Duke University
DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

phone (919) 684-6447
e-mail acouncil@Duke.edu
fax (919) 681-8606

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday, September 20, 2012

Susan Lozier (Chair of Academic Council / Nicholas School of the Environment): Welcome, everyone, to the first meeting of Duke's Academic Council for the 2012-2013 academic year. For any new members to the Council or any new members to the University, I am Susan Lozier, a professor of Earth and Ocean Sciences in the Nicholas School of Environment and chair of this Council.

It is a pleasure to welcome everyone back for a new academic year. I am not sure how many of you feel as I do, but in a somewhat odd way I am often relieved when September rolls around, because then I can unburden myself of the expectation that I will make great leaping strides of progress in my research during summer days, that are *mostly* unencumbered by meetings and classes and appointments. Unfortunately, my research progress has a pace that pays scant attention to the seasons. Ideas, papers and chapters seemingly haven't a clue that they should cascade in the summer when I am primed for harvesting. Indeed, it seems scholarly progress has a deliberate pace that cannot easily be rushed. So, to those of you, like me, who fret that summer did not produce the expected yields, I offer consolation in the form of a poem by Thom Gunn, a 20th century Anglo-American poet:

Considering the Snail

The snail pushes through a green
night, for the grass is heavy
with water and meets over
the bright path he makes, where rain
has darkened the earth's dark. He
moves in a wood of desire,

pale antlers barely stirring
as he hunts. I cannot tell
what power is at work, drenched there
with purpose, knowing nothing.
What is a snail's fury? All
I think is that if later

I parted the blades above
the tunnel and saw the thin
trail of broken white across
litter, I would never have
imagined the slow passion
to that deliberate progress.

Welcome to September (laughter). It's a new year for deliberate, and passionate, progress. And, speaking of deliberate and passionate progress, welcome back to Council business.

Before I go any further, I would like to introduce my colleagues who attend most fervently to Council business by serving with me on the Executive Committee of the Academic Council, known by its acronym of ECAC.

1

I'd like to ask my ECAC colleagues to stand when I call their names: members entering the second year of their service are Phil Costanzo (Psychology & Neuroscience), Cindy Kuhn (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology) who will apparently be arriving a few minutes late and John Payne (Fuqua School of Business). This is the second year of my ECAC term as well: I will serve as chair of this Council through June of 2013.

Recently elected ECAC members are: Nan Jokerst (Electrical & Computer Engineering) and Maurice Wallace (English and African and African-American Studies). Dennis Clements (Medicine/Pediatrics) and Kathy Franz (Chemistry) are also new members, but their travel schedules preclude their attendance at today's meeting.

Serving in the role of ECAC Vice Chair this year is Phil Costanzo and in the role of Faculty Secretary this year is Cindy Kuhn. So please join me in thanking all my ECAC colleagues this year (applause).

We have a full plate today, but I want to take just a moment to look ahead to our coming year.

Our meeting on October 18th will mark the 50th anniversary of the Academic Council. Since the Council first met on October 18th in 1962 there have been tremendous changes in the structure of this university, in educational models and in the professoriate itself. To celebrate the 50th anniversary, we have planned a series of Council Conversations for the spring that will consider the challenges and opportunities associated with these changes and then focus on how these changes will shape the University in the next 50 years. Also, in recognition of our 50th anniversary, Richard Wagoner, chair of Duke's Board of Trustees, will address this Council at the November 29th meeting, where he will focus on the Board's role in University governance. More on all of these activities later when we kick-off our year-long celebration at the October meeting. So please stay tuned.

This coming year we will continue to focus on global initiatives, as well as add a new focus on online education, and we will continue to consider new degree programs that come our way. Also, this spring, Professor Lee Baker, Dean of Academic Affairs for Trinity College of Arts & Sciences, will lead a report to the Council on the academic success and engagement of our student athletes here at Duke.

This past summer we were reminded of the glory of sports, and on this note I would like to congratulate our 2012 Duke Olympians. But this past summer we were also reminded of the dangers of glorifying sports. News reports on university sports programs around the country have provided ample reminder of this danger. And so, here at Duke, it is worth reminding ourselves of the need to be vigilant for any activity that undermines the standards that we set on and off the field. Toward that end, ECAC has invited Professor Baker to remind this Council of the partnership between the academic units and the athletic department to provide that vigilance. It is important for us as elected representatives of the Duke faculty to understand those efforts.

I think it is also important for us to stay informed about Duke athletics beyond the scores we read in the morning paper. For the past year, I have received and read the Duke Athletics Weekly email update from Kevin White, Vice President and Director of Duke Athletics. The weekly update contains the usual and merited boasting of team and individual successes on the field, but also includes the rightful boasting of athletes' academic success. But what has most impressed me about these updates is the other information that is delivered. For instance, just last week Dr. White wrote of the ACC's inclusion of Notre Dame and he also wrote of the news reports about former Duke men's basketball player Lance Thomas being sued by a jeweler in New York, a lawsuit which this week was settled out of court. In his update, Dr. White informed everyone that they are in the process of gathering information about the situation and working

together with the NCAA to find out exactly what happened. He concluded with the reminder that self-reporting and open communication of all compliance activities is a standard of Duke's athletic department.

I have been impressed with this straightforward communication and believe that all Council members would find this newsletter informational. I learned from Kevin that he is happy to add anyone to the distribution list. So, I have asked Sandra Walton in the Academic Council office to email the Council membership in the coming days to give any member an opportunity to opt out of this opportunity. You need simply reply to Sandra and your email address will not be added to the distribution list for the Duke Athletics Weekly email update. If you opt not to opt out, I think you will be pleased.

Finally, I welcome your suggestions for other topics for upcoming meetings. If you would like to suggest an item, please send those to me. Please also encourage your colleagues who are not Council members to attend our meetings. All faculty, not just elected representatives, are invited and welcome to participate in this University forum.

One more thing before we turn to our agenda items: I want to note that the attendance sheets are being circulated, so please initial and return these to Sandra at the end of our meeting. As a reminder, our bylaws state that you can be removed from the Council after three consecutive unexcused absences. So, please email Sandra if you are unable to attend our meetings. And another reminder, when you stand to make comments or ask a question, please remember to identify yourself for the benefit of everyone in the room.

And now on to our first order of business and that is to approve the minutes of the May 10th meeting.

