

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
012 ALLEN  
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447  
e-mail [acouncil@Duke.edu](mailto:acouncil@Duke.edu)  
fax (919) 684-9171

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, April 17, 2014

**Joshua Socolar (Physics and chair of Academic Council):** Welcome, everyone, to the April meeting of the Academic Council. We do have a lot to do today. But first, I am pleased to announce the results of the deliberations of our Faculty Scholars Award Committee. The Faculty Scholar Award was established at Duke in 1974 and is the only Duke award bestowed by the faculty. The following students were selected to receive the award based on dossiers submitted to the committee. They will receive a monetary award and will be recognized, along with their advisors and mentors, at a reception next week in the Academic Council office. The recipients this year are members of the class of 2015. The first is Eugene Rabinovich, who's majoring in Physics & Mathematics. The second is Tara Trahey, majoring in Art History & Visual Arts and Italian Studies / Classical Civilizations. Eugene plans to pursue a PhD in Physics. He is interested in quantum theories of gravity and cosmology and Tara plans to pursue a master's followed by a PhD in Art History. She is interested in the use of digital technologies for the display and curation of art collections. Honorable Mention was awarded to Gift Nyikayaramba, majoring in Electrical & Computer Engineering. Gift plans to pursue a PhD in electrical engineering with a focus on the development of low-cost materials for solar energy systems. I think I can speak for all of us in saying that we are thrilled to see what these students are accomplishing and proud of what it

says about the mentoring they are receiving here at Duke. I would also like to thank the following members of the Faculty Scholars Award Committee for their time and effort in reviewing the dossiers and interviewing the students in order to make their selection: Jimmy Roberts, Economics, served as chair; other committee members were Chris Dwyer, Tom Ferraro, Cindy Kuhn, and Carlos Rojas -- some of them are members of the Council.

Our next item is the approval of the minutes from the March 27th Council meeting. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

*(approved by voice vote with no dissent)*

The next information item I have for you is about the slate of candidates for the election of the next ECAC. The following eight (refers to slide) of your colleagues have agreed to run for election to ECAC. They're all members who have been elected to the Council and they either have been serving a year already or are elected to a new term. And you will receive via email the election materials and a ballot next week sometime. So I want to thank all eight for being willing to stand for election and wish them all luck.

Now one of the responsibilities of ECAC is to suggest to the President choices of faculty colleagues who would be effective in serving on University committees. Over the next few weeks, we will be considering candidates for

the list of committees that you can find here (refers to Academic Council website). You go to Members & Committees then University Committees. This list of committees needs to be replenished for next year. As you might expect, at ECAC the same names come to mind each year due to our own familiarity with people who have been tapped for committee service in the past. We would like to broaden our scope and encourage wider participation in faculty governance if possible. And so, I invite any faculty to contact me via the "Contact us" button here on the website to let me know of your interest in a given committee. If you could do that within the next week or two, that would be helpful.

**Sara Beale (ECAC/School of Law):** Or nominations of third persons.

**Socolar:** Yes, if there is somebody that you think would be particularly good, please let us know. When we send the names up to the president, we haven't always confirmed that they're willing to serve yet. So we're interested in any suggestions.

Our next agenda item concerns the appointment of a Faculty Ombudsman. As detailed in Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook, the role of the Faculty Ombudsman is to facilitate prompt and equitable resolution of allegations by faculty members and instructional staff if there has been a violation of either: the university's policy concerning academic freedom and academic tenure; or the university's policy of equal treatment in employment.

The Ombudsman is appointed for a term of two years by the Academic Council and reports to the President. Our current Ombudsman is Jeffrey Dawson, Professor Emeritus from the Department of Immunology. During his long tenure at Duke, he has served on numerous university committees, including

multiple terms on the Academic Council and a term on ECAC. Jeff was first appointed as Ombudsman in 2008, was reappointed in 2010 and 2012, and has indicated his willingness to serve another term. In preparing for this meeting, in response to a procedural concern raised by a faculty member, ECAC found that there has been no Council discussion of the activities of the Ombudsman since 2004, and concluded that a simple vote with no discussion would not be appropriate. We have therefore revised our original plan as reflected in the published agenda. Today we will hear a brief report from Jeff on the recent history of his activities as Ombudsman and then open the floor for questions. Acting on the general principle that Council members should have a chance to digest information on substantive matters before being asked to take any action, we will delay the vote until the May meeting. So, Jeff, could you give us a sense of the volume and nature of the cases that you have handled and their outcomes?

**Jeff Dawson (Faculty Ombudsman/Immunology):** It's interesting that when I was asked to consider another term I'd had a relatively quiet period, and I thought that's not bad. And in the weeks since I said yes I would consider it, things have exploded (laughter), so I'm not so sure now. What kind of things do we see? And "we" is me. The office consists of me and a mobile phone -- that's it. And I will meet anywhere with anyone at any time. We've even done telephone conferences from an international site. A lot of the traffic is simple phone calls for clarification: put me in the right place or where do I go to look up this? And it's usually questions about policy, although we should all be familiar with the Faculty Handbook, we're not. That's my job; I really need to know it backwards and forwards. The second, probably most frequent visitor -- and that's probably once a week or so -- is to have someone come or I go and see them and

spend some time discussing a problem they're having. The office is basically about conflict resolution. Hopefully before they get to getting to the ombuds, they've made an attempt with whomever they're having a grievance to try to work this out to some mutual satisfaction. Obviously if they haven't, they're having difficulty communicating, they'll come by to talk to me. And sometimes it's just venting and that helps. They might come in and spend an hour, hour and a half and just get it out of their system. And I may never see them again, but it was important to them. The bad side of this is lots of time I don't get feedback; they'll go away and they'll never contact me about what happened or where did you go with this. But during those meetings generally I try to work out what is the issue, and the issue that they come in with is not necessarily what's really bothering them. Because they'll come in very emotional in many cases, angry in many cases, and it takes some time letting them talk, maybe asking a guided question or two to get out what is the real issue. What do you want to address? What have you tried? What needs to be done? And then in the course of that discussion, we may discuss -- if things are going well -- what are the options that you see? And again, I try to get them to evaluate their own options, get a sense of what's real and what is probably not possible. Then if they leave and attempt to go back and renegotiate their problem, again sometimes I hear from them, sometimes I don't. And I assume if I don't hear from them that either they gave up or things worked out. If I get a phone call saying, "nope that didn't work, we need to meet again," then we talk about the possibility of mediation. Do they want me to go with them into these meetings -- and I've done that -- so that there is an impartial observer who makes sure that what is said and what is heard coincide. It may be that the atmosphere is so poisonous that I'll serve as the shuttle diplomat, so I'll take the person's concerns to whoever this is,

