

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council
Thursday, February 15, 2018

Don Taylor (Chair, Academic Council / Sanford School of Public Policy): Thank you, everyone, for coming to the Academic Council meeting today. It's been a while since we've been together. We had our two meetings in two weeks in November, and then our normal six week hiatus that had an extra month because of ten inches of snow.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 16 AND 30 MEETING MINUTES

Taylor: We need to approve the minutes for both the November 16 and 30 meetings. They were posted online ahead of this meeting. Any corrections or edits to the minutes?

(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)

PROPOSAL FOR A NEW MASTER'S DEGREE IN CRITICAL ASIAN HUMANITIES

Taylor: Next, we will have the first in a two-meeting sequence to consider a proposal for a new master's degree in Critical Asian Humanities. Professor Carlos Rojas is with us. Carlos is a member of the Academic Council. Leo Ching was going to be here with him to present, but Leo is filling in for a colleague, teaching now, who has the flu.

At our next meeting, when it will be time for questions or comments and the vote, Leo will be at it and Carlos will not. So they'll double-team across the two meetings.

Carlos Rojas (Asian and Middle Eastern Studies): I'm Carlos Rojas and I teach contemporary Chinese cultural studies. My home department is Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, or AMES. For the past five years I've been the acting DGS for the program we're hoping to formalize at this time. I've also been a member of the Academic Council for the past six years.

What we're proposing is an MA in what we've been calling Critical Asian Humanities, or CAH for short. It provides training in the critical analysis of written, visual, and performance cultures in East Asia. It integrates approaches and methodologies from literary studies, film studies, and cultural studies. And we hope to prepare our students either to pursue a doctoral program in a related field, or to pursue a career somewhere in the cultural industry related to East Asia. The program, as I mentioned, would be housed in our home department, AMES. We welcome students working in any area of cultural studies relating to East Asia, from the modern and early modern period. Given the research interests of our faculty, we've identified three specific

areas where we think our department and Duke as a whole is particularly strong. These are Global China, Japanese Empire Studies, and Borderlands Korea. Particularly Global China, which is my own area of study, I would note that Duke, both our department of AMES, and Duke as a whole, is unusually strong. Most programs only have one, or at most, two, faculty members working in modern Chinese cultural studies. Our department has five, and that's not even considering a few affiliated faculty members outside of the department in Literature and Cultural Anthropology. This, by my count, is a stronger concentration of faculty expertise in modern Chinese cultural studies than you will find anywhere outside of East Asia. Our faculty concentration in Japanese Empire Studies and Borderlands Korea is also unusually strong for a North American institution.

The degree requirements for the program are fairly straightforward. Ten courses, of which at least eight have to be graduate level. They may include, but are not limited to, graduate level courses focusing on East Asia. We permit students to take methodology courses in areas relating to literary studies, film studies, cultural studies, even if they don't necessarily relate to East Asia on the logic that this provides methodological training. At least five of the required ten courses must be graduate level courses in our department, AMES. Then there is an introductory methodology course that is taught by our department that is required of all students. All students are also required to take an independent study with their thesis advisor, who would also be a member of the core faculty from our department. Those are two graduate level courses that are already accounted for. The budget projections are as follows.

We're expecting an average of eight students a year. Students are required to be enrolled full time for at least three semesters. We expect most students to complete most or all of their coursework in three semesters. Although, many of them may stay on for a fourth semester to finish their thesis but would be paying only a fraction of the tuition, just a continuation fee. So we're only calculating an average of three semesters of tuition per student. We've reproduced here the budget projections for the first two years [refers to slide]. So for the first year, we would have only presumably half the cohort. And then by the second year we would be operating at full capacity. This is the standard 60/40 breakdown of tuition to the department and then that's returned to the Graduate School. All of the tuition revenue will be either devoted to program development for the graduate program within the department, or will be kicked back to the students themselves in the form of fellowships. Here I have presented a sample of one year of the budget projected expenses and it mirrors how it will look for the following years as well. The other thing to mention is that there will be two reserve accounts, one is a tuition reserve, to anticipate the possibility of reduced enrollment in certain years. And then also another reserve for seed funding for a potential doctoral program that we hope to develop at some point down the line, but this proposal is not contingent on that.

I'm aware of the fact that this body has seen a lot of proposals for new graduate programs, particularly new master's programs, and that there's some concern about proliferation of MA programs. I know that our program is distinctive for two reasons. One is that, in contrast to a lot of MA programs that I've seen

proposed over the past six years, many of which are presented as a second or a third graduate program for a department that already, in many cases, has a graduate program, our department does not currently have a graduate program of any sort belonging to our own department. We're one of the few departments within Trinity College that does not have a graduate program. We're also one of the very few departments in our field, East Asian Studies, among our peer institutions, that does not have a graduate program. Most of the departments in our peer institutions have not only MA programs, but also have highly-competitive PhD programs in this very sphere of expertise. That's one reason why we think our proposal is distinctive. The other is that we're not really proposing something entirely new, but rather we're proposing to formalize a program that already exists and that I have been running successfully, we think, for the past five years. I will explain what I mean by that. The APSI, Asian Pacific Studies Institute, has had an MA program, a trans-disciplinary MA program, since 1998. At that point, my department, AMES, only had four tenure line faculty, only had one tenured faculty, so at that point, it would have been impossible for our department to claim that MA program. Currently our department is much larger. Ever since I have arrived here in 2009, we've been advising roughly two-thirds of the MA students in the APSI MA program. That number has continued to grow. About five years ago, in 2013, I proposed that we create a new track specifically designated for students wanting to specialize in what we're calling Critical Asian Humanities to work with the faculty in our department and that track has been running since 2013, we think quite successfully. What we're

proposing here is simply to formalize that reality and to have it moved administratively from APSI to AMES. At the present moment, APSI runs the administration program. AMES has complete oversight over the academic aspects of the program. Most of the tuition revenue goes to APSI. We're proposing to simply formalize this and to move it over to AMES altogether. We have APSI's support in this. They've been very cooperative over the past five years.

