

Minutes of the Meeting of the Academic Council  
Thursday, April 28, 2016

**Nan Jokerst (Chair, Academic Council / Electrical and Computer Engineering):**

Welcome, everyone. Thank you for being here to start our meeting early today. We have a lot to do today so we're going to get started.

I hope that you have all had an excellent semester, and that you are enjoying our beautiful campus this spring.

We have a lot of important business today. President Brodhead would like to open our meeting with a few words before we begin the rest of our business.

**Richard Brodhead (President):** My friends, the astute among you will remember that in 2012 I was appointed to a third term as President to last five years, and the even more astute will realize that the last of those years is next year. Today I am here to inform you that next year will be my last year as President. During the course of this meeting, we will be sending out a notice to faculty, students, staff, alumni, and the general Duke universe. I thought it would be best to break it face to face with some group, and I thought that this would be the perfect one to do it with. Just to say a few things: You knew it was going to happen sometime; some of you may have been longing for this for years! (laughter) But in any case, I would just say that it seems to me, actually, for a transition, a

very good time. We have installed successor leadership of outstanding quality in all the other relevant positions of the university. We had a great Provost who was succeeded a year and a half ago by another great Provost. We had a very dynamic Chancellor of the Health System who was succeeded last April by another outstanding Chancellor of the Health System, Gene Washington. When Laurie Patton left to go to Middlebury, everyone thought, what are you going to do about that? But we found Valerie Ashby and she has been outstanding and next year we will welcome Ravi Bellamkonda as an outstanding new Dean of the Pratt School. Elaine Heath is an outstanding new Dean of the Divinity School. So I think that the place has a lot of stability and quality to accompany a change in the presidency. The other thing I think is that next year, a lot of things that have taken a lot of work or a lot of time to accomplish will come to fruition. That's why, among other reasons, it seems to me a good time. The DukeForward campaign ends in June of 2017, the very same time as my presidency, by almost astonishing coincidence (laughter). Just to tell you, you remember the goal was \$3.25 billion. We've now raised \$3.15 billion, so we'll hit the goal this summer, and then we'll have a year for gravy, as you might call it, which I think is great. We will do our best to work on that. The very extensive construction of the campus, this has been

a big project. Just walking over here today; the Chapel is open today, you can walk in and see all this work coming to an end. West Union will open this summer. The athletic campus will be done and lots of those projects will be finished. Phase II of the Duke Kunshan University project will come forward to this body for resolution in the fall, so that will be another event of next year. I'd have to say, work on issues of race and diversity and inclusion is never done in a university. You don't do something and then you're done with that. It's endless work. You do what you do and then you stop there and say, what more needs to be done? But I do think that this year and next year, we will have accomplished very important progress in that domain and I give credit to the Academic Council for all its work on the Faculty Diversity Initiative aimed at faculty issues. And I am expecting their report, within a small number of days, maybe within the week, from the Task Force on Bias and Hate. That will be another important thing. I thought about that report, I haven't seen it yet, but my thought is that the report will be reviewed for public comment. We're late in the term to do anything about it, so I think we'll leave it over the summer and then the committee can have a look at it in the fall and see if there was anything in the comments that it wished to address. The way this works is this: the Trustees are in charge of the appointment of the President. They will form a search committee. The details of this will be announced by the Chair, David Rubenstein, sometime quite soon. The committee this time, as in the past, will have a vice chair from the faculty, it will have representation from the faculty, so there will be consultation about that. I wanted to announce this now rather than at commencement, which seemed the

other opportunity, partly because commencement isn't about the President. That seemed to be inappropriate. This will also allow some time to get the search process geared up before the actual end of school. I will just say this to end: I'm still going to be President of this university every day until June 30<sup>th</sup> of next year and I don't feel that I have lots of different gears in which I am able to do this job, so you will probably see pretty much the same me at my job as you have before. It's far too soon to say goodbyes and thank yous; we'll have a tedious year of farewells (laughter). I just want to say what I hope you have always known. Every day I have held the job of President of Duke University, it has been my extraordinary privilege to be entrusted with the fate and fortunes of this university. Thank you very much. (Standing ovation)  
Okay, I'll stay after all! (laughter)

**Jokerst:** Well, Dick, I'd like to thank you for telling the faculty in an Academic Council meeting about your decision. We really appreciate that. Thank you.