try to work it out. But again, you must appreciate the ombuds has no power other than the power of persuasion. So if I run into, let's say a supervisor of a faculty in one capacity or another who's taken a fixed position and it just isn't going to go any other direction, then it's my duty to go back to that faculty member and say basically we're not going to solve it by an informal method, you have the following options if you wish to pursue this. And the next one would be the Faculty Hearing Committee. If it goes to the Faculty Hearing Committee, then I have to write up a report summarizing the grievance, what the faculty member has done in an attempt to solve it, what I've done in an attempt to solve it, and pass that on. I will say that in the first two years that I served, there was a very steep learning curve, I think. I had a lot of help from Rich Burton, my predecessor, but I came on board with four very difficult cases. And the financial squeeze hit at that same time between 2008-2010, and I had a lot of traffic in the office. Basically faculty who were in non-tenure positions but in contracts, and many of them were being let go through no fault of their own performance but it was a financial decision. It was not easy, and I think I reported to the president at the end of that two year term that this was a concern of mine that maybe we weren't doing the best job of preparing people if you're going to terminate their contracts. So if it goes to the Faculty Hearing Committee, the procedures for that are outlined pretty well in the Faculty Handbook. I will say that in my first two-year term I had one case go that far. And in the remaining four years, fortunately, only one additional one has gone forward. So in some respects I'm a gatekeeper, and I feel good about that. In other cases you can't tell really how satisfied people are as a result of the interaction. So I don't know if a lot of people just gave up, didn't come back, didn't pursue it, etc. I don't think we've had anybody go to the ultimate step and that is bring a legal case against the

university. The other part I would say of my obligations to you and to the president and provost is to report periodically. And generally what I do is report just prior to the end of a two-year term because I like to give a pretty good idea of the type of cases I've had in the two-year period. And that changes. As I said, in the first two-year term there were an awful lot of terminations. In the last four years, the bulk of them have been senior faculty members with a little bit of pressure on because they're no longer productive and basically being encouraged to retire. There's less of the type that I saw again earlier that have to do with "I have a difficulty communicating with my supervisor" be that a chair, a division chief, or a dean. So I think at least the new round of leadership is a little bit better at managing people, at least that's my read on it. So in those two-year reports I share them with the president, the provost, and the chair of Academic Council. They generally indicate general trends. I don't list or talk about any specific cases. What might come up, and I can tell you about the last two-year block, was that in going through the Faculty Handbook there was a noticeable lack of detail with respect to what do you do with an institute or center, for example, that has seen better days. There's no sunset clause in my reading of it. I brought that to their attention, and I'm hoping that maybe that will get some attention by this group. I think the other thing that came up probably earlier in that two-year term was ambiguity in terms of what the OIE did in cases of examining a claim of sexual harassment. And there was a lot of confusing language in the Faculty Handbook in terms of what is an informal hearing and what is a formal hearing, and I think they've gone to some degree to clarify that. I'm not sure that they're there yet. I think at this point I'd like to open it up to questions rather than bore you with any more of this.

**Socolar:** Questions?

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** I think that for faculty the ombudsman can be a really important avenue to pursue when it comes to issues of addressing harassment and discrimination when other avenues have failed, and so in that sense the ombuds can play a really critical role in Duke's ability to create and maintain a fair and unbiased environment for faculty. So I'm really heartened that the Academic Council has created a new committee, which I hope will investigate not only issues of diversity but more specifically harassment, and so I'm thinking of the ombuds position in that context. So I request that this newly formed committee investigate the role of the ombud in determining how that office might better serve the university. Some questions to ask are how well understood is the position at Duke? You addressed that a little bit in your comments. Is the implementation forwarding our goals of diversity? How are nominations for that position secured? How are candidates vetted and is that procedure consistent with our goals of diversity and inclusion? Second, I request that -- and it's not really a request to you, more to Josh -- that in the spirit of inclusion that you rename the ombudsman position. Our sister universities have found other ways to name that office that are a little more inclusive. And I also wanted to ask you what your goals are for your next term and how your office might help Duke achieve equal and unbiased treatment for members of our community?

**Dawson:** Right. I wanted to touch on one point that you raised about the relationship with OIE. Whenever a case comes in and an individual claims sexual harassment, by law that has to go to OIE, okay? My role in that presently is basically to walk them through what they can expect in an informal hearing versus a formal hearing. My role then waits until a decision is made, and if they come back and there's been some sanctions for example placed against the faculty member, do

they want to appeal that? What would be the mechanism for appealing that? If for any reason the decision is unsatisfactory, or might not be that they were formally accused, but there was additional language -- what would we do about that? How can we help clarify that? So the role in terms of that particular grievance, sexual harassment, would first go to OIE, but I could help prepare them for that meeting, and I do. And then, depending upon the outcome, we may meet again.

**Springer:** That makes it sound like most of your clientele are people who have been accused?

**Dawson:** Yes.

**Springer:** And you imply that the OIE has actually ever sanctioned someone?

**Dawson:** I don't know the answer to that. I'm sorry, to follow up I didn't address all of your questions?

**Springer:** Right. So one of them was what your goals are for this next term and how your office can help Duke achieve equal and unbiased treatment for members of the community. One of the things that really struck me in your comments, one is this use of the word "gatekeeper," which I think is an unfortunate description of the position. And there is also this issue of a larger duty to the community. So you spoke in terms that seemed to me to be a little paternalistic, like your somebody's counselor and you're trying to help them work through their problems when it actually may be a reflection of deeper structural issues at the university. Can you have an impact on that?

**Dawson:** Well that's right, so if you look over time at a pattern, I am obligated to pass that on and I do. This seems to be a recurrent problem.

**Springer:** Pass it on to whom?

**Dawson:** The president, the provost, and the chair of Academic Council. For example, I'd say two, three years ago there was -- it's a problem unique to the School of Medicine -- but when it comes to negotiating a retirement, it's not as clear cut as it is in other schools. And often I've seen individuals from the School of Medicine, both basic medical scientists and clinicians, who need that help. I'm not sure that's something the ombuds should be doing, so I reported that in one of my biannual reports. And as a consequence there is a new office within the School of Medicine.

**Socolar:** Other questions?

**Dan Gauthier (Physics):** Just to echo one of the comments or questions, when I tried to search for your contact information before I knew who you were on the Duke University website, it was hard to search and find any contact information for your position. Anything that would be done to help with that...

**Dawson:** I think the easiest place is again under Academic Council.

**Gauthier:** Right, but unless you know that that's where you should go, it would be nice if you could go to the Duke University homepage and type in "faculty ombuds" and...

**Dawson:** I know. We also need a better description of the charge because I get a lot of questions from -- unfortunately staff do not have an equivalent position -- so I get a lot of phone calls from staff saying "what do I do?" and I have to redirect them to, probably an office that's not ideal.