Are there any corrections or edits to the minutes?

(approved by voice vote with no dissent)

Candidate for Earned Degrees

The start of the new academic year brings closure to those who graduated over the summer and so we now turn to a Council ritual: the approval of candidates for earned degrees.

Today we have nominations of candidates for earned degrees during the summer 2012 term for all schools except the School of Nursing. Approval of the nursing degrees was granted by ECAC on behalf of the Council in August.

In accordance with the University Bylaws, I will call on representatives from the various Schools and Trinity College for recommendations of approved candidates for various degrees. These lists will be forwarded by the Provost to the Board of Trustees for approval at their meeting on September 28.

Diplomas dated September 1, 2012
Summary by Schools and College

Graduate School
    Dean Paula D. McClain
    Doctor of Philosophy   103
    Master of Science   27
    Master of Arts   44
    Master of Arts in Teaching   13
School of Medicine
    Dean Nancy C. Andrews
    Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research   7
School of Law
    Dean David F. Levi
    Juris Doctor   2
    Master of Laws   2
Divinity School
    Dean Richard Hays
    Doctor of Theology   2
    Master of Theology   3
    Master of Divinity   7
    Master of Theological Studies   4
School of Nursing
    Dean Catherine L. Gilliss
    Doctor of Nursing Practice   11
    Master of Science in Nursing   51

Fuqua School of Business
Dean William Boulding
Master of Business Administration 49
Master of Management Studies 1
Master of Management in Clinical Informatics 35
Nicholas School of the Environment
Dean William L. Chameides
Master of Environmental Management 1
Sanford School of Public Policy
Dean Bruce Kuniholm
Master of International Development Policy 12
Pratt School of Engineering
Dean Tom Katsouleas
Master of Engineering Management 22
Master of Engineering 1
Bachelor of Science in Engineering 2
Trinity College of Arts and Sciences
Dean Laurie Patton
Bachelor of Science 12
Bachelor of Arts 26
TOTAL 437

Lozier: Thank you and congratulations to all the graduates of summer 2012.
I now invite President Brodhead to the podium for the recognition of the 2012 University Scholar / Teacher of the Year Award recipient.

University Scholar / Teacher of the Year Award

Richard Brodhead (President): Thank you so much. I apologize for my extraordinarily dramatic arrival. I could have come by a helicopter with James Bond (laughter) but I thought this was maybe almost as good. I am about to call out the name of somebody and I wonder whether it wouldn't be just as easy to ask Sunny Ladd if she would come stand next to me. It diminishes the surprise factor but it won't diminish the pleasure factor, right? I even see her husband Ted. It is my very happy duty to announce the winner of the University Scholar/Teacher Award for the year 2012.

The University Scholar/ Teacher Award was established in 1981 by the Division of Higher Education of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist Church and it's based on the belief that colleges and universities draw their strength and vitality from their faculties – a view that I hope will not be controversial in this room. This award annually recognizes an outstanding faculty member for his/her contribution to the learning arts, the institution and the community through teaching, research and service. I suppose it cannot be any great surprise that Helen F. Sunny Ladd, the Edgar Thompson Professor of Public Policy and Professor of Economics is the 2012 recipient of this award (applause). Seems like I should have a big cup to give her like they do at Wimbledon where you kiss it and lift it over your head (laughter), well, someday Sunny.

We all know Sunny Ladd but maybe not everybody knows every detail of her merits, so maybe you will give me a minute or two to explain some of them. She is a leading scholar in the field of education policy. Her 2011 election to the National Academy of Education recognizes decades of outstanding research on a variety of education policy issues including school accountability, education finance, teacher labor markets and school choice. With the help of two Fulbright scholarships, she researched the lessons of education systems in New Zealand, post-apartheid South Africa and the Netherlands. From 1996-99 she co-chaired the National Academy of Science Committee on Education Finance which produced two widely cited reports. She is also a famous and superb teacher as recognized by the 1994 award of Duke's Howard Johnson Teaching Award and the 2006 award of the Richard A. Stubbing Teacher/Mentor Award from the Sanford School. We assume that you have some little shrine somewhere in the house where these things (laughter) are just sort of wrapped up, is that right? The glowing reviews from Sunny's students in both undergraduate and graduate courses reflect in part her innovative teaching style which incorporates widespread use of case materials. As Director of Graduate Studies of the MMP program for 15 years, she has also left a legacy in

her successful effort to integrate and professionalize the core curriculum.

Sunny Ladd's service to the university and her discipline has been extensive and noteworthy--ranging from the leadership position that she has held most recently as Chair of the Search Committee for the Dean of the Sanford School, to her leadership in her profession including service as the President of the National Tax Association, as well as serving as the President of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, the main professional organization in her field during the year 2011.

Embodying the ideals of knowledge and service of society, Sunny Ladd has inspired countless students and provided research vital to informing the debates over education policy, some of the deepest and most important debates of our culture. On behalf of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist Church, Duke is proud to honor Dr. Helen F. Ladd as Duke University's 2012 recipient of the University Scholar/Teacher of the Year Award (applause).

Wait a minute. This is not as thankless as I thought: concealed behind the podium: a diploma signed by me (laughter). That'll be good and this extraordinary – this is in fact the document I just read. Sunny, on days when you're feeling blue, you can walk into the little Sunny shrine (laughter) and read this and you will remember that you are after all a most fantastic teacher, person and faculty member. Do you want to say a word or two?

Helen (Sunny) Ladd (Sanford School of Public Policy): I'd love to say something very briefly, four brief things to say. First of all, I am humbled by this but absolutely thrilled at winning this award. It excites me that it combines the scholar and the teacher aspects. Second, I came to Duke 26 years ago in 1986 and when I came here Duke was a very good university but it wasn't a great university and over the last 26 years it's really moved towards greatness and I've been just so pleased to be along for the ride. Third, I can't imagine a better department or school for me to be in than what is now called the Sanford School of Public Policy and I appreciate all my colleagues here. We have a very collegial department. We've had great leadership and Bruce Kuniholm, thanks for being here today. It's just been a wonderful place and it puts great value on the three aspects of my professional life which I am most proud: teaching, high-quality research and policy engagement. My fourth point is just to thank my husband who is here in the second row. His name is Ted Fiske. Some of you may know him as the author of the Fiske Guide to Colleges. I know him as a supportive and loving husband. He's also my co-author on two books and co-editor on another, and as I often say among my many, many co-authors, some of them are in the room today, he's my very favorite (laughter). So, thank you Ted and thank you all (applause).

