

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
304 UNION WEST
BOX 90928

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Academic Council

Thursday November 20, 2008

Paula McClain (Political Science, Chair of the Council): Good afternoon....the first order of business is to approve the minutes from the October 23rd meeting. [The minutes were approved by voice vote without dissent.] Thank you very much, John...

John has put up here a nice reminder that when you speak, please give your name so that when it's transcribed off the tape, we know who said what.

Proposal to establish a Duke Global Health Institute Masters of Science degree – vote

The next item is a vote on the proposal from the Duke Global Health Institute to establish a Masters of Science degree. The proposal was presented at the October 23rd meeting by Dr. Michael Merson. Are there any additional questions about this? Dr. Merson is here and can answer those. Great. If not, we will proceed with the resolution:

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the proposal to establish a Masters of Science degree within the Duke Global Health Institute.

This does not require a second, so all those in favor, please say aye? [The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Undergraduate Admissions for student athletes–update

McClain: I will now call on Professor Michael Gillespie, Chair of the Athletic Council, to present an update regarding Undergraduate Admissions for student athletes for 2008-09.

Michael Gillespie (Political Science/Chair, Athletic Council): We have some other information if you haven't gotten this...

The Athletic Council met on September 6, 2008 in the first meeting of the year to meet with and hear from our new Athletic Director, Kevin White, and to discuss the proposed new admissions guidelines for student athletes in Olympic sports. You have, or will soon have, a copy of the proposal and I will be happy

to discuss them in a moment. These guidelines were established through a conversation between the Assistant Athletic Director for Academic Advising, Brad Berndt, who's with us today, Dean of Undergraduate Admissions, Christoph Guttentag, who's also here, and were approved by Provost Lange. These have already been unanimously approved by the Academic Committee of the Athletic Council and were then unanimously approved by the full Athletic Council in September.



The executive committee of the Athletic Council subsequently met with the President and the Provost to discuss with them other matters that they wished us to focus on this year. Central to their concern was, as it has been for a long time, examining ways to improve the academic experience of student athletes. After some discussion, and input from Kevin White and Martha Putallaz, the Faculty Athletic Representative, we have formed an ad-hoc committee to consider what has been a long-standing concern: the opportunities for some form of international experience for student-athletes.

This committee will be meeting during the academic year and reporting to the full Athletic Council in the spring. And I hope we will be able to get back to you with more information in our spring meeting.

The Faculty Athletic Associates Program is currently being chaired by Suzanne Shanahan and Fritz Mayer. They've been working with the current Associates while at the same time conducting a comprehen-

sive review of the program to determine what has and has not worked. Here, they're working closely with the Athletic Department and coaches and anticipate putting changes in place in the program in the spring that should take effect hopefully in the spring, but certainly for the following academic year.

I have also distributed to you information on the graduation success rate for Duke Athletics which is indicative not only of our overall success, but of our success in individual areas, and certainly our success in comparison to our national competitors. Obviously, the current financial situation has, and will continue to have, an impact on Athletics, and I'm sure that many of you would like to know what that will be. While I have my own opinions, these are not very well-informed, specifically in respect to Duke and I would suggest that we defer those questions for another occasion.

We have with us today, Christoph, Brad and Martha who will also be able to help answer your questions. I think I'd like us to focus first, if you have questions, on the Admissions criteria because Christoph has another meeting he has to go to...

The changes in the Admissions criteria were really a wonderful process because they put in place, I think for the first time, real incentives for coaches to recruit higher quality student athletes. I think we also gave them a little bit more flexibility – not with respect so much to academic merit but really in terms of how they recruit students over a period of four years. Christoph might want to speak to that, certainly Brad. Christoph, if you want to add anything?

Christoph Guttentag (Dean of Undergraduate Admissions): No, I think that essentially, we were working with a system where coaches were limited each year in the number of players that they were able to recruit, and we had a lot of success in terms of flexi-



bility with football and basketball: not in increasing the total number of players on the team, not in increasing the total number of athletes in the student body, but in giving the teams more year-to-year flexibility. We thought it would be worth trying out for a handful of years to see if the other sports would benefit from the same sort of flexibility. Brad and I had a lot of discussions about this and the important principle for us was

that this not mean a net increase in the presence of athletes in the student body, but really flexibility from year to year for the coaches. And I think we, and the coaches, and the athletic administration have all been comfortable with what we came up with. We'll be interested in seeing how it plays out in the next couple of years.

Gillespie: Brad, do you have anything you'd like to add?

Brad Berndt (Associate Athletic Director): The only thing I would add is that what we started out with is the minimum expectation that we let the students graduate. That's the minimum. We want them to engage intellectually and contribute and benefit from the Duke community. So, as we talk about graduation rates, those are great, but we expect our students to graduate...