Let's continue our meeting with some announcements:

First, the conversation at our March Council meeting regarding the Duke Kunshan undergraduate degree was time constrained, and did not give all Council members a chance to offer their thoughts. The Provost has been very responsive to faculty suggestions regarding DKU, and we will be meeting in the fall to discuss DKU again in depth. In the meantime, to provide further opportunity for faculty input, I encourage you to send suggestions, questions, and comments via email to the Academic Council at this email address, [acouncil@duke.edu](mailto:acouncil@duke.edu), and

we will forward them to the Provost. Responses from the Provost will be made available to the Council in September. While we could not find the time to have a meeting where we could all discuss in person our suggestions, comments, and concerns regarding DKU, we're going to do it electronically and share all of those comments and responses at our September meeting.

Second, the annual reports from the Academic Programs Committee, University Priorities Committee, the Global Priorities Committee, and the Athletic Council will be available as advance reading materials for our May 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Since our May meeting is as busy as this meeting, we will follow the same procedure as last year for these committee reports. Rather than presenting each report orally, the chairs of these committees will be available at our May meeting, and we have reserved time at the meeting so that the chairs can answer any questions that you might have for them.

**Sally Kornbluth (Provost):** In terms of the future conversation about DKU, you will also make available the eventual reports from APC, UPC, and GPC? It would be nice if some part of a fall meeting, before we get into the real, formal meetings on DKU, that perhaps the current chairs of APC, UPC, and GPC could at least say a word or if people have questions about the reports from those committees.

**Jokerst:** I think that would be a great idea. Any other questions about the process regarding DKU?

**Pat Wolf (Biomedical Engineering):** I was just wondering if the comments that come into the Provost's office will be made public. Because any discussion we have here is public.

**Jokerst:** Yes, so the intent here is to collect the comments, they'll be coming through Academic Council, and of course you are all welcome to interface with the Provost directly as well. Any comments coming into the Academic Council office, we'll pass on to the Provost. And those questions, comments, and suggestions, and the Provost's responses will all be part of the September Council meeting and the materials prior to that.

**Kornbluth:** I think part of the problem is that when it's framed this way where concerns and questions come up, I don't think this should be the only venue because it actually means that only criticisms, concerns, and negative comments are aired. So I think, eventually, we're going to have to have some kind of full, open discussion that will air both positive and negative comments so that these can be addressed, so that the Council can actually discuss. If it's only the concerns that are sent to me that are made public, yes, we do have a chance to address them, but I also think that there is some opportunity for people to engage there who actually support it and want to air their views as well.

**Jokerst:** I agree completely and that's why we explicitly said "feedback and suggestions" and that includes positive feedback and support. I would encourage you to send in your opinions, negative or positive, but in all cases I'd like you to be constructive. If you see something that you're concerned about, then let's have a suggestion, if you can, for the Provost, as

to how we can constructively change the conversation about DKU. The Provost has provided a lot of reading material that you all have access to and we will also have the APC, UPC, and GPC reports.

### ***FACULTY SCHOLAR AWARDS & HONORABLE MENTIONS***

**Jokerst:** It is now my distinct pleasure to recognize the stellar undergraduates who were recently selected for the Academic Council's Faculty Scholar Award or an Honorable Mention.

The Faculty Scholar Award was established by the faculty at Duke in 1974. It is the only Duke award bestowed by the faculty on our undergraduates. Receiving the Faculty Scholar Award has had a positive impact on students who apply for graduate fellowships and other awards such as the Fulbright, Marshall, and the Rhodes Scholars.

This year, our Faculty Scholars Award Committee has selected one winner and two candidates deserving honorable mention.

I would first like to thank the members of the Faculty Scholars Award Committee for their time and effort in reviewing the dossiers and interviewing the students in order to make their selections.