Lozier: I just want to add a few words to that and say Sunny, on behalf of your faculty colleagues assembled here and your colleagues across the university, let me offer warm congratulations. I think it is especially pleasing that you are recognized on this Council floor because through these past 26 years you have served as a member of this Council *and* also served as a member of ECAC. So it's hard to find room to add something to President Brodhead's eloquent tribute so let me just say that in my personal view that award should be the University Teacher/Scholar/Citizen Award. Thank you for your contributions and devotion to this university -- much appreciated (applause).

Election of Faculty Hearing Committee

We turn to the next item on our agenda which is the election of the Faculty Hearing Committee. The proposed new members for this committee were listed with your agenda. As background: the Faculty Hearing Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Council and has jurisdiction to consider complaints

from faculty concerning issues such as termination of employment, violations of academic freedom and allegations of harassment not resolved by other university bodies. The process for issuing a formal complaint and the explanation of the role of the University Ombudsman are detailed in Appendix N of the Faculty Handbook.

The Faculty Handbook states that the Faculty Hearing Committee will consist of 12 tenured faculty members nominated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and elected by the Council at large.

The proposed members for you to vote on today are:

Steffen Bass (Physics)
Philip Rosoff (Pediatrics – Oncology/Hematology)
Tolly Boatwright (Classical Studies)
Ellen Davis (Divinity School)

The newly-nominated members will serve a three-year appointment, with the exception of Ellen Davis – Ellen will serve a one-year term as she plans to be on leave for the 2013-14 academic year.

These newly-nominated members will join these current members:

Sam Buell (Law School) 2014
Nan Jokerst (Electrical & Computer Engineering) 2014
Tom Metzloff, (Law School) 2014
Phil Costanzo (Psychology & Neuroscience) 2013
Kerry Haynie (Political Science) 2013
Judith Kelley (Sanford School of Public Policy) 2013
Terrence Oas (Biochemistry) 2013
Jocelyn Olcott (History) 2013

Are there any questions? If not, all in favor of electing these four individuals to the Faculty Hearing Committee, please say aye? Thank you.

(*approved by voice vote with no dissent*)

I want to thank each of the faculty who has agreed to serve on this important committee, and I want to especially thank Tom Metzloff-- I'm not sure if he's here today--for agreeing to serve as chair for another year.

Bylaw Changes Governing Election of Council and ECAC Members

We turn to ECAC's proposed changes to Council bylaws that govern the election of Council members and ECAC members. An edited version of the bylaws with the proposed changes was distributed with the agenda and I think Reed is now going to put up on the screen what those changes are. Before I ask for questions, I'm imagining that many of you might need to understand the motivation behind these changes. So, I want to take a few minutes to explain the motivation.

The motivation comes in four parts:

1. The first motivation was that ECAC saw a need for us to change the service term for when Council members were seated. Currently, new Council members are seated in April. This is somewhat problematic because Council business is always bounded by the academic year itself. Many of you, who have been on the Council for years, know that we often have two meeting rules. With the two meeting rule and the new members being seated in April it meant often times that we had to rush business to finish before the new Council members were seated or we couldn't introduce new business afterwards. So, it has made a lot more sense to seat the new members in September and have members serve through the academic year.

Now, as far as we can ascertain, the only reason it was ever in April rather than in September had to do with the election of ECAC members. So way back when, before we could vote electronically and people assembled and voted with paper ballots (which we still do

sometimes), there was a need then to gather the new members to vote for the Executive Committee members who actually begin their service in the summer on July 1. But now since we have electronic voting, what we would like to do is have new members, who will be elected in the Spring, but start their term in September. However, the election of the Executive Committee members would be the responsibility of the newly-elected members and those who are returning for service the following academic year. As I mentioned before, we can do that electronically. We think this will clear up a lot of confusion. In fact, many of you probably didn't even know that you actually were supposed to be here last April and May, so I think there may be some new faces here. Some of the members who weren't re-elected or didn't stand for election again often come to the April and May meetings not knowing that they no longer have voting privileges. So that was the one change: we want to align the term of the Academic Council members with the academic year and that change then is reflected in **Section I.C.**

2. The other change that we want to do is make a provision for the case where there are insufficient number of faculty members who are willing to stand for election to produce both a nomination ballot and an election ballot.

Brief background on this: years ago the process was that every member who was eligible for election was listed on a ballot and then went through a nomination ballot where people selected the nominees and then the nominees who got the highest votes of that nomination ballot were then sent on to an election ballot. About three years ago, those of you who were on the Council recall that we moved to a system where not everyone eligible was listed, but only those who were willing to stand for election. This has greatly simplified the process, but it's also led to the situation where we often have an insufficient number of people who are willing to stand for election to warrant a two-step process in the election. Let me give you an example--we'll take my

school, Nicholas School--and let's say there are four open seats, and there are ten members who are willing to stand for election. Currently what we would have to do is take those ten members, put them on a nomination ballot to select eight that would stand for election. Or let's say that only seven members decided to stand for election but we actually need eight for the nomination ballot.

What the new bylaw change states is we need three times the number of faculty members willing to stand for election as open seats in order to negate the two-step process. To clarify, we need three times the number or fewer in order to negate the nomination step. So if we have more than three times the number of people willing to stand for election as open seats, we'll do a two-step process. If we have three times or fewer we will just have a one step process. I hope that's clear. Those changes are in **Sections I. B. 2 and I. B. 3.b.**

3. The other change we are making has to do with the election of ECAC members. Currently, ECAC members are elected via slates, whereby two nominees compete against each other for each open slot. When you vote for an ECAC member, for an open seat, you vote for "this person" or "this person" and then you go to the next open seat and there are two more choices. This has lead over the years to a somewhat awkward situation. We believe that this process of the slates dates back to where there were far fewer divisions represented in Council. Currently we have 12 different divisions represented in the Council and there are eight seats on ECAC. So years back, when perhaps there were just eight divisions represented, you can imagine then that if there were four open seats and one of them was in the humanities division, then you would select two members from the humanities division and have them run against each other. But currently if we have four open seats, there are eight divisions that are underrepresented and we run into this awkward situation where we're running somebody from Engineering against somebody from Social Sciences or somebody from Nursing and somebody from

the Law School. It doesn't really make much sense, because people aren't really competing in head-on-head competitions. It's not like we have forums where people are saying "I'm against faculty governance" and "this one's for faculty governance" (laughter). Instead, what we would like to do is list eight members--or two times the nominees for each open slot--and have the Council as a whole vote for them. So if there are four open seats we would give you eight nominees, you would then vote for four.