Questions

Tom Metzloff (Law/ECAC): Some of the changes seem to permit the teams to use what had been spread out over a couple of years all in one year. What mechanism is there when they've used them all up where you've used your stretches, reaches up? The next year are we going to say, no, you're out?

Guttentag: Yes – exactly. We keep track year to year.

Metzloff: Then they say I have the greatest kid in the world – can I have one more?

Guttentag: Tough.

Berndt: And that's a great question. One of the things when we talk about the changing landscape in college athletics, you're not going to get a great class every year, it could be the class of '09 got 4 or 5 kids you want, and the next year is not a very good class athletically, so this gives the coaches the options to go ahead and do that but that's...Christoph answered just the way that we expect it to play out. They use up all their spots that one year they don't get any the next year.

Joel Huber (Fuqua): Aren't you at all worried that a coach in the last year of a contract might say: this is the time for me to damn the future? Or if you bring a new coach in, you're going to say you get a clean slate again? Have you thought about that?

Berndt: We have thought about that, that's why we have an Athletic Director who's also a Vice President at this institution and that's his responsibility along with my responsibility, along with Christoph's. The next coach coming in will have a tough time if that's what his predecessor did.

Gillespie: If I could just speak on behalf of the coaches: I think we've got an absolutely superb coaching staff, and one of the reasons they come to Duke is that they know if they have one bad year they are not likely to be fired. Unlike schools in the Southeast Conference (just pick one at random); so I think that goes a long way towards helping us out academically as well, because they know the kind of program that

we expect them to have both in terms of its academic success and in terms of its athletic success.

Other questions on this issue? Are there thoughts or comments on the whole question of the international experience of athletes? This is obviously something we have pondered. It's very difficult for athletes to spend eight weeks, for example, in a DukeEngage program away from campus. We've talked about other models. There's a model, called Coach for College, that's being run by one of our former tennis players in Vietnam, which is a shorter-term program, and has been really transformative for some of the athletes that have participated in it.

So, one of the things that we are thinking about is whether or not there are shorter-term international experiences that might be appropriate. Obviously – and Brad can speak much more clearly to this than I can – we have to be careful that these are not just programs for athletes, they have to be regular Duke programs that are open to anyone who wants to go. But programs that meet the needs of athletes that would also benefit the general student body would be ideal.

In any case, we have a very good sub-committee put together that will be considering this issue, so if you have any thoughts or comments about that – and I know many of you have more experience with international education than I do, certainly – so I would very much appreciate your emailing me or the committee or Martha, who's a member of that committee as well, any thoughts that you have about what we can do to improve on that score. Thoughts, comments, other questions? Thank you very much.

Question for the President

McClain: Thank you, Michael. There is a tradition in Academic Council that any faculty person can submit a question through the Academic Council Office for one of the administrators to answer at the next Academic Council meeting. And we received such a question put to President Brodhead to answer. The question is:

In the Nov. 7 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education the tuition and fees for most of the universities in the United States are given for 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. Duke's tuition and fees for 2008/2009 are \$37,925, a 6.8% increase over the previous year. For Princeton the tuition and fees for 2008/2009 are \$34,920, for Harvard they are \$36,173 and for Yale they are \$35,300. In light of current economic conditions, do you think that our higher tuition and fees are sustainable at Duke?"

President Brodhead: I come to answer this question, and to commend the author of this question for being such a careful reader of the Chronicle of Higher Education. If the Chronicle of Higher Education were as careful with its editing as the reader was with his or her reading I would perhaps not be answering this question. The question is based on a correct perception of an incorrect figure. The figure should have

read \$37,295 instead of \$37,925. That actually made a 5% increase instead of a 6.8% increase and when we called the Chronicle of Higher Education they were very embarrassed and they hastened to correct it in the on-line edition. It is indeed true that our tuition and our combination of tuition, room and board are higher than those of some schools by not large amounts, and that does include the schools that were mentioned in the question. However, in the group of 18 leading universities with which we compare ourselves, we ranked tenth last year and I could tell you the very distinguished schools with figures higher than ours.

Now, I'll approach the question that I think is more interesting which is, is the model of high quality, high tuition education sustainable, are we imagining under the circumstances that have broken out and developed in some measure since the time of the last meeting of the Academic Council? The answer to that is, that we live in a time of great uncertainty over this very question, and one thing that my colleagues in the administration have thought wise is not to propose a figure for tuition, room and board for undergraduates for next year until it's time to seek approval at the February Board meeting, so we'll have a little longer time to understand the dimension of things.

