

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 January 20, 2011



ECAC, 2010-11: L-R Suzanne Shanahan, Marie Lynn Miranda, Steffen Bass, Sandra Walton (Assistant to the Chair), Craig Henriquez (Chair) Jennifer Brody, Larry Zelenak, Ann Brown

Craig Henriquez (Chair, Academic Council and Professor of Biomedical Engineering and Computer Science): Welcome everyone and happy 2011. I hope you have all had a relatively smooth start to the new semester. Because our speakers for our first agenda item have a meeting supposedly more important than this one to attend (laughter), I told them that I would get them in at the beginning. And if there is one thing I have learned after my many years here at Duke University, it is to make the folks at OIT happy because you never know when your internet access may mysteriously disappear.

So, we will move on to our agenda with the approval of the December 2 minutes. [Passed by voice vote with no dissent.]

eLearning Changes (Blackboard etc.)

Our first presentation is from Tracy Futhey, Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer at Duke University. If you have read the *Chronicle* or *Duke Today* in recent days, you are probably aware that Duke is piloting a new eLearning software platform possibly to replace the current eLearning platform Blackboard which many faculty members have been using for a long time. Last spring, Julian Lombardi (OIT) announced to us the creation of a special working group to look into alternatives to Blackboard and he asked for faculty input at that time. We were hoping that the Council was going to hear the news here today for the first time, but in these days of Wikileaks (laughter) and in this case, Dukie-leaks, information gets out really fast. So

while not the first such presentation, Tracy will still briefly discuss the eLearning recommendations of the working group and the timeline for the plans going forward. Tracy?

Tracy Futhey (Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer): Let me bring up here with me [Ed Gomes](#) who is the Senior Associate Dean in Arts and Sciences responsible for their technology environment; Ed has chaired this eLearning roadmap group. Let me also mention Ed's backup supports. Here in the room, we have two other really critical crucial members of this effort, [Amy Campbell](#) who worked with [Lynne O'Brien](#) and the CIT. Amy is in on many of the day to day activities in CIT around Blackboard and some



of these other systems and has been instrumental in this eLearning task force as well as [Samantha Earp](#) over on the right hand back row. Samantha is a member of the Office of Information Technology and she heads up our Academic Services Activities and so they provide much of the support for the academic systems that we use in combination with the CIT.

Let me ask Ed to start – he's going to talk about the work of the eLearning roadmap group for just a couple of minutes. We are going to try not to have power point presentations or anything too formal so that we have plenty of time for questions. Ed will talk about the recommendations that the group made as it met over the last fifteen to eighteen months and I'll come back on and talk about where we stand now and where we will be going forward with those recommendations.

Ed Gomes (Senior Associate Dean, Trinity Technology Services): Thank you, Tracy. Just as a bit of background for those who aren't aware of the eLearning process; we have been meeting for several years and we represent all of the schools and we have twenty-something folks, that means we're all twenty-something which I kind of like that (laughter), that represent the schools and various departments on why eLearning technology is necessary to support teaching and learning here at Duke.

One of the big Kahunas in that group of technology is the learning management system, currently Blackboard version 8. What we were charged to do was to undertake an investigation of the tools out there that are the competition for this current tool that we have here at Duke because a transition to the next version of Blackboard would be a significant shift in look and feel in usability for

faculty and students. So why not take a look at what the landscape is and make the recommendation for the best tool and not just the next step in terms of the Blackboard evolution? Within this fifteen-month process we involved a lot of faculty and staff in the discussions, we've had some demos, we've had some presentations and then in the end we made a recommendation to senior leadership, the people that are in the front of this room, about what we thought Duke's next step should be in terms of a learning management platform.

We recommended moving to **Sakai** for some key reasons, one of which is that it is an open-source technology and allows a little bit more flexibility in terms of being able to develop the framework that we see fit to suit our needs. Development – and Blackboard basically has to run through the Blackboard development process and is a little bit more limiting – therefore we wanted the flexibility to be able to do some development either in-house or with some of our institutional partners who have also deployed the tool.

The second piece is that we are a global Duke as you will see in lots of publications, and as we are growing to be a global Duke we have a larger and larger number of affiliates in places like Shanghai, China, India, etc., each person who wants to access the site whether it's for courses or organizational management of things that they are involved with, a 'seat' within the licensed application, and for Blackboard that means additional license cost. With Sakai as an open-source framework we don't have those limitations so we can expand it as much as we can possibly support given the resources that we want to throw at the service; so that was one of the other key areas.

The recommendations that came out of the committee were to proceed with a phased implementation, and the initial phase is a very limited pilot, and we're in the process of doing that now. Tracy and some of the other folks in the room will talk about how that is moving forward, this gives us an opportunity to do some analysis



from the basic perspective of what Sakai can do versus what Blackboard is able to do. Are people comfortable with making that transition to this new tool and what would it take to provide some level of support to the faculty who actually have to move from one system to the next? So it's a learning process for us, it's very small in scale and I will present some information about who the

participants are in that later. We wanted to take this information and then during the summer continue the transition towards implementing a more fully functional version of Sakai that could support Duke, be integrated with the other services that we provide, and then ramp up to a much larger scale pilot in the fall of 2011. So we are looking at the integration, looking at the technical requirements for supporting that, to understand how that is going to function. We also recommended that we do an externally hosted solution, at least at this point, because one of the things that we weren't clear on was whether we could actually ramp up a Sakai implementation fast enough to support these pilots in the spring and in the summer, so we have actually implemented an externally hosted pilot implementation and will investigate whether that is something that we would continue in the future or whether we feel like – after we gain an understanding of the technical requirements supporting it – that we can run that in house.

I think that is basically where we are now in the process. Part of the rationale of moving forward with this is that our current Blackboard contract expires at the end of fiscal year 2012, that is June 2012. Our initial implementation strategy is to complete a transition by that time period but part of this analysis of the short term and the broader pilots is to say what is it actually going to take for us to get there – can we meet those goals given that we have to investigate what the process is for transferring material from one system to the next? Knowing that we have to run two systems in parallel, what are we going to do with this process? Analyzing the cost of doing that, but also of managing the existing resources that we have today and analyzing what the final resource requirements are going to be for a broader Sakai implementation that supports the functional needs of Duke.

Futhey: So I will just touch on a couple of the points of the next step in the pilot. Ed talked about this being an open-source system, and when Julian (Lombardi) was here a year ago, you may have heard more about that. But I want to make sure that you are aware that what that means is many of our peers have already gone to Sakai as their learning system, and in the process, they have built additional tools and capabilities into the system, each of us sort of adding to the next. When Ed talks about Blackboard and one of the limitations in Blackboard being that the company has to develop what we ask for, it's one of the major differences, that for us, and the eLearning roadmap group, was a strategic choice and disadvantage of moving into a Blackboard environment. In other words, we did not have to wait for the vendor to deliver the next set of capabilities, we might find that the University of Michigan built those, or Berkeley built those or Stanford built those and we could take those tools and build upon that. One of the things that we think we'll find out in the pilot, there are about four things that we are aiming from the pilot, is that set of features in the baseline Sakai system as it exists today and how close does that come to fully meeting the needs of our faculty versus where there might be some gaps that we need to prioritize and evaluate whether we would develop tools in those cases or whether some of our peers might be.