They are:

Carlos Rojas (Asian & Middle Eastern Studies) and also a member of the Academic Council and Carlos served as chair of this committee.

Chris Dwyer (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Caroline Bruzelius (Art, Art History & Visual Studies)

Cindy Kuhn (Pharmacology & Cancer Biology)

Nathaniel Mackey (English)

The following students were selected and were recognized at a reception last week and they will also receive a monetary award.

The first is Meghana Rao, who is majoring in Evolutionary Anthropology, and has studied the effect of the microbiome on monkey social status. She is passionate about improving community health, and she plans to become a physician and explore evolutionary medicine and its application to the intersection of biology and social structures in humans.

The Honorable Mentions are:

Indrani Saha, who is a Program 2 major in Cognitive Aesthetics and hopes to pursue a PhD in art history, theory and criticism to become a professor and continue her research into experimental approaches to study the human aesthetic experience.

Yilun Zhou, who is an Electrical & Computer Engineering & Computer Science major and is planning to pursue a PhD in Computer Science conducting research into robotic learning. He plans to continue his research merging computer science and questions about what it is to be human.

And I will say, being at that reception and meeting these three individuals and their advisors was humbling, to say the least. Our students are absolutely tremendous and stunning.

## **WINNERS OF THE 2016 ECAC ELECTION**

**Jokerst:** Next, I would like to announce our four newly elected members to ECAC. First, I would like to thank all of our candidates who ran for election to ECAC. We appreciate your willingness to serve the faculty.

The newly elected ECAC members are:

Kirsten Corazzini (School of Nursing)  
Grainne Fitzsimons, (Fuqua School of Business)  
Andrew Janiak (Philosophy) and  
Mari Shinohara (School of Medicine / Basic Sciences)

Congratulations and thank you in advance for your time and efforts for this Council. As chair, I look forward to working with you next year (applause).

In addition to me, our continuing ECAC members are:

Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment)  
Josh Sosin (Classical Studies & History)  
Trina Jones (Law School)

While we welcome these additions, it means that we say good-bye to four other ECAC members. I would like to recognize and thank the following for their wonderful service to this Council and to ECAC:

Anne Yoder (Biology and director of the Lemur Center)  
Beth Sullivan (Molecular Genetics and Microbiology)  
Kerry Haynie (Political Science & African and African-American Studies)  
Chris Woods (Medicine and Global Health) (applause)

## **APPROVAL OF THE MARCH MEETING MINUTES**

**Jokerst:** I'd now like to ask for approval of our March 24 meeting minutes.

Are there any corrections or edits?

May I have a motion to approve the minutes from the March 24th Council meeting?

*(Minutes approved by voice vote without dissent)*

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**Jokerst:** I will now call our meeting into Executive Session for our next agenda item, the presentation of candidates for Honorary Degrees for Commencement 2017. This means that all those who are not members of the faculty must leave the meeting. For those of you who must depart, we will welcome you back in about 15 minutes.

## **MEETING RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION**

**Jokerst:** I now return our meeting to open session.

## **VOTE ON THE PROPOSED NAME CHANGE TO A PROGRAM IN WOMEN'S STUDIES**

**Jokerst:** We will now vote on the proposed change to a program in the Women's Studies department as presented to us last month by Professor Priscilla Wald. The supporting documents were posted again with today's agenda and Priscilla is here for further questions before our vote.

Are there any questions?

May I have a motion to approve the name of the Program in Women's Studies to the

Program in Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Studies?

*(Name change approved by voice vote without dissent)*

**COMMUNITY STATEMENT FROM THE PROVOST'S IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE OF THE DIVERSITY TASK FORCE**

**Jokerst:** Our next agenda item is a presentation of the proposed Duke Community Statement.

At our May Council meeting last year, Professor Trina Jones and I presented the Report from the Academic Council Diversity Task Force regarding faculty at Duke. Provost Kornbluth subsequently formed the Implementation Committee for the Diversity Task Force, Chaired by Professor and ECAC colleague Emily Klein. As part of the work of the Implementation Committee, I would like to invite Emily to the podium to share the Community Statement that she and the Implementation Committee colleagues have prepared for your consideration. This item was posted with your agenda and we plan to vote on this at our May 12 meeting. We have about 10 minutes for this agenda item today.