In fact, I just returned this morning from Boston at a meeting of the presidents of COFHE institutions where you may guess that this subject was hotly debated. And there were people who said in a time like this you should set your tuition closer to the actual value, actual cost of the product and then be able to discount it for more students. That would be one theory. Don't forget, if you charge a lower-than-realistic tuition you're benefiting the students whose families could have paid the actual tuition. So to some extent, our balance is not wanting to drive the figure up, but wanting to recover enough from tuition to make the experience rich for everybody, and to make the university affordable for everybody.

I think the main number I would have you keep in mind is not the list price, which is only paid by people who are not eligible for aid. I'd have you remember that a number in excess of 40% of our undergraduates receive some measure of grant aid from this university, and that our budget for that aid was \$86 million, a gain of 20% over last year which is significantly higher than the gain of 5% at the level of tuition. I have reaffirmed this university's commitment to need-blind financial aid and I want to say that one of the great pleasures I had since I saw you last, was announcing on the Plaza on the afternoon of the 7th of November, that we had reached the 300 million dollar milestone.

It was observed by many at the COFHE meeting, that it was smarter to have raised money for financial aid three years ago and reached the goal this year, than to start this year to try and reach that goal. We're in better shape than we were, and this is a fundamental commitment. In short, this university is committed to

having quality education be affordable and we will continue to work with families to make it so...

Capital Building Plans

McClain: Next, we have Executive Vice President, Tallman Trask, who is here to discuss capital building plans and the current economic situation as it affects Duke.

Executive Vice President Tallman Trask: I was meeting last week with ECAC, and we fell into a conversation about finances and capital projects, and so forth and they suggested that I come say a bit about where we are and what the outlook looks like over the near course and the longer term. First thing I want to say is Duke is financially stable. The world isn't – but Duke is. Our FY '09 budget is beginning to show some strains. Nothing we don't think we can handle, but the truth of the matter is: income is down a bit. We are all waiting until after December 31. A lot of our models depend on valuations in markets at the end of December. And so, in January or so, we will know a whole lot more about where we actually stand.

We've had a lot of conversations, and I'm sure many of you have read the various presidential memos that have gone out announcing which particular project has been cancelled at Williams or whatever. We are not ready to do that. We are not going to impose any freezes from the center.

Peter is having conversations with each of the deans, because the reality is each of the schools are different and a single attempt for us to tell them what to do is not only not helpful, it's counterproductive. We are currently assuming and hoping the fiscal 2010 budget will be equal to the fiscal 2009 budget – it's too early to say that yet. There are a lot of discussions about tuition and financial aid. We are planning now to cut administrative costs in fiscal 2010. I should warn you in advance that cutting costs here means also cutting services that people have gotten used to, but it's our desire to protect what we've got and especially the academic programs.

As to capital...well we have a very long capital budget wish list which is revised and added to periodically. There are currently six projects that are in the planning discussion:

1. the renovation of West Union,
2. the renovations of Biddle and Baldwin,
3. something at the Nicholas School,
4. phase one of New Campus, and
5. Athletics Master Plan and some
6. School of Medicine construction.

Those are the only things alive, they are all in planning only, and my expectation is we will not be able to authorize any new construction until mid-2009 when we know more numbers. And without some philanthropic inflows the amount we will be able to authorize will not be very great.

But we hit it in the right moment, we don't have a lot of things we're obligated to, we don't have a lot of things under construction. The things we've just built

have all been paid for, so we're not in any immediate danger. As I said to someone, or I guess Mike Schoenfeld corrected me, the sky is not falling and he said but the cloud cover is increasing. What I've also said to others is a penny saved is a penny earned. It's important we all save our pennies to spend them on things that are truly important. A penny saved this year can be spent next year. The ability of the central administration to give you large amount of nickels and dimes rather than pennies over the next year or two is going to be pretty tough. But, we're fine, everything is holding as we expected, but we're going to have to wait until January to get a real sense of the numbers.

Questions

Martha Adams (Medicine): I've heard that construction costs were coming down...

Trask: That's true, but the analogy I have made is if the house you wanted used to cost a million dollars and now cost \$800,000, it doesn't help you if you only have \$200,000 to spend. We are hearing all kinds of rumors about costs going down, we haven't seen it because we haven't bid any big jobs recently. Architects are saying so, contractors are saying yes, but not as much as the architects are telling you. It will depend largely on the overall market in the Triangle in particular, and largely on behaviors of certain foreign governments over the next few months and years, in particularly, the cost of commodities.

Earl Dowell (Engineering): Tallman, does this mean that Central (New) Campus is likely to be pushed



back by some unforeseen figure and you're holding your powder dry in that respect?

Trask: It's too early to say. We've already said we could not afford to build the whole thing at once, anyway. So, I think the real discussion now is how much can

there be in a modified phase one? And that will be a trade off against all these other projects. I am still hopeful and optimistic that we can proceed on New Campus construction sooner rather than later. But my guess is, at a lower scale than we had imagined.