The next several months will tell us about how close the fit is of that system to the actual needs of the dozen or so faculty and 400 or so students who have been using it. Ed also referenced the timing; we have a pretty aggressive timeline to try and move the new learning-management system and depending on what we find as we support faculty in transition, we may be able to meet that aggressive timeline or we may need to work to extend it a bit so that you can also smoothly transfer your courses and your colleagues can do the same. Tied to that is what level of support and resources you need. There are some tools out there that in many cases, in many ways automate the transfer of content from Blackboard into Sakai, and again, these are tools that are written by other universities who were in the same position that we are in a couple of years ago. So we will take those tools, we will be testing them in the next several months to see how close they come to fully transferring the content of the course you taught last semester so that it is ready to go, for example, next semester. So another piece of the pilot is to understand that support model that we need. And then a final piece is what in the IT world we call the integration. Right now in Blackboard a student adds or drops a course in the Storm or SISS system, and it automatically gets updated and reflected in Blackboard. We'll need to make sure all that same level of integration exists in the Sakai system so that you can use it just as seamlessly, as we look to deploy it in the future, as you've been using Blackboard in the past. So those are some of the points of what we will get out of the pilot and how we will ensure that what we are getting to you over the next 18 months is going to be as functional, and we would expect, even more functional than what you have been able to use in Blackboard in the past. So, Ed, you have a list of some of the courses that we are testing, so let's get some questions.

Gomes: We actually have a website that discusses the Sakai pilot and for those of you, we didn't want to bring handouts, rather than just give you access to the information, this is going to be a site that is going to be revised on a regular basis, it is going to be our method of communication around the pilot:

<http://sites.duke.edu/sakaipilot>. We have a group of folks who are going to be managing this site, providing new information, reaching out to faculty. It is a way for you to ask questions and give us feedback on this process and we recommend that everyone take an opportunity to look at the space. There are also links to our eLearning roadmap website which has reports that were generated as part of this process as well as we'll continue to have reports on the status of our other eLearning investigations. But the list of pilot participations is here and we tried to cover the gamut in terms of as many types of programs and courses as possible, we have multi-section courses, we have courses that have requirements where they are using Asian languages, we have large courses, smaller courses, seminar-size courses, representation from the schools, as many as we can get access to, so this is our starting point. We have eleven courses and somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 students, so we have a pretty good cross section that we hope is going to represent some of,

but not all of, the functional requirements that we hope to roll out in a fully functional Sakai.

Futhey: As I had said at the beginning, we didn't want to have to take you through a powerpoint per se, but wanted to give you a high-level overview since it is a topic that you have talked about here before and see what questions or issues you might want to raise.

Questions

Steven Baldwin (Chemistry): There might be a period where a given student would have to operate in Blackboard and Sakai?

Futhey: Yes, we expect a period of time where we will be running both systems by definition, Blackboard is a proprietary system, doesn't embrace content through other systems, so there may be students, in fact probably 500 of them this semester, who for one course or two courses are going to Sakai, but for any other courses might be going to either Blackboard or non-Blackboard websites. Many of our courses even today aren't operating in Blackboard, sometimes because the faculty want to display the data differently or make sure that people outside of Duke can see it which is a limitation in Blackboard that we will be able to get around down the road with Sakai.

Baldwin: You might think about typical freshman courses, first-year courses rather, the first wave to go in for the incoming rush in the fall.

Futhey: That's a great idea for us. This semester we, again, were trying to target a very narrow and small pilot that helped us explore the ability of Sakai to meet the seven or eight use cases we had defined, but next fall we expect to have a broader pilot, we had not identified specific criteria for focusing that pilot but that might be a great way to do that.

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology): Are there any functionalities that will be lost?

Futhey: So this is the point when I am going to turn to the colleagues in the back of the room, Amy in particular led the subgroup that looked at functionality of the system. We think that the systems are pretty well on par in terms of the feature set, in a sense both could deliver on the needs that Blackboard currently provides. Amy?

Amy Campbell (OIT): Just to speak a little to that, we did have a team that looked as closely as we could at a number of different functionalities and comparative systems that we were looking at over the summer. It kind of depends on what level you want to get at, if you want to be a high level and, say, discussion board, well there is one, if you want to get the detail of what does this particular idiosyncratic thing that the Blackboard discussion board does, it may or may not be that, but at the high level, and the medium level, you are pretty comfortable, and there is some functionality that needs to be enhanced. Multisection courses might still work better in Sakai – one thing in particular, uploading documents and dashes is something you can do in Sakai, and the public-private aspects are something you can do more easily in Sakai than in Blackboard. The other thing I'll mention is as Tracy and Ed both pointed out, if there is a

functionality that doesn't seem to be there or isn't as fully developed as we would like, it might be that another school has developed plug-ins that will do it better, or maybe we could develop it if it's a high enough priority...

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): Will we have to import our existing course materials from Blackboard to Sakai or will OIT be doing that?

Gomes: We're looking at a number of options.

Franzoni: I say Ed will do it for everyone (laughter).

Gomes: There are, and Samantha will go into the details, but we know that there are tools out there that purport to be able to do this in a very massive scale, and in some cases the tool will do a good portion of it, and in some cases it will require some actual hands-on, and so part of the analysis that we will be going through this spring and over the summer is to try and figure out what resources need to be available to be able to support that need. Samantha?

Samantha Earp (OIT): Just to add to that, part of that depends on what you are using on Blackboard currently and that varies widely between discipline and between faculty members. So some of the tools that are out there for example, there is one that was just developed ...at



Carolina...that can take certain kinds of materials and transfer them very easily. Some of the things like tests do not transfer so easily. We will probably have a blend depending on the kind of course. We are trying to figure out not only certain general migration paths but for certain kinds of uses, what we need to look at to get those folks into the system.

Futhey: And our expectation is that the pilot helps us better understand how big that gap is of making the easiest possible transition of courses and it's in all of our interests to make sure you all are happy with the transition and so we'll be working to make sure that we've got the resources identified to make that as seamless as possible and that will not necessarily mean perfect – you will obviously want to validate what's in your courses – but our hope and expectation is through the existing tools or through enhancement to the tools or through brute force, people we bring to bear will be able to ease this transition as best we can.

Earp: Just to amplify that one further level, when Julian was here last year he talked about an ongoing process with the client, he talked to faculty whether more

than one interviews or disciplinary meetings and I think he heard similar things. Probably the single most important thing we heard on our conversations was just this point concerning how much effort am I going to have spend to get my materials from one place to another. I just wanted to make sure you know that we hear that, we understand how important that is for this particular one we researched the pilot along with multiple other things we need to do.

Futhey: And we knew no matter what decision we made there was effort involved, because the new version of Blackboard is different from the old version of Blackboard, and we weren't going to get a pass on that one anyway. What we just don't quite know is if it is an extra ten percent or twenty percent of effort that we'll need to put in and that's what we are trying to get sized right now. Yes?

Brenda Nevidjon (Nursing): We're pleased that there is somebody from the School of Nursing there, she happened to mention though she does not teach online, she currently uses Blackboard and some others to enhance her classroom. She wasn't sure if some of the people in the pilot are fully online in their teaching, because there are a number of faculty who are completely online, not enhancing.