I arrived here at Duke in January of 2009 and I've been on the APSI Graduate Committee ever since I arrived here. So I pulled up some numbers from the past nine years [refers to slide]. The blue graph is admissions. As you can see, for the first two years and the years preceding my arrival here, it was a very small program in terms of applications. Typically, under 50 applicants. And the yield was often seven, eight or nine. It was not a terribly selective program, let's put it that way. For some reason, in 2011, there's a sharp spike in applications. It more than doubled. It has remained at roughly that amount of around 100, give or take a little bit. Then, interestingly, in the first two years, 2011-2012, our yield remained more or less the same. But then in 2013, which was the year that we created the CAH track for the first time, for a variety of reasons, some of which are coincidental and some of which are related to the curriculum of the track, the yield doubled, or nearly doubled. We had 19 students come in that first year in 2013, 13 of which agreed to join the track based on their disciplinary interests. That first year, the APSI side of the program was less than it had been historically. You'll see the following years that the blue line is the MA students that are either in the APSI program prior to the

CAH track, or the students in what we now call the interdisciplinary track, which is really the APSI track. And you'll see the numbers, historically, more than even out. What has happened with the creation of the CAH track is that we simply brought in more students. This is an important point that I want to stress, is that if you look purely at the blue line, APSI student enrollment, MA students, it is more or less continuous. It may ebb and flow from year to year. Focusing on our students, in the five years of the track, we've had 28 students receive their degrees. Of those students, precisely half, 14, are continuing their education at other sites. One of them is pursuing a PhD here. The other 14 have jobs in the culture industry or a sector related to what they were studying here. We've had 12 students apply to PhD programs; 11 got in. They got into what we view as very competitive schools. They're actually enrolled in a variety of different disciplines, including literature, film studies, theater, history, et cetera. Of the students that are currently working, two of them have full time jobs here in related sectors, and then many of the rest have returned to China where they are drawing on their training that they received here.

To conclude, we think that there are a few reasons why we would like to formalize this, what we view as sort of an ad hoc arrangement and move the track formally to AMES. Part of the reason for that is that AMES, unlike an institute like APSI, has control over its hiring and over its curriculum. Students in the APSI MA program, by necessity, are reliant on the curricular offerings of the various departments over which APSI has limited or virtually no control. Also, APSI has limited control over hiring decisions. So that is a strong reason why, if possible,

the MA program should be housed in a department. Secondly, we feel that faculty in our department, and this is probably true across Trinity as a whole, feels much more invested in the department as kind of a locus of identity. Therefore, having the program be based in our department I think will strengthen faculty morale and also would encourage greater buy-in on the part of myself and my colleagues. Thirdly, the concentration of expertise among faculty within the department very closely mirrors that of a large subset of students who are applying to the APSI MA program. We feel that we can meet their needs and provide them a kind of focused disciplinary training that they cannot receive through a broad-based interdepartmental program. Finally, institutional connections. Our program and our students will continue to work closely with APSI and will continue to take advantage of and contribute to APSI programming. They will also work with other institutes such as the FHI, Franklin Humanities Institute. They are required to take at least half of their courses in our department, in AMES, but they are welcome to take courses in allied departments such as Literature, Cultural Anthropology, History, et cetera. We also hope that they will collaborate with and take advantage of new opportunities associated with DKU, including two new research centers that were approved just this past November and have gone live this spring. One is a Humanities Research Center, of which I am the co-director, and the other being a Contemporary Global China Research Center. Thank you.

Taylor: Questions for Carlos? Remember to say your name and your department to help with the minutes.

Kerry Haynie (Political Science / African and African American Studies): How much overlap is there with the faculty in APSI and in AMES?

Rojas: Well, all AMES faculty are in APSI. So basically any faculty member whose primary area of either research or teaching is East Asia are by default part of APSI. The number of faculty who are actively participating in APSI is a separate question. Technically all faculty working on East Asia are part of APSI and therefore all of AMES's East Asia faculty and all the faculty that would be participating in this program are members of APSI and active participants.

Haynie: So that would be now the same faculty with two graduate programs, the APSI and the AMES?

Rojas: Yes, but this is true of faculty from other departments. For instance, Religion has its own MA program and has its own East Asia faculty. So they have some MA students in their program, they have some MA students in the APSI MA program that are specializing in Religion and they work with both. Political Science is the same way. They have their own MA program. Some students enroll directly in Political Science, some MA students enroll in APSI but with a focus on Political Science issues, and I would say that we will continue to actively participate with the APSI MA program. For instance, this year, I am advising a number of our own students in their theses. I'm also advising an APSI student. Leo is the same way. He's advising several of our students and he's also advising an APSI student. We envision to continue that split – it's not split loyalty, but we're helping out where we're needed.

Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History, and Visual Studies): How much of a difference in the curriculum is there between this and the existing MA track? Or is it basically more of an administrative shift?

