

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 October 20, 2011

Susan Lozier (Chair of Academic Council/Nicholas School of Environment): Good afternoon, everyone. If I can have your attention, I will start the meeting. Welcome to the October Academic Council meeting. I trust you have had a good month to date.

As usual, the first thing on our agenda is approval of the minutes from our previous meeting. [Approved by voice vote with no dissent.]

Last month in September, the bulk of our meeting was focused on the Duke Kunshan initiative. The President and the Provost gave an update on the initiative and fielded a number of follow-up questions from this Council. You may recall that I focused my remarks on the unfortunate lack of faculty input and engagement with DKU in its formative stage. As part of my remarks, I mentioned that moving forward, we now have venues in place for faculty engagement with DKU and other global initiatives down the line. I want to be sure to give credit to last year's ECAC for initiating these venues.

Approval Process for Degrees

Today the bulk of our time will be spent looking at those venues so that we are all on the same page, or at least all reading from the same book at the same chapter. As many of you know, one of the faculty's most important roles is the approval of degrees and so to preface our discussion of faculty involvement overall in global initiatives, I would like to start by reminding you of the structure of the approval process for degrees here at Duke and then I will show you how and where the input of the Global Priorities Committee and the China Faculty Council comes into play.

To begin, what we should see here is the familiar academic approval process, where the schools and institutes develop programs and those are fed to the Provost's office [slides]. From there, the approval process, which is shown by the black lines, follows the Provost's office and sends it to the Academic Programs Committee, which I mentioned is chaired by Professor John York.

They vote on the proposal, send a resolution to ECAC; ECAC vets it as well, sends it to the Academic Council and after we approve the degree it goes on to the Board of Trustees. This process was altered somewhat in April of 2010 when this Council approved the creation of a Master's Advisory Council. For master's degree programs across the University, the approval process stays the same, but this Master's Advisory Council, or what's termed MAC, was added to provide advisory input for Master's degrees.

So, the approval process is the same...but the red arrows indicate here the approval process. This has been in place since 2010 and that Master's Advisory Council provides input on the growth of and demand for professional programs, gives advice to the Provost and the deans and the institute directors about the formulation of the Master's programs and also offers suggestions for the review of these programs.

Now, in thinking about educational programs that have a global component, look, this is the structure for that. So again, the approval process is the same as it is before, but patterned after how we had added the Master's Advisory Council for master's degrees, now for global programs we have the Global Priorities Committee sitting here.

The Global Priorities Committee is in an advisory capacity, not an approval capacity, for the degrees. The other thing that is slightly different is that instead of just schools and institutes proposing degrees, it is also possible that an area council – and the only one that is formed right now is the China Faculty Council – it is also possible that the area council could also be sending proposed degrees, usually in conjunction with schools and institutes, to the Provost's office so the OGSP here, that is the acronym for the Office of Global Strategy and Programs.

The Provost's office is really acting as a clearing house for the collection of proposed programs. The Global Priorities Committee will provide input and then the approval process is the same as before.

So what I do want you to note is that none of the diagrams that I have shown here pertain to undergraduate

programs, since those are the purview of the Arts and Sciences Council and also Pratt's Engineering Faculty Council.

In my discussions with Ruth Day, who is here today, Chair of the Arts and Sciences Council, I understand that the approval process for new credit-bearing undergraduate programs with a global component will be the same as that currently in place for domestic programs. The Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Council is currently examining how best to add the advisory input of the GPC and the China Faculty Council to that approval process. On the same line, I will also talk with the chair of Pratt's Faculty Council, Professor Don Bliss, in the coming weeks in order to explore what their plan is for incorporating input from the GPC and the China Faculty Council.

Before we move on, I have one more note to add and that is this: In thinking about our role in the approval of global educational programs, I am reminded of the most important thing I took away from Professor William Kirby's visit to Duke late last month. As you may remember from the President's comments at the September Council meeting, Professor Kirby is a Harvard professor and a historian of modern China; he is now serving as the senior advisor to the President and Provost on China Projects. During his visit to Duke, Professor Kirby met with faculty members on the GPC, on the China Faculty Council and also with members of ECAC. In the discussion with ECAC, we pressed Professor Kirby for his opinion on the potential risk for China initiatives.

He replied, and I am paraphrasing:

There really is no formula for sure success for American educational initiatives in China. However, there is a path to certain failure: just relax your standards.

I think it is important for all of us to keep this in mind as we set about our work. Our reputation for quality programs should not be compromised as we reach across the globe. I am sure we can all agree on this.

Global Priorities Committee

Now that I have hopefully set the stage for this discussion, I'd like to call on Professor Jeff Vincent of the Nicholas School, who is the chair of the Global Priorities Committee, to address the Council regarding the initiation of the Global Priorities Committee. He will review the charge and talk to you overall about their idea, so keep in mind that this committee is just starting and that we want to present this Committee's charge and its initial thoughts to the Council.

Jeff Vincent (Nicholas School of the Environment, Chair, Global Priorities Committee): I really appreciate the opportunity to be here and discuss the GPC with you. Basically I want to lay out some of the ideas that we have been developing for what we can do this year and get feedback from you.

This is a new committee. It met twice last spring, it has met twice so far this fall. The committee is twice as old as I am. I was on leave last year, so I wasn't at the spring meeting, so I am particularly new to a new com-

mittee. So this is a good time to get some input as we get going.

A little bit about this committee: it is made up of senior faculty members who are nominated by ECAC and appointed by the Vice President/Vice Provost for Global Strategy and Programs. The description and composition here includes several ex officio members as well. I see some people here who are on the committee, Terry and Tom. So this is the composition of the committee.