Amy Campbell: She described her course to me as a hybrid course and she said she does significant portions of her class online, but there isn't a class that is fully online for this particular part.

Speaker: What about archived old courses? If we want to access them from five years ago, would we have to migrate that?

Futhey: If you had said three or four years ago the answer would be different. A couple of years ago, actually, we worked with Academic Council and other bodies to set up a four-year retention policy for course information. So in other words, even if we were still in Blackboard, we wouldn't be able to look back five years, six years, eight years, but four years, the life of a typical student here at Duke and as a reasonable amount of time to have an archive is what we have been targeting, and we don't yet fully have the plan in place for bringing all the courses along all those four years and we'll evaluate as we go along whether it is more appropriate and cost effective for us to move courses and put the effort into the movement or try to find a way to transition as that four years comes to pass. What we won't want to do is use Blackboard for any period longer than we have to, but for some period of time, depending on the cost to transition courses, we might keep it around without much change just as an archive.

We've also heard that what faculty often want in those archived courses is access to the grade book detail and some of that is actually quite straightforward to export into Excel or into other ways. So to the extent that what you need is access to student grades for future recommendations that may be one that is easily provided in another way but we'll use the pilot to make sure we fully understand that.

Franzoni: Will there be a Sakai sandbox or something that we could play around in, maybe over the summer?

Futhey: Yes.

Henriquez: Thank you Tracy and Ed, we look forward to seeing Sakai in its full bloom. Before continuing, the Provost has some news he would like to share with the Council.

Death of Reynolds Price

Peter Lange (Provost): I have some grievous news for our community and for the larger cultural world and for all of those of us who appreciate the ways literature can enlighten and uplift and help us to reflect on others and ourselves. I learned since this meeting began today that Reynolds Price died this afternoon after a very short illness. He lived a grand and enlightening life despite his disability and his wisdom and humor enhanced all of us who knew him. Thank you.

Henriquez: Before we move on to our next agenda item, I have a few pieces of information that I would like to make you aware of before we go on. On January 12, the Council, even though you weren't here, approved the December earned degrees at a special meeting that was attended by ECAC. The numbers in each school will be listed in the January minutes. Among these were the first two earned MD degrees for the Duke/NUS Graduate Medical School in Singapore. Congratulations to all the students...

Earned Degrees

Diplomas dated December 30, 2010

Summary By Schools And College

School of Nursing

Dean Catherine L. Gilliss	
Master of Science in Nursing	23
Doctor of Nursing Practice	7
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	65

Graduate School

Dean Jo Rae Wright	
Doctor of Philosophy	75
Master of Science	38
Master of Arts	40

School of Medicine

Dean Nancy C. Andrews	
Master of Health Sciences in Clinical Research	3

Duke-NUS Graduate School of Medicine, Singapore

Dean K. Ranga Krishnan	
Doctor of Medicine (March 31, 2011)	2

School of Law

Dean David F. Levi	
Juris Doctor	2
Master of Laws	2

Divinity School		
Dean Richard Hays		
Master of Theology		2
Master of Divinity		11
Master of Theological Studies		5
Fuqua School of Business		
Dean Blair Sheppard		
Master of Business Administration	240	
Master of Management Studies		1
Nicholas School of the Environment		
Dean William L. Chameides		
Master of Environmental Management		15
Master of Forestry		5
Sanford School of Public Policy		
Dean Bruce Kuniholm		
Master of International Development Policy	6	
Pratt School of Engineering		
Dean Tom Katsouleas		
Master of Engineering Management		49
Bachelor of Science in Engineering		8
Trinity College of Arts and Sciences		
Dean A. L. Crumbliss		
Bachelor of Science		24
Bachelor of Arts		47
TOTAL		668

Election Information, Annual Faculty Meeting, Death of John Blackburn

As you know from several emails that have been sent from the Academic Council Office over the past few weeks, we have been asking faculty to complete a survey regarding the Council’s upcoming election, which begins shortly, or at least at the end of this month. In terms of participation of the roughly 3000 eligible faculty members, we’ve had about 25% participation. Not great, but not awful. Interestingly enough, 396 have said yes to serving so that’s good and 381 have said no, so it’s about fifty-fifty. We just sent another reminder email this morning and 50% said yes and 50% said no (laughter). So I guess we understand the statistics a bit. We’re hoping that the yeases will meet all of the rank-requirements in terms of the Council bylaws and the election process so that we will be able to populate the nomination ballots, and for those of you who don’t remember, this Council actually approved this process of allowing the nomination ballot to be filled with names of those faculty who have expressed the willingness to serve.

And actually looking at the language more carefully, I don’t know if it was by accident or maybe very cleverly transcribed, to say that for each school or division, we’ll either list all faculty members or a subset that expressed a willingness to serve which means that not all of the

divisions or schools will necessarily have a subset – they may include all the faculty and then some divisions and schools where we’ve actually not had enough faculty to say yes or no and so you may see all of them listed. Fortunately, the biggest one, which is the Clinical Science division is reduced to a reasonable number so we will be able to launch this later this month.

I also want to remind you to mark your calendars for next month’s annual faculty meeting, the University faculty meeting which will be on Thursday February 17th, at 4:00 which I know you all can attend because you can attend this meeting on Thursday at 4:00. It will be in the Love Auditorium in the LSRC. This is run by President Brodhead, it is not run by Academic Council, so this is not at the same time as the Academic Council meeting, in fact the Academic Council meeting will be the next week, so you will have two meetings in February to attend. As you recall, last year ECAC looked at the bylaws and agreed as a group to have this event have its own place and time, independent of an Academic Council meeting, and we will be doing that again this year. Email invitations will be going out sometime in the next few days from the Office of Special Events and University Ceremonies. I will give a summary of Academic Council activities over the past year basically serving as the warm-up band for the headline act which will be President Brodhead who will give the State of the University Address. So please come, encourage your colleagues to come, there will be food and drink, so that is always something to look forward to.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the passing of someone important to the University, **John Blackburn** who died this past week and offer our collective condolences to his family. Dr. Blackburn was the former Chair of the Economics department, former Provost and former Chancellor of Duke University. Among his many accomplishments, he was known for his leadership in the creation of Central Campus. I never met Professor Blackburn, but became aware of him this summer when I was researching the origin of my home department, Biomedical Engineering. After much effort, I tracked down the original Provost’s approval letter in the Medical Center Archives which is conveniently located behind Bojangles on Hillsborough Road (laughter) in case you want to know. The letter was signed by John Blackburn, acknowledging that after Board of Trustees approval, the official transition of Biomedical Engineering from division to department will take place on February 1, 1971, almost exactly 40 years ago.

Chair Nominating Committee Report

I’d now like to call on Dona Chikaraishi, Professor of Neurobiology, who is a current member of our Council and a former member of ECAC to present the nominating committee’s report for the nominees for the next Chair of Academic Council. We will be voting for the new chair at our February meeting – Dona?

Dona Chikaraishi (Neurobiology): I’m delighted to have this opportunity to tell you about the recent work of the Academic Council Chair Nominating Committee. The

committee is composed of five faculty: Linda Franzoni, Mechanical Engineering, Kerry Haynie, Political Science, Greg Wray, Biology, Larry Zelenak, Law, and myself from Neurobiology.

