huston: The thing about programmatic proposals such as this is that once they're actually operationalized from the students' point of view, there's many ways in which you can [inaudible] programs. To the extent to which an accelerated master's program, as it's being discussed here is meant to serve those students who are really passionate about a topic and want to and it has a career element. I'm in complete support of it but like so many others there's a high likelihood that it's also going to be used in a strictly careerist way, which does cut across and sort of contradicts the crust of the Imagining the Duke Curriculum.

Story: But it's focused on research training.

Huston: Yes, I'm not speaking just about global health.

Story: Research is an important component.

Huston: Yes, I'm not sure that would negate that, depending on where the career opportunities are in global health. I'm also thinking about if economics decides to do an accelerated master's program, that is something that a lot of very careerist students would be very, very interested in because it would increase their way to Wall Street. What I'm wondering is whether there can be some creative thinking about well what do we want to do about the careerist element and is there something in the selection process where we might be able to at least partly correct for it?

Kornbluth: I do think that the admissions at the graduate level then becomes really important, which is there has to be thinking not just in a "We want to grab the students that we can grab into our program." It has to be thinking about this particular piece of the master's really being to identify those students who are really passionate. That does put the responsibility ... We can't parse that at a distance, but it does, the onus then is on the graduate programs to really think about whether we're putting into that [inaudible]. The other thing that I will say, in that it's the junior/senior year divide they're making that decision, honestly, those students have already selected into that mentality or not. You know what I mean? It's pretty late in their undergraduate career. I could editorialize on this for hours but anyway, I think that is a bit of a landmine in terms of that. I think it has to be the students who can't see doing anything else but going to do a master's in global health because it's so exciting, etc. It's a matter of somehow parsing that, but I think that's hard to do from an administrative perspective.

Klingensmith: Or impossible.

Kornbluth: Yeah exactly. Exactly.

Layton: Thank you. Lots of discussion. Time to move on.

Faculty Teaching and Development and Support report

Layton: Carol is going to tell us about the survey results and the recommendation from the ad hoc committee on teaching development.

Carol Apollonio (Slavics): Fortunately this is very simple, comparatively speaking. We are happy to report that the work of the ad hoc committee for teaching is now over. This is our little report. Our charge was to consider the advisability of creating a standing committee for teaching, a parallel committee for the standing committee for research, and then to recommend a charge for that committee. Specifically we were asked to survey the faculty, to explore what is done at peer institutions, to explore what's done at Duke to support teaching, and to explore larger opportunities for mentoring, development, collaboration for instructors at Duke, regardless of discipline, regardless of their connection to technology.

To eliminate any suspense, I report that we do recommend the creation of a standing committee and I'll return to that later. We have results of online research of what's going on at other institutions, and interviews also were done with people representing teaching resources at other institutions, and we also have a description of resources within. These are available as part of our report. We used Qualtrics; there were 200 responses from Arts & Sciences faculty. Our survey asked about faculty priorities for teaching and support, recognizing, evaluating, and rewarding teaching, the degree of use of Duke resources for teaching and the nature of that experience. It was a pretty short survey, I think a lot of you here must have taken it. I think we got pretty good results.

Each question offered a set of options, plus a comment box. We got lots of very interesting comments, very exciting comments that we were not able to evaluate, there were so many of them, but that would be something for the teaching committee to look at and make sense of. For example here's our priorities question. In addition we had other, in addition to these options. One important thing to note about this slide is that some gremlins got into the computer and the blue lines are actually counterintuitive. What this means is a lot of the blue line is less important. I don't know how that got there.

The highest number is very important responses went to TA support, which is the shortest blue line, and administrative support for recognizing, evaluating, and rewarding teaching. The greatest number of unimportant responses went to assistance in developing lessons, and that's the longer line here.

Hasso: Explain that again, I'm sorry.

Apollonio: The question is how important are these? The long blue line means not important.

Hasso: Oh okay. Got it.

Apollonio: Okay? Now we have a different set of blue lines that's a different side of interpreting, so bear with me here. How satisfied are Duke faculty with the way their teaching is being rewarded, evaluated, and recognized? Again, a little counterintuitively, the longer the blue line, the lower the satisfaction. Okay? So, good satisfaction about teaching, how teaching is recognized. Slightly more than half are somewhat or very satisfied and also somewhat less than that but still faculty seemed relatively content with how they were being evaluated but the clearest dissatisfaction is in how teaching is rewarded. So 139 respondents of 210, that's about 2/3rds, are somewhat or very dissatisfied with the way their teaching was rewarded. I hope that makes sense.