What we're also trying to do is to lower the barrier for Council members themselves to participate in this nomination process. For many years if a Council member wanted to nominate someone to ECAC they needed to nominate a whole slate, not just a person. As far as we know, in the past 20 years this process has never been taken advantage of. It sits there in our bylaws and talks about the slate that is produced from the Council--five members from the Council have a slate--that would be voted against the slate that is produced by ECAC and then there could also be additional competing slates. What we wanted to do is simplify this. Thus, prior to the election of ECAC members, the chair of the Council will ask the Council if there are any nominations. If 5 members of the Council nominate someone who is willing to stand for election, that nomination will be taken into consideration by ECAC in selecting their nominee pool. Another addendum to the bylaws is that we have also taken into consideration, the need for representation across the University.   These changes are in **Section II. B. 2**

4. The last one is a fairly easy one. There is language in the bylaws that says on alternating years the names on the ballots will be listed in forward or reverse alphabetical order. We're moving to where we are doing everything electronically, so we can simply shuffle these or have them listed randomly. So we think it best not to have that language in the bylaws. These changes are in **Sections I. B. 2 and I. B. 3.b**

At this point I hope I have sufficiently explained the motivation. What we are really trying to do is bring this election process into line with having the 12 divisions and also being able to vote electronically. I want to remind everyone that I am introducing these bylaw changes at today's meeting but we will not vote on them until the October meeting. I am happy to open the floor now for any questions, about the changes.

Questions

Josh Socolar (Physics): Can you just repeat what you said about how we will ensure that there is representation across all divisions?

Lozier: Yes. Actually currently in the bylaws there is nothing that talks about representation in ECAC. If I can refer you to **Section II.b.2**, there is a line that says ECAC will take into consideration nominations received from the Council and as well as taking into consideration broad representation across the University in preparing the nomination ballot.

Socolar: So it would be possible under this system for two people from Natural Sciences to both get elected?

Lozier: It would be possible, but it's not likely. For those of you who have been on ECAC before, I think everybody understands the culture has been to really have that broad representation. So it would be unlikely that two people from Natural Sciences would be put on the election ballot.

Someone said if we have 12 divisions and let's say that we have four open seats, that means four divisions are already represented, so eight are not. Should we then write in our bylaws the nomination ballot should be filled with names from each of those eight divisions? I think the preference has been not to hardwire it that way. For those of you who have been on ECAC before--especially those of you who have served as chair--you know it's not always that easy to get people from each division willing to stand for election.

One thing I forgot to note. In addition to having these discussions in ECAC, all these changes were vetted with the Faculty Elections Committee. I see Kathy Nightingale is here--she is the chair of that Committee--as well as, Don Taylor, Lori Bennear and Donald Frush. Any other questions? If you think of questions later, please email me and I can take those into consideration. If there are no further questions we will vote on these bylaw changes next month.

Final Agenda Items

We will now move to our final two agenda item, an update from Provost Lange on the Duke-Kunshan University initiative and another on Duke's Online Education Initiative, providing an interesting juxtaposition. I have a few words on this juxtaposition before I invite the Provost to take the floor.

Last September, at the first Council meeting of the year, I expressed faculty concerns about the DKU initiative. If you recall, at that meeting I described our global initiative as an effort to launch a rocket before ascertaining whether rocket fuel was available. At the time, bricks were being laid in Kunshan, yet it was not yet clear what programs were available nor was there much clarity regarding the level of faculty enthusiasm for this initiative. I think it is fair to say that the administration and faculty made considerable progress together last year in identifying the programs and the enthusiasm.

And now, another fall, another issue: this time the issue is Duke's foray into massive online education. And here the concern is not whether we have sufficient rocket fuel, but whether we have the right rocket. There is plenty of rocket fuel. Faculty enthusiasm, ideas, and engagement on this front have been, and are, impressive. Yet, figuring out the best delivery platform, the rocket, is problematic in the rapidly evolving landscape of online education. And so, faculty who have advised the Provost to date on Duke's effort in this ar-

ea, have agreed with him that we need to take an experimental approach to this endeavor, an approach he will describe shortly. ACOE, the Advisory Committee on Online Education, has met since June to advise the Provost on not just the online opportunities as they present themselves, but also on ancillary issues, such as those concerning intellectual property, assessment, and course selection, to name a few. And so, despite the warnings in the press about a campus tsunami just offshore ready to tear asunder our educational model, the faculty voices that I have heard on this campus on this issue carry more enthusiasm than wariness, more openness than rigidity. I believe that such enthusiasm and openness find their source in a firm belief in the strong foundation of our educational model. Thus, we look to this new wave of online education as an enhancement of, rather than an assault on, our university model. The faculty look forward to continued engagement with the administration as we launch these initiatives on whatever rocket is currently on hand.

And now, with that introduction, I invite the Provost to give the Council an update on DKU and then a presentation on Duke's online education initiative. Because we think that most of you are interested primarily in the second issue, because it is new, I've asked the Provost to spend most of his time on it, after giving the DKU update.

Duke-Kunshan Update from the Provost

Peter Lange (Provost and Thomas A. Langford University Professor): Thank you, Susan. Welcome back everyone. It has been an active summer on all fronts. Let me just say a few things about DKU first. We've been moving ahead in a fairly steady, upward trajectory, though probably not as steeply upward as we anticipated. We are developing a better understanding of the complexity of the approval processes in China and interests and opportunities among faculty about our Chinese initiative are also developing at a good pace. So we have a parallelism going on in which it's taking us a little longer to get to

where we want it to be, but during that same period of time we are building up more campus interest and more campus momentum then we would have had, had we been where we expected to be at this point.