What do we do? The charge as I received it last spring is really twofold. The first is to look at proposals for new programs and activities and to assess them, both at the proposal stage and to monitor them as they are being implemented. This is the micro-part of our work. The more macro-part is to review and refine Duke's global strategy.

On the micro-side, don't worry, I am not going to go through each of these points, if we are going to look at proposals for new programs and activities, we have to have some criteria that we are going to apply and some questions that we are going to ask. One potential source of such questions is a document by Greg Jones, the former VP and VP for GSP titled "Duke as a Global Research University," and I have listed these here. You will have these slides, you can look at them.

A number of issues raised and questions that should be asked of the GPC as I see it, are not to just evaluate programs, but to elaborate these questions, to develop a set of questions, revise them as we work through proposals that come up. I have highlighted here benefits to Duke. That is one question that we might want to unpack a bit. What do we mean benefits to Duke? Faculty, students, teaching, research, here in Durham, activities abroad, so quite a bit of elaboration to be done on this particular point.

Thinking about the second issue of the global strategy, I think that a good strategy is to recognize that Duke is already engaged heavily around the world. This is a nifty interactive map that OGSP put together. Not interactive on my slides, but it is if you go to the website and you can get information on where Duke has activities around the world. The darker the shading, the more the level of activity. Tier 1 activities are defined as here. So there are already a number of places where Duke has a physical presence, staff on the ground, and quite a bit of activity.

As we think about areas where Duke can engage, a question is, how do we identify these areas? The document by Greg referred to major regions, here are some criteria for identifying major regions. Again, I see the role of the GPC in going through and reviewing points, elaborating them as necessary to help us think through which are the regions where there is greater potential benefit for Duke. An idea of something that we could do this year and coming years is to pick some particular areas where there is an indication of faculty interest across schools and institutes and in the initial meeting of the GPC we had some short brainstorming about this, and here is a list of some regions that were suggested by members of the GPC as ones where there is interest of

faculty across different schools and institutes and we could consider some of these regions and try to apply the kind of principles that were listed on the last slide and develop new ones.

There may be ideas of other regions as well that we have not thought of and so I welcome your thoughts on this. In addition to where Duke can engage and benefit from engaging, of course the important question is how to engage, does engagement mean just more activities abroad or also more activities on campus or are there benefits between these two? Are we thinking of individual foreign sites where there are a whole bunch of activities and programs or a more dispersed approach? In some locations, a more concentrated activity makes sense, in others, a more dispersed approach makes sense. To what extent do we attempt to integrate education, research and service in particular locations, versus focusing on one or two? Glomming everything together sometimes may create costs that impede core activities.

And then, last point here, going at it alone versus collaborating either with local partners or other non-local universities.

These are some of the questions I think we'll need to consider as we look at different regions where there may be benefits for Duke engagement. Now, a benefit of Duke having been so active already is that we have a lot of information that we can chew over. Here's a list of just some Duke programs and institutes that are active internationally and that have had to think about strategy-where to work and what to do there.

An idea for the GPC is that we could take some of these different programs, invite in representatives and talk to them about how they have gone through a prioritizing exercise and determine where to emphasize their activities and which activities to emphasize. I noticed at the start that a question was emailed in concerning Duke-NUS medical school. This was actually something that was suggested at a GPC meeting – I didn't cheat and type that in after seeing that posted on the screen. So there is much we can learn from what Duke has already done.

I'll close by just mentioning some other thoughts that we have come up with. First of all, monitoring DKU. We will have DKU as a standing item on the agenda, to have regular updates of what is happening with that initiative. I hasten to add that we have the China Faculty Council which is also looking much more closely at activities in China than GPC is, which has a broad global mandate. You'll hear from Professor Paul Haagen about the China Faculty Council and learn more about what it is doing.

The idea has come up of having a conference on globalization of higher education to bring in representatives of other universities that have had international initiatives-maybe representatives of the local educational establishment in the countries where those universities have been active to explore some of those issues that have been raised in our discussions here and other ideas. I'll close with that. I'm very open to suggestions that you may have. We're still figuring out our agenda so

please, I welcome feedback. If you want to contact me, here's how you do it.

Lozier: Thank you, Jeff. I am going to open this up for questions, but first I think I will invite Paul Haagen up and have him talk about the China Faculty Council, because the work of the two committees is closely related. Then I'll open it up for questions to the two of you. So, I get to welcome Paul Haagen back up to this podium, former chair of the Academic Council and currently the chair of the China Faculty Council. He'll also tell us about the initial work of the committee and the plans for the coming year.

Paul Haagen (Law School/Chair of the CFC): Jeff called his committee a young committee. It's four times as old as ours. We have met once and this is very much going to be a discussion of prospectively what we are going to try to do and what we understand our role to be and our relationship particularly to the Global Priorities Committee. As you can see from our charge, what we are supposed to be doing is looking at programs, opportunities, various kinds of matters that could be developed in China and this includes both DKU and other kinds of matters. The Law School for example has very extensive cooperation agreements and projects – we have a program that we have been running for almost twenty years now that is separate from DKU and we think this is part of the charge.

Because this is, I think a very new way of thinking about faculty involvement and a committee as generating possibilities and getting people to think about opportunities. We're very much making things up as we go along. We are trying to figure out ways in which the group of persons on the committee can effectively interact with the larger university community about what looks like interesting positive opportunities, relying on some of the strengths of the members of the committee, and what is likely to make sense or not make sense. But out of this both to advise the faculty, to interact with the faculty, and then also to advise the Provost and the Academic Council, about what look like promising or less promising opportunities.