**Brenda Nevidjon (ECAC/School of Nursing):** I have some thoughts to the comment

you made where so many of the individuals you see, you don't hear back from. So you don't have a closed loop on that which means it's hard to know -- did things get resolved, did they not get resolved, and if they're not getting resolved then there may be patterns that are being missed. Do you have any thoughts about a different approach?

**Dawson:** I think in the past few years, I've gone back and tried to close that loop, but it's not always successful.

**Diane Nelson (Cultural Anthropology):** I would just like to follow up on a couple of the questions of my colleague over here. One, I guess I am a little confused too, like if this is a position that could be more activist on some of the issues that were raised maybe specifically about sexual harassment or other questions about diversity? I mean, I don't want to put too much more labor on what sounds like a barely functioning office except for your goodwill and energy. Or if there are maybe other places the university needs to think about to address these questions? And I also like the idea of changing the name.

**Dawson:** To? I mean, I'm already using "ombuds," is that what you meant?

**Springer:** That's one option.

**Nelson:** In terms of this position being one that could more activist in addressing issues or if it's only ever reactive? Does that make sense?

**Dawson:** Yes, I'm trying to think. You would need help, I would need help certainly, and what would be the appropriate bodies or body to do that? I wouldn't say that I'm totally up to speed on everything that you would need in order to do a really good job in that area, so you'd definitely need help.

**Jim Cox (School of Law):** So I was the chairman of the Hearing Committee for a number of years that gave rise, when Keith Brodie was president of the university, for the position that you now occupy. And a lot of water has gone under the bridge obviously since then, so I can only speak to what the original intent was and I know this has been tweaked around the edges. I would just offer the fact that what you describe is consistent with the position that we brought, and that was that we really had nothing that was short of a confrontational proceeding. And President Brodie and myself both thought that we needed to have something that could be facilitated in a way in many instances, but not all the instances. And we also foresaw there were going to be situations that -- whether we call them "structural" or whatever it's going to be -- that that would have to be dealt with elsewhere, but we also felt it would be inappropriate for the ombudsman to be anything other than a facilitator of both groups, somebody who could move between both camps to try and understand what the others are saying and to try to smooth things over. And that would probably be counterproductive if one were ever sitting as an advocate for a particular bent on something of structural concern, that that had to go someplace else. Now as I said, that was twenty some years ago, we've gotten a lot of experience since then. But I would just say that the little bit I know about conflict and dispute resolution that this seems a sensible manner that we see a lot of times operating in the legal field, and I actually think it makes sense with what you're doing. But at the same time being watchful -- are you pointing out, for instance, where you have to place an issue in some other place where others need to pick up the cause and bring up changes that need to be done at that point?

**Beale:** Jeff, can you tell us, can you use any numbers -- you talked about the fact that it's

you and your phone and it's a small operation and it got busy lately -- roughly how many people contact you during the year, roughly how many ask you to do more than just sit down with them where you may for example do shuttle diplomacy or try to do a kind of conciliation or mediation process, where you play a significantly more active role in that process?

**Dawson:** Right. It's roughly once a week that I actually have a sit down with a different person, so roughly that over the year. It's episodic as you might guess, when the budgets come out and when decisions about appointments, promotions, and tenure come out, it's heavier than that. Other times it's quiet. In terms of cases where I need to do some investigation and/or contacting people, probably I'm guessing four to five a month, something like that. And those are continuous; I have sixty days to clear a grievance. But I'm handling that many, let's say, in a month's time.

**Beale:** Can I ask one follow-up about that? You talked about the fact that in some cases the person is going to go in and attempt, after a discussion with you, to kind of reach some solution with the person or group that they have a problem with, but then in other cases you would be more actively involved in trying to bring the two parties together, which sounds like mediation or conciliation or that kind of thing. How many of those cases are there? Because that -- Jim (Cox) was referring to the Law School -- I mean there is an industry that does that with a lot of training and techniques that I don't have and I'm not sure that we've ever had you trained in, so I'm just wondering how big a piece that is of your job?

**Dawson:** Probably once or twice a month I'm involved in that. It might be done by phone. The person bringing the grievance may say

"I'm having difficulty with this person," and I may contact them and say "are you aware?" Again, you're breaking confidence; I have to ask the person coming into my office, "may I contact this person? What may I say?" okay? Under that frame of reference, I'll contact that person -- maybe by phone -- I'll say I want a meeting, and they'll say, "well what is it?" and I'll explain it, and they'll say "okay, I'll sit down and talk with so-and-so." And then I might get an email from the faculty member saying everything is worked out.

**Ronen Plessner (Physics/Mathematics):** I'm going to ask about, again a somewhat statistical but also procedural question -- presumably it happens that someone comes to you with some grievance that you perceive is not due to misunderstanding, but that somebody somewhere is just doing something that's wrong. You're the one who knows the Faculty Handbook and you realize that somebody's supervisor is just violating the harassment policy or something. Could you say something about the procedures of what you do when confronted with a case where somebody somewhere is doing something that's wrong?

**Dawson:** Go to that person and point it out. I'll point that out to that individual. It says right here in the Faculty Handbook.

**Plessner:** Which individual? The complainer or the complainant?

**Dawson:** The only one I've got access to.

**Plessner:** So you don't follow up? You just tell them, "here's the violation" -- you tell the person who's talking to you, "you're right, this is..."

**Dawson:** Well it depends upon the outcome then. Yeah, I would follow up. But again if someone digs in and says, "I'm not consider-

ing” ...

**Socolar:** I think you originally meant that you talked to the person who you think violated the Handbook?

**Dawson:** Right, right. So a faculty member comes in and says “they’ve done this and so is this legal?” And I’ll say, “no, it’s not according to the Faculty Handbook; do you want me to contact them or do you want to point it out to them?” And often they’ll say, “would you do it please?” So yes, I will. Then again, they may persist.

**Socolar:** One more question.

**Springer:** (addressing Jim Cox) You mentioned this idea that the ombuds should not be an advocate for either side, but the definition of the ombuds in Swedish is actually public advocate?

**Cox:** No, I was actually talking about for a cause. I think they have to be an advocate for -- once they get the facts, I could see the strategic thing is to go in and tell somebody that you’re violating rules of personhood rights, and so you’re obviously going to be an advocate for them, absolutely. I think that what we worry about and what was not thought about in the initial conversation -- we didn’t open it up, and I think that’s your point -- that it [the ombuds] could be an advocate for a particular new, independent cause or movement or whatever it’s going to be, independent of...

**Springer:** So what about an advocate to follow policy and law? In that case then you’re an advocate for the community to make sure that the policy was followed.

**Cox:** Yes, but you do do that. I mean, that’s consistent with what he’s saying.

**Springer:** But when you said you would contact the person the complaint was made against and that person might still be recalcitrant, you just sort of shrugged your shoulders.