Dowell: If I could ask one more question. Could you walk us through the current formula for how we decide how much of the endowment we can spend, do some sort of multi-year averaging, in particular the impact of the stock-market behavior on that source of income?

Trask: The endowment pay-out is set by formula, which can be modified, but we don't often do that, at 5.5% of the average of the last three December 31's, and we did it on December 31 – most people do it on June 30 – for two reasons. One is, if we do it in De-

ember then we know the number going into the next budget cycle, we're not guessing at it. And secondly, when a very significant portion of the endowment was in private equity, the federal government gets very upset if investors give them bad numbers on December 31, whereas they don't care nearly as much about June 30. So, it was an attempt to try to make a conservative estimate as what those are worth. Obviously as markets go up, that number goes down because the 5.5% generates less money. We had actually fallen into the 4's because of the rapid escalation of the market. So last year, we made a one-time adjustment, in essence a double payment out of the endowment. And we also upped the pay-out rate on financial aid accounts from 5.5 to 5 ¾. As of today, we're okay on a continuing 5.5 % distribution for next year.

What the market does between now and the end of December will tell us more about that, and if we make it next year and the markets don't return, then we're going to have problems making it in 2011.

But as I've said to everyone, these models assume, if we believe them, that it wouldn't always go up, that at some point something was going to go down. And the reason you were reserving and having these fairly conservative spending rules, was that when it went down, you would still have money to invest. And, so our notional value of our endowment is down close to a billion dollars. But the amount of money we have added through earnings unspent over the last decade is more than double that.

So, it's a question about what are your priorities, when do you want to spend your money? It looks to me at least for the next year or so, we're okay on formula. We may actually want to go above that – that's the decision that we're all talking about, that's a very gutsy decision to decide to invest in a down period. But I don't think it's beyond the discussion at this point, that we are relatively very strong. If you look at our resources per student, as we've grown over the last fifteen years, and excluding Hopkins, because their applied physics lab just dominates their budget. But if you look at our resources per student, and you talk about the SHYMP schools – Stanford, Harvard, Yale, MIT and Princeton, those five – take out MIT, and Duke is sixth. We used to be 23rd, and so we have a lot of flexibility, we have a lot of economic capacity, but we're going to have to think very carefully and differently about how to spend it. And one of the things I'm really concerned about is a 30-year, very big, capital commitment can't be walked away from.

Sabbatical Leave: Handbook Language

McClain: Thank you, Tallman. Provost Lange will now address the Academic Council about the proposed language regarding sabbatical leave for the Faculty Handbook. As you remember, this was originally presented by Dean McLendon in the April 17, 2008 Academic Council meeting and we endorsed this policy, pending Board of Trustees approval. The trustees have approved and we will now hear from the Provost

regarding the language that will be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

Provost Peter Lange: I believe this should be rather a brief item. As you understand this is essentially the enabling language in the Faculty Handbook for something you have already voted to approve. The relevant clause is number two in the new policy. If you look at the page which is entitled (from Chapter 4, the Faculty Handbook) Professional Affairs of the Faculty, and you look at clause two, it says

“individual schools upon approval by the Provost, may institute programs to enable eligibility for sabbatical leaves for tenured members of the university, faculty of the rank of professor, associate professor or assistant professor after a period of active service to the university of less than six years but no less than three years.”

So that essentially guarantees sabbaticals at the level we have been used to, but enables schools to institute policies which would provide sabbaticals at an earlier period. Arts & Sciences is currently taking advantage of this, and has drafted rules, which have been shared with ECAC for its information, and which are also being shared with the executive committee of the Arts & Sciences Council which is the operative body for the rules of Arts & Sciences in this regard, given that this general rule is passed.

So, really all we're asking you to do is approve this which is the enabling language for something you already approved earlier.

McClain: If there are no questions or comments regarding this change to the sabbatical leave policy, then we can move to the resolution.

Be it resolved, the Academic Council endorses the revisions to the sabbatical leave section in Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook.

This does not require a second. [The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.]

SACS Reaccreditation – update

McClain: The last thing on our agenda is an update from Judith Ruderman regarding the SACS reaccreditation process for Duke, followed by an update from Professors Tolly Boatwright and Prasad Kasibhatla about Duke's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

Judith Ruderman (Vice Provost for Academic and Administrative Services): Mine will only take a minute, Prasad is voiceless at this moment, so he won't be here and Tolly teaches until 4:05 PM, so I may actually have to start her presentation.