The committee met twice, the first time we summed the list of twelve senior faculty who we felt would be qualified and capable of serving as chair of Academic Council. We then contacted these twelve to ask if they would stand. I was told by numerous people that the hardest part of this whole committee was getting two people to stand, so I have to tell you that we were shocked when five faculty representing four different schools were willing to stand – it was quite wonderful. I think it is actually quite impressive that we could get five very busy and probably overcommitted people to take the time and energy to be nominated for Chair of Academic Council and I think this actually speaks volumes about the commitment of the Duke faculty to university governance – I was actually proud to be a faculty member to see that we could get five colleagues who would be willing to serve in this important and time-consuming job and so I wanted to thank all five of you who were willing to be nominated. This however made the job of the nominating committee more difficult because we were planning to only meet once, however, having this embarrassment of riches, we met again and collected CVs and had a very full discussion about all the nominees. It was a difficult decision and in the end I have to tell you we actually ended up voting, for the two final candidates. So I'm here to tell you that we are bringing two nominees forward to stand for the Chair of the Academic Council, they are [Susan Lozier](#) and [Tom Metzloff](#). Both of them have had significant roles in the University and have been active for over a decade.

Susan Lozier is Professor and Chair of Earth and Ocean Sciences in the Nicholas School of the Environment. Susan has been on the Academic Programs Committee, ECAC, the Board of Trustees Committee on Undergraduate Affairs, and she is currently the Chair of the Academic Council Committee on undergraduate education known as ACCUE.

Tom Metzloff is Professor of Law; he too has served on ECAC and just finished a term on the University Priorities Committee. He is currently co-chair of the Board of Trustees Facilities and Environment Committee and is a member of the University's Facilities and Environment Committee.

Statements from the candidates as well as their bio sketches will be on the Academic Council website so you can have an opportunity to look at them before the vote which is at the next Academic Council meeting. Thank you.

Henriquez: Thank you very much Dona. I just want to say that I have worked with both Susan and Tom over the years on several committees and I can tell you both of them will make outstanding chairs – good luck to both of them. As Dona said, we'll be posting information on the candidates ahead of the February meeting in which we will vote.

Now something was mentioned to us by the nominating committee yesterday in our ECAC meeting

about when to actually have future chair elections. Right now the election is done in February, it allows the Chair-elect to then join ECAC and get some familiarity with what ECAC's role is and some of the issues that are facing the University at the time. The committee asked whether or not it made sense to have the election of the next chair to occur earlier, perhaps in the fall semester. Maybe at the beginning of the fall semester to allow the Chair-elect some time to get acclimated to ECAC and the issues at hand, and particularly those members who might be nominated who have never served on ECAC and who might not be sure what the process is like at that level. I can even say for myself, who served on ECAC a decade before being elected Chair, there is a lot that has changed in the way the University runs and a lot to learn. I think it actually could be a helpful process.

This would require a bylaw change and that would require your input and so I'd be interested in hearing if anyone had anything to say about it, if this would be a good idea or not a good idea or should we pursue the bylaw change or leave it as it currently stands? Comments?

Peter Burian (Classical Studies, former AC Chair): I imagine that even with considerable university experience, things have changed...

Henriquez: Any other comments? Someone who has served as Chair and knows what is involved? Dona?

Chikaraishi: One of the things that the committee talked about was also that it would give the Chair-elect a little extra time to get their academic life in order to make space for this new role.

Henriquez: Yes, that's a good point. There is a significant commitment of time that actually involves the candidate's home department of relieving time and teaching so this would give the department more time to prepare for the following semester, so there is that advantage as well. Paula? We'd like to get as many former chairs to comment as we can.

Paula McClain (Political Science, former AC Chair): My only concern would be whether or not the current chair will be a lame duck given that the person who is going to take over is also in service – I don't think we want to undercut the authority of the current chair.

Henriquez: Any other thoughts? We just got this yesterday, so we'll ponder it a little bit and see what the Council thinks about it given those comments. Thank you very much.

Global Masters of Management Studies Degree and Program

Our last presentation, I can see them all lined up neatly at the back, though I'm not exactly sure if they are all involved in this, is from Dean Blair Sheppard and Deputy Dean Bill Boulding, from the Fuqua School of Business regarding their proposals for the creation of the Global Masters of Management Studies Degree and Program and for their request to convert the current pilot status of the Durham MMS to permanent status. Before I bring Blair and Bill up I want to give Council a brief history of the MMS degree because it is a bit confusing.

First, the MMS degree is not new. It was approved by the Council as a new degree in November of 2006. The degree was established as a partner degree with an outside institution and that's how it was originally constructed. The particular partner institution that was approved by the



Trustees was the Seoul National University in Korea. There was an understanding that any new partner that would be involved in the MMS degree would require separate approval both by this Council and also by the Board of Trustees.

The way that degree works is that students eligible for the Duke MMS would first enroll in a one year MBA-like program at SNU and then would come to Duke and complete a one year MMS, so it's sort of a partner degree. This degree is actually up for formal review this year by the Masters Advisory Committee and whether the form of this degree will continue as now configured or change based on what is approved in our next meeting requires some more discussion, so will leave it at that.

In March of 2009, the MMS degree came back to the Council and was brought as a stand-alone degree. This was approved by the Council as a three-year pilot. The particular track of the MMS is called Foundations in Business. Today, Fuqua is coming back today to tell us about their assessment of that program and ask to make the stand-alone MMS degree permanent. So the MMS degree exists, but this stand-alone MMS is one that has been in the pilot stage and they are asking for our approval next month for this particular degree.

In addition, Fuqua is coming today to present a *template* of the MMS degree that could be offered at other sites around the world. Like the local MMS degree this could potentially have many different tracks. Before a particular Global MMS degree can be offered, however the site would need to be approved, through some process that is still not fully defined but will likely involve the recently formed Global Priorities Committee which this Council approved recently and also Academic Council before going to the Board of Trustees.

What you will hear today has gone through the various committees – it has gone through the MAC, APC and ECAC and all of those groups have given their approval. It now comes to you as a presentation before we vote at our February meeting. So that is a preamble,

hopefully not too confusing. I'm going to ask Blair and Bill and Kathy to give their presentation.

Blair Sheppard (Dean, Fuqua School of Business): What we want to do is split this into two pieces, one piece I'm going to ask Bill to present because the relevant issue is how is the degree working, it's a degree, and the local degree and reports are Bill's, so I thought it would be better to hear from someone who actually has the responsibility for making it work.

You have the document in today's agenda that summarizes how it's working and all we want to do is let Bill describe it to you and take any questions that you have to the global variance of that degree and I'll field those questions. (Both of us will field any questions you want...)

Just one piece of context: the MMS that was created for Seoul National is a completely different animal than this one, so there is a nomenclature issue, but please don't confuse what we are asking for today in any way with the Seoul degree. We are happy, if you said as one of your instructions, to find a new name for the Seoul joint activity, having to do that, and the important point is that the Seoul national degree is actually the second year of an MBA where you take all of the electives. We didn't want to give them the MBA because we didn't want to grant a Duke MBA to students who hadn't done the core, because we think the core is a key aspect of what a Duke MBA is and so we wanted a new name.