**Emily Klein (Nicholas School of the Environment / Chair, Provost's Diversity Implementation Committee / Member of ECAC):** I should also mention that we will have a fuller report from the Faculty Diversity Implementation Committee on what we've been doing throughout the year at our next meeting too. We are bringing this one item now. The Faculty Diversity Task Force report noted that Duke had no university-wide statement on diversity and inclusion and

so we thought we would try to develop such a statement. The Implementation Committee devoted a significant amount of time and effort to craft such a statement. We got input from the President, the Provost, ECAC, other colleagues, and we ask that the Academic Council adopt this statement as a proactive affirmation of our commitment to excellence, diversity, and inclusion. I'll take comments and questions.

**Brigit Carter (School of Nursing):** I just thought it was extremely well written. I thought it was very inclusive and encompassing of what we would expect to reflect what our community's commitment is to diversity and inclusion. When I read it, I felt that, to try to get as much in their as you could, I thought it was very well done. Thank you.

**Klein:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Amen! (applause)

**Klein:** Feel free to email me or the Academic Council if you have other comments or suggestions.

**Jokerst:** Thank you, Emily. Having been an ex officio member of this committee, I can say that this committee worked long and hard to craft this statement. Thank you for the comment about the wording because many hours went into crafting this statement and the committee is to be commended for their work.

**ENDORSEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S STATEMENT REGARDING HB2**

**Jokerst:** Our next agenda topic is a motion for Academic Council to endorse the statement made by the Duke upper administration regarding North Carolina

House Bill 2, also known as HB2, which is shown on this slide. We have 15 minutes for a discussion and 5 min for a vote on this agenda item. There has been a request by a Council member for a paper ballot on this item, so we will be distributing a paper ballot. This was included with your materials before the meeting, but I'm not good at remembering what I've read when I'm sitting in a meeting, so I thought I would put it on the slide.

The floor is now open for discussion.

**Klein:** I'll just say that we were so happy to see this statement come out and many faculty have been a part of a grassroots movement among many schools, starting with the Law School, I think, where the faculty at the Law School developed their own statements, signed on to it, and have sent their signatures. I happened to get copied on it, Divinity was copied on it, we started our own, it's kind of a grassroots movement that has happened and it's been a wonderful thing. DGHI grabbed on too, you got it from me, et cetera.

**Alex Rosenberg (Philosophy):** Is it to be understood that this motion explicitly focuses on the component of HB2 that regards the LGBTQ community as opposed to other components of this unfortunate piece of legislation that restricts the ability of the people to sue in state court regarding discriminatory practices?

**Klein:** Well, the last line says, "We urge a *full* repeal..."

**Jokerst:** Frankly, ECAC wanted to move something forward to the faculty because there has been a groundswell. Law, and I believe Nicholas School, have slightly

different statements that they have generated, but we felt that the statement here urging a full repeal of HB2 was representative of the motion that members of ECAC wanted to make to the Academic Council. Regarding content, I don't feel comfortable stipulating what the thoughts of all the ECAC members were.

**Sara Beale (Law School):** I was just going to observe that when I read it, I found in paragraph two, when it refers to laws that protect members of the LGBTQ+ and others from discrimination, that included, for example, the elimination of rights for people covered under present law to bring suit to state courts. So you could write things differently, but I think that it's fairly clear.

**Amy Laura Hall (Divinity):** Could you just add those words you just said? If you elaborate on that...

**Thea Portier-Young (Divinity):** The end of that sentence also addresses the prohibition of municipalities setting minimum wages, and so on. So I take that paragraph to be addressing the full content of the bill. I hear Amy Laura asking if we could be more explicit about the content of the bill itself, which may go into a preamble to this statement.

**Jokerst:** We could work on this more, and bring it to you in May, but ECAC did want to bring something in a timely manner to the Council. So we could take friendly amendments, but we will have a limited time to discuss this today.