I had hoped to give you some definitive information about the first prong of our reaccreditation effort. I've appeared before you before, so you may remember that I am the liaison from Duke to the Commission on the Southern Association of Colleges & Schools (SACS), our regional accrediting body. Every ten years we go through a very rigorous self-examination and review, by peer reviewers from around our region.

And that review encompasses two separate initiatives. The first one is the compliance-certification report, which is a very all-encompassing and rigorous look at almost every aspect of our institution, addressing eighty-eight core requirements, comprehensive standards and federal regulations.



We submitted our compliance certification report on September 8, 2008 after about 1 ½ years of work with a very large committee and school liaisons – some of you in this room may have been involved in that effort. At any rate, our ten external reviewers from the comfort of their easy chairs reviewed our report and then met in early November in Atlanta to discuss us. Hence, I had hoped to have the verdict if you will (it seems sometimes as if we're on trial) by now and tell you, well: we came out with flying colors, whatever. That's the best-case scenario.

But I don't have a response yet, now I am expecting it by Tuesday of the coming week. So, all I can tell you is that we submitted a website of 3000 links, a hard copy version of 500 pages and an accompanying DVD. They wanted all of that! And I do suspect that we may well be found wanting in one or more areas, probably the area of assessment being the most salient, because as you well know (and we have discussed this before in this group) this is the name of the game these days, and in some areas of Duke we have very robust protocols and many cycles of improvements to show and in some areas of Duke, we do not. So, we are only hoping that the reviewers look at these areas and not at those areas, but that is perhaps too much to hope for.

What I don't know is what other aspects of our operation we may be found wanting in, but I think we did a decent job of explaining Duke University to our external reviewers.

Are there any questions about the compliance certification report? It's not the most scintillating of topics – not as exciting as faculty leave; I understand that!

Questions

John Staddon (ECAC/Psychology and Neuroscience): Do you any idea how many personnel hours this process has taken?

Ruderman: My boss and yours, the Provost, asked me at one point to count those hours to keep track of them, I told him that I didn't want to do it (laughter). And, sometimes I can't talk back to him, I told him....

Staddon: Surely, you could have hired somebody!?

Ruderman: Many, many person hours, and there's an expense, a financial expense, attached to this too. But that's the way it goes.

Lange: If you want my frank opinion, John, it's over a million dollars worth of effort without question.

Staddon: And, I take it there's no easy way to make the process simpler?

Lange: No. Believe me, if there were, we would have found it.

Joel Huber (Fuqua): Let me ask the question a different way. We are required to do this and we are doing it: were there aspects from this study that you felt we should pay attention regardless of the fact that we are sending it out to someone else?

Ruderman: If you're asking was it a worthwhile endeavor?

Huber: No, I'm not asking you that. Were there things you got out of it that you feel we ought to do,



and I want this to be a personal question not a political one.

Ruderman: If you're asking me personally, I will say that I do think an emphasis on assessment is important, that we should be able to demonstrate that we don't take

for granted what we do, that we continually work to improve ourselves. I don't think there's anything unreasonable about that expectation. I will think it's unreasonable if we have shown 96 (I'm picking a number that was shown by another institution in our region) 96 assessment plans, and yet there were 100 units and four were missing, and we'll be reprimanded, I will not find that reasonable. But I do think that an emphasis on assessment is appropriate.

Now I don't know if I'm even in the majority in saying that, because people have complained. It seems like a burden to have to put your mission statement on

your website, or state your student learning outcomes, but you ask me personally, I think Joel, and I've answered you personally. Now along the way, we found other little areas where we could improve, and we have tweaked and made adjustments, so that's a good outcome to any self-examination.

Barbara Shaw (Chemistry): Is this whole report available to faculty to examine, available for discussion by this body?

Ruderman: I think I need to discuss that with the Provost before I make a response and I'll tell you why. There are certain attachments in this report that are allowable for accreditation purposes, but are restricted in terms of other uses, and so my guess is that we will remove probably all attachments, and the narrative then would be available for review.

Shaw: Let me ask another question. When you say "remove," will it be clear to the reader what was removed essentially?

Ruderman: Yes, it will.

Shaw: Also, I presume there were faculty on this evaluation?

Ruderman: Absolutely. There were faculty, especially on our assessment working group. Believe me, no faculty would have wanted to be involved on the compliance certification team. You've got better things to do, but we had an ancillary group, called the Assessment Working Group, and it had a lot of faculty on it.

Any other questions about the compliance certification? Well you can see that I'm kind of stalling because this is Tolly Boatwright's baby, she is the co-chair, with Prasad [Kasibhatla], of the second prong of the re-accreditation effort, which is called the Quality Enhancement Plan, or the QEP.

Now, SACS has done this, this is the third decade in which they've had this kind of self-study that is supposed to lead some kind of enhancement of the way we operate. Twenty years ago, the subject was "Crossing Boundaries" and it really helped to jump-start our big push on interdisciplinary studies.