One initial matter that we will be taking up as the first project is this question of seed money. We have a small set of grant possibilities. We are working on a RFP to try to create various incentives or opportunities for the development of ideas for engaging in China again. At a whole series of levels, DKU and non-DKU, full-pledged course proposals, academic programs and conferences and matters of that type. You can see the membership of the committee is drawn from across the university and contains faculty at various levels of seniority, then a group of ex-officio members who represent both the Provost's Office and various schools. So, this is our central charge, which is generative: to try to develop ideas and to feed those ideas to the Provost's Office and to GPC and help shape various possibilities.

Questions

Lozier: Are there any questions from the Council for either Jeff or Paul.

Phil Costanzo (Psychology and Neuroscience/ECAC): We are talking here about Master's education, professional education, not Bachelor's education. What about academic Master's degrees and PhD programs as they get transported to the global theater in many of these places? Will that bring in ECGF and other ways of vetting graduate programs and PhD degrees and collaborations of that kind across international waters?

Lozier: Let me go back here to the governance chart. I apologize if I was implying that in this third chart we were only talking about Master's programs. The Council approves Master's programs and PhD programs as well, so what this really excludes are credit-bearing undergraduate programs though this includes PhDs as well. So your question is, as we work through PhD's that have a global component, will we involve the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty? How will that come into play? The answer is yes we will of course but how it will come into play...

Costanzo: To inform the Academic Programs Committee structure?

John York (Pharmacology/Cancer Biology/Chair, APC): The Academic Programs Committee gets a summary from the executive committee of graduate faculty, a resolution if you will for all that. So, we take that into consideration.

Lozier: So in this case it would be no different then?

Sunny Ladd (Sanford School of Public Policy): This is just a brief question for Jeff Vincent. When you listed all the activities of the groups, I noticed that you did not have the Talent Identification Program and my understanding is that they have enacted a program in India right now and I wondered why you excluded it?

Vincent: That was a representative list. This is a list of suggestions that we have heard about. I think actually TIP-India was mentioned and it was just an oversight not including it on the list. I think I had there at the end 'others' so this is an opportunity to get suggestions just like this one. Now, that's a long list of programs and it's probably not going to be possible this year to work our way through all of those as we try to learn about the process of setting priorities globally and what we can learn from those organizations, but that's one I will add to the list. And if there are others, please let me know about them. I'd be happy to hear about them.

Lozier: Or if you have ideas about why one program should have a priority over the other program that would probably help the GPC organize their work for the year. Any other questions then for either Jeff or Paul from the Council? Alright then I thank you both. Thanks for your work and keep us posted on your work throughout the year.

DKU Update

Continuing for just another short moment on China, I would like to remind you of two things:

First, at last month's meeting I promised you a FAQ on DKU and I want you to know that that is in the works thanks to Nora Bynum from the Office of Global Strategy and Programs and also to Jeff and his committee. They are gathering questions and also the China Faculty Council chaired by Paul. I hope that we will be able to make that available within the month.

Second, in addition to the work of the GPC and the China Faculty Council, faculty on the University Priorities Committee are being updated on the financial aspects of DKU at their monthly meetings this year. Professor John Payne, who chairs that committee, will be updating the Council later this year.

Masters of Management Studies in Finance in the United Arab Emirates

Now that we have reviewed the process for the governance structure for new programs and degrees, we are going to proceed to the next item on our agenda and that is the vote regarding the proposal from the Fuqua School of Business for a degree of Masters of Management Studies in Finance in the UAE. Dean Boulding is traveling and could not be here today to take any additional questions, and so Professor Jennifer Francis, Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research of the Fuqua School, is here in his stead.

At this time, are there any questions for Professor Francis about the proposal? The proposal was posted with the agenda.

Questions

Kerry Haynie (Political Science): In reading the proposal, I had a question for the Dean earlier and I'm not clear about faculty. Where will faculty come from for this proposal? There are a number of initiatives from Fuqua around the globe. Would it be additional faculty hired or the same Fuqua faculty we have now who would be teaching in different places at different times?

Jennifer Francis (Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research, Fuqua School of Business): That is a great question. The short answer: we would not hire full time faculty for any of these new initiatives that we think are not at a mature enough stage to warrant hiring tenure-track faculty. I would say what we are going to be using is Fuqua or what we call Fuqua-vetted faculty. In some cases, obviously we are going to ask our faculty if they would be interested in doing this. Sometimes it might be part of their teaching credit or on an overload basis or we have faculty who teach for us that we have a long standing relationship teaching-wise with them but they are not part of our tenure-track faculty – they might be used as adjuncts or visitors that we have vetted in a very strong

sense, that we think of as Fuqua faculty who work in those domains.

Haynie: I think you know the caution that Susan got from now the senior advisor on China in terms of Duke quality. Are there assurances that it will be a Duke quality, Fuqua quality program?

Francis: Absolutely. We would not put anyone in here that was not very well vetted by us in terms of that. Normally that would mean that we have observed, that we have experience, with their teaching in those domains.

Haynie: In this process, is that a faculty decision or is it a Dean's appointment?

Francis: It's usually the role of the Dean's office but you'd probably also be talking to faculty who might know those individuals a little bit better to find out more information about them.

Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering): Could you just estimate the number of those faculty? Of the vetted faculty?

Francis: As opposed to the Fuqua faculty or the Fuqua-vetted?

Wolf: The Fuqua-vetted faculty that may teach anywhere around the world. How many of those do you think there are?

Lozier: Or maybe we could ask right now for the UAE program.

Wolf: I'm just asking for a guesstimate of how many there are around the world.