Rojas: In terms of the curriculum, the two important differences is that in the interdisciplinary track, they are required to take courses from at least three different departments. So it's structurally required that they be, I don't even think of it as interdisciplinary, but trans-disciplinary. The other difference is that, whereas for us, they have to take at least five of their courses in AMES, they can take all of their courses in AMES. So we don't require that they spread their attention across different departments. the other difference is that currently and historically, APSI only accepts graduate level seminars focusing on East Asia. So it's really an area studies program. Whereas we permit and even encourage students to take methodology courses or even content courses in their discipline in parallel areas, under the reasoning that, say, a course in American art history could provide them with useful training for thinking about East Asian cultural production.

Taylor: If you have questions that you would like us to forward to Carlos, you can email them to me or to the acouncil account. We will have time for questions at the next meeting and a vote. Thank you.

PROVOST'S TENURE STANDARDS COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

Taylor: Next we're going to have a report from the Provost's Tenure Standards Committee. This committee was formed out of the Provost's Strategic Plan last

summer. Bruce Jentleson, from Public Policy, and Anne Allison are co-chairs. This presentation has been cancelled twice. It was cancelled in November because of agenda crowding and it was cancelled in January because of the snow. But the committee is still very much in listening mode. So this is a super important topic to the university and the faculty. And there's plenty of time for you to be heard by this committee. The committee plans to issue a report to the Provost, who is planning to sit with it over the summer and have more consultation and whatever next steps there may be. Anne is travelling today so we have another solo performance of a duo.

Bruce Jentleson (Sanford School of Public Policy / Co-chair, Provost's Tenure Standards Committee): Thanks very much, Don. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today. As Don said, Anne Allison had a previous commitment for a conference, so she's out of town. I thought what I would do today is just kind of quickly run through some slides that give you a sense for the structure, the purpose, the process that we have been following, which pretty much tracks with the memo on the Academic Council website. And then really leave as much time as possible for any questions and discussion.

When the Provost announced the creation of the Tenure Standards Committee, one of the initiatives coming out of the Strategic Plan, as it was put in their statement, part of the rationale for this was increasing the diverse forms of scholarship that have not been taken into account in our appointment, promotion and tenure process. While progress has been made in interdisciplinary efforts,

criteria for rigor and impact in less traditional, alternative, or emerging forms of scholarly expression, including online education, public scholarship and policy outreach have not developed in kind. The role of the committee is to re-evaluate these criteria for tenure and promotion, to clearly define criteria that reward the many scholarly activities we value as a community. We were constituted in the late summer / early fall. President Price's inaugural speech picked up on some of these themes, by no means talking just about us, but I think in the broader context, we must prevent our research from ossifying around practices that were designed to confront another century's challenges and that limit our ability to confront the emerging problems of today. The landscape of human knowledge and human challenge has changed, so too must our maps and tools for navigating that. Are we bold enough now to invent more productive and sustainable ways to organize and catalyze scholarship around pressing problems? Are we broad-minded enough to collaborate across the full range of scholarly perspectives, disciplined enough to drive resources to support this work, and flexible enough to alter expectations of what counts as valuable research? This was a very broad statement but the rationale of this committee was very much a segment of that. The charge and mandate that emerged from this had a couple of key aspects to identify and define what types of knowledge creation and dissemination should form the basis for tenure and promotion, create rubrics for evaluating and assessing excellence, including measures of engagement and impact, and ensure Duke's commitment to excellence as well as its commitment to diverse and innovative scholarship. Our committee has 16 members, counting the two co-

chairs, drawn broadly from the university, with the exception of the Law School, which runs its own process there. But every other unit is represented. We also have seven ex officio members coming from various administrative positions. What I really want to do is kind of give you a sense for the work plan that we've been following since we really launched at the beginning of fall semester. Organizing the committee, dealing with the diversity issue, what we've been doing and continue to do for faculty input and outreach, some sense of what our external outreach has been, research we've been conducting, and ultimately culminating in a final report. So we set up four subcommittees, task forces, to deal with different aspects of this. You could imagine how hard it was once the semester started to organize committee meetings and we felt a lot of work had to happen in between committee meetings. The full committee has been meeting on a monthly basis and in between, a lot is being done within these different subcommittees. One is dealing with the existing policies and practices and one is dealing with public and policy engagement, along with new technologies and non-textual scholarship. And one is particularly dealing with the arts and questions that are proposed for the arts. The existing policy and practices task force has been looking at the methods and metrics that are currently used to assess excellence. In other words, if we were simply going to review the system as it is, what adaptations, what changes, what reforms might be made, both procedural and substantive? What alternative metrics and methods might be relevant to the broad task of assessing excellence in scholarly work and research? And then, again, what are some of the procedural issues? As I said, we've been working on

these, we're at the point now where the next full committee meeting is next week, that these different groups are beginning to sort of think through and identify what the key issues are and then report back to the full committee.

In the public and policy engagement, there are many aspects of this, but we've really been trying to hone in on this as it relates to scholarly research, not necessarily just what we traditionally consider to be more in the basket of service. Assessments of the contribution to research and scholarship that goes outside the academy, whether in addition to or instead of within the academy. What types of public and policy engagement merit APT process consideration? What criteria impact, influence, excellence, rigor should be applied and how to measure those. This is an example of metrics. This may be some work done by our own folks done in our library system, scholar works, that some of you may be familiar with. It's very interesting, they've actually been doing a lot of work on how one thinks about the strengths and weaknesses of many of the existing metrics that we use, many of what one might call "alternative" and newer ones that are being developed. We've had a presentation at our last meeting by the folks who are working on this for a longer time than our committee has been in existence.