Ten years ago, the topic was "Balancing the rules of the research university." I see people like Steve Nowicki who were involved in that effort. That report recommended the changes in the undergraduate curriculum, the Arts & Sciences curriculum, for example. Eventually, with a committee led by the now Provost, we saw that happen.

So, now we have a Quality Enhancement Plan. All we were told was that it had to enhance student learning. We have a large, university-wide faculty committee, that has been at work for over a year attempting to determine the direction for our QEP. We started with a very broad theme of "re-imagining liberal education in the 21st century." Eventually, the QEP committee lit on what it thought was the most salient aspect of re-imagining liberal education, and it will not surprise you that it is already a signature of Duke University, but it did take us another six months

to arrive at this, and that is what Tolly Boatwright is going to talk about.

Mary T. Boatwright (Classical Studies): I don't know how much Judith has said already, but let me just talk about the QEP in the way that's it been described most recently which is the way we are going to be going forward. We have our over-arching aims for the QEP as a whole, and then we have three different prongs that we are going to use to attain those aims. And I'll speak about each of those three when we get to them. But here when we started you can just see that these over-arching aims of the development in students of an awareness of significant and contemporary issues in their global scope, including appreciation for the history, distinctions and priorities of individuals and groups in other regions and cultures. [Prof. Boatwright then read from the slides reproduced in the [APPENDIX](#).]



So that's what I have. But we still are very open to hearing tweaking, hearing your questions. It's not completely written yet. That's because the server went down last night that it's not completely ready. But anyhow we welcome comments and information from you all and criticisms too, thank you.

Questions

John Staddon: What are *intercultural competencies*?

Boatwright: Oh, I knew you would ask me that. I just said to Judith yesterday, I don't know what that means!

Ruderman: This is a concept that is very much in the air. The notion is that our students are not well enough prepared. I'll just take as a first example, study abroad, that they find themselves carrying their own lack of self-awareness of their own paradigms, if you will, cultural paradigms.

Intercultural competencies is the term that is used a lot, helping our students and anybody to develop both the knowledge and the skills and the attributes to fully embrace and engage in another culture. So, it has lots of different aspects. (I know I'm kind of babbling now!) It concerns developing self-awareness of what you bring from your own culture when you go someplace else, things you haven't been aware of unless

you have intentionally studied them as well as attributes of other cultures – listening skills – it’s comprehensive. I’m no expert in it obviously, that’s why I’m not giving you good enough answers, but that’s the term that’s used these days.

We don’t mandate anything like it for our students, and one of the tests of the first cohort of global advisers will be to investigate what we already offer at Duke. International House offers something like this for staff, but we don’t offer anything like this for students and we don’t have anything mandatory for students studying abroad or going, well DukeEngage does have a mandatory session, so that’s the kind of thing we hope to inculcate.

Staddon: So, I mean it’s more than getting along with furriners? It has a kind of therapeutic aura...

Boatwright: One can think about it in terms of you don’t what to do the Ugly American, but I think much more operative is the “inter” part both for our students or whoever is interculturally competent to be able to communicate, to work with people, but to learn as well as to teach. It’s a two-way street, and to be aware of sensitivities and cultures.

Ruderman: If I could just say, John, there was a one-page Chronicle of Higher Education article by a college undergraduate about how she was ill-prepared to get the most out of her abroad experience, and she says it much better than I did, I think if the Council is interested we could get that article to you.

Staddon: I think I get it – it’s sort of like those “World’s Local Bank” HSBC ads in European airports.

Susan Lozier (Nicholas): Thanks for your presentation. Do you have an estimated cost for the program?

Boatwright: We’re just in negotiations – we don’t yet have an estimated cost, but that’s a very good question.

Lozier: Will that be part of what you submit in February?

Boatwright: Yes, absolutely, but we don’t have it yet pinned down, so it would be foolish of me to throw out a number.

Lozier: And when are you submitting it, where are you submitting it?

Ruderman: The same place we submit everything else – to SACS. We have a visiting team that will concentrate on the QEP – they’re coming in March. The chair of our team is the president of UVa. We have on that team a president of Tulane. We also have a specialist on Global Education, who we picked after some investigation, and he’s at Georgia Tech, and he’s coming. So that’s what’s going to happen in March, they’ll concentrate on our QEP. Am I not answering your question? You look puzzled.

Lozier: I guess what I’m wondering about is this what we’re telling them that we are going to do or is this like an exercise to show what we could possibly do?

Ruderman: This is supposed to be something that we have planned, and that we will implement. Now if we implement one of more or these activities, prongs, and something doesn’t turn out to be useful for us, at achieving its objectives and we don’t think that even with tweaking it could, then we are allowed to kill the program. But this is a plan that we’ve developed to implement, not just something that we might or we think would be nice.