Francis: Oh gosh, around the world, that we currently use, 15 or 20 relative to a faculty size of about 90 to 100. Now that is not including what other new work we do. I will say that from our discussions with faculty on the tenure track here in Durham, there is a high enthusiasm for teaching in the UAE in some cases. I have not gone through the whole process of figuring out who is going to staff, who is going to teach, every single course but I think there is a great deal of enthusiasm. Does that answer your question?

Wolf: The number just seems low. I mean, I'm wondering if you're answering the question that I am asking. All over the world the number of Fuqua adjunct professors that are being used is 20?

Francis: At any given time. I guess I am still confused. I mean we have some adjunct professors who are here right now teaching for us, sitting in Durham teaching our classes, do you want those included? I thought you wanted the ones who might be teaching for us globally, outside of Duke.

Wolf: Yeah, I was thinking globally. I mean 20's fine if 20 is the number (laughter).

Francis: Well I'm just saying our only global programs at this point are cross-continent and our global executive MBA program which moves around. They don't have that many additional staff, additional faculty that we need there. I think 20 is probably a pretty generous number for that piece of your question.

Lozier: So Charlie, I will get your question in just one moment, but as a quick follow-up, I sense from what Kerry's asking and from what Pat's talking about, there is a sort of sensitivity about who's going to be teaching

in these global programs and it's something that I talked about in September, but I think the work of the Global Priorities Committee could actually address that as well. It isn't something really that Jeff talked about, but through ECAC and through the GPC we could also talk about this question, about who's making the decisions about the faculty who are teaching these programs, developing the programs and so I think that would be, given the concerns here, a good thing to add. The other thing is we haven't yet talked that much about the faculty governance and that is something that ECAC is going to have an ongoing role in developing.

Charlie Clotfelter (Sanford School of Public Policy): I'm just trying to imagine taking financial accounting in eight days and I wonder is this something that Fuqua does routinely?

Francis: We routinely teach courses in very compressed time periods. I would think of it in more than eight days. I would think of it as the time that we are very much going to be insisting that the students prepare prior to the start of the eight days and that will be substantial. They will take classes over a four day period-very much an immersion, intense, experience, a one day break to deal with faith issues in the region, followed by four days. After that we would propose that, they're not taking an exam or anything right at the end of the eight days they need a little bit of sink or soak time, what we are believing at this point is we would deliver some sort of exam structure approximately two to three weeks after that and determine what, if necessary, needs to be done in the middle.

I think another point to answer your question: we would be looking for a true immersion experience for those students on those days, so this is simply not going to be lecturing to the students for two hours or three hours and having them go off but rather having them work on cases, working on teams that we would have TAs very closely monitoring and making sure that the students are not spinning their wheels but constantly learning during that whole process. We have some experience with that in some of our other programs where we use that same type of model to really have an intense... the class begins at 8 in the morning and they are working until 9 or 10 at night.

Bruce Jentleson (Sanford School of Public Policy): How are you going to deal with gender issues in terms of students coming in? I'm assuming that the constituency that you are going to draw from is going to be heavily male. Is there going to be a proactive effort to try to make this a leader, if you will, in the region of trying to get women into these programs?

Francis: I think, absolutely. We want a very diverse class. The most diverse that we can enable with that. I think, as you know, we are delivering the program in Dubai which should not have the same issues with respect to gender and the classroom instruction element of that, but we are going to try in every possible way to try to break down that gender barrier in the context of our classroom there and in general in our role in the region there.

Jentleson: Dubai's less restrictive than some other areas but it will probably take some sort of explicit, proactive strategy.

Francis: I think it will. For example, I think we would make every attempt to have TAs and faculty be both genders to encourage the reflection of respect for that particular field.

Speaker: Along the same lines, I saw that recently Fuqua has plans to open an initiative in Kazakhstan and it seems to me that Fuqua is developing a bit of a reputation here in developing programs in places with atrocious human rights records. Kazakhstan's ruler has a reputation for building a city reminiscent of Ceausescu's Bucharest or Pyongyang and for pouring oil on dissidents. The UAE has an atrocious record with regard to labor licensing and good labor and so on. In the last meeting, I brought up the idea of a living wage for all staff in these initiatives. And we will see to apply that the programs in 2013 would include checks of records that such guarantees have indeed been put in place. Could you respond to that?

Francis: Sure, let me respond to your last point first if I can. I believe that we have put in place to deal with your question about living wage, a review of that as soon as it is feasible and will obviously be monitoring that on an ongoing basis with the partners and relationships that we work with in the UAE.

With regard to your first point, the Fuqua School is not planning programmatic activity in Kazakhstan. It is not a Duke program; it is not a Fuqua program. We are in discussions with helping them create a piece of their own university. It is not our degree. That is not a programmatic function that we would be involved in.

Lozier: Any other questions then?

Garnett Kelsoe (Immunology): I obviously know that you can't tell me the results of the program that is not yet in place, but in these highly condensed, immersive master's programs, what generally is the expected ratio of graduation and failure?

Francis: That's a very good question. I think a lot depends on how carefully we select the students and how carefully we prime them for the experience that they are going to have. I will tell you that the Fuqua School has a policy – in addition to our GPA requirements, we have policies, a demerit system, if you will – that if a student scores in our lowest two grade categories, a demerit system kicks in at which point they would become automatically expelled from that program.

I would say that is very strict and it is a rule that we have applied to all of our master's and executive MBA programs. We don't hesitate to apply that rule, so out of a typical class of 100 executive MBAs, and I stress executive MBAs because they are very senior individuals, it would not be surprising after the first term that we said three of you are summarily dismissed. That is not something that we insist on. It is more that we have a system in place to try and deal with the weak student who is identified very early in the program. And I think that is the issue. Identifying the weak student, and I think it is one of the reasons, in the UAE proposal, we have an additional course, the business quantitative analysis

course, situated right up front to set a very clear tone about the nature of the work that will be required and to make sure that students are academically prepared, for at least the mathematical components to follow.