Now onto the slides. On August 17th we received preparation approval from the Ministry of Education in China. That means we can proceed to take several steps now, which I will describe in a couple of minutes. It does not mean however, that we can start teaching programs at DKU. That requires establishment. We will be announcing the preparation approval in a larger ceremony in November, with the President and our partners. At the same time we are moving toward submitting the paper work for the establishment approval. Basically, in the preparation approval, we will indicate the things that will commence, once we start teaching. What the Chinese are basically saying is that "It's great that you've promised that, but before you can start teaching, we want to know that you actually did the things, and are doing the things that you said would be in place when you start teaching." That's what this is about. It's very bureaucratic in some ways. It's not nonsensical in the other case, especially when you think about this being a country receiving numerous proposals from other educational institutions from other countries. It's annoyingly long, but it's not really that foolish. In any case this slide more or less describes to you what we need to do in broad terms and I want to stress what we are being asked to do is no different than what other schools who are establishing joint ventures in China are being asked to do.

At the same time we are moving ahead with the creation of the Senior Leadership for our campus. After a thorough international search we announced today that we have named **Dr. Mary Brown-Bullock** as the founding Executive Vice Chancellor of DKU. She was the president of Agnes Scott College. She is also the Chair of the China Medical Board. She is a historian of China and is well grounded in Chinese and speaks some Mandarin. She will be a resident on campus this fall and will move to

China in the late winter.

At the same time **Dr. Liu Jingnan** has been named the founding Chancellor of DKU. He is a former president of Wuhan University. He is also a member of the Chinese Academy of Engineering. I would remind you that the real operating officer in this arrangement is the Executive Vice Chancellor as in the British university style. The Chancellor is more a ceremonial position. Although in this case, the chancellor will also play an important liaison role, both with our partner at Wuhan and at the Ministry of Education, because he is an eminent Chinese scholar. We've also named **Nora Bynum** as the Vice Provost for DKU and China Initiatives. Nora has already been playing this role and this will serve as a formalization of her responsibilities.

What are the key tasks we face this year? First, to prepare the application for the Establishment approval. Probably 20% of the pages require intensive, substantive action and 80% of the pages are, in one form or another, already completed in the preliminary proposal or larger boiler plate. We will be registering DKU as an operational entity governed by its own board as soon as possible. That comes along with the preparation phase. That board will then replace the Executive Preparation Committee which has been an informal body drawn from the three Universities, reflecting the same distribution we will have on the board.

We will be recruiting faculty and staff for programs that are at a pace commensurate with the actual starting up of programs. We are developing the academic and administrative support infrastructure and we are also working on courses in the graduate degree level and the undergraduate non-degree level. We have some new proposals for areas of course development at both levels. We will be working with the China Faculty Council, the Global Priorities Committees and a new faculty committee on teaching Liberal Arts in China that Dean Laurie Patton has been establishing in Arts and Sciences, since that is an intensive

locus of the undergraduate programs. We will be considering a bridge cooperative program with Wuhan for the 2013-14 year, because we don't believe that we can get full establishment approval by 2013-14, and therefore be able to set up straightforward DKU programs. Whether this will happen or not, is still under discussion with our partners.

With respect to the DKU facilities, we were slowed by some disputes over materials during the spring and the construction did slow down quite perceptibly for a period of time. It has now started to pick up and they've also sent out the "tenders" agreed to by us. Tenders are used for competitive bidding. We've sent out the tenders on a series of things. They've gone out and should be responded to in the next month or six weeks. When the responses come and the firms are selected, then the pace of construction will go up very substantially. Kunshan still has promised that the first five buildings will be done by July of 2013. We continue to monitor the procedures which we discussed with the Council earlier.

The other thing you should know is that we did receive, on the 30th of August, a letter from **Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)**. You all know what that is, yes? Regrettably (laughter). They have approved the way we are proceeding at DKU and we will be able to deliver the programs without further work. You can see the particular conditions of this SACS approval on the slide. That is basically my report on DKU as an update. We will continue working hard on many fronts. There is a lot of enthusiasm from people working on it. We've had new project proposals coming forward at both the Masters and Undergraduate level. We're still feeling very good about the project and actually we are learning a lot. We are also able to do some additional things because of the delay, although I am not suggesting we would've desired the delay had we been able to avoid it. Are there any questions on this?

Questions

Dan Gauthier (Physics): I was in the United Arab Emirates recently to review the New York University program there. We got to interact with the commission there that approves the degree programs and they were very impressed with how Duke worked with the commission in the program at Dubai. Then I heard rumors that that program no longer exists?

Lange: It never was established.

Gauthier: So to what extent are we at risk? What risk mitigation is being done to make sure that something like this doesn't happen in China?

Lange: Well that would require me to explain to you why we're not in Dubai, which I won't do at great length. Basically what happened is what the Council had feared and actually, I think, it's a very good example. What happened in Dubai and the UAE was that when they came very close to signing the final agreement, they basically sought to change some of the terms of the agreement in a way that we would not accept. Then there was lot of back and forth and at that point, we withdrew. You asked me whether that's likely to happen in China and the answer is that I think that it's extremely unlikely. We have no experience from any of the other universities that have done that. This has been a long and very deliberative process. It's gone through the highest level within the Chinese government. In the UAE it was at a lower level. There was no equivalent to those five directorates and the Minister of Education, all of whom had to sign off on all the various things. I can't give you a guarantee, but I can promise you that if the same kind of substantive issues of concern to Duke were to be raised at that point, either we would get our way or we would have to consider it.

Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering): I was just rereading the email that was sent by the President when this announcement was

11

made. It was called a "Preliminary Approval" as opposed to "Preparation Approval." Is there a difference?

Lange: No.

Wolf: Is this the same announcement?

Lange: This is the same announcement. It would matter if the "P" in "preliminary" was in lower case or uppercase. It is "Preparation approval" with a capital "P" but it is also "preliminary" with a lowercase "p" (laughter).

Brodhead: Have you got that? (laughter). In all my messages, you must study the case (laughter).

Lange: Actually I think we're on the case.

Lozier: And that's actually from President Brodhead with a capital B! (laughter). Were there any other questions?

Gauthier: Can I ask one more question? So, a huge amount of senior people now are coming onboard. Salaries have got to be there, and faculty hired and we're looking at Fall 2014. I'm just really worried about the exposure of the University with all these salaries, if the process takes until 2015, then we're sitting on these salaries for yet another year.