The third group is really working on digital and technological transmissions, circulation and presentation of scholarship, scholarly contributions to technological advancement and innovation. How do we really measure and assess scholarship in a digital age? Not only in terms of ways of disseminating and communicating, and

collaborating with scholars, and there's some overlap among these areas we're working with, but each one has enough distinctiveness to have its own working group.

The Arts – it turns out that a number of universities, peer institutions actually, have procedures, systems, criteria, for tenure line positions in the non-textual creative arts. We've been looking at them. What are the measures for excellence in the Arts? What are some rubrics to assess scholarly output in various forms – installations, performances, exhibits, or other creative outlets? Trying to learn from other universities as well as develop our own. So these are the four groups we had. In December we realized that there was an element of the diversity issue, that I know this Council did a report on a couple years ago that related to us, as we formed an additional subcommittee to deal with this and the questions we feel were most relevant to our work are, how well are current tenure and promotion policies and practices serving Duke's commitment to diversity? What changes consistent with the Tenure Standards Committee's overarching goals would enhance faculty diversity? For example, there have been a lot of studies done in different disciplines of sort of structured bias in terms of citations, publications, and a variety of aspects of that. So there's a lot to work with there. We're trying to bring that into our work as well.

We've been working on faculty input and outreach, as Don said, we recently had wanted to present to the Council back in November. Members of our committee, we began, actually, initially in September and October, with everybody kind of going back to their departments and their schools and kind of surveying, what have

been the issues in our own processes here? We're fully aware that this is a matter of both the Faculty Handbook and broad university-based norms and standards, as well as criteria that happened at the local level in terms of departments and schools. So they came back to us with a list of issues that are some of the issues that we've been working on from that. What are the overlaps, what are the differences as one looks across disciplines? Anne and I have made presentations to the Deans' Cabinet back in October, the Academic Programs Committee also in late October, the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee in early December, and now to the Academic Council. We've been conducting individual consultations, we're open to other ideas, we're really, as Don said, very much still in the gathering information as well as starting the process stage. So as follow up to this, we're happy to talk with anybody individually, either to me and Anne, or relevant members of our committee.

We also have been doing some external outreach. There are a number of universities that have been wrestling with this. And indeed, some have developed criteria and practices and processes that are useful to learn from. They may work for them and not for us, but we've been reaching out and studying other universities for over a decade. I've been, in my own discipline of Public Policy and Political Science and International Relations, running a program called Bridging the Gap, which is for scholars in those areas who are trying to connect both as PhD students and as faculty to the policy world. About a year and a half ago we had a meeting of Provosts from many universities to talk about this more broadly. Sally came, the former Provost of

the University of Pennsylvania came as well. And we had Provosts from a number of other universities. So that was a network that I could readily reach out to in this role, with Sally's help, and say, we're doing this at Duke, can you give us any of your ideas? And some useful information has come in. Some of the professional associations had a lot of our disciplines. Different disciplines have been working on this and we've been able to talk with them, get some of the reports that they've published, and the like. And a number of other universities have turned up that have related initiatives that we've been looking at. Part of this has really been as a research endeavor, not just running a committee. There's actually an interesting and somewhat burgeoning literature on alternative metrics, on the relationship between the university and our role as scholars and the notions of the various aspects of the mission of universities and institutions in society and looking at other policies and the like. So we've been doing quite a bit of research. We have a couple of graduate students working with us and really gathering the kind of information that we think is helpful, actually critical, in making informed decisions. So a lot of our effort, really all the members of the committee, but in particular Professor Allison and myself, have been spending a lot of time on researching this and trying to find out what we need to know in order to do this. At the end of the academic year, we will complete a report that we will provide to the Provost and then the normal processes will flow from that part in terms of various committees will get to consider it and the like. That's a rough sense, as quick as I could, for how we're organized and what we're doing. I'm happy to take any questions or comments

now, as well as happy to take any follow up conversations after this.

Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences): You mentioned that the Law School is outside this process. Is the Medical School inside the process or outside the process?

Jentleson: Sally can help me with this, but the Medical School that operates within the tenure system that reports to the Provost, is that the best way of describing it?

Sally Kornbluth (Provost): Yes, so the Basic Science departments that come up through the Provost's Tenure Committee are part of it, but the Clinical Sciences tenure process is not.

Jentleson: So on the committee, you saw a faculty member from the Medical School.

Cohen: That was one of the reasons I asked. The faculty member who is on from the Medical School is in the Basic Sciences. There's no representation from the Clinical Sciences, the largest faculty group.

Kornbluth: We have no influence to define the criteria there.

Cohen: Thank you, that makes sense. By the way, do you know whether a parallel practice is going on in the Medical School?

Kornbluth: I don't believe so, because the Basic Science APT committee, the dossiers come directly to the Provost's office, without a separate stop there. So they're not refining those. I don't believe there's any parallel process right now, at least with the Clinical Sciences APT, but it's an interesting question.

Taylor: Although, there is a proposal from the Nursing School that's making its way through the APC committee and on the way up.

Kornbluth: But that's at the school-level committee, that's not the Clinical committee that the Nursing School also rolls into.

Craig Henriquez (Biomedical Engineering): I find it interesting that the entire discussion was absent of the word "teaching" in a university. I think, obviously, scholarship is weighted more than teaching, but is that because we believe that our ability to evaluate teaching is okay? Our ability to evaluate service to the university is okay? Or is it because its value is diminishing over time?

Jentleson: My sense is that, in terms of the mandate of this committee was really to focus primarily on the research aspect. It's been a pretty formidable mandate we've had and, at least in my view, in no way does it or should it diminish the value of teaching. I teach a lot of undergraduates and believe fundamentally in the importance of that as part of Duke's identity. But I think, as we've been doing this, the sense was we had a pretty robust agenda, how that's dealt with could be some sort of follow-on activity, I guess.