Lozier: Any further questions then? I would just like to add a short follow-up to Bruce Jentleson's question about gender diversity. I also think it would be as important to have a diversity in ethnicity as well when the TAs or the lecturers are in front of this class.

Francis: We have no problem with that. I think John had a question.

John Payne (Fuqua/ECAC): So I am part of a group that wrote the proposal for this degree, and the question that has been asked about quality is I think vital to this body. The general view we have is that a majority of the teaching will be done by regular-rank Fuqua faculty as a way to make sure that any Duke degree or Fuqua degree is the quality that we want to have. If there is any sort of view that in some sense this is not going to involve the Fuqua faculty, I wanted to make sure that was corrected. That will be what we will teach. Obviously, it is in our daytime program. We have visitors and adjuncts teach some courses, but this is a Fuqua degree to be taught by Fuqua faculty.

Lozier: Thank you, John. Are there any further questions?

If not then, may I have a motion to **approve the proposal for the Master of Management Studies in Finance degree in the UAE.**

[Approved by voice vote without dissent.]

Thank you, Jennifer. I appreciate it.

Faculty Question for the President

The next item on the agenda, is a question that was submitted anonymously by one of our Council members for the President. As I mentioned at last month's meeting, the Council has a tradition of collecting anonymous queries from faculty and asking the President or Provost to respond at a Council meeting. Since President Brodhead is traveling today, Provost Lange has agreed to respond on his behalf. I will read the question in case any of you did not have the opportunity to read it before the meeting. The question is as follows:

I applaud the administration's sentiments about the global nature of higher education and Duke's potential role in that endeavor; I would like to think of myself as someone as devoted to cosmopolitanism as anyone else, but I am still somewhat troubled about how things add up with these ventures.

We first must be careful stewards of our own institution's viability and local/regional/national mission before we go off and contribute to the world in such a substantive way. We now have marked a five-year anniversary of the beginning of our relationship with Duke University-National University of Singapore. I am wondering how this undertaking has measured up to initial ex-

pectations and benchmarks? I know that it seems to have been working well for the Singaporeans, but how about for Duke, and specifically, Duke Medical School?

Peter Lange (Provost): Thank you for this question. I presume you all noticed that my formal title is Dr. Peter Lange (laughter). Let me answer this question, I have actually an extensive response. Let me start with the fact that overall this is considered by the Medical School to be a major success, both for Duke, for NUS, and for Duke-NUS. Let me review for you why they feel this way.

Let me start with education and training: over the course of five years, the opportunity to open programs in a setting in which there were not large and previously established institutions and practice this has enabled the faculty at Duke-NUS to develop a number of new programs in a very innovative way. There is a new educational method called *Team Lead* that has garnered significant attention in a number of places and is now being ported back to Duke Medical School as well as for a number of courses here at Duke. That method is actually quite intriguing in terms of the way that it re-configures how lectures and discussions and classes are used and we have had a variety of presentations to faculty about it.

Second of all, there has been the development of new content for clinical education in the form of voice-activated power points that will enhance learning for medical students and those in residency training here at Duke.

Third, there are training opportunities for Duke students in research and clinical medicine. Duke-NUS currently supports two medical students per year to work in laboratories at Duke-NUS.

And fourth, in this area there are training opportunities for residents from Duke to do rotations in Singapore. With regard to research, Duke-NUS stakeholders are providing Duke approximately \$3 million of aggregate for phases one and two in direct support of collaborative research between Duke and Duke-NUS faculty. To date, four such projects have been supported. There are Duke faculty with fractional appointments, those who spend six to seven weeks per year there at Duke-NUS. Duke-NUS reimburses Duke for 20% of their salary plus fringe and has provided more than \$4 million in funding for research activities in Singapore. Duke faculty with significant faculty appointments at Duke-NUS have space, research startup, and access to significant access to research funding. Finally, there are strong collaborations and a research basis developed between a number of Duke investigators in metabolic diseases, in neuroscience and psychology, in infectious diseases, and in health systems and service research. There are further ones developing in the area of cancer. This has helped some Duke faculty develop research collaboration in a variety of Asian countries.

More generally, Duke-NUS stakeholders, that is the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health in Singapore, are providing approximately \$18 million in aggregate in Phases 1 and 2 in unrestricted funds to Duke

as a curriculum licensing fee for the unrestricted use related to medical education.

I think that is a very substantial list of benefits beyond the ones which are more qualitative in character, that is the enhanced reputation of Duke abroad, our ability thereby to attract students and faculty from the region. I am happy to take any questions.

Questions

Lozier: Any follow up questions for Dr. Peter Lange (laughter)?

Lange: I can wear my white coat (laughter).

Wolf: I think that one of the initial attractions of research in Singapore was the ability to do stem cell research there during the Clinton Administration and so now that has changed somewhat, I am wondering if that has had an effect. I believe I heard that research dollars in the Singapore government are now being tied to translational projects – only those that are going to produce products within the next three or five years, I know that I have heard this at a meeting.

Lange: I wasn't at that meeting, and I am not saying that as a joke, but let me answer the two parts of the question. With respect to the first part, I don't know. Perhaps there is someone here from the medical school that can answer that question with respect to stem cell research, and whether there are ongoing projects there. I don't think that was the initial major motivation for the medical school to become involved there. I think it was much more the notion of collaboration and the kind of benefits that we have seen all summer, these were unexpected. I think that was part of it, I just don't think that was the primary motivation.