Lozier: Okay, I’m sorry, I’m just a little confused, because who decides that that is the program, so basically this isn’t a program then that’s approved by the faculty or something like that, so basically this is submitted to this group and we’re saying that we’re committed to having this program put into action at Duke?

Ruderman: Well, we have a leadership team and it’s been in existence since we started all of this accreditation work, and it has faculty members on it, and administrators and students, and they have the ultimate responsibility for saying this is what Duke will do.

Lozier: Not Academic Council?

Ruderman: You may not remember that, it seems like years ago, but it was probably a year and half ago that I came before you and solicited topics, so we tried to get faculty input.

Lozier: I understand.

Esther Gabara (Romance Studies): I was just



wondering if you could say a little more about how a program of this sort will reach the bulk of communication and learning from a number of different sites, and especially the service-learning component, when there seems to be no language knowledge required, I’m not exactly sure which service can be offered except for the small number of Anglo countries – how is this addressed?

Boatwright: The service component as I think I stressed it ... the students were very keen that there would be some sort of service component. I think they were not worried, but they felt that there was the possibility that they were just helicoptering in, being there for 6 ½ weeks, maybe going to a museum or something, doing their work, and then leaving. They were the ones advocating for service learning so they’d have

some interaction and feel that they are making a difference.

Gabara: That's very lovely, but it's a little disconcerting also because it means that they kind of go in with this idea that they are going to be doing something when they don't seem to have a great deal of knowledge already to be able to – so the question is not just about service learning, it's actually a question about what you said about receiving multi-cultural ... all of this seems difficult to me when there's no ability to actually communicate and learn from people except for those who are able to do so in a level of English that allows them to be ...

Boatwright: The six places that have been identified are Singapore, India, London, St. Petersburg, but many of the places have English being commonly spoken, but I hear you.

Gabara: These are the Commonwealth countries!

Ruderman: I think that we should say everything you are saying is very important, and this is not meant to be an immersion program in the same way that our other study abroad programs are. That said, your point is very well taken, how can students do service work or internship if they don't speak the language?

The first two pairings we're thinking of are India and Singapore. Still very different programs for our Duke students – those are not programs our undergraduates currently go abroad to, but English would be spoken there, so that buys us some time to consider even more fully the next pairings and your point about if you don't have the language what can you hope to get out of this?

Gabara: There does seem to be a structural issue that should be considered, as well as ...

Boatwright: But also I think that the focus of that semester needs to be something that can be addressed at both sites and can be something the students are making a difference with, so whether it's something like Green Economy is something that's been thought about for the Winter Forum, Global Health is one that's been thought about for the Global Semester Abroad, so there is going to be on the theme interaction with the local communities with local doctors, so it's not just coming in, but you're exactly right, because it has to be deliberately addressed how there is going to be interaction and how we can make sure that there is a level of interaction that is profound...

Steve Nowicki (Dean of Undergraduate Education): If I could just offer a perspective on it, I think the point that you make is very valid. I think it's important to keep in mind that this concept of a global semester abroad is not a substitute for a Duke semester abroad immersion program, but another alternative to add to the menu of possibilities for how Duke students engage the globe. And there's a trade-off with this, because one envisions a program that explicitly goes to two, I could imagine three places, with the idea of studying one subject from alternatives perspectives, the trade-off is that it's more difficult for the students to acquire the language skills for those two, or perhaps

even three places, because it's hard enough for American students to acquire skills for even one.

So it adds to the menu of possibilities. What it offers though is something that is not usually done with a typical semester abroad at Duke, any semester especially, and that is the ability to see an issue from different perspectives, to look at that issue from the perspective of India and from the perspective of China, and I think it's going to be the individual students and their faculty advisors who help weigh positives and negatives for different students, so it's adding to the menu of options, and that's very much part of the way this whole QEP has been developed.

Understand that here at Duke we do actually quite a bit with students. We have a number of programs which offer global perspectives so what we're doing here is adding to that menu and then with the global advisors trying to get the whole picture together.

Carlo Tomasi (Computer Science): I think that's a valid point and there are several other points that could be made about the other programs, like for instance it's not clear that having students for two or three days in a room talking about things helps to provide a much more effective way to expose them to international issues or that having a group of advisors amassing information for a year is necessarily specific enough and a clear enough advantage.

We are paying for these additional programs in terms of Duke resources, and perhaps more importantly, students' time, and to re-phrase a question that I asked in another venue about this, how do we know really that adding any of these things actually strengthens the exposure that we give to our students as opposed to perhaps trying to improve some of the many programs that we already have?