**Jolie Olcott (History):** I actually think there's a virtue in having it like this. If we try to get into every detail of this law, I think the generality of the wording

encompasses enough of what we're trying to do and the timeliness is probably more important. The law is deplorable in every aspect and I think that is conveyed in this. I would just get it out there as widely and quickly as possible.

**Rosenberg:** I agree with all of those comments and my main purpose in raising this question was merely to put it on the table whether it is explicitly understood by the Academic Council that these features of the law are incorporated in our condemnation.

**Jokerst:** Yes, and that will go into the minutes, as well as the rest of the conversation.

**Beale:** I was just going to observe that, if you have a broad, general statement like that, it's pretty clear that it's general and it picks up everything. If we added two or three things in to highlight them, the danger would be that it would be read as exclusive. We might unintentionally leave out something that we wanted to include. I would tend to think that we're better off with this strong but general statement.

**Rochelle Schwartz-Bloom (Pharmacology and Cancer Biology):** I think this reflects what's happening in the general media with everything. The entire bill gets lost because the letters LGBTQ+ stand out just from a text point of view. One way to deal with it simply, without changing anything, would be to just put in bold "LGBTQ+ community and others."

**Kerry Haynie (Political Science and African & African American Studies / Member of ECAC):** I thought the motion was to endorse this, not change the statement...

**Jokerst:** Yes, so the motion is to endorse this statement. So when I ask for a second, we will have an opportunity for friendly amendments.

**Aaron Franklin (Electrical and Computer Engineering):** For someone who is relatively new to the university community, can someone help me understand the typical role Duke has played in the past with respect to making sweeping statements on a political topic as an institution? Is this a common practice where the statement is made and it's motioned through our subset of the faculty and then published as if it represents the university as a whole? Does that make sense? Is this a common practice?

**Brodhead:** It is not at all a common practice for the university to issue sweeping statements. The university never takes positions on specifically partisan matters. The university does not endorse candidates and the President of the university does not endorse candidates. The only thing about the law that was passed is that it was so sweeping and cut so fundamentally at things that are actually values of this community that we have a stake in it, not only as citizens, but specifically as people who are trying to recruit faculty and trying to get people to come to conferences here. It is not a joke that there are people who have reconsidered when they saw this law. It's a new fact when deciding whether or not to come to Duke to college or graduate school. The law, you'll remember, the caricature of which is that it's a bathroom law, not that that in and of itself is not a serious issue, the law was extraordinarily sweeping in trying to sweep up all kinds of things and make the broadest de-legitimization of protection you possibly

can. It's not like this is our view on a tariff bill or something. This is our community standard being involved in this and that is why we would make the rare exception for this case.

**Jokerst:** Thank you, Dick. Members of ECAC are bringing this motion to the Council. Do we have a second for that motion?

*(Second)*

A paper ballot has been requested by a Council member for this vote. The paper ballots will be handed out now. If you are an elected member of Academic Council for this year, please raise your hand for a ballot and pass these to the end of the row to be collected and counted. We will announce the results of the vote later in this meeting.

### ***MOTION FROM KARLA HOLLOWAY AND DISCUSSION***

**Jokerst:** Our next agenda topic is a motion made by our colleague Karla Holloway, which is shown on this slide.

Karla is unexpectedly unable to attend our meeting today due to illness. However, our ECAC colleague Kerry Haynie has talked with Karla, and will address questions about the motion in Karla's absence. You received this with my email message to the Academic Council. Here is the prelude to the motion, and this is the motion itself (refers to slide).

I will moderate the conversation today. We have 25 minutes for discussion and 5 minutes for a vote on this agenda item. The floor is now open for discussion.