Another question: What resources on campus have faculty taken advantage of and how would they evaluate that experience? Here, the blue lines match how your brain works. Nearly 80% of respondents have taken advantage of classroom tech support. That makes sense right? More than half have used assistance for teaching technology. Only 20% or less have taken advantage of assistance with designing courses or making classroom arrangements or mentoring. Okay?

Here we are at our recommendation. We do recommend to create a committee. The purpose will be to represent faculty interests related to teaching. I should say, as you may suspect, that there were some very eloquent comments in our comment boxes to the effect that no new committee is needed. We did not do a qualitative analysis of those and that again is something to be left up to later, I guess. I should note, then, in that context this would be a committee of the Council. This would be a committee of the Arts & Sciences Council to parallel our committee that we have for research. In other words it's not an administrative committee, it's a committee that would serve the faculty as a way to understand what faculty views are and opinions and desires are related to faculty, to gather information from us and communicate with the administration on our behalf. It would replace two committees by the way, if you're counting. One would be the committee for

assessment and the other committee for technology. Maybe Anita or somebody can explain what the nuances of that are.

The charge now, a recommended charge for this committee would be to explore and improve the system currently in place for evaluating, recognizing, and rewarding teaching, to help faculty take full advantage of existing and future resources available here. One idea, for example, would be a simple website where ombudsperson to answer questions, direct inquiries related to teaching because there's so many different entities on campus that work with teaching. Also, to represent the faculty so that we have a stronger voice and matters directly related to teaching. In particular we noticed strong opinions being expressed about classroom design and outfitting. We suspect that creating a mechanism for input of these and other matters would be welcome everywhere on campus. That's our report and I think I'm ready for questions. Nobody else was able to be here from our committee, it was a very small committee, so ...

Huston: Your first slide showed that TA work was judged to be one of the important things that's needed. Does that mean more TAs or training TAs?

Apollonio: Well I will say this, we have a lot of, what are they called by statisticians, sub analyses of these data. We noticed, as one might suspect, that the answer to that question correlated pretty well to higher ranked faculty. Does that make sense? Instructors are not asking for TAs, basically. Beyond that, I'm not sure if that means more money for TAs or more TAs or more something else. It's not something we want to ... Yeah, each box, if you took the survey, you remember, if you answered a certain way, you were given the opportunity to express yourself more.

Huston: Could you give us a sense of what we charged to the committee was to see what's out there and where it is. Did you get a clear sense of that? How fragmented is it?

Apollonio: Yeah. Clear is a very interesting word to use I guess. It's very, very interesting. I think there were 11 institutions that -- actually Mike Munger's not here -- conducted interviews and he had research assistants helping him do this. He interviewed people representing various offices at various universities and it was not clear. It was complicated, the kinds of ways in which these teaching support entities interacted with faculty was problematical sometimes. The way they worked administratively was difficult for the different institutions. You think about teaching, you could think about, for example, the writing programs always have strong teaching support. Graduate programs have teaching support for the graduate students who are learning how to teach, right? Then of course the technology is a huge thing everywhere and it's happened so rapidly, that the technology has jumped in in ways that maybe are very different at different institutions. It's not clear. It's very interesting.

Steven Asher (Psychology and Neuroscience): I think this is terrific. One thing that struck me was as increasing number of students at Duke as well as other universities are coming from backgrounds where their high school education wasn't so strong, right? Whether it's first generation or minority students. When I think about universities around the United States that are playing a leadership role in that area, some of them are our peers, but some of them are state universities. I guess the one phrase that hit me in the report that I might just make a suggestion to

think about is really looking beyond peer institutions for ideas and innovation with regards especially to students who come in, in some way underprepared.

Apollonio: Yes. Yes. That's so true actually. So true. We're going to have a record of this, right? We can look at that. That's the sort of thing that a committee could really look at seriously I think. Yeah.

Nowicki: I'll say two things. One, I think having a group of faculty reporting to the Council thinking about this is a great idea because these are really important issues and faculty are the people who should be taking the lead. I'm all for that. Following a little bit on Steve's point, though, I guess I'm a little discouraged on this slide that unimportant, that a high ranking unimportant factor was recognizing different cultures and styles. Because I really think that is a major issue not just at Duke but in institutions like ours across the world. I'm discouraged that a third of our faculty ranked that so low.

Hasso: What does that question mean? What's the question? It might not be what you're thinking.

Nowicki: This all seems to me to be in the context of supporting our faculty in these domains, and supporting faculty ...

Hasso: We might feel like we are recognized in our different cultures and styles of teaching. That's why I'm asking, is I don't know what that question means.

Apollonio: That's a great question. I think if you think about the point of view of the faculty member looking at all these questions, I guess you could see that they might interpret that a little bit differently. Yeah you might be talking about recognizing different students from different kinds of backgrounds, for example. But you could also I think be considering different learning styles.