Unfortunately, probably, we took that same name and posted for a completely different model which is a pre-experience Masters – that is the one that we are asking for your approval here and later, the key piece to this is the core issue. Our presumption in both of these degrees is that the majority of students will have had no work experience or, limited experience, and so it is a completely different operation and it fills a void. That's one piece of history.

Prior to about fifteen or twenty years ago, many business students who took MBAs came straight out of undergrad. What happened is we got so much variability in the class that you could no longer effectively teach the students, because you had those who had worked for six or seven years and people with no work experience whatsoever. The needs of those two groups are dramatically different. They prepare for different jobs and

the experience you'll get from most students varies. In the US, essentially the move to – except in very weak programs – work experience requirement. The problem is that that created a void such that there is no professional offering in business of quality, of rank, for students coming from undergrad and we want to get that offering. That is a void that is actually bad, we think, for the world. It exists as a degree in Europe but that is a degree we'll talk about both here and internationally. What Bill is going to speak to is, are we doing a good job on that degree?

Bill Boulding (Deputy Dean, Fuqua School of Business): I'm going to try and keep this fairly brief since we have had what I hope is a thorough report that documents the assessment of the degree today. But to go back to the point in time when we started this process: two years ago the economy was collapsing and we were approached and asked was the business school willing to put together a degree that would help current seniors who were going to graduate into a horrible job market, could we do something that would give them a landing and transition program? So our answer, when we were asked that question, was only if that degree would have permanence, that we weren't interested in doing something that was only good in bad times, it had to be a degree that was good in good times as well. So the faculty did a great deal of due diligence, was this a concept that could be permanent, was it sustainable, did it make any sense?



After a lot of thinking about this, the decision was yes, we thought that it made a lot of sense to add this to our portfolio of degree programs. Now, even though we made the assessment that we thought this program would have permanence, when we came to you, less than two years ago, we did not ask for permanent approval, we asked for provisional approval. I think that made sense, because when we came to you we were going really, really fast, and given that we were going so fast, I think it's reasonable to say, "are you going too fast? Are you making mistakes, are you missing things that you really need to think about?" So, totally appropriate to be careful in terms of the provisional status.

The second thing was not only were we going fast, but this was a really new category in the business-school world in this country. We don't have MBA programs who were offering this pre-experience masters degree, so a new

category, and the third question would be, if we think it's a good idea that's fine, but can we execute and will the market value this degree? The provisional status was fully appropriate.

Now, in terms of the basic concept that we came up with – it's very simple. We felt like we can take students who came out of an Arts & Sciences background so they're liberally trained or scientifically trained and we could take that background and their passion from their undergraduate experience and create something that was more valuable than the current benchmark of someone going right through an undergraduate program into business. The idea is that you can combine this background, be it liberally or scientifically trained, with business essentials and you would have a student who is much better prepared to enter into the business community or the non-profit community or into an organization in general.

So, the thinking was that you could take someone who might have a passion for language or so an example would be, we had this student who had studied Mandarin all through his undergraduate experience, and he went from the MMS program to taking a position in China. We had a student who studied Islamic Studies and he went from his undergraduate career in Islamic Studies to taking a job with a bank in Dubai.

So, that was our thinking, that we could create this combination of really interesting undergraduate experiences that had value in the world that the student wanted to enter into one that had business demands on them. That was one thing, to see the different kind of student be created. The second thing was, we felt like by taking advantage of a really excellent Arts & Sciences background that we were going to be dealing with students who had increased ability to learn and so we could offer them a Masters level experience because they could absorb more in that program having been deeply trained in our undergraduate experience, they could learn more, do more graduate level work as opposed to undergraduate level work and so the student coming out of this combination of an undergraduate degree and the MMS degree would be ahead of the game relative to someone who went through the business program as an undergraduate.

That was the concept. The really good news is that that concept works and so I'm going to tell you why we think that's true and also be honest about some of the bumps and bruises that we experienced in that process.

Starting with the bumps and bruises – the first thing is we invented a new category and we were sitting in a business school where we had a bunch of MBA students who suddenly had to welcome a new community into their community – they thought it was their community. We had to make sure that everybody understood that this was a common Fuqua community, common Duke community, and so it took a full year to really get the MMS students integrated effectively with the MBA students. Now, we have very good relationships, they work together, they engage in joint activities, and I think that's much smoother now. The initial reaction was challenging.

Second thing is that this was a new idea and new ideas don't automatically meet with quick market success.

In particular, we had to work really hard with employers to get them to understand this concept. The interesting thing is we had talked to a lot of CEO level people and given them the concept and they were all very, very enthusiastic, but what it turns out matters more than the CEO in the hiring process were the people actually on the ground doing the hiring. What we ended up doing was creating a lot of fights in different organizations where the CEO is telling their people you need to hire these new MMS students and the recruiting team is saying, no we're not. We had a lot of battles, and shame on us we did not predict this would happen.

The good news is that we worked through that and eventually we had to work a lot harder and provide a lot more support than we initially planned on but we ended up with really excellent employment success with that first year graduating class. What do I mean when I say excellent to be calibrated on that? I would say the employment statistics in terms of employment three months after were right on par with what we saw in our MBA program – first year program, same level of success as our MBA program which has been in operation for years.

The other thing I would point to is the starting salary for the graduate MMS students, the entry into their business career, that starting salary was \$4000 lower than the salaries of our entry MBA students who had six to eight years of work experience. So they were really fulfilling the promise of getting a great start on their careers. Other things that we look to are our faculty love the program and love the students. They think this is a great group to work with and they are very, very happy with the program and at the same time the students love our faculty. They think they're getting a really great educational experience and so the metrics on that are all very encouraging.

In terms of the market reaction, we have market reaction on the recruiters' side, you can't run a business program if people won't hire your graduates, you can't run a business program if you don't have people applying to the program. On the admissions side, the first year applications doubled in the second year and as we look to the third year entering class, the best data that we have now is we're doubling again. The market response is extremely favorable.

I don't think that I have left anything out – the student quality is high. I want to make sure that everyone understands that even though applications are increasing rapidly, we have no goals to increase the number of sections. Our goal now is every year to increase the quality of the students, we're very happy with the quality of the students, we want to drive that quality higher and higher.

The last point, in terms of the metrics, is that it is providing a positive contribution to the business school, it doesn't provide as much as was noted in some of the conversations because we have had to spend more money on the career-support side of things, but even with that it is still a net positive in terms of contribution. Overall, I'd say that it is a very successful launch and with that I'll

either entertain questions or transition to Blair taking over on the global side.

Questions

Charlie Clotfelter (Sanford School): If you were going to describe to a layperson what this degree is as compared with an MBA how would you do that?

Boulding: So it's a pre-experience degree. What that means is an MBA student coming out and they enter into our program with six or seven years of work experience and so the idea is that they're going to be able to use that six or seven years in the work environment to have different kinds of academic experiences that take into account that experience and so they will then move into a graduate of the MBA program, they will move into a leadership position. These pre-experience students are going to move into analyst roles, they aren't going to start out leading teams, and so the academic curriculum is designed around not being ready to go out and lead an organization, it's designed around giving you the analytic skills that you need in order to do the analysis that is needed to be at the successful entry level of your career.