**Dawson:** Yeah, you have to go beyond that.

**Springer:** Are you going to go beyond that?

**Dawson:** I can, yes.

**Springer:** You can?

**Dawson:** I haven’t had that though.

**Springer:** You haven’t had that before?

**Dawson:** No, if I’ve pointed out a problem it’s been resolved.

**Springer:** Really?

**Dawson:** Yeah.

**Springer:** We should talk.

**Dawson:** Okay (laughter).

**Socolar:** Okay, on that note (laughter) thanks very much. And it’s clear that there were some issues raised here that warrant some further study, so ECAC will think it over and make some recommendations about procedural aspects and also about that name. If anybody has suggestions for a name, send them in. I think we all agree that ombudsman is not the best term. I have no idea what it takes to change the Faculty Handbook though, so we’ll have to figure it out.

**Dawson:** We’ll be talking about that (laughter).

**Socolar:** Okay, the next item on our agenda is the creation of a new regular rank faculty ti-



tle called senior lecturer and Dean Laurie Patton and Senior Associate Dean Kevin Moore are here to present a proposal. Various supporting documents were posted with our agenda. We'll discuss the proposal today and vote on it at the May meeting.

**Laurie Patton (Dean, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences):** Kevin and I are delighted to be here to present this to you, and what we'll do is just go over the main points of the proposal presuming that you've had a chance to look at it. And then I wanted to describe a little bit of what this proposal was not to make sure of that in advance of some of the queries that we've gotten and its peregrinations through the various committees -- I think that you're the last before the BOT. We're really excited to be at this point as well. So Arts & Sciences in general has appointing units that hire lecturers, and what we have discovered in the last two or three years --and certainly even before then, it's kind of a lived experience in academic life kind of question -- is that a lot of those lecturers have been in rank for many years, seven years or more, without the possibility of promotion and the six percent raise that is usually attendant upon that promotion. And we were increasingly uncomfortable with that. We felt that there should be, within the lecturer rank, a possibility for advancement within the rank as we have with professors of the practice and as we have obviously for the tenure track. And we feel that lecturers make an incredible contribution to our collective life together, to curriculum, to the university, and to the profession more broadly. And so we also consulted with our fellow folk in the Sanford School and the Nicholas School of the Environment as well as -- we checked with the Pratt School of Engineering and they do not have regular rank lecturers -- but we did check with the other two schools. And this proposal has their support as well. We just want to mention to you also that both Stan-

ford and Penn have this rank of senior lecturers, so we are being consistent with our peers on this and the opportunity of giving them promotion. And talking a little bit, touching on the criteria for promotion, we would like to propose that normally -- again that phrase is very important because there could be interesting exceptions to this -- they would have served a minimum of two terms as lecturer for a total of at least eight years in that rank before they were promoted. That the promotion would be a demonstrably higher level of excellence in teaching, in responsibility both in the classroom and in curriculum development within the department, and we also want them to be active in the dissemination of their pedagogies and their scholarship about pedagogies if that is something that they engage in. And obviously significant contributions to the department and to the teaching profession. And we propose that we follow exactly the standards for promotion and the procedures for reviews that are in the Handbook for a non-tenure track faculty rank, which is in Appendix C of the Faculty Handbook, which would mean that it would go through the candidate's department and then the approval of the dean. So that's essentially in a nutshell what we're interested in. We have a number of different departments in Arts & Sciences that have lecturers. They tend to be concentrated in AMES (which is Asian, Middle Eastern Studies), Romance, and Biology, but they are sprinkled throughout. And we feel that given the number of them, given their extraordinary contributions to our collective life together, we think it's really important to create this higher rank for promotion within rank. Let me just end -- and Kevin can add anything that he'd like to add as our senior associate dean for faculty appointments -- of what this is not. And this is really just to do a kind of advance anticipation of some of the questions that we've had and the really great discussions we've had so far. The first is that this is not an attempt to

hire more lecturers and replace tenure track positions with lecturer positions. We've actually gone down slightly in our number of lecturers, and we are very deeply committed to maintaining the proportion of tenure track folks that we have in Arts & Sciences, so we want to make that crystal clear. Second, this proposal is not an imposition of this rank on anyone. It is simply available for departments who would like to use it. But we have some departments who don't have lecturers at all, some who don't have professors of the practice at all, it's entirely up to the department to decide what they'd like to do with the rank and whether they'd like to use it. And it really should be a matter of department self-governance. And on that note, let me just end by adding that we're really very much looking forward to working with departments on reshaping their bylaws, and we will work very closely with departments to reshape their bylaws should they choose as a matter of self-governance to use this rank. So I'll end there, and Kevin you can add anything if you want?

**Kevin Moore (Senior Associate Dean of Faculty, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences):** Laurie has covered pretty much everything. But by way of a very brief background and in answer to Josh's question about what it takes to change the Faculty Handbook, the regular rank title of lecturer has been in existence at Duke for a long time and it's only been in the last few years, as Laurie said, that we've kind of come up against this ceiling in that ranking, which we have several highly qualified faculty members who are deserving of promotion for whom there is no promotion available. A recent chair in Romance Studies where we have ten lecturers who mostly deliver the language curriculum asked us whether we could promote a lecturer to senior lecturer and thought we could just wave a wand and do it, and that's when we found out...(laughter)

**Patton:** Here we are.

**Moore:** Here we are, right. ECAC, APC, etc all the way up to the Board of Trustees because the Board of Trustees has to approve any change to the Faculty Handbook.

**Patton:** The wand waving -- there are many committees in the wand (laughter).

**Moore:** Laurie has really covered everything else. The cover note that we submitted after meeting with ECAC really amplified a couple of things that were already in the proposal that ECAC asked us about, specifically whether all departments would use it, whether this implies the devolving of teaching responsibilities from tenure stream faculty to lecturers. The answer to both those questions is no. And what the criteria for promotion would be. In there, just as it is with professors of the practice in Arts & Sciences and Sanford, the two units with which I'm most familiar, each department develops its own criteria for promotion from assistant to associate and from associate to full professor of the practice depending on what that practice is. And we work with those departments to make sure those criteria are robust and specific and we would do the same thing in this case.

**Patton:** And just to anticipate another question that has come up "why couldn't lecturers just bump up to professors of the practice?" And that certainly has happened in the past, but the key thing there is that the distinction we make -- and of course every department is different -- more generally speaking is that lecturers are primarily committed to pedagogy and professors of the practice do have a practice, whether that is research in a science or in a humanities or however we think about it that may not be at the level of a tenure stream person but still is a practice. It could also be an art or music or dance, etc. And so the key thing there, we're certainly willing and open and have in the past done exactly

that jump, but it has to be after rigorous review -- this is in fact regular rank, even if it's not tenure track -- of what that practice consists of and whether we can think of it as a practice. And that's primarily done by the department as that's appropriate as a matter of self-governance. So that's pretty much it.