Lange: Okay, so actually I have the data and I don't think it's consistent with what your fear is, though I certainly understand where it's coming from. For this past fiscal year 2011-12, we've budgeted 2.7 million dollars to be spent as our share of expenses at DKU. The real cost in the last budget year was 322,000 dollars. The variance was due to delayed staff hiring. We hired only two people. One on January 1st and the other on May 1st. So as of the end of the past fiscal year we've only had two hired staff on that budget. I've already noted the delay which means other expenditures will also be delayed. You saw the two positions we have here. We've budgeted 3.4 million dollars, 2.7 was budgeted last year. It is our anticipation that the actual expenses will

again be substantially lower than that. Although, almost certainly higher than the 322,000 dollars that we've budgeted here, because it was the Executive Vice Chancellor and we've also hired a director for Human Resources. We haven't done all of the budget adjustments because we need to think through what the timing will be and work on different budgets, but you don't need to fear that we're building up this huge infrastructure, which is not being used because that's not actually happening. The only thing I would say is that obviously with the delay, we may also be able to either have more programs or more students because our recruitment times are longer, and that may defray on the revenue side longer term.

Lozier: Actually I liked to add something, because I think Dan's point is well taken. I think what we could do with those senior administrators in the intervening time, considering how many of us were worrying that we wouldn't have enough programs when it opened Fall 2013, so if we now think that we have the people in place that can generate more momentum, we might be in a better position, when DKU does open.

Gauthier: That was the problem at the NYU program at UAE; they just weren't prepared to teach.

Lange: Right and we've seen that with other international programs, to be honest with you. From other schools that is, not our own.

Online Education Initiative

Lange: Susan referred to this being a venture in space, and whether we had the right rocket, and of course that was a pun in itself because it is in fact an adventure in using space for education along with place. And I want to stress of course it's always place along with space, to borrow from the Fuqua language. She also stressed that this is an experimental approach. I do remember once, 10 years ago, when we ran to what I referred to as an experiment on using iPods in the classroom. We

do actually have a long tradition of trying to be quite experimental in the use of technology in the classroom. There was an anonymous question submitted to the Academic Council about whether I had gone through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) since we were running the experiments with iPods (laughter). And I will tell you that we did not run through the IRB for that nor have we gone through the IRB with this experiment. In fact I could use the word "trial" but then that will get me into different trouble (laughter).

So let me start by just giving you a sense of how dynamic this area is. One way of doing that is by showing you not one but two slides. I'm not going to go through all these things, but I wanted to show you this to give you a feel for what has been going on. I'll leave this up just long enough so you can get a look at it.

This slide takes you through July of 2012. It was in fact in July that Coursera announced additional schools and we were one of those schools. In subsequent months, there has been a lot of action. This is a very, very dynamic area. It is dynamic technologically, it is dynamic in terms of marketing, it is dynamic in terms of the commentary in the media, it is dynamic in terms of the interests of teachers and students about what this system may or may not offer. I want to stress to you that we don't know how much benefit we may receive for this at Duke, and people don't know, more generally, how much benefit will be derived from all of this in six months or a year. But there is certainly a lot of potential and you need to be in the middle of it, in order to be able to glean the learning you can from it, especially if it doesn't have a very large downside, except the amount of work that people are putting into it.

So why are we going into this area? I want to stress three broad goals.

The first is to promote teaching and learning experimentation and innovation on our own campus and in our own courses. First of all, you could consider online education to be a

kind of "greenfield" for course design without constraints, like the kind we have on campus. I can tell you most of the Coursera courses we are offering are not 14 weeks long. We have faculty members who are participating in Coursera, teaching courses that they have also taught before on campus, saying "you know if I hadn't had to teach this course for 14 weeks I never would have. I've always crammed two or three weeks of material in because I've got to meet the schedule, and I've got to have the seat time." So they are experimenting with new ways of teaching their material not only in terms of how they deliver it but even how much material they deliver and over what period of time. I think this will come back to challenge us, on our campus, because if you think about it, we have a system which is incredibly rigid. And we don't have to have a system that's rigid, but we have to do substantial things to change it. That's especially true at the undergraduate level.

The second thing is to use electronic materials to make better use of course time. This is the kind of "flipped" format; it's just one example of this, but just think of it also in terms of the opportunity, for instance, to prepare your students. So let's say you have a course that you did in the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC format) and you were to say to your students "before you come and take my full course, I'd like you to go through the MOOC. It's kind of a prep, so that when you come to the class you're going to be better prepared, and I can teach in class differently. It's not saying that I'm going to substitute this; it's just saying that I can teach differently."

Let me provide some examples of this: supporting interdisciplinary teaching (because we can create these courses in a different context), and create modular repurpose content--I think this is a really interesting thing. We're developing an awful lot of electronic pieces for courses: videos, other kinds of lecture material, other kinds of testing material. We can--and I've checked under our IP policy--we can create and we will create a depository of all these materials, which will be available to all

the Duke faculty and students. So that we'll have our own little mini Kahn Academy. So you can have access to materials prepared by our own faculty, which can be used and cross purposed, and which can be used in a preparatory way as well.

We're also going to experiment in technology for social learning--this is one of the big, over-hyped yet understudied areas--which is how far can you get with online sectioning? How far can you get with self-created groupings of students in large courses, where do they put themselves together? What are the advantages and what are the disadvantages? How far can you use peer review online?

Second of all, supporting the strategic goals of global outreach and knowledge in the service of society. This is true in the most direct way because we are pushing knowledge that Duke faculty have. We have a faculty member teaching in Coursera--I will not name who it is--but he has noted that if the number of students who signed up for his course on Coursera actually take it--and I stress they won't--but if they actually did take it, it would be as many students as he would teach in 50 years. So let's say only 10% of them, still five years. If only 10% of them finish it: complete the course in the proper way.

And of course it can also assist us in our global programs. As we continue our global outreach we can use these courses to send some material to our global sites to complement and work with the courses that are being taught at the site as well as the MOOC courses taught at the global site in a kind of flipped way. And of course it also enhances our reputation. I can assure you that we've had very, very good feedback about the role that Duke is playing here.