Clotfelter: And in terms of the tools themselves it sounds like they might be similar?

Boulding: Yes, the tools are very similar, they're graduate level, so in that sense they are similar and some of the content changes because you don't talk about the same kinds of leadership issues that you would in MBA programs.

Sheppard: Two important differences. One of them is the level, especially in the managerial content, and the second one is that in the MBA of a second year, which allows you to get concentration depth, in the MMS there's four courses maximum that allow you that concentration so it's essentially doing a much better job than work is doing because we are allowing students to have a real liberal arts education arrive in a higher volume business education.

Sara Beale (Law): So in the minutes from last time (March 2009 Council Meeting) there was discussion about how this would aid other schools, the Trinity students, not just the straight undergrads but other schools in Engineering or who want a degree but want to come straight through. Is that happening?

Boulding: Excellent question: so when we had the original conversation, when we got provisional approval, there was a fair amount of excitement around the room for those opportunities and at one point Peter (Lange) said, "hands off while this program has provisional status." And so let them be on their own and make sure they succeed, and so the answer is that we have not done anything in that regard. I suspect the interest is still there and if we move to permanent status, then we are going to have to start going down that path and figuring out those roles.

Beale: So just to be sure I understand you, if a law student had applied during this transitional period you would not have accepted him?

Boulding: We would have accepted him as a full time student in the MMS but we wouldn't have had the kind of MMS training.

Lange: You know, I don't remember saying hands off (laughter). I believe what I said was let's go with this program with what we can run with this program and they provided the first list.

Beale : And to follow up again, the reason this is working already is that would have revenue implications for you?

Boulding: No, it would have changed the experience because we wanted to make sure that we had full control over the classroom experience and the overall student experience without worrying about integrating students from other programs who may have different goals.

Lange: In also integrating other kinds of content and figuring out how to do an MMS course, for an MMS degree, let's say in environment or environmental studies for example and intellectual challenges.

Sheppard: The question is in a sense is there an intention to do that, and the answer is yes.

Beale: So you're telling me that we should still vote for this because we think it's going to help our students even though that hasn't happened yet?

Sheppard: If we had been allowed to, yes. In a sense we have had that conversation in the global case, we've had clear conversations about how we would work with other schools, and there are letters of endorsement from three of the deans, we've actually talked through what the design looks like. We have not done nothing, we have done something, in the sense of thought through how you would do it, and what you would discuss is take four courses and four electives and those electives could be content from another school which then, gets particularly to have some reduced time in the other schools and shared tuition. It's not a revenue issue for us, it's let's make sure we know how to do what we ought to do and then share with the schools. We are telling you that we are ready to do that now because we know what the program is.

Thea Portier-Young (Divinity School): I guess I have three questions, how many students have you matriculated each year in the pilot? And then out of curiosity because



we are getting ready to roll out two new degree programs, just a little bit more about what practical steps you took to integrate the MMS and MBA student populations and on

the career support side, what practical steps you took to rectify that hiring bias and what were the associated costs?

Boulding: Year one, 99 students, year two, the current year, 101 students. In terms of promoting the integration of the students into the broader community, what really mattered was that in year one we did not have student leaders in place, ready to program, and the thing that we have this year we got the student leaders in place really early and they communicated across programs, they deal with issues, and can feel like they are part of the same program.

I think that was the biggest thing, and on top of that what we did was add the program deans to those conversations. We had the coordination across the program dean, across the student careers, and that led to a general tone setting of 'we all love each other' and that made things a lot better.

In terms of the career support, what we found was that we had to invest more in resources to reaching out to corporations, so we engaged in some fairly major communication efforts to reach out to different organizations and we got our corporate-relations team heavily involved in that activity. We can help people understand the concept and get them to pursue our students. Once the people meet our students and hire our students, the students sell themselves so there is this problem that you have to get to a place where people know what you are and what you are doing to 'we love you.'

The other thing is that we discovered that we need to give the students more support to work around the research process. And so we have spent more money around career counseling activities and programming activities to help the students understand how they need to present themselves and to take advantage of that career search process.

Sheppard: One piece for you, often times the recruiter for the entry level position is a different person, and the recruiter who recruits our MBAs has to be jealous of the relationship with us. There was the CEO-to-recruiter fight and there was the recruiter-to-recruiter disagreement and so we mediated. But the important point is that 100% of the people we recruit or hear back from is that they are back on campus because they love the students.

Chikaraishi: What percentage of your matriculants is Duke undergraduates? Do you cover for them in particular?

Boulding: In year one, 60% of the students were Duke undergraduates and this year I believe it is 20% who are Duke undergraduates. Because the program wasn't approved, you heard what Craig said, we came here in March and so couldn't even go to market with a program until May and so we relied heavily on the Duke undergraduate population in year one. Now we have a much more diversified set of schools that have learned about us.

Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs of Trinity College, Cultural Anthropology): My question is, you said you benchmarked the salaries against the MBA students, but you also benchmarked those against our math, statistics, and econ seniors?

Sheppard: Not salaries, placement success. The benchmark I gave and the salary was against the MBA class.

Boulding: We also benchmarked against other MMS programs that are prevalent in other parts of the world, in Europe in particular, and they are an enormous gap in our favor, but I would have to be honest that I don't know the data about the salaries of some of those groups of students.

Baker: The question is for our seniors, are they in a less desirable position?

Boulding: So this is another reason why we wanted to go to provisional status eventually, which was a fair amount of uncertainty around what was the relationship going to be, not only between our MMS and MBA students, but what was it going to be between the MMS and undergraduate students. In year one, as a consequence of that, we did not have tremendous coordination between undergraduate recruiting efforts and our recruiting efforts. In year two, everyone is now on the same page and they understand that it is not competitive, one against the other, but rather we are actually able to bring in new firms.

We had sixty-four different companies hire students in the first year and since they all really love these students, what's happening is that we are increasing the pool. Blair, do you want to say anything?

Sheppard: Key point is that the degree we're describing is essentially the same degree. So for the question of what's the nature of offering globally is the same offer. So the question becomes, what makes us believe that it is a good idea to be global? And a couple of important points: the recommendation from APC actually came from the conversation we had with them which is we tend to have the same ambitions and processes and the interview is the same, and they simply want to hold us to that, both points that are in the piece, and that is our intent. That the global offering is not something different from what we are doing here.

It is important to realize that part of the reason we are excited about what we are doing here is as we did research in countries that we're talking about eventually being in, it became clear that there was a desperate need for this kind of degree service. So let me just take you back to the reason why we think having a degree in those countries is important and the characteristics are such that we have the degree. Our goal in being global is to learn as a school and as a faculty the things we need to learn so that we can better prepare our students for the world that they are about to get in. And I will highlight three key characteristics of that world. The first is most of the developing nations are going at a rate three times faster or more than the developed nations and what's occurring therefore is the developing nations are becoming a larger piece, and it's hard to call it a developing state, but the nations we used to think of as developing are growing their proportionate share in the global enterprise at a rate faster than we anticipated. For example, China surpassed Japan this year, five years before people thought they were going to do it five years ago. Now the reason for that is Japan stagnated in trying to improve, as developed economies continue to stagnate and developing economies continue to

sustain their growth, that just means that what is inevitable is going to happen.