**Socolar:** I think Laurie and Kevin have answered all the questions (laughter). If there are any more questions?

**Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering):** Just a point of clarification, Pratt has one lecturer and it's in Biomedical Engineering. We just hired one in Biomedical Engineering last summer, so she hasn't quite...

**Moore:** That's how long this has been in the pipeline (laughter).

**Henriquez:** The other question, you mentioned a term, which sounded like the term might be four years, but I think that term can be flexible. So is there a sort of timetable, six years going up to...?

**Moore:** Yeah, up to five. The Faculty Handbook specifies that any non-tenure stream regular rank appointment can be no more than five years in length, unless you're a full professor of the practice or a full research professor who has been reappointed in rank at least once, in which case it can be ten years. And those criteria will apply here, so a maximum of ten years or five years per term regardless of whether you're a lecturer or a senior lecturer.

**Henriquez:** So when would the person go up for promotion?

**Moore:** That's a really good question. It would depend on their profile. Normally, following our conversations in APC, no less time than seven years in rank, sort of parallel to

the tenure track, at least in Arts & Sciences.

**Patton:** But I think you're absolutely right, Craig. We do want to build flexibility into this no matter what because we could get an extraordinary pedagogue who we really want to feature in a number of different ways who comes from another university or whatever it might be, and we would therefore shorten that term. And we do so in cases of professors of the practice and early tenure, etc. So I think we would make sure that that flexibility was built in by the use of appropriate words like "normally" and so on.

**Socolar:** If there are further questions....oh, well I have to take this one (laughter).

**President Richard Brodhead:** I know I should stop. I've been in a university that had this rank; it functions just fine. But when you mentioned the analogy to the ladder ranks, assistant and associate, it raises a question, which is if the number of years have passed where you would come up for consideration for promotion to this rank and you weren't promoted to it, can you stay in the lecturer rank?

**Moore:** Yes.

**Patton:** Yeah, that's correct.

**Brodhead:** So, in other words that's the key difference between it and the...

**Patton:** Right, exactly right. That's the difference and then professor of the practice *mutatis mutandis* is the same thing.

**Socolar:** One more question.

**Joel Meyer (Nicholas School of the Environment):** What are the particular advantages to the professor being promoted to senior lecturer? What do they get out of that other than a change in title?

**Patton:** Well, as I mentioned earlier I think the idea of -- universities work in several economies, they work in social capital, they work with prestige capital and they work with actual capital. And so they're going to get a six percent actual capital raise, they will get a prestige capital raise, and my guess is many of the lecturers that we work with within the departments that were referred to earlier, they have supervisory capacity over the pedagogical challenges that they face in terms of organizing curriculum and so forth. And so for all those reasons I think that many of them feel that that rank would allow them to have that supervisory capacity in addition to a higher status within the department. And you know, this is a larger question, but I think what concerned us was this situation of being long term in the lecturer rank with no possibility to move to a POP but still great distinction within pedagogy.

**Socolar:** If there are any further questions about this, please send them to me, and I will relay them to Laurie and Kevin and we'll try to get them answered before the vote at the next meeting.

**Patton:** Thanks very much.

**Socolar:** Thanks so much Laurie and Kevin. We now have the chance to hear reports from committee chairs about the activities over the past year of three committees that are central to our faculty governance structure: APC, UPC, and GPC. I have asked each of the chairs to summarize their agendas from this year and to give you a sense of how their committees operate. We'll start with Alex Hartemink, Professor of Computer Science and chair of the Academic Programs Committee.

**Alex Hartemink (Computer Science/Academic Programs Committee, chair):** Josh, ECAC, and distinguished members of the Academic Council, thank you for

the opportunity to provide an update regarding the activities of the Academic Programs Committee this past year. As a brief bit of background for those who may not be familiar, APC is a provost-level committee of faculty from around the university who's purpose and charge is to provide the provost input, advice, and guidance regarding the academic mission of the university. Faculty serve for three year terms and this year's roster included seventeen faculty drawn from seven of Duke's schools. This year's meetings were also attended by up to fourteen others ex officio, including the provost and vice provost for academic affairs, dean and associate dean for academic affairs for the Graduate School, deans and divisional deans of Trinity in Arts & Sciences, the chairs of the Academic Council (Josh) and Global Priorities Committee, and a representative from the Graduate and Professional Student Council. In addition, as chair of APC, I myself served ex officio on the University Priorities Committee and on the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs subcommittee. So as you can see, APC does not operate in isolation of other bodies but rather sits within a nexus of coordinated communication and decision making involving multiple layers of faculty and administration. Diving a little deeper, APC's priority roles are three fold: number one, we are part of the process for evaluating external reviews of existing programs and institutes; number two, we are part of the process for evaluating proposals for new degree programs or initiatives; and number three, we discuss and weigh-in on matters of relevance to Duke's academic mission. This year in the first category we considered external reviews of eight entities: Biology, Slavic & Eurasian studies, the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, the PhD program in Nursing, IGSP, Civil & Environmental Engineering, German and at our last meeting we will consider the Duke Global Health Institute. In each case, we are part of a longer stream of processes in which

these bodies are vetted. First, there's a self-study in the unit, an external review committee, a response by the unit, processes by which they come through perhaps the ECGF and eventually up to APC. In the second category, we considered a new PhD program in Biostatistics, and master's programs in Historical & Cultural Visualization, Medical Physics at DKU, Bioethics & Science Policy, Statistical Science, and Economics & Computation. Additionally, we approved the transfer of the master's of management in Clinical Informatics from the Fuqua School to the School of Medicine, the creation of a new terminal master's degree in German and a new name for the department of Religion, henceforth known as Religious Studies. In a third category, we discussed the review criteria for institutes at Duke, the establishment of the new rank of senior lecturer, just discussed here today, we heard from Provost Lange as he reflected on the APT process and also on the state and trajectory of Duke's academic distinction and distinctives. We received an update from Eric Toone on the Innovation & Entrepreneurship Initiative and we will be receiving an update from Susan Roth on the Bass Connections at our last meeting. Last but not least, we spent some time discussing issues arising with the creation of new master's programs at Duke and with the overall review process for the growing number of existing Duke programs. As you can tell, APC has been kept quite busy this year. And of this rather lengthy litany of reviews, proposals and discussions I want to take a few minutes and elaborate on two of them. With the creation of a number of new master's programs, many on campus have started to wonder about not the merits of any individual proposal but rather their accumulative impact on the overall academic milieu on campus. This has been discussed in many places from here in the Academic Council to the Graduate School, to the offices of the Provost and Deans and to the Chronicle. Since this is