Now, the hype about MOOCs is ridiculous. The transformation in one year of higher education that's going to happen...Sometimes you read about "the Boards that are firing college presidents because they did not rapidly enough move (laughter) into the entire MOOC world." Well, they fire, and then rehire. I think there are actually four distinct functions. And these four functions will happen in very different mixes across types of schools. There will be the acceleration of teaching innovation. As the MOOCs become a possibility as I described for people to try out new things, the excitement of the MOOC will then tip people over the top. You know people who have been sitting in their offices saying "I really need to adapt my course. My students are bringing all these new things but I never really quite got there." Well the excitement about all of this, is actually tipping people over. So it's an accelerator of innovation.

The second thing is enhancing the in-person educational experience. This is the sort of "flip model." It's not going to be one or the other--some use of digital in one way; some use of digital in the other way.

The third one, which is the one that is most talked about as being the big money saver, "I can get those expensive faculty members out of the classroom and substituted with these MOOC courses, with no classroom experience in which the institution will be able to have no marginal costs for adding the additional student, once the course is up." Now, first of all that economic model is, I believe, hooey, although the marginal costs would be low. But second of all, this is not going to happen at Duke and it's not going to happen at many, many schools. It may happen at some, it may happen for a piece of the curriculum, it may complement the curriculum, as I was suggesting earlier, but there are lots of different ways this could happen.

Finally, of course, it expands educational opportunity reach and I have to tell you that among the creators of these MOOC platforms--the people who are creating the Courseras and Udacitys and edXes--the commitment to providing access to high quality educational materials to students who would never have such access in a non-digital world is a very deep and idealistic commitment. I think many of us share it.

As I said, it's going to vary by institution and it's going to vary whether it's for credit or open access or not for credit. At Duke, acceleration is a big factor. Enhancement is the most important factor, I think, and the expansion of educational opportunity.

This slide just shows you who some of the players who are out there. Notice the dates at which they were founded. The one that was founded the longest ago, 2tor, is currently the leader in providing online combined asynchronous and synchronous teaching for masters students. They are doing that with pretty good institutions: Washington University St. Louis, UNC-Chapel Hill, USC, in fields like Nursing, Social Work, Law and one-year business programs. But each of these companies is in a very competitive market place and I have to tell you that they are adjusting to that competitive market place by changing their approaches, sometimes monthly. Literally we had a call with one of these companies and a month later when we talked to them again, they said "remember that call we had a month ago? We'll we're actually not going to do it that way, we're going to do it this way." This is a very fluid field, and we don't still have--except for 2tor--business models that attach revenue to what they're doing. They will get there but they haven't got there yet.

This next slide shows you the number of enrollments for our Coursera courses. As of September 17th, which was about two months after these courses went up, the total is 223,000. It was 205,000 last week and its 223,000 this week.

Just to go through the fields. I'm going now from your left to your right. "Bioelectricity and Quantitative Approach," "Think Again How to Reason and Argue"--note a Philosophy course is the leading course, so don't think this is all about the sciences--"Introduction to Astronomy," "Introduction to Human Physiology," "A Beginner's Guide to Irrational Behavior" (laughter)--that was the one I thought was going to be the leader (laughter), "Medi-

cal Neuroscience," "Health Care Innovation and Entrepreneurship," "Introduction to Genetics and Evolution," "Image and Video from Mars to Hollywood with a Stop at the Hospital." So that's our initial array, we will be selecting more courses in the future. We're actually working with the Advisory Committee on Online Education to think about the process by which we will make such selections. Probably in the middle of the Fall, there will be a call for courses.

I won't go through with you the exact number; actually I do have the total number of enrollments, which is 233,274. If you want to know where in the world these enrollments are, this gives you a map, essentially of where the students come from--these are hits for one month. In case you're geography isn't so good it's, in descending order, US, Brazil, Canada, UK, India, Russia, Australia, Spain, Germany, and China.

Speaker: Are these unique hits?

Lange: These are unique hits in one month. Okay, what does our website look like? This is one of our courses "Think Again: How to Reason and Argue." On this page you can see how we're supporting our courses. At the top you see the place in the Coursera catalog that this course occupies. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong's picture there is part of a video ranging from 90 seconds to 2 minutes, where he presents his course. If you want to have some fun, you should go look at these videos. You'll see the incredibly theatrical qualities of some of your colleagues (laughter). Actually this is one thing we want to be aware of, as I cannot imagine that this will not feed back on the campus before too long. Our undergraduates are saying, "Why don't we have some of these videos about our own courses?" We actually got a request last year from DSG to start doing that and there has been some initial effort at doing that.

As you can see on this page, this is the list of support operations that are going on from different places within the University, and I can

come back to questions about that if you want.

On this next page, you can see a little bit about different options. So in this course, which is taught by Prof. Plesser, you'll see there is a background question, which says if you can't do this work don't take my course. Therefore that's an alternative form of prerequisites. On this next slide you can see the features of a Coursera course. On the left hand side there is a syllabus, video lectures, peer assessments, etcetera. This is just to give you a feel for it. Every course is different. So I can show you this, and I can guarantee you that the next time this course is taught--this is not our course, this is actually a course I think Lynne (O'Brien) is taking-- she's taking this course and I think she would say the likelihood this course will be exactly the same the next time it's taught is very low. And our faculty who are starting up these courses know that.

Okay, now I want to raise a few questions. First of all, there are lots of questions out there about the authentication of the identity, certification of students, and giving credit for these courses. Ask yourself the following question: why would a student cheat on a not for credit course? And yet we know that students are plagiarizing in peer-review sessions in some of these MOOCs. There is an interesting question about why a student would cheat, and there's also an interesting question about how much we, as an instructor in a not for credit course, should care about whether a student cheats. It is a wrench for a faculty member to think that some people might not either complete his or her course, or might or might not do all the work in the course, or might even cheat in the course, but the truth is when you have a large number of enrollments, you need to remember that students take these courses, for very different reasons. You could well imagine for instance, taking a course in music history, to understand a lot more about the structure of music in a historical sense. A student might never take an exam in that course, but would be a more vastly educated person if they go to every class, at

the end than they were in the beginning. That would be an enormous extension of the work of that scholar, to have reached a lot of people like that. So there is an interesting challenge here.

How do we know who's taking the course? We're going to get lots of data from our partners about who is taking the courses. There are questionnaires in the beginning, there are questionnaires at the end, and there's a lot of data which is collected digitally. Everything will be anonomized, but this is a large number of students, so you get a lot of interesting data that you can work with. In fact, computer scientists are quite interested in how you use this data to think about teaching and learning and so forth.