And the second piece that is important is that the institutional structures of those countries are not the same as ours. So if you teach a student how to be successful in the United States alone, you're preparing those students for a world that existed five years ago and is decreasingly real today.

The third important piece is that the economies are interdependent. If you think about the Cold War as an analogy, teaching a student who is going to enter the business world in the Western economy Soviet practices is probably not a necessary thing because we weren't doing business with the Soviet Union. Teaching a political science student or an international relations student, that was a critical thing, but teaching our students wasn't so much. But it turns out, the economies are highly interdependent [now] and it doesn't seem like it is going to stop and the reason it's not going to stop is that technology permits it to be that. And so you have increasing importance of those countries, and differences, and those differences don't look like they are going to disappear quickly, so China is not going to give up thousands of years of Confucian thinking to become, say, something just like the US. The Middle Eastern and Arab and Islamic countries of the Middle East are retaining some Islamic influence, it's not going to go away.

And so we are going to have interdependence among things that we might not agree on. And if you take a look at our course content, if you take a look at our research, if you take a look at our framing and our positioning, it's a mirror. So the point for us is, we have to engage other places in the world in our research activities and in our teaching activities and in some form of living there, at least part time, as faculty, so that we actually change the way we frame what we teach so that our students are better prepared for the world we are putting them in. That's the fundamental premise. A lot of what is articulated is that there is market growth and therefore we should get to that, that's the second consideration that is not a primary piece consideration. To do that, the belief is you need some research presence, you need some citizenship presence, you need to be doing something in that country because of it, and then you need some degree, not many, but some significant degree in the country that has the following characteristics: it doesn't put significant demands on the faculty because if it did, it would be hard to execute in the fall, so you don't need to put many, many faculty in place, you need to put a few.

It needs to permit efficient teaching for the faculty, you need a design you're proposing for the efficient teaching, so you are there in some cases for three weeks, you can get to course loads there, for others a six and a half weeks is the idea that there is one person teaching the course... and the other people teaching after, which promotes efficient teaching.

And that it is non-brand hardening for the school, so if we were to take our daytime MBA and deliver it in China, for example, none of those three characteristics would hold. It would require tremendous resources to pull off, we probably would do a bad version, a bad job, and

therefore it would be very hard, and it might not be the need, because as it turns out the level of sophistication for the people getting poured on the back end isn't there, but the difference here is that this degree meets all three of those characteristics in the market.

So, for example, McKinsey finished a study a year ago saying that 60-70% of the students graduating in China are not ready to work in business enterprise. What we now have is a student ghetto in Beijing with an increasing number of students living in that ghetto looking for work. There are jobs there but the companies don't want to hire those students because they have no ability to do what is required of them. There are very attractive jobs out there but the companies don't want to hire them because there is no way they could do that job. Same need in India, same need in Brazil, same need in UAE, and the main way to think about it is that universities lag economic development, so in some ways the logic behind an MMS in each of these countries is equivalent to the logic behind the MMS supporting a liberal arts education in the United States. It's a different issue but similar in that students coming out as undergraduates are actually not ready for the kinds of work that the people receive. That's the first, so it meets a clear market need.

Secondly, because it's a fixed curriculum in each location, or an A plus board even if you allow some very limited, two or three different streams when we work with other schools for example, it's faculty-efficient teaching because it is at most fifteen, in doing a degree with environment, for example, it would be three plus eight, and you can get a couple of sections and therefore get very efficient teaching...

And the third model is instead of being brand-harming it's brand-enhancing because you are actually entering countries where growing numbers of students and employee firms exist and you are meeting the need in that country and it really raises your profile.

One of the dilemmas that Duke has, and Fuqua has in particular, is that outside the United States, our brand is nowhere near as strong as it is inside. We are calibrated in China with schools that are in the 18,19, 20s, we are not calibrated with schools that are 1-5. Right now we are in the United States. So it is coming upon Duke to do something that raises its profile and like we've done with the MMS in the United States be the premiere offering in the market. That is the intent.

Final point is as it relates to the economics work for these degrees in each of these countries there are three critical issues. First is that we are asking you to approve this degree as a template and then we'll take the approval of the degree in particular cases back through a group of people at the level of Academic Council and the Board of Trustees and we have appointed a committee at Fuqua of all former associate deans who are not going to be gone next year and I think that's six people.

The important point is that these are the people who actually understand the economics of the business school because they created it for better or worse in some cases but they understand it and so we don't have to bring them up to speed and they are highly trusted by the faculty so if they say "Yes, the economics work," we have that as a test

in each of the countries. Business and Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees are obviously in this, so you have three groups that are looking at economics and so we won't offer something that doesn't look like it's viable.

One final point is our goal, our hope is that we can essentially become the school that makes it easier for other schools to get into a country if they choose to by saying we'll offer them first-aid courses, we'll do the administrative work, we'll do the tuition technique, we'll work out the compensation back as a fair model to teach.

John Staddon (Psychology and Neuroscience/Faculty Secretary): The economics seems to be very well thought through and as usual very persuasive and so on. As you presented it, it sounds a little like a vocational training program. In what way is it different?

Sheppard: Well you've got to understand that a business school is actually a professional school. It's the same degree that we are offering our present students, so if you are asking me "are we a business school?" then yes. Are you asking me "are we going to teach people how to turn a pipe?" no. We are going to prepare students for the job of being an effective analyst in a major bank, an effective analyst in a consulting firm, or a management rotation position in behavior. We are going to teach the analytical constructs behind what's required of that profession. Now we are professionals.

Staddon: So it's basically vocational training at a higher level? (laughter)

Sheppard: Understand the following thesis: even in the business school I care about whether my students get in and therefore I do that. I actually think, you can characterize it as you like, I think the reason that that characterization might take some offense, and not minor offense, some offense (laughter)...

Staddon: Major offense?

Sheppard: We can calibrate, but more than minor! (laughter) And so let me take you back to the history of business schools. It turns out, before 1952, business schools you would think of as great schools and what happened is you took people who were in them who were practicing business people and you brought it back, you copied your spaces and there was no intellectual underpinning behind the education of the business. There was a report written by the Carnegie Foundation that essentially said this creates an unsustainable long-term model because there is no cumulative knowledge around the practice or theory of business that's embedded in this. Therefore all business schools essentially became applied social sciences. So, on our faculty who you would be very happy to hire in most of your departments.

Staddon: Even Psychology!

Sheppard: There are many psychologists, myself included (laughter) and it turns out that when I was publishing before I became an administrator and I was publishing in the major psychology journals, I had a reasonably decent clip, you would have given me tenure (laughter). And that's true of all of our faculty. And it turns out, our faculty, according to *Business Week* and *Financial Times* is number one and number two in the world at the scientific discovery process in underlying business practices. So we're teaching the degree that the

faculty likes to teach. It's an intellectually predicated degree, but we have the additional requirement of making sure the students can actually do something with them when they graduate. What we are doing is important, which is preparing people for a professional role at the same time we are raising their general intelligence. Yes?

McClain: Craig, maybe this isn't the right time, but I'm just confused about what the template is? (if we are approving a template, what does it mean in terms of this degree?)

Sheppard: It's a curriculum designed with a targeted audience. It's in the report.