being discussed in a number of venues, I only wish to make one point at this time apart from letting you know that we in APC are also discussing this. Many are rightly asking about the impact of these programs as a function of the number of new students that will arrive on campus on such resources as housing, dining, career services and CAPS and the like. However, I also want to point out that some impact arises in proportion not to the number of students but rather in proportion to the number of programs. One such impact is on the regular review of established programs at Duke which is the second topic on which I wish to elaborate. APC began a conversation this year about the burden associated with the very critical task of any organization, in particular a university, to regularly review its operations. In our case, the multiplicity of units that contributes to Duke's academic mission. I won't go into all of the details but the short message is that there exists a little over 100 programs for which the university should be regularly reviewing, and if a review needs to happen approximately every five years a little bit of math would suggest that about 20 programs need to be reviewed every year. APC meets about 14 times per year. At this point, we've mostly identified the challenge and we've proposed a number of possible ways in which a solution might be developed. But mostly we are teeing this up for the next provost -- Peter outgoing and Sally coming in -- to contemplate possible ways of making this very important process more effective and timely. And I just elaborate with a few details on this one topic to give you a sense of the kind of issues that APC is interested in discussing. Before I close, I'd like to take this moment to thank all of the people on the committee, a number of whom are here in the room, who so generously and faithfully gave of their time and concern and wisdom to the university as well as the many faculty and administrators who have visited with APC as guests this past year to provide

further input and perspective. I particularly want to thank Keith Whitfield, John Klingensmith, Josh Socolar and Gloria Taylor-Neal, in the Provost's Office, for all their help and coordination of the schedule this year. Thanks also to you for the opportunity to report to you about APC's activities this year. I'm delighted to take any questions you might have. Thank you very much.

**Socolar:** Thanks, Alex. Any questions for Alex?

**Patton:** I was just very struck and concerned about the challenge that you just outlined in terms of faculty labor, in terms of workload, etc. It's a huge amount of service. I will say that when I think about this committee in comparison to other institutions, this is a committee that a lot of other institutions just don't have, and it's a kind of university-wide intermediary body where faculty can own the programs and really dive deep into programs that allow a kind of literacy that is very hard to maintain in a university about programs across multiple units. And I would only say that alone is worth preserving.

**Hartemink:** Oh, absolutely.

**Patton:** I just want to make sure everyone knows that, there are not a lot of APC's in the country and it's one of the things that makes Duke really Duke.

**Hartemink:** Yes, I agree with that point.

**Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology):** Basically, I want to reiterate that same idea, but also to get an idea of the kinds of programs that you review. How many are master's, how many are PhD's, how many are professionals?

**Hartemink:** Mostly about 60 to 70 are sort of vertically-integrated programs of some kind. It might be a department which has under-

graduate and graduate programs, PhD, master's the whole thing is reviewed, typically in a slice. Then there are some interdisciplinary programs that join between two units, say, I'll make one up, so biophysics. It probably is not reviewed with biology, it's probably not reviewed with physics, it might require a separate targeted review for that. Then there are programs that are non-professional degrees within various schools. The PhD in Nursing is an example. We don't look at the professional degrees in Nursing which are vetted by external bodies and certification standards. Then there are also institutes and initiatives, cross-school things. You start to add it all up and it quickly approaches a hundred.

**Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences):** It strikes me that this, aside from the number, divided by the number of times that the committee meets, it's potentially an enormous time-sink effort....

**Hartemink:** Yes, it is.

**Cohen:** And so raising the question, when you do these reviews, what are you doing? How deep of a review are you doing? I mean, it seems to me that you review one institute, for example, could take months of work?! It just doesn't sound like you could possibly have the resources for that, so what are you actually doing? (laughter)

**Hartemink:** There is a large pipeline process in which different aspects of the unit are being reviewed at different depths. The most important thing probably, you could argue is the actual self-study that the unit goes through on its own to identify some of its own strengths and weaknesses and opportunities and threats, what's been happening since the last review and so on. Then you get that material besides the implicit benefit of going through the process of generating it, it does take a ton of work, then of course it's

evaluated by an external review committee. So we, the university, get input from other peer institutions on that unit, a report is written, the department responds. But then, for example, the ECGF looks over all of those documents and has a conversation with the leaders of the unit, asks questions targeted maybe at specific areas of concern that they might have and writes up a resolution summarizing the ways in which the unit is on the right track, they agree with the external review or disagree, it comes to APC and we do something similar. So, we have access to all of the materials in the same way that in a promotion case, the binder just keeps getting thicker as it moves down (laughter), and we're a bit like APT in that we review the sum total of the thickness of the binder and then give a recommendation to the Provost. But we're not a decision-making body, we are simply advisory.

**Earl Dowell (Mechanical Engineering):** At one time there was a memorandum of understanding that was signed by the provost to the dean and department chair that said the department will do this and the university will do that and we agree that we will go forward on that basis. Is that still done?

**Hartemink:** That's above my pay grade (laughter). I haven't seen any MOUs in my lifetime. Maybe I saw a first one last week regarding the joint-program in German between Duke and UNC, there was a MOU between the two provosts and that was part of our review of the German program. My understanding is yes, after we're done we make a resolution or a recommendation to the provost and then the provost, factoring all of that information into account, undertakes a process of establishing a MOU with the unit but I don't actually know.

**Patton:** That is correct.

**Socolar:** Thanks very much.

**Hartemink:** I will yield the floor to my good colleague.

**Socolar:** Our next report is from Peter Feaver, Professor of Political Science and Public Policy and chair of the University Priorities Committee.

**Peter Feaver (Political Science and Public Policy/University Priorities Committee, chair):** So the UPC is the sister committee to the APC, which is why I was the Alexander F. Hehmeyer Professor before Alex was. We also play basketball, but then the comparison breaks down at that point (laughter). So UPC is convened by President Brodhead, it's chaired by myself, by faculty, it's populated by faculty and a heavy number of administrators -- not a number of heavy administrators (laughter). The charge is to look at the connection between academic priorities for the university and the financial realities of the university. And so you can see the way the advisory committee charge is (refers to slide); this is in our charge document. The membership is, as I said, faculty but I think what's distinctive about us is that we meet with the financial leaders of the university. So while it's convened by President Brodhead and he is nominally on it, in practice it's Tallman Trask and Peter Lange who are there at every single one of the meetings along with Tim Walsh, who is the senior vice president for financial matters and a similar person from the medical school. We also have student representatives. What we do is we meet every two weeks to identify or to review issues that have been identified either by the faculty or the administration. We have an extremely broad portfolio. Any issues that have significant financial implications could be brought to the committee. In practice, we tend to focus on the campus side of things. So there's a terminology in Duke called "Big Duke." If you look at the entire financial portfolio of Duke about half of Big Duke happens