Kornbluth: Yeah, it was not meant to preclude the other things. It was really designed to look at one of the specific criteria for tenure, namely research scholarship, taking into account different forms of scholarship and how they're evaluated. How we evaluate teaching and service are completely other questions and, not to go into it here, but there are a

lot of questions about teaching evaluations as they currently exist, how we collect teaching evaluations, whether there should be peer evaluations in teaching, et cetera, that are another whole category of issues that we will ultimately want to address, but I think it's beyond the mandate of this committee.

Jentleson: I think in our report, in the introduction, we want to be very clear about what we're addressing and what we're not and recognizing that there are many other elements crucial to the process and to the university. I appreciate your emphasizing that.

Ruth Day (Psychology and Neuroscience): This is a very well organized committee and you have four sub-groups and they do map into the charge. There were other things in the charge that do not now have subcommittees and I'm sure you fold them in in certain ways. The two that I noticed are knowledge and service to society, and how that would be measured, and the other is interdisciplinary work. We have become quite well known for that. But the measures are lagging behind on this. I'm just wondering, are you going to be adding more sub-groups, or is this going to be folded into the other sub-groups?

Jentleson: Knowledge and service to society is very much that public and policy engagement group. It's really about scholarship that, in a scholarly way, addresses broad societal problems, from the local to the global. That's why one of the types is when you're doing a scholarly work and your target audience is either not primarily just your discipline or not at all your discipline. That's very much our

piece of that. We're not in any way ignoring that one.

Day: Is part of that going to be having an effect on society? Actually changing policy or practices?

Jentleson: Ah, yes, the impact question.

Day: Not just the academic part.

Jentleson: No. How do you measure impact, right? You could have a great idea and some unnamed public official doesn't do it. Or you could have a bad idea and they do it and it's not the effect you wanted. So one of the things we're looking at is various efforts to develop broad metrics and other kinds of things that get at that. When we're talking about engagement, the goal of the scholar in that particular piece of work is to make a contribution that goes beyond just a disciplinary dialogue. On your second point, interdisciplinary, I think that Duke has made enormous progress on that, I think there's a lot of progress to be made. I think one of the areas that we slice into it is kind of like the diversity issue. When you look at some of the existing metrics, and you see some of the issues that are problematic for interdisciplinary work, whether it's external impact factors or others. It is part of our report but we haven't strictly tackled that directly. But it very much comes in in that way and a number of other ways.

Day: It turns out there are different models for interdisciplinary work and there are some that we assume but there are five or six others that we identify in the Arts and Sciences Council. So the rubrics might be different for the different types of interdisciplinarity.

Jentleson: Right. And by having a broad university-based committee, people are talking about this from different ways. Some of them are physical science people who are talking about collaborative work that leads to patents but may not necessarily lead to a scholarly journal article. How do we think about that? So I guess we could have had a working group on interdisciplinarity but it's cutting across the technology and the people working on our additional and new technology, it's very much an interdisciplinary group that does a lot of interdisciplinary work.

Day: Just one final point, if you don't mind. Once you get the list of metrics that seem relevant for all of the different areas and so on, it looks like you're set up very nicely to look at that in terms of schools and programs and departments and so on. But within those, there can be individual differences. Have you discussed the idea of relative weighting of all of the metrics, not only in terms of those larger units, but on a case-by-case basis?

Jentleson: We are in the process now, as we move through this last part, of trying to discuss these issues. One of the things that is very clear, and I think it's true now, and as we've looked at other universities as well in this particular way, is you have this combination of university-wide norms and criteria that get, if you will, operationalized, tailored by different departments and schools and no sense of one size fits all. In fact, when you get into these areas, it's probably even truer than the notion that you just leaf through a bunch of metrics that tell you citation count and stuff. So we're being sensitive to that. Part of the process of having a report that will then go to various groups

is, we're 16 people, plus seven, but there are probably aspects or angles that we haven't look at yet, and we're doing our best to do that. Then the process will continue to really make sure that it serves the interests of the university and the faculty.

Jane Richardson (Biochemistry): I think on the interdisciplinary question, there's something that's more general than rubrics. There is a problem that, you know, Computer Science thinks about publication differently than we do in Biochemistry. The main thing that I've seen over many years in this is that everybody says they're in favor of interdisciplinarity, but basically, tenure is thought of by each side and the person is compared to people who are 100% in their discipline. That's a harder thing to do something about.

Jentleson: It is. And I think it's one of the reasons, talking to the Provost, this comes up a lot at the APT level. As a faculty member of the Sanford School, we have nine or ten different types of PhDs, tenure line faculty, we have had to work with this a lot. I'm not saying we got it right all the time, but I think that is one of the issues with interdisciplinarity. For example, people may not publish in the journals as much as someone in that discipline might. The university has been trying to work with that a lot and hopefully we can help by further analysis and study.

Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine): I guess to sort of piggy back on a colleague's questions about education, I wonder whether there are opportunities to make education scholarly? Beyond just teaching a class, the innovation in teaching. Or the reach to other colleagues

around the world, now, in terms of picking up on innovative teaching methodologies or really looking at learner outcome and impact and really making those metrics that support the research.

Jentleson: I can't say I've thought that through, but I think let's take that into consideration and figure out how it might fit here. Even if we have some things that we say we haven't thoroughly looked at, but out of this process would be worth taking a further look at and any follow up, and that's a good example. As I said, if people want to follow up individually with me or with Anne or with others, this is kind of the time to do it. We're really working through to try to finish this process for our part at least before the end of the semester.