McClain: Right, right, but the way you presented it is that you set up another site in another country. Who then approves, let's say one country we use that but in another country is then going to hire all local people?

Sheppard: The template has specifications in it that are really very important which says that anyone teaching is approved through the Duke faculty process and is managed by the faculty governance model. We use the same which is specified in the report. The template is not just the curriculum; the template is also the management model to manage the curriculum. It's not just the curriculum; it has two pieces to it, three pieces to it.

The first is that the target student that would come to this degree, that is specified, a pre-experience student who has a background typically other than business where we can actually add value by teaching the courses we have, from leading institutions who are admitted through the same process that you would admit students here, the same rigorous criteria, the same model, they've got to speak English, they've got to have an outstanding GPA, they've got to have outstanding GMAT scores, they've got to interview well, they've got to have evidence that they are good leaders, are people who are critical to their school.

There's a specified curriculum model which is eight core courses and those will never change plus four electives and those electives we think of as leading to mini-concentrations if we thought of it that way. Right now we have one that is preparing students for that particular set of roles as we described earlier, we think that is generally what we would offer but we have schools who would like to partner with us say can you have an environmental offering, can you have an engineering offering, can you have a policy offering in those four electives? and so that can vary but there is a lot of fixedness in it.

And the third is the American model which is all faculty are hired through the same process that we have here, the administrative structure is managed through the same process we have here and so we're insisting that we have no intention of having someone teach in another country who we would not use to teach here. Same criteria.

McClain: What if we approve the process? If each country has to be approved, who approves it?

Henriquez: So as I mentioned in the preamble, that process is still being worked out. My expectation is that it's going to go through the traditional layers of approval from the MAC committee, we are now going to use GPC, the Global Priorities Committee to look at individual sites and programs and how it is set up at those sites that will

inform APC, it could engage APC in that process, then to ECAC, then to Academic Council and then to Board of Trustees, and we imagine that we may do this for maybe the first three or four or five sites and then after that maybe the process will change but every single site will have to go through the process.

Lange: I would like to just add that we have an agreement with the (BoT) Academic Affairs Committee they will approve each degree since we have a process at Duke, we're going to the Board, we're going to the Council or to ECAC, that actually dictates the upper end of the process and the subsequent lower end, the MAC is really in place to assure some of the more practical end of this and the Global Priorities Committee, the academic part of the Programs Committee, will be able to partner further.

The reason for having a template was so that Fuqua doesn't have to start from scratch with every program, this is a structure that will be laid over and it was good to have a discussion of the structure and know what the structure is going to be and then be able to evaluate site by site what's the appropriate content, what's the appropriate faculty load, etc. The balance between laying out the basic core elements of the program and thinking about the faculty issues, student improvement issues and placement issues, etc. will change as we bring forward the site. And how many sites? Craig said four or five, that's actually a pretty big number, I kind of blanched with that number (laughter) I'm not sure we are going to get four or five.

Henriquez: I didn't say over what period of time (laughter).

Lange: All right, all right. My anticipation is that it would be a couple of sites. Does that answer your question?

McClain: I just want to be clear that approving the template is not a blank check?

Henriquez: Absolutely not.

Lange: Absolutely not.

Sheppard: The reason we wanted a template approved in each of the countries – we can have a discussion about implementation in the countries rather than say ... the worry we wanted to defray from in this process is that if you approve China and we won't do something dramatically different in those countries in that this degree is meant to be an extension of the local degree.

What happened when we started talking about a single country, people would say well how else is it different and it was easier for us to say the following logic: we have a local degree that has the following characteristics and it works. If you want to take that same degree with the same management model, the same admissions model, the same processes and get you to agree to the premise that that's a good basis for us to do global offerings.

We then want to take that particular agreement we have with you and for each country say, "here's what it looks like in this country" and we are going to constrain ourselves to all of the things that have been agreed to in the template and the template actually has some pretty solid constraints in it. Same admission model, same faculty model, same curriculum base. It has the same target audience, that's a very constraining template, not a

liberating thing, but then we go back and say in each of these countries here's how the implementation works and so that's the reason for the three-step process. It's not to avoid something, it's to make the next conversation. Yes?

Staddon: I thought I saw on the internet that you guys are having an MMS open house at Abu Dhabi and I was curious as to what you are going to do there?

Sheppard: We're not having an MMS open house, we're having an open house. So the thesis accordingly is we actually have been in these regions with staff for three years now. We have staff in Dubai, we have staff in India, we have staff in China, we have staff in Russia, and they are driving demand globally for all of our programs and their support in the local applications of programs, so this is key. Part of the reason we need to have the capability of the region is not just for that full-time degree, we have a cross-continent MBA that goes through each of these sites. We have a global MBA that goes through each of these sites and we weren't able to execute well on the delivery in those sites because we didn't have people on the ground to support it.

The benefit of a local degree as an additional operative to those regions is that people are more likely to help us for global moves. If all we do is say that we are here for you to take care of us, the senior business leaders and political leaders are less likely to interact with our students, so there are synergies between offering the MMS and the other things we do which is part of the MMS.

Lange: John, the answer to your implicit question is no they are not recruiting for MMS in Abu Dhabi.

Staddon: I know, I'm just really curious.

Sheppard: We're recruiting for cross-continent global, our daytime MBA, and the MMS.

Baker: One of the more critical success factors of the local MMS is your argument about the relationship between the MMS and the Liberal Arts. All of the regions in the world that you have named aren't bastions of liberal arts so what is going to be the new relationship between the previous schooling of these students and its relationship with the MMS relationship with the liberal arts?

Sheppard: So the same degree interestingly, and it fills two slightly different voids. The liberal arts void is that you are really well educated, you are incredibly interesting, now can you do something for me? The void in the country is how do good businesses really work and can you socialize to be able to work in those businesses? We have communications courses, we added this to the degree because we were finding that this was actually an issue with the students training here but it's really the issue in other countries and so we are going to have to do an even better job of how are you going to make your presentation, this is what you can think of as the vocational outlet, but we are going to have to do a better job there because the gap, what the multinational and national firms are doing is saying these kids just don't know how to work in a business at all.

Then the second gap is education in a way that engages them such that they are effective as members of a larger community team within an organization, and then the third gap is largely the same gap except for they tend to

be science based students rather than a broad recruit. So you'll have engineers and scientists that need it but you're not going to have an intern, although to be fair they have foreign language schools, but they don't have what you think of as the humanities. They aren't deep enough. So there is a point but it's the same meeting. Others?

Henriquez: Thank you. So the good part about this process of approval is that it actually takes two meetings. It gives you a chance to chew on what you heard today and reread the reports and see if there are any questions that you have and if you have questions you can forward them to us at acouncil@duke.edu and we will get them to the folks at Fuqua.

I want to make it clear and I want to amplify a point that was raised and the question that Paula asked about the approval process, this is something that I think may be important to clarify in the resolution from Academic Council in terms of approval of a template which is an unusual thing. We haven't done this before as far as I know – approval of a template. So in that I think we need to specify clearly the approval process within that resolution, and we will draft something, we will get it out to you ahead of the next meeting and hopefully you will like the language and approve that at that time. Okay, so I will see you on the 17th at the University faculty meeting and then on the 24th for our Council Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon

Faculty Secretary, February 17, 2011