in the health system and then another quarter happens in the medical school and then a quarter is called "campus," which is what most of us are most familiar with. That includes Tallman's area, everything from parking to buildings and whatnot and then the provost's area, which is all of the faculty and educational dimensions. We spend most of our time on that last quarter, although we have looked at issues that touch the rest of Duke. What we don't do is we don't take formal votes. We could, it's in our charter, but we don't as a matter of practice, unlike APC. And we don't exercise a formal veto; we're advisory to the president. But we serve a role as a sounding board and perhaps at points as an agenda setter. So, how is our agenda set? The UPC agenda flows from three different streams. The first stream is Duke's fiscal calendar. So there are issues that are working their way through Duke month by month, and some of them come up to the budget and finance subcommittee of the Board of Trustees and/or to the full Board, and we will see those as they are migrating their way through the fiscal process. Then there are other issues that the administration or the Board of Trustees is going to take that are deemed to have significant impact on the academic life of the university, and we will look at those as well -- academic life broadly defined. And then the third thing we can do is issues that we identify that we want to look at, whether or not the administration has felt the need yet for us to look into. So, we'll give examples for the things we did. Under the first stream, the fiscal calendar, we got the briefing before the Board did on DUMAC and got the very good news that DUMAC has recovered considerably from the dark days of the financial crisis. And that's allowed something like a return to quasi-normalcy in the budget process and in the vision-casting for the university opportunities to start thinking about things that might cost money, rather than merely trying to save money. The sec-

ond, early on in this year President Brodhead proposed to the Board of Trustees a revision to the Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility. This was partly responsive to a student-led desire for a change in socially responsible investment policy and also of course President Brodhead's own desire to tweak the system that had been in place for a long time. That was briefed to us at UPC, and we gave feedback, and the Board ultimately approved it. Under the third category, I just picked one of several issues there (refers to slide). The UPC has heard for a long time the challenge of feeding money into the SIP, and that was a focus of UPC's efforts the last two years. This past year, I wanted us to look more at how the SIP monies were spent and how we would evaluate the setting of priorities in SIP and so forth. And so we asked Provost Lange to speak to us on that issue and had a rich discussion. And a take-away that I've listed (refers to slide), which is my take-away not Peter's take-away -- I think Peter was very satisfied (laughter) with the level of faculty input he got both to the SIP and to the Duke Forward campaign and not all the faculty were as satisfied as Peter was with that input. Although Peter told me privately that if I had fared better in the SIP I would have been more satisfied (laughter), and he may be right. So, putting UPC in context: we're not like APC in the sense that we are not a decision-making body, we're not taking a formal vote, but we are like APC in the sense that we do contribute to faculty governance. And our power comes from the convening authority, I think, and the responsiveness of the administration. It is remarkable how much time Tallman Trask and Peter Lange and others devote to UPC. And probably the biggest value is the two-way education. We are educating, informing the senior administration on faculty perspectives on things they are working on on a daily basis, but even more, this is an incredible training ground for faculty on the financial realities of



the university. And I'll close by observing that when I came on the UPC a couple years ago, I had reached the level of confidence -- I'm sure you in the room have reached -- where I was confident I knew how to do the job of a professor, which was to deliver training and education in the classroom environment, and I thought I knew pretty much everything that needed to be known about that subject, and therefore I thought I knew everything that needed to be known about college (laughter). After a semester in UPC, I realized I was the tiny, tiny little end of the spear and there was a whole lot happening to make that possible. And so I've been learning about that, and it's a very rewarding committee for that. So with that I'll pause and take questions or get hauled off.

**Socolar:** Let me just make two comments before we get to questions. The first is that the Advisory Committee on Investment Responsibility that Peter mentioned here is operating and as promised we're going to hear in this body a report on their activities over the past year from Jim Cox, the chair of that committee, in May. And the second point I wanted to make is that the University Priorities Committee is one of the committees that was on that list that need replenishing for next year, and if anybody is interested please let us know. Questions for Peter?

**Dowell:** I agree with everything you said, particularly the part about the two-way communication. It always seemed to me that the educational experience would be enhanced if UPC actually looked more explicitly at the trade-offs among the various university priorities when the budget is put together. And maybe this has changed, but when I served on UPC, we tended to look at one issue at a time. Should we build this building or not? Should we strengthen this academic sector or not? And it was sort of a yes/no. It was never a matter of looking at the trade-off be-

cause maybe if we didn't build the building we could strengthen the academic sector more or vice versa. Is that still the case? How do you look at the trade-offs among budget priorities within UPC?

**Feaver:** I think that's a fair comment. We tend to be more single rather than cross-cutting, and the locus for that at the university tends to be at the strategic planning process, which is set separate from these formal committees. So I presume the next provost will convene a strategic planning process, and in that setting the cross-cutting issues will be raised. I'm sure UPC will be briefed on that at several points and we can raise those issues then.

**Lee Baker (Cultural Studies and African & African-American Studies/Dean of Academic Affairs and Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate education):** Does UPC deal with undergraduate financial aid as one of its priorities? You didn't mention it, and I was just curious.

**Feaver:** Yes, so that would be one of the topics we had, the financial aid commitment that Duke has made and the implications that has, which are profound for the budget. So we looked at that on a number of levels and also discussed with the administration the various ways of managing the costs of financial aid. So that's exactly the kind of issue that we would spend time on and we did this year.

**Brodhead:** It's a great point to make because the whole point is that at a university, one issue doesn't trade off against another issue one issue trades off against 300 issues. And so when you mentioned two things, first the question of where the students come from and how do they pay and all these things and so the notion that you can actually structure an agenda that shows what the nature of a choice is in a focused way, you've got to go to

a lot of these meetings for a long time before you have some sense of what all the different things are that are trading off against each other.

**Socolar:** Thanks very much. Finally, we'll hear from Jeff Vincent, Professor of Forest Economics and Management in the Nicholas School, and also a member of this Council. Jeff has served on the Global Priorities Committee as its chair since its inception in 2011.