Boatwright: I'm not sure I can really answer that, except in terms of your question about time. Of course, a student's time is a very important aspect of this. The global-advising program should help people not waste time, it should help people to understand what opportunities there are and how best to prepare themselves for them. The Winter Forum, the question you asked about, you know 2 or 3 days, how does that really prepare you, here we're thinking that people will be working in break-out sessions where they're working together, people who have engaged in the renaissance weekend and that kind of conference which is the model for this, 2 ½ day conference, say that is transformative. I have never engaged in something like that, so in part this is turning to literature and best practices, but I understand what you're saying, it might be seen as superficial and it might be seen as adding on rather than strengthening something that already exists, and so Prasad can't speak today, I don't know if you want to add anything, Judith?

Barbara Shaw: When you said 4-6 staff people, are you talking about faculty staff?

Boatwright: For the global advising?

Shaw: Yes.

Boatwright: Those would be advisors who would not necessarily be faculty, they would be as some of the other advisors here who are advising now in the Academic Advising Center, so when we've spoken about this with Dean Rasmussen, one of things we've discussed is for the advisors to be able to teach if they wanted to teach a course in let's say a language that we don't normally offer for what is valid, because having somebody teach the students is a very different kind of relationship that is established than when you're just advising. I would just add here that there is the goal, for advising here at Duke, to lower the number of students per advisor, and this would fit in with that goal as well. I think Dean Rasmussen said that it's 12 to 1, and they want to lower it now to being fewer students per advisor.

Shaw: There is this question could we do better with faculty within our established programs and de-



partments? Could we already have the extra people and the extra time to develop this ourselves without bringing in another 4 – 6 people – which normally will expand to 10, 15 or 20 people. I'm not trying to make light of this, but I do think that there is a problem in the sense that every time we open up new programs we actually make it more difficult to do better what we could do in the past but maybe cannot do as well because of cuts in various ways.

Boatwright: Yes, it's a very good point to bring up.

Julie Britton (Fuqua): I think it's really important as we develop these new programs to look at other places that have existing programs with similar objectives and see if we can't also learn and develop good evaluation tools to help us assess, especially in the early stages as we're trying to see: does it really meet the goals that we set out? How does it meet them, where does it fall short in meeting them? Because in any of our programs we try new things like we need to do, but we want to be sure that we're assessing and learning and moving and growing in the directions we want to move, so I would encourage you to do that.

Boatwright: Absolutely; I've now become friends with the assessment people at Duke that I didn't know before and who are wonderful. We have been working very closely with them and they've been invaluable, because that is a huge part of the QEP, is the needs assessment, have we met our benchmarks? But thank you.

Roy Weintraub (Economics): Have you given any thought at all to the question of what observations you could make over time that would lead you to say



this is a really bad idea?

Boatwright: Yes, there are benchmarks. Each prong has to have benchmarks, very specific benchmarks, what are our goals and how will we know if we're reaching them? And it has to be evaluated every year, and I think people in assessment are very clear-eyed about what constitutes success or not. This is not the way that it is asked for by SACS, the way that it has to be written for their specifications has to include these benchmarks and assessment and there has to be the out that if something isn't working that we're not going to continue to throw money at it for three more years if it's not working. But, you're right because with any initiative there are costs involved, and so we have to be able to know if that cost is worth it.

Susan Schneider (Nursing): I just happened to notice that there were probably implications for health and travel and wondered if you had any consideration



for maybe an international health clinic that could be run by a nurse practitioner who could help some of these students learn things, like work with immunizations and see what they needed, things

like maintaining health with a different diet, what to do if there's a health emergency, in a place where they don't speak English? I can see that will be a real role for nurses.

Nowicki: The answer is of course we have to do that, and I'm only speaking as a member of the committee, although it has been a committee of many

months... already taken the lead on that sort of thing with DukeEngage. In other words, Eric Mlyn, with DukeEngage, has already been working to develop that kind of pre- and post-trip health advising, awareness, and we will really be piggy-backing on the front that has already been cut for us with DukeEngage and expanding it as necessary. But I think we're very aware of that part of the equation. I agree that a Nursing Program will be an important part of giving us those tools.

Schneider: And I see that as an interesting wrinkle because we can use it as learning opportunity for students as well.

Nowicki: Yes – never seen dengue fever before!

Boatwright: C'mon we want to get kids into the program, not turn them off! Anyone else? Thank you very much.

McClain: I'd like to thank Tolly, Prasad and Judith for what is clearly an awful lot of work. You have our appreciation. That brings us to the end of our meeting today. The next Academic Council meeting will be December 4 – only a couple of weeks away. Have a wonderful Thanksgiving, don't eat too much and with that the meeting is adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon
Faculty Secretary, November 28, 2008