Taylor: If you have questions you want to send to us to forward on, you can.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: UPDATE ON DUKE KUNSHAN UNIVERSITY

Taylor: We will now move into executive session to hear a brief update from Provost Kornbluth about Duke Kunshan University as related to the executive session from our November 30 meeting. So if members of the press could leave now, we will come and get you momentarily and we will then continue with an open session brief update on DKU.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

Kornbluth: As most of you are aware from all of our discussions last year and also into this year, the plan is to launch the undergraduate program in the fall of 2018. So our admissions have been open and we were holding our breath to see if

we were actually going to get applications. You may recall that the target for the first year was to have 175 students from the PRC and 50 or more international students in the first class, with ultimately, as the classes build up year after year, to a total size of 500. I'm very pleased to report that we have all our applications in and they came in through the Common App. We received 3,143 applications for the class of 225. Amazingly, 592 of those are international applications from 80 countries. 322 are from the United States and 270 from other countries. The top other countries are Kazakhstan, maybe that's because of our Fuqua program on Kazakhstan, making Duke famous there, South Korea, Pakistan, and Ethiopia. So we are just processing applications. I asked Denis [Simon] this morning, how they looked in terms of quality. He said, for American applications, we can look at things like SAT scores and grades and everything...

Denis Simon (Executive Vice Chancellor, DKU): They look very positive. We've been told that they look like Duke quality applications in terms of at least the quantitative data that they've surveyed on the first round.

Kornbluth: Right. And then the PRC applications become a little bit more complicated. Part of the issue here is we haven't really figured out how you work yield in this system. It's fairly complicated because on the internationals, obviously, we have no idea at this point what kind of yield to expect. But that's a small slice. On the PRC side, as I think I explained in previous meetings, it's all really hinged on the Gaokao system. We also have a certain number expected per province. So I don't know if you want to say anything more about that. It's a little hard to explain...

Simon: It's a long discussion but it is as complicated as Sally suggests. We have somebody designate quota per province and also the Gaokao scores, even though it's a national exam, the Gaokao scores are also arranged by province. For example, you could be the top in Gansu Province, which is a poor province, and that would leave in, say, Beijing Municipality to be somewhere in the middle to even lower cohort. They range and they're supposed to give some adjustment for the fact that some will come from richer, better provinces with better education systems and others will come from lesser. But it's supposed to be, in principle, an equitable system, meaning that somebody from a poor province, because of that adjustability can make it to the best universities. So every student will select three schools and then they will start to negotiate once their Gaokao score is in. We will negotiate with the students to see how many will put DKU as their number one choice. This happens in the space of about a week. It's all built up to this. They take the exam, they wait about a month, get the score, and then within a week, the rest of their college is decided for them.

Kornbluth: I think I explained this last time a little bit, but we're not competing with Fudan, and Tsinghua, and PKU, et cetera because we're actually in a different batch. It's almost like being in an early decision batch with a very narrow group of school. NYU Shanghai, us, some of the military colleges, it's a pretty small cohort. As Denis will say, they're getting tons of calls from parents, et cetera, and even political questions.

Simon: And political people calling too.

Kornbluth: Like, what do I have to do to get my kid in? So that's a good sign. Similar to some of the calls we get here.

Simon: No one at Duke can relate to that, of course... (laughter)

Kornbluth: So anyway, that looks very promising. I think the faculty hiring, we talked about last time, in the first batch, we made 23 offers and 22 accepted. Actually, a cohort has been on campus in the past week. They're doing curricular design, they're discussing with colleagues here. But we've already started the next round of faculty hiring because we're looking to hire 25 or more faculty for 2019. For that batch we have 1,357 applications for the 25 faculty slots. 275 Natural Science, 563 in Social Science, and 519 in Arts and Humanities. We have advanced our senior hire searches across all divisions and junior searches will begin in March and April. So that's moving along. We've gotten eight majors approved, seven under review. The student information systems look like they're ticking along. Finally, for those who have been there, where there was this kind of empty space where we kept saying the innovation building was going to go, there's actually an innovation building coming up. I saw a movie of the progress of this. They got a lot of people working very quickly on this, so hopefully we will have the innovation building soon. The master plan for the whole campus is in the final rounds of discussion and negotiation so we can get going on the dorms. That won't be necessary for the first year but will soon become necessary as we build up the total size of the class. That's pretty much where we are. I don't know if anyone has any questions for me or for Denis while he's here, because he's

the one on the ground who knows exactly what's happening.

Andrew Janiak (Philosophy / Member of ECAC): I think it's amazing that you have applications for 80 countries. Do we know how they heard about it? From Kazakhstan to Ethiopia.