**Jeff Vincent (Nicholas School of the Environment / Global Priorities Committee, chair):** Thanks, Josh. As Josh mentioned, this is my third year as chair of GPC and it's also my final year. During this time, I've learned many things. Just two weeks ago, I met with Josh and members of ECAC and I learned this concept of committee years. And I was informed that when you convert from calendar years to committee years (laughter) the three year old GPC is about to enter puberty (laughter). And this fortified my conviction that it was definitely time to get out and hand over responsibility to someone else. Before sharing the report card for this teenager this year, let me provide some context. So, the GPC was conceived by the faculty and administration following the birth of DKU. It's an advisory committee and functions in many of the same ways at least from a process standpoint as UPC does. So, a bit more like UPC than APC. Its responsibilities differ however. One is to review and refine Duke's global strategy and the other is to assess university academic programs and other programs that operate globally, both when they're being proposed and while they are being implemented. GPC meets monthly and consists of a dozen senior faculty members and a nearly equal number of ex officio members mainly from the Provost's Office. We advise most directly Mike Merson, the vice president and vice provost for global strategy and programs and Nora Bynum who serves as vice provost

for DKU and China initiatives. The three of us work together to set the agenda for the committee for the year and also for individual meetings. Given its origin it's not surprising that during its first year, GPC directed much of its attention to DKU. During its second year, the major activity of the committee was to formulate a statement of the GPC's global vision for Duke and you heard from me about that last year in haiku form (laughter) and that's the statement that envisions global Duke as a set of three interlocking campuses: our home campus here in Durham, a world campus that's distributed across partnerships and sites around the globe and an online digital campus. That statement also advocates four guiding principles for our global activities: the integration of teaching and research, interdisciplinarity, knowledge in the service of society and increased, though not exclusive, attention to developing regions of the world. By the start of this year, the GPC was certainly up and running, more than that but like many pre-adolescents if we believe the committee years idea, it was a little unsure of its direction. We finished the global vision which was a major responsibility with respect to the first part of our charge. The big issue of our first year which was DKU, evolved from an idea to buildings on the ground and efforts to start recruiting faculty and students. And there are other committees on campus, the China Faculty Council, the Liberal Arts Committee for China, others that were better suited for overseeing these more operational aspects of DKU. So what we did this year was we took note of priorities that the provost laid out in his remarks to us at our first meeting, and we noticed that one of those was online education and more broadly, online initiatives. And we decided that a deeper consideration of global aspects of those initiatives, not everything related to online education, but aspects related to our global activities would form a useful theme for the GPC this year. And this idea was en-

dorsed by the Advisory Committee on Online Education, or ACOE, which is co-chaired by the provost and Scott Huettel from Psychology and Neuroscience. So as we did when we had our regular meetings with heads of global programs and reviewed what they were doing, we set time aside to talk about the relevance of online initiatives to their programs, and in this way we tried to flesh out a bit more this idea of a digital campus. These discussions includes ones with representatives from DKU, including Mary Bullock who of course addressed this Council a couple months ago, the Africa and Brazil initiatives, Duke Engage, and the Global Education Office for undergraduates. Let me share two broad impressions from these discussions. The first is that although online education is the most obvious activity on the digital campus, to the GPC the digital campus encompasses much more than that. It encompasses research. So in my field, Environmental Economics, physical proximity enables Duke to share a research seminar series with NC State and RTI International where we get together in person and invite leading researchers from across North America to meet with us so we can pick their brains. With telepresence, we can now consider jointly organizing such seminars series with say, a peer institution in Europe, and thus increase our interactions with top environmental economists in Europe and not only those in North America. Launching one or more research seminars series with DKU would seem to be especially valuable next year as a means of welcoming the new DKU faculty to our scholarly community and introducing Duke faculty to leading researchers in China. The digital campus also encompasses campus engagement, and this came out in our discussion with Duke Engage, which is the exemplar of putting knowledge in the service of society. Duke Engage is not explicitly global, but it has a very large global footprint. And what came out of that discussion was the possibility that in cer-

tain instances digital technologies can enable Duke Engage students to remain usefully engaged with their partners in other countries even after they've returned to Duke and thus have a longer and richer engagement experience. The second impression I've taken out of the discussions of the digital campus does concern the educational component, and the overall impression is that this component is really broad. So we already at Duke have degree programs that are predominantly online. We already have courses that are jointly offered with partner universities abroad. Of course we have MOOCs, we've heard a lot about those massive online open courses that have enrolled hundreds of thousands of students from around the world. And we have professors who are using Skype to include in their classroom discussions the authors of papers that are being discussed on a given class day. So much is happening in the educational component of the digital campus. And the point I want to make here is that not only that this is diverse, but I think it's useful for us to think of this digital space as indeed a campus, and to consider the relevance of institutions that are associated with programs on this physical campus to that digital campus. For example we maintain connections to graduates of our degree programs though the alumni associations of various schools. So does it make sense to think about all of the graduates of those MOOCs as alumni in some sense? They might be a resource that can assist us in our global endeavors. Maybe they can help bring Duke to the attention of talented young people in obscure corners of the world who might be strong candidates to our degree programs here in Durham. I believe as the digital initiatives here and our global programs both continue to evolve that more and more of these issues will come up. Let me close by thanking the members of the GPC for their time and dedication. Most members of the committee have served three year terms and many of them still have time yet to serve.

I deeply appreciate the commitment of those individuals. I'd also like to thank the Peter Lange, Mike Merson, and Nora Bynum for allowing the GPC to really be a faculty-driven committee but at the same time to help us plot our course. I'd lastly like to thank OGSP for the high quality of administrative support that is provided. So let me stop there, and I'd be happy to respond to any questions that you may have.

**Socolar:** Questions for Jeff?

**Jane Richardson (Biochemistry):** I certainly don't know enough to ask this question in a knowledgeable way, but just being in and out of the outside of various digital activities, I wonder in thinking about it as a campus is there any way that we can correlate it better and have people who are doing diverse activities of this sort know about each other more than seems to be true?

**Vincent:** That's a good point, and one of the main things we tried to do with the GPC this year and in past years is to make connections across different programs. And so a way that we've encouraged that this year is that as we were designing the agenda for the year and the individual meetings, I did consult with ACOE, the Advisory Committee on Online Education, and invited to the committee on a regular basis Lynne O'Brien, who is associate vice provost for online initiatives, and other members of ACOE also attended. So we attempted to provide a forum where there could be information being shared between the activities of the global programs, their thoughts on the role that online initiatives might play, and opportunities to look for some commonalities and some ways to reduce costs and increase benefits as we use these technologies more and more. And we've actually scheduled a meeting -- I say we -- Mike Merson has scheduled a meeting for May where we're going to debrief on the

discussions that we've had this year with members of ACOE and hopefully we will address the kinds of issues that you've raised here or take a step towards doing that.

**Patton:** This is a general comment for all three reports, which I thought were really, really helpful. I'm very struck by our conversation about trade-offs and I think that I would love to encourage all three committees -- who are clearly highly functional, really engaged in all the vast issues, the deepest ones that we all care about -- to actually structure an agenda around trade-offs, if we can. Even though it's deeply complex, I think having an understanding of how each of these deeply important issues that all three committees deal with have to situate themselves within the larger ecosystem of a university budget and university set of properties would be really helpful. So if we could at least have one meeting of each of these really important faculty committees which focuses on the trade-offs, I think it would be really, really helpful.

**Vincent:** I will be sure that my successor is aware of that (laughter).

**Socolar:** I want to thank Jeff and Alex and Peter -- all three -- the amount of time required to chair one of these committees is really substantial and they've done a great job (applause).

So next I need to call us into executive session for the purpose of reading the nominees for honorary degrees for next year.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR HONORARY DEGREES FOR 2015]