Nowicki: This is something a faculty committee could actually drill down on, what did faculty really think? But when I read that, I was thinking I'm teaching an Intro to Bio class to 150 kids and they're all different and they're coming from very different perspectives and backgrounds and if I say there's only one kid in that class that I need to teach to, I think I'm underserving our students. If somebody said, "I can help you figure out how to do a better job teaching Intro Bio to a broader, more diverse class," I think that would be a good thing.

Apollonio: Right, right. Again, a good place for that conversation to happen would be in a committee.

Nowicki: Yeah exactly. With the faculty figuring it out.

Valerie Ashby (Dean): It's contradictory, Steve. So I saw that too on another slide that links to culture and style. Right here. Adapting to ... if I look at this third one down. Adapting to teaching to different styles. Have you taken advantage of, so that means a lot of people have taken advantage of it, so then it contradicts the slide ...

Nowicki: No, this is the one that ...

Ashby: Okay. So that means that some of the people haven't taken advantage of it yet.

Apollonio: Yes that's correct.

Nowicki: This actually would be a little discouraging as well.

David Malone (Education): One observation is it seems like many innovative practices are coming out of the Center for Instructional Technology. Their showcase highlights, and I think Sean's here so that seems there could be some potential synergies here. Then a question about the notion that this committee could also do the work of these other committees. I think you mentioned that?

Apollonio: Assessment and Technology, yeah.

Layton: It's something that we're considering...

Malone: It seems to me that Assessment's got enough on their hands that if this committee took over Assessment, that would be a large part of their work and it might diminish the time that they had to function as a body that help improve and strengthen our teaching.

Apollonio: Those are two conversations that are going on right now. Just about your first comment though, about the CIT. We have four people on the committee. Myself, Mike Munger, Owen Astrachan and then Andrea Novicki, who runs the CIT programs. She had input in this whole process and she's the one who collected all the resources, by the way, available on this campus related to the CIT and actually beyond. I think the CIT is something we know about and we're aware of, I'm not sure everybody knows about what they do.

Ashby: Just to that point, too, there's a significant statement in the strategic plan which faculty will see soon --the deans have already seen it -- around improving teaching and there's a statement on how to really coalesce all of the resources we have and really address teaching needs. There is a significant component for funding in the strategic plan that will come back to faculty.

Huston: I think this is a good idea too, but I think there's a way in which this fits into a pattern of governance at Duke that we may need to rethink and maybe should be part of the brief of the committee. Which is, it's typical of Duke that for any function there's 8 or 12 different offices fulfilling that function. Each with their own administrator, each with their staff members and their own way of doing things. It does, I think, add to a certain amount of [inaudible] to the university and a difficulty in actually making decisions. I'm wondering ... I think it would be worth thinking through whether one of the briefs of this committee would be thinking about how to defragment support for teaching.

Apollonio: Again, they would certainly have a lot to think about and a lot to do including that. I mean I think as a body of the Council, it would be sort of a different type of an entity, right?

Because the purpose would be to make a faculty voice, and perhaps simplify those connections for faculty. That's where the idea came up. So many good ideas have come up, for example, of an ombudsperson who would be a source for good information among all the 15 other committee or something, where all the grants are available, there's ton of teaching grants for example.

Huston: Here you're talking about consolidating all the information that's in the meetings. That would be really positive. I actually I'm suggesting something beyond that as well, which is to perhaps come up with suggestions for consolidating this stuff. Because right now if we just leave it here, we have yet another administrative body and governance body dealing with something that's already fragmented amongst several different governing bodies.

Apollonio: That seems like a really super charge for a committee.

Nowicki: If I could follow along, as one of those bloated administrators, I tried to do that years ago and failed. It's because nobody wants to give up their little piece of the pie. So, all for it. Absolutely. I actually do think that that would simplify and make better the way that support works to help faculty in their teaching.

Lee Willard (Trinity): How does this relate to the proposal for the replacement for Keith Whitfield and for the faculty in the advancement position? Because it seems like these things are beyond just Trinity, they're university wide. We've historically had this committee in the Council previously and it evolved out. I don't know the reasons for that.

Layton: We had this committee before?

Willard: A teaching an honors committee at one time, Phil Costanzo chaired.

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): I used to be on it. It just kind of fizzled out.

Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience): It may still be in the by-laws. It ran for a long time and it devolved into selecting the Trinity distinguished teaching award. But it was just under the leadership of one or two chairs of the committee that it devolved. Really.

Layton: I guess the answer is we don't know. Thank you.

Apollonio: The report is available on Sakai so everyone can read it.

Layton: Thank you everybody. See you in November.