Simon: We actually do. We starting doing more in depth research but actually digital media was the key to the broad representation. We targeted a number of countries in East Asia and Southeast Asia just for proximity purposes and also the fact that we already know they're sending a large number of students to China for higher education. So, like South Korea, Pakistan would be good examples of that. So that's consistent with the general growth. But the really interesting thing is the spread, all over Africa. We had some concepts about where in the United States the students would come from. We thought, okay, let's take the Advanced Placement tests in Chinese and Mandarin and see which high school kids take that test, and use those as pockets of activity for Chinese. But actually, we got applications from Arkansas, Texas, Alabama, we really got across the entire United States. Sure, there are some concentrations in San Francisco, LA, New York, and Boston, as you might expect, but the fact that these are also scattered all over the US means that they've heard about us through the digital media and that modality has been extremely effective. Then we picked up on that. We've done a lot of virtual media kind of things as well. Our recruiters have done meetings with guidance counselors, with high school officials in various countries, all that stuff has helped to kick in. And then we get a fairly big project with the Institute of International Education,

which has hubs through Ed America and other things throughout the world and they've helped us. We took eight target countries and then they introduced us to the ten most prominent high schools in each of those countries. Again, we got some good yields from those kinds of things. At the end of the day, we did better than we thought, to be honest, and we think that now the big problem for us is processing all the applications, because we actually had an infrastructure built for about 1500, and we basically doubled that amount, or more than doubled it. We've had 38 people reading applications. So a lot of people.

Kornbluth: We're helping. Jennifer [Francis, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs] and others who have been organizing to read American and other international applications here.

OPEN DISCUSSION ON TOPICS OF INTEREST

Taylor: One of the things that ECAC has been trying to do this year is carve out some time without a set agenda and so that's what we're going to have now. Another thing ECAC has tried to do, and those of you who have served on ECAC know it's hard to do this, is not to be totally driven by the process and the system and the things that we've got to do. So we try to carve out some time to say, let's talk about things without having a deadline to meet. I just want to give you briefly an update on three such topics. They're at different points of clarity in ECAC's mind about what comes next. And then after that, I'll just open it up. It could be anything that any of you would like to talk about.

The first topic that we spent some time talking about is academic freedom and freedom of expression. ECAC read the book by Erwin Chemerinsky, our former colleague from Duke Law School, called Free Speech on Campus. We've talked about that a couple of times. This is a super important topic but at this point, ECAC doesn't have a plan for some sort of statement of any sort. This is something that, culturally, people look to the university and say, gosh if you guys can't get straight, how can we engage hard ideas, if we can't do this -meaning the university - then who in the world can? So the stakes are super high. We're talking and ready to hear from any of you about this. But we've been talking about this. It's important.

Kornbluth: I'll just also remind people that the Provost's Forum this year is on this as well.

Taylor: Yes, the Provost's Forum is on March 1 and the topic is on freedom of expression and free speech on campus. There are, I think, four panels and David Brooks is making a public lecture. So that's in a couple of weeks. ECAC doesn't have some proposal that we are about to say, we need to think more about this.

There's a second topic that I think ECAC has gotten a little closer to a consensus and that is, we believe that it's time to alter the consensual sexual relationship policy and to take the step of explicitly forbidding, say, between faculty and undergraduates. If you look at so-called Appendix Z in the Faculty Handbook, there is a fairly detailed, circuitous conversation about all the ways where a romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student is inappropriate. Basically, it's if you have any power over

them. I think we're getting to the point - we, being ECAC - that there are so many hoops and steps, it would actually be simpler to say that we as faculty have this incredibly privileged role in trying to seek truth and new knowledge and invite students along in doing that as well and that when it comes to undergrad students, it would be best to just say, this is not an appropriate thing for a faculty member to be engaged romantically with an undergrad student. We think that the same sort of concept of relationships between faculty and graduate students is more complicated, so we have in mind a fairly straightforward alteration at some point in the relatively near future for undergrads. But with graduate students, we're looking at what other universities do and I think the general concept of reporting and clarity and sort of sunshine into the situation is crucial. We've been talking about this with Sally, we talked some with Vince, so at some point, we plan to advance this idea and to alter so-called Appendix Z of the Faculty Handbook.

The third topic is, we've had a lot of discussion about harassment, sexual harassment, but all kinds of harassment, and looking at the breadth of the policies for Duke University, Duke Health System, it has this incredibly complicated enterprise in which we're involved. And we've talked in multiple sessions in ECAC with Sally. We've discussed it with Vince. And Vince and Sally are also in discussions here. Whereas I think with the consensual relationship policy, I really think that's the faculty leading that, I think with this broader harassment and sexual harassment policy, it's really Sally and Vince and others in the administration are getting straight with what types of extra changes we need.

That will come to us for the normal consultation process. Those are the three things that we've been talking about and it's been sort of serial conversations during the conduct of this ECAC and those are things in addition to the normal routine business of ECAC that are on our minds. Other members of ECAC are here. We'd be happy to hear from you about these, or if there are other items you think we should be looking at or that we need to be discussing.

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment): Good for you for tackling some very difficult things. With respect to the harassment policy, my understanding is that Ben Reese, the head of the Office of Institutional Equity has been working with a group for months and months to come up with a new university harassment policy. I'm sure you know this. I just don't know how it meshes with what you're thinking.

Taylor: Yes. So I believe it's really been like two years' worth of months and months. And that policy has gone to Vince and Sally. We've talked generally with them, but we haven't seen this proposal. I understand Vince and Sally are trying to get on the same page and then it will sort of come to us. This is the type of thing that will be discussed. Do you guys have anything to add?

Vince Price (President): Sure. I would just say that the questions that surround sexual harassment have to do both with policies regarding what happens when there is a complaint or allegation, as well as broader questions about how we can improve the climate in every unit across the campus. These are somewhat separable issues. I think that the policy review itself has been directed toward

improving our policies with respect to reporting and handling of reports. I think we have more work to do collectively to think about prospectively how we build a stronger, more welcoming environment for every member of the faculty as well as students and staff. So I think that's a fair characterization of where we are.