With respect to the second one and exactly how those research dollars...I think that is particularly with respect to the second phase. I have heard something similar, but I don't know the exact details of it. Translational is a very, very plastic word if I could put it that way and the estimation of whether or not something will or won't translate in three to five years, as we all know, is also always a guess. So how much it is tied to that and how tightly it's tied and what the consequences are, if such a thing doesn't emerge, I can't tell you. If you want, I am sure we can get an answer which we would circulate probably by email to the council if you want an answer to that, but I am not the person to answer because I am actually only a PhD doctor, just not to fool you (laughter).

Peter Burian (Classical Studies/ECAC): I have a question, Peter, and this was very interesting on Singapore. I took the question, when I read it, to be motivated by the new China initiative, with some sense of what we might learn about China from Singapore in terms of investing time, energy, other resources. When Bill Kirby was here, he gave a very sturdy picture of possibilities for Kunshan, and suggested a level of commitment and engagement that is far beyond any of the plans that we have made so far. So I just wondered: are there lessons

for Kunshan from Singapore and ways to find what we learned from that experience?

Lange: It's funny, because I also thought there would be a Kunshan connection to this question, and I wrote down a set of things that we might expect. How Duke here on campus, Duke-Durham, might expect to benefit from the undertaking in Kunshan, and I can answer that question. Is that what you are asking? Let me make a try at it, and more broadly, one of the things we learn is that these things take time. The report I am giving you is after five years up and running operations in Singapore.

Two, that the collaborations involve a lot of learning on both sides. Part of that is just culturally-based, part of it is the political dynamics of each of the countries and how they make decisions, for instance, is a second one, and the third is that unexpected things will happen. Let me just take as an example, the *team lead* example. I do not believe that was anticipated by anyone, yet many people will cite that as one of the most important, certainly on the educational side, the most important thing which has emerged, which is an entirely different way of certifying some courses, which the medical school in particular has a need for although I think we have a substantial amount on the campus side as well because they had already gone to video capture their courses and they had already found that many fewer students were actually attending the lectures with video capture, especially the first year medical courses. And they weren't sure that they were getting the same kind of educational result in the video-capture setting as when the students had to sit in seats, although there wasn't really any firm assessment done.

The new way of approaching these courses has allowed us to try some new ways of dealing with the kind of flexibility that they got out of dealing with the video capture in the old system with a much improved and much deepened educational approach.

So that is an experience which was not anticipated, which I think has been good, and which I think the broader lesson is that you can try things somewhere else when there is a tabula rasa if you wish, which you can't try at home.

So now let me turn to some of the things that I would expect that might arise out of DKU. In the shorter term, I think there will be a lot of cross-cultural training for our students, and teaching experiences for our faculty in settings for which you won't just have a few students from another culture sitting in classes primarily with US students, but in which there will be a much more balanced mix of students from another culture, in this case, Chinese culture and Western culture and non-Chinese Asian cultures. So we'll have an intensified set of opportunities for those kinds of experiences.

Second of all, we will have what I will call immersive research opportunities for those of our faculty working on China or East Asia, and also for those working on major global challenges such as energy or the environment in which China's growth represents a major contributor (*contributor* not necessarily being a word in a positive sense!) to the nature of those challenges and how

they will have to be met if the global environment or the global energy situation is to improve over time. We have a number of faculty where those are areas of high priority and China is going to be a major player in those two as examples.

Third, I think there are going to be opportunities to experiment with Duke-NUS with new teaching, learning, and curricular ideas including, but certainly not limited to, the uses of technology, and I could elaborate on what some of those are going to be, but I don't think we need to do that.

On a longer term, I think that we expect to improve our access to top-flight students, faculty, and research talent that is emerging in China and East Asia, in Asia more generally, both reputationally, because we will have a base from which to attract them, and for instance, to bring students, if you want, into the Duke world earlier, in their experience, maybe even with TIP kind of programs which we are expecting to do, with some high school programs that would be linked up to the Kunshan campus with the undergraduates that would be at Kunshan but then have undergraduate programs here.

And finally, I would say that we expect to have an added ability to attract top-flight faculty to Duke by our presence in the region. I think we are all aware, and I just saw an article last week, though I don't remember the citation, about the shifting balance of publication in top science journals by authors inside the United States, or even from the West, and authors from Asia, and especially China.

So there is a rebalancing going on, and our presence there and our reputation there, will enhance our ability to attract some of that talent, and obviously as a top flight global university, we have a need to be assured that we can attract that talent. So those would be some of the things that I think would benefit us all back here on campus as we develop that.

Dona Chikarashi (Neurobiology): I wanted to ask you in terms of Duke-NUS, the financial arrangements in terms of the \$3 million the research grant was made, will this continue going forward...

Lange: I believe that is the plan for phase two, but we are just starting phase two. And again, when you get into the details of it, I got this information from medical school folks and I can only go so far with it. My understanding is that is the phase two. That's right, Mike's (Merson) here and he is the vice-chancellor for Singapore. Do you want to come up here and do this? (laughter)

Lozier: And actually, I think he *is* a doctor! (laughter)

Lange: Listen, he hasn't practiced medicine in so long, you might want me!

Cynthia Kuhn (Pharmacology and Cancer Biology/ECAC): I do have a serious question. When you have something in NUS, in terms of the number of Duke faculty that have gone over there, what is the best-case scenario? Because I gather that NUS pays them, but we have certainly expanded the faculty and the teaching responsibilities which is a primary question about any of these engagements, but I don't know numbers. I honestly

don't know what happens some probably won't be coming back. We probably expanded back to replace them, but there are certainly teaching faculty, and I don't know the extent to which Duke pays them versus Singapore, but that is some experience with how you deal with the teaching demands of Duke quality in an ideal situation, where I suspect what NUS is paying is the chunk of it, which will probably not be the case in China, but I don't know the numbers.