How can we certify completion? This is one of the biggest challenges. What does it mean to complete a course? This will be a challenge for the instructors. All of these issues remain at the behest of the instructor for the most part. How would you grade? How do you certify that the person you are grading is the person taking the course? But there are also lots of technology working around that, including, in the case of a couple course providers, actually going back to a hard place thing. For example, they've made a deal with Pearson Test Centers, so if a student wants to get a grade, they go to the Pearson Test Center, they show their ID and then they sit down and take an exam on a computer that restricts their ability to navigate freely on the computer. You can do that, but that's an odd sort of thing in a way. You've got this great space, but then you say you can't actually get a grade in this course, unless you go to a fixed place. I suspect that some electronic means of getting reliability of certification will emerge very quickly in this space, but we don't know yet when it will come.

This is a certificate which the instructors in our courses can give if they wish. It would say that "'your name' has successfully completed an online non-credit course offered by Duke." The professor would have his/her digitized

signature and there would also be a legend about how you can verify the authenticity of the certificate, and a warning that we cannot attest, as a University, to the identity of the person having taken the course. What is this certificate worth? (laughter) Well, it depends. It seems like it's worth nothing. But imagine you go to your employer and you say "I really would like to change my position. I am now way better attuned. I've taken three of these courses. I have three of these certificates showing that I've completed the course. I'm going to demonstrate that I have, because let's have a conversation about the material and you're going to see that I know a lot more than I did before." So a lot of people are taking these courses, not to use the certificate as an entry by itself, but maybe just as a verification they took something they can then verify in other ways as well.

Early observations about the MOOCs. It's complicated and time consuming. It's not easy--anybody in Fuqua could tell you this is true. The material in the courses belong to us and we can store it. Copyright negotiations are incredibly complicated. This is an area which is going to have to evolve; there is no question about it. There are huge opportunities in assessment and we have an assessment committee built up from faculty at Duke who are interested in the issue of educational assessment, to figure out both how to assess the learning outcomes of the course and how to assess our overall entry into this area. In terms of adding in person elements, and the financial models, this is really still a thing in evolution. I think the easiest thing to say is that when the companies start making money, we will start making money. But not before.

So this is what we are doing. We're launching our first Coursera course on Monday. We will be implementing our assessment plan. There's a process for adding Coursera courses during the Fall, working with ACOE. There is the possible option of developing credit courses: we're working with a company to see whether we can reach an agreement about doing that in a way that we like, and that

would be for undergraduate courses. We're monitoring the changes every day. For example, the ongoing copyright issues. I think with that we'll conclude, except for one thing. This has been an enormous amount of work and it has taken a level of commitment from staff at Duke which has really been exemplary. I want to really herald--and Lynne I think you should stand up--Lynne O'Brien (applause), the director of the Center for Instructional Technology. At the same time, she has really been my right hand person in mounting this work over the summer. With that I will conclude and take any questions.

Questions

Josh Socolar (Physics): You talked a little about whether we can authenticate and evaluate student performance. There must be some system, envisioned or in place, for evaluating the courses themselves?

Lange: Yes, that's what the assessment exercise will be about.

Socolar: And yet who is going to do the evaluating? Or rather, how might that work?

Lange: Well that's what our assessment committee is going to do, but I'm assuming that we will have mechanisms at the end of courses to think through how we discover how much people learned. Now at large numbers if some people either don't answer or they are not the people who answer, it won't make a big difference. For small numbers it would make a huge difference for the outcome, for large numbers it will make less difference. That however is what the committee is in charge of doing: thinking through how we would assess and how we can get enough information to allow us to assess the outcome. What I hope we can do is actually do some things in parallel. This is not only about online, but also internally. For example, are flip courses doing a better or worse job and at what aspects? There are all kinds of possibilities and that's what this assessment committee is really dedicated to working on.

17

Socolar: Is the demand for these courses mostly at the introductory level? Do we have any sense of whether people are interested in advanced courses?

Lange: Well I showed you the courses that we're putting up. Some of those are clearly introductory; some of them aren't really introductory. We know at the web level in the Coursera catalog, more broadly, there are both. There's obviously going to be a lot of demand for introductory courses. But I think there will be over time, increasing demand for more advanced courses. And I think the whole thought of having to build a MOOC curriculum--how you sequentially offer courses, how you determine if you've meet the prerequisites and are eligible for a course--all of these things are possible.

Sunny Ladd (Sanford): Two questions. I assume there is a charge for taking these courses? I'm also unclear whether there will be teaching assistants, or is everything online?

Lange: No, there is no charge. As for your other question, in the MOOC environment there are no teaching assistants, or very few. There might be someone to manage the web traffic around the course. Don't give your email to 16,000 students (laughter). There are no teaching assistants, except maybe aides to the course.

How will they make money long term? There are various different models that they are working around. I'm not sure which ones they are going to land on. There are some that I think are more interesting than others, but I have to tell you, there is a lot of ambivalence about doing things related to payment for the courses, which would create entry barriers to the people who most need access to them. So, if you come from a really impoverished country and you are likely to never get access to material like these, if you create a payment system, even something as simple as requiring a credit card, then that creates a monstrous entry barrier. There's a lot of shared ambivalence about that. Right now, it's not costing us a lot of money to put this up. I think our initial investment is not that high. I'm also seeking a gift to support our ramp up effort. To the extent that we can do that, I think we would prefer not to charge, and let companies decide how they want to do it.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): The list of courses you showed before, are those being offered this Fall?

Lange: Fall and Winter.

Klein: Okay, so in addition to the wide world of people out there taking these courses, these are also being taken for credit by Duke students right?

Lange: No. Not in this asynchronous way. Now it is possible for a Duke professor to take his or her asynchronous course and say that's going to be the lecture portion of my Duke course, but there are going to be both classroom sections in which I'm going to run discussion among all the students in the class, or however else they want to work it.

Lozier: I want to thank the Provost and given the pace at which this initiative is evolving, I imagine this is not the last time we will have you on this Council floor answering questions about the MOOC world. And this concludes our meeting today.   I want to congratulate Sunny again (applause). I look forward to seeing you for the kick-off to our 50th anniversary celebration at our October meeting. Have a good evening.