Taylor: One of the things, I think, from ECAC's perspective – we have a new Faculty Ombuds, Tom Metzloff, who ECAC actually met with yesterday. So for the first time, the Faculty Ombuds is not retired. And I don't mean that as a negative thing. In the past, that's who we chose as Ombuds. Tom did some training that we haven't done in the past and I think he's more linked in and we have asked him to be more linked in with the broad role of Ombuds. One thing I note is that the Ombuds is not an advocate. Sometimes people don't realize that or understand that. So Ombuds, I think, works pretty well if a faculty member wants to bounce ideas off of another faculty member in a confidential setting and then be guided about what to do next. All the way to OIE, this is the place where Duke University can bring the full force of law and Duke policy. Somebody can be fired for something that they do that's illegal at Duke. I think in between those two, there's a gap. We know this and we, at least in ECAC's mind, what we really need to do is get straight what is in the gap. In particular, proactive efforts to try to make things more inclusive and better in all parts of Duke. For me, my PhD is in Public Health, so I think of this as a harm reduction problem. The theory of harm reduction is, when you have something that you know you're not going to get completely rid of, you don't give up and say, there's nothing we can do. But you work continuously and you never stop

trying to do a little better. Just to give an example, in 1950, the smoking prevalence in the United States was 60%. And it's 17% today. So in 1960, nobody could have believed that, right? Do you realize, you could smoke on an airplane in 1994 in the United States? It's unimaginable today that that was true just then. And in 1975 it was unimaginable that that would ever go away. Unfortunately, I just gave an example of something that took two-thirds of a century (laughter). So we would hope for more rapid improvement than that. But I think harm reduction is the way to think about it.

Kornbluth: One thing, and this also was partially under the Diversity Task Force, but obviously is important in all realms of culture. We have Abbas Benmamoun's office that is now starting to operate. Abbas has gotten to know a lot of the schools. Abbas and I and Ann Brown [Vice Dean, Faculty, Duke School of Medicine] on the Medical School side are in close conversation now about how we think about the proactive space that you're talking about, not just the incident space. So I think there are ways to start moving the needle, that, again, hopefully won't take two-thirds of a century.

Roxanne Springer (Physics): I also thank you very much for tackling these issues. It's critically important and I'm very pleased that you're leading us in the right direction here. I have a question that has to do with consent and also a recent news story that you probably aren't allowed to comment on, but when it comes to the harassment policy, between students, and I'm going to remind everyone again about the student experience survey that 40% of undergraduate women experience sexual assault during their four years as

undergraduates here at Duke. So at this point, do we have an affirmative policy, in other words, relating to this news item? Apparently it's not sufficient to not give consent. You actually have to say no and be believed before the sex is considered non-consensual? What is Duke's policy at the moment, and if it's not, in California it's a "yes means yes." I think that means that in order to not be guilty of an assault, you have to receive an affirmative consent. Where is Duke?

Taylor: I'm going to nominate myself as not an expert on Duke's student conduct...

Steve Nowicki (Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education): I can comment on the student conduct. We have a policy that requires affirmative consent. The lack of affirmative consent is no. There is no requirement that there has to be a statement of no. In other words, "yes means yes" is the policy of Duke right now for the undergraduates.

Springer: So this news story – because the committee disagrees that she actually said no, the judge has refused...

Nowicki: I can't comment on the details of that but, are there any lawyers in the room? I can only state what the policy is at Duke right now, which is that affirmative consent has to be given. That's the student conduct policy in place right now.

Taylor: I will say, just from ECAC's perspective, the part of this very broad area we just talked about, the least is the undergrad student part of it. Partly because there are so many people focused on that and these sorts of issues. We just haven't talked about that particularly a lot.

Haynie: This is on a related topic, but when I was on ECAC, legal counsel came and talked to us about this issue and about trying to change our internal process and encouraging more faculty to participate in the judicial process. Is there any progress on that? And maybe it's a question to the President as well about more pressure on the national government about this Title IX craziness that we're in, having to participate in these kinds of things that we're not qualified to do. I know the university has been pushing back and trying to get some change.

Price: We do continue to advocate for positions that we think are appropriate with respect to Duke policies. After having gone through a pretty extensive process of revising those policies and putting them into place, we're not in favor of kind of a roll back, a change of position with respect to what the federal government would deem appropriate in places like Duke. With respect to faculty participation in panels, I don't know if Steve is in a better position to comment on that, but populating these panels, making sure that they understand the nature of the issues that they're asked to adjudicate, is very hard work, I will tell you this. It's very labor intensive. So we have spent considerable time building up what I think is a much stronger system to navigate those cases. That being said, I think it's almost inevitable that the parties to these disputes not finding satisfaction with the way Duke has handled any case will go to other places, including courts, to re-hear their claims. That will never go away, regardless of what Duke does or what the federal government might decide to do.

Nan Jokerst (Electrical and Computer Engineering): Just a little bit of an answer to your question, Kerry. When I was Chair, ECAC did approach Larry Moneta about our concerns that faculty weren't represented on some of these committees, tenure-track faculty. He did ask for ECAC to give him names of tenure-track faculty who could be approached to be on these committees. I believe he did approach some of those faculty. I don't know the current makeup. So the loop was closed, but I don't know the resolution of closing that loop.

Taylor: We can find that out. Other comments on this or any other topics? Well, no one ever got hooted out of town for ending meetings early (laughter). Okay, so the March 22 meeting - Sandra was about to murder me for forgetting to tell you - the March 22 Academic Council meeting will serve as the Annual Faculty Meeting of the Duke faculty and the highlight of this will be President Price will address this body. And after that we will have a very nice reception. So please come March 22 and if you're able, stay afterwards for a reception. Thank you.