Lange: No, the numbers are not large. I would guess that it is less than 20, and probably less than 10.

Mike Merson (Interim VP/VP Global Strategy and Programs): I think right now the teaching there is done by Duke-NUS faculty primarily. In the beginning, Peter is right. Before I was involved, there were a number of Duke faculty that helped them get started. They are very self-sufficient.

Lange: We have a few people over there. Dale's over there.

Merson: We have faculty there, sure, not teaching.

Lange: And that's another thing – what's another thing we learned? There are multiple faculty models, so at Duke-NUS, there are Duke NUS faculty, there are Duke faculty who are seconded to NUS, there are Duke faculty who visit NUS, so we have a much more differentiated faculty model for serving that program.

Kuhn: Fortunately ideal because they are paying faculty.

Lange: The point is that we will be charging tuition at DKU, that's a contrast you're drawing, whereas my understanding is at NUS they charge no tuition, so the funding mechanism has to be different.

Lozier: Are there no further questions then for the Provost from this anonymous query? If not, I will ask the Provost to stay here because another tradition of this Council is to ask the President to provide updates for the Board of Trustee meetings, and so again, the President is traveling, so the Provost has agreed to give the update from the September meeting at the Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees – September Update

Lange: Right, and I will try to do this succinctly. I will cover the major items that came up at the board meeting. The first one that you might like to know, is who are the new board members. There are a number of new board members named this year, so I will just quickly identify them. If you want more information, you can get that from the University Secretary's Office.

First, **Allyson Duncan**, Law '75. Allyson Duncan has served as US circuit court judge on the Court of Appeals for the fourth circuit since 2003.

Second, **Gerald Hassell**, Trinity '73. Gerald is chairman, president, and CEO of Bank of New York-Mellon, the corporate brand of the Bank of New York-Mellon Corporation, a worldwide leader in investment management and investment services.

Third, **William Hawkins, III**, Engineering '76. Bill Hawkins retired in June 2011 from Medtronic, Inc. where he served as chairman and chief executive officer.

Mr. Hawkins assumed the role of CEO in 2007 and became chairman of the board in 2008.

Fourth, **Betsy Holden**, Trinity '77. Betsy Holden is a senior advisor to McKenzie and Company, working with clients across industry on strategy, marketing, innovation, and board effectiveness initiatives. She has 30 years of marketing and general management experience, and was formerly co-CEO of Kraft Foods and CEO of Kraft Foods North America. She was also a former chair of the Trinity Board of Advisors.

Next, **Robert Penn**, Trinity '74. Bob Penn is president of three privately held independent oil and gas production companies, Penn Resources, Inc., Penn Brothers, Inc., and Rock Island Resources Company, Inc.

The next is **Ashley Crowder-Stanley**, Trinity '77, Divinity '80. Ashley Crowder-Stanley serves in the Western North Carolina Conference of the United Methodist Church, is executive director of the Transition into Ministry program funded by the Lilly Endowment. Until June 2011, she was senior pastor of the Wesley Memorial United Methodist Church in Highpoint, North Carolina.

Next is **Jeff Howard**, Jeff Howard is executive vice president of Salem Investment Counselors, a Winston-Salem based company which manages assets for individuals, families, foundations, and endowments. He is president-elect of the Duke Alumni Association Board of Directors, and will serve as president from 2012-2014. Mr. Howard was elected president to the board in 2011 and will serve a four-year term. This is a statutory term. Two years as an observer, and two years as a voting member. So we always have two people, we have the prime chair and the incoming chair, which switches four years on a staggered basis.

We have next **Ali Saaem**, who is a PhD in biomedical engineering from Pratt School of Engineering this past year. He is the elected young trustee of the graduate student council.

And **Michelle Sohn**, who graduated from Duke in 2011 in English. She was a Baldwin scholar, and was elected Young Trustee from the undergraduate student body in 2011 and will serve as an observer on the Board this year, and a voting member in 2012 through 2014.

So introducing those new members to the board was a first matter of business. That was followed by a report from DUMAC on the financial performance. DUMAC finished the year, the fiscal year, so the year ending June 30, 2011 with a 24.6% return which will likely be ranked the third or fourth highest of our peer group of 50 university based management companies. The five and ten year performance of DUMAC are both also top decile. So DUMAC has been performing enormously well over the last decade.

Following the DUMAC report, Tallman was asked to report on the University's financial performance over the last fiscal year and we have a very good year by his account. We are in total net assets increasing \$1.5 billion to \$8.2 billion, and we had the first positive operating margin in a number of years with \$54 million.

The next item was a presentation by Christoph Gutentag and myself on undergraduate admissions. It con-

sisted of two parts: the first part was a report on the past admissions round, and the results were very positive. Applications were up this year by 11%, they have risen 46% over the last three years from approximately 20,000 to approximately 29,500. The selectivity, which means the number of students we admit as a percentage of the number of students who apply has fallen to 13.3% from 20.6% three years ago. You can imagine that if you don't increase the number of students you admit, and you decrease it slightly, that is going to happen. That is a good thing and it puts us in a very different league with respect to selectivity. And we had a record high percentage of the class composed of students of color, 45%, with the third highest SAT average in Duke's history and improved geographical diversity, with, and here's a striking fact, California now being the top state for applicants in the class.

We then turned to some issues of the kinds of opportunities that our growth and selectivity has presented. Strategically, the challenges are always to strike the right balance between applicants that made it in the early and regular decision processes. Among other things, students who apply early actually really want to come to Duke, but historically they have not been as strong a group as the group applying regular decision, so we have always had to make very discreet choices about how many to admit in that early decision group. We have been increasing the percentage from the high 20s to the low to mid 30s. We will see again this year how that goes.

So early decision, how to balance the number of students who express interest in different areas of their undergraduate college and engineering and pre-professional studies, responding to changes in gender balance and determining the appropriate level of an international presence. Those have all been things which Christoph has to balance as he puts a class together out of this very large number of applicants, many, many, many of whom are truly outstanding in every way.

In terms of the practical challenges, what we have seen really is that this growth by 50% basically of applications means that we have to probably change and improve the way that we have dealt with those applications. To put it very succinctly, we have been reading every single application three times, regardless of the quality of the application, which you can see, by some things, right off the bat. And admissions is going to institute a new process which has been discussed in a variety of settings in order to devote more time to the strongest half of the applicants and less time to the weaker half of the applicants. We are going to take particular care, however, with regard to those student groups, whose "face-credentials," if you want to call them that are well-known not always to reflect their real quality.

So that was the discussion of admissions, followed by a discussion of gender, universities and the legal landscape. Some of you may be aware that the Office of Civil Rights has issued a set of new regulations with regard to sexual misconduct and how it is handled on universities under the Title IX provisions. We all think of Title IX as having something to do with women and athletics, but actually Title IX has a much wider scope. It

has to do with the treatment of women within universities more generally. Under the new regulations from the Office of Civil Rights, they address how sexual misconduct is reported. The need for university-wide Title IX coordinators, so that you can't have Title IX violations dealt with in multiple places without a single central coordinator, enhance training for staff, changing the standard of proof of sexual misconduct cases and in student conduct proceedings and in the availability of internal appeal processes for the accuser as well as the accused, and increased focus on campus climate.

We have to make a number of changes on our processes, fortunately, in most areas we were in pretty good shape, but we are having to make some new changes and there are interpretive issues which remain out there which will be hammered out in the next few years as cases emerge.

So that's what happened on Friday. Then on Saturday the session was largely devoted to first, an update on Kunshan. The update on Kunshan almost directly reflected the one which was given in the Academic Council last time, which you will recall, happened less than a week before the board meeting, so I won't review that for you again.

There was also a discussion of the international heat map. We have been going through a risk mitigation process which requires us to develop these heat maps, I don't know if you know these, but you have the probability of an untoward event and the amount of damage that untoward event could do and you then locate the types of the events on the heat map, with the upper right-hand corner being really, really hot, and the lower left-hand corner being really cool, not out of much consequence. We go through this risk assessment exercise and we review that with the board for international risks.

Finally, Dean Kuniholm presented a discussion of the Sanford School of Public Policy. Regularly at board meetings one dean presents his or her school for discussion and review, and Dean Kuniholm focused particularly on issues of admissions and financial aid in the Master's program in his oral presentation having done a rather lengthy written presentation which he gave us. So that's really what happened at the board meeting, I can take any questions if there are any. But that's what the agenda is. Emily?

Questions

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): Did you say for undergraduate, what the actual yield was?

Lange: 40. I may not have said it. The yield has gone up from 40.6% to 43.6% from two years ago. Now part of that to be fair, is if you admit more kids to early decision, you get a higher yield. But only about half of it.

Chikaraishi: Does the central handling of these harassment cases involve both undergraduates and graduates?

Lange: Now let me be clear. It doesn't mean the cases have to be handled centrally, but there has to be a

central coordinator, so there doesn't have to be one judicial body for the whole University, which everyone agrees would be disastrous really. But there has to be one central coordinator for all the efforts who understands all of them, brings the people who manage those issues together to discuss how they will get adjudicated...

Chikaraishi: So, essentially, you will take the things that are already in place and put some kind of central coordinator on top of it?

Lange: Correct. But we also have to ramp up some of the procedural things. Yes, Jeff.

Jeff Vincent (Nicholas School of the Environment): Two questions, heat map is interesting. One is, what range of risks are considered under it. Secondly, is any information from this available?

Lange: The range is pretty much the things you would expect. Political risk, financial risk, students getting hurt, students misbehaving, academic freedom issues, all that. Whether it's available...I actually don't see why it wouldn't be available and I can actually put it on the GPC agenda. That would be a great GPC agenda item. It's a very thorough process. I think that I am the owner of the campus side of the international risk, so as the owner of the campus-side of the risk assessment, so I am happy to share what I own (laughter) with the Global Priorities Committee.

Lozier: Where on the color wheel, if we are looking at this, would the DKU initiative fall? Is it blue or yellow (laughter)?

Lange: You'll see when we share it. It's not broken down into individual issues.

Lozier: Okay -- any other questions?

Klein: Going back to the Title IX question, so have you decided who that top person will be?

Lange: It's Ben Reese.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): Obviously you were just mentioning the new board members, not the other ones, but I wondered whether the board includes people with experience in the academic end?

Lange: Yes, it does -- a few. Do you remember how many?

Richard Riddell (VP/University Secretary): No, I don't remember how many.

Lange: Jane, I will tell you that the proportionality has not been changing. Thank you all very much.

Lozier: Before I conclude the meeting, I want to remind everyone to sign the attendance sheet so we don't have to get that bouncer at the door, so this concludes our meeting. Our next meeting will be November 17th. Until then, take care and have a good evening.

Respectfully submitted,

John Staddon

Faculty Secretary, November 9, 2011