**Jim Cox (Law School):** I was puzzled by a number of features of this resolution. I come to this from a standpoint of an area of organization law. My understanding is that we don't really have a representative on the committee. ECAC, which I've served on in the past, makes nominations to individuals, from which I believe the President selects who will be on the committees. So we don't really have a representative form of government on the trustees. That's the first thing. The second thing I was struck by from an organizational standpoint is that, first of all, it's hard for us to be voting on something that I think could be potentially as profound as this without some supporting documents. For example, it's making reference to things that were in the Chronicle. I'm not sure exactly which issue of the Chronicle, and which dimensions of that. Are we talking about the ongoing litigation, which, I take it, would not be the case, because it's all tied up in litigation. You're not asking us to show any disapproval of the court system which some of this litigation is being worked through. It also is entangled with all kinds of issues with attorney-client privilege. For this, we're looking at organization issues in which, are you asking us to say we distrust Kyle Cavanaugh and those who report to Kyle Cavanaugh who may have carried out an inspection here of the safety officer? Or President Brodhead? It's not clear to me what the unease is here. It's quite open ended, it strikes me. It's without any sort of foundational documents to help me react to this as to what's appropriate. You're asking a large body that's time constrained here to make a decision on something like this. I think the appropriate thing would then be to have some discussion about what we think the issues might be. I'm not clear about what

that would be. Then ECAC could, over meetings or otherwise, like we've done in the past, figure out whether there's something here. But at the same time, I think there is nothing here that raises the level to suggest that we should have some level of disapproval of the administration's ability to clean its own stable. We think the stable needs to be cleaned. So that's the word "independent" that comes up. What makes us believe there is evidence here that we've had anything other than an independent investigation of whatever is at the heart of this? I don't know what's at the heart of this. So there's ambiguity here which I believe deserves us to say it's an ill-drafted proposal that remains inchoate. We cannot react to it.

**Jokerst:** Kerry, do you want to react to that on behalf of Karla?

**Haynie:** My understanding of Karla's intent with the motion based on conversations with her is that there is no process for such an investigation when there's a senior level administrator in the kinds of situations we've read about in the Chronicle. Is there a process that's transparent that we know the outcome of that investigation? It's calling for a procedure in which there's an investigation. I think Karla was motivated also by the fact that, if the police report conducted an investigation of its own cost, that was part of the question.

**Roxanne Springer (Physics):** I was a member of two of the subcommittees of the Diversity Task Force. As you know, that was focused on faculty rather than broader, but we did have the opportunity to interview a number of leaders and investigated the structure and it became apparent to us that, and this is not unique

to Duke, when you ask an institution to investigate itself, it is highly motivated to find itself innocent. What we saw is that the same kinds of potential flaws that the faculty bodies experience is mirrored in what the non-faculty staff experience. So I take this request of Karla's that we actually support an investigation on appropriate procedures. That will help answer your question about policy and structure.

**Richard Schmalbeck (Law School):**

Obviously it comes up from time to time that a senior officer may be involved in an event of this sort and there are procedures in place for recusal of that person. I echo Jim's comments. We have no basis to think that that's been ineffective or produced a bad outcome. We're basing this primarily on articles in the Chronicle. I read those articles and one of the things I noticed about them is that the complaining witnesses were pretty vocal and well-represented in those stories; the university and the individuals who are accused were not very well represented because they didn't want to offer comment. You can hold that against them, I guess, but any defense lawyer will tell a defendant that it is generally unwise to offer a lot of public commentary about your position. It can sometimes create difficulties and rarely helps. These are also personnel matters. It seems to me that this is unmistakably a vote of no confidence in our administration and procedures. I can imagine coming to the conclusion that I did not have confidence at some point, but I'm certainly not even close to that yet. We need to let this play out a bit. There will be depositions taken where credibility of witnesses will be examined, we'll know more. I think it's hasty to try to make this motion now. I actually think

that the appropriate outcome here is not to vote down the motion, necessarily. I think that better would be to table the motion. Because further facts will come out, and there's nothing really to be gained by haste in approving what amounts to a vote of no confidence. I don't want to offer at this point a motion to table, because I don't want to cut off debate, and a motion to table must be voted on immediately without debate. But when you're tired of hearing the debate (laughter).

**Haynie:** I'm pretty confident that Karla's position is not that we have an investigation of the details of the case, that we go and talk to witnesses. That's not her intent. I think this is a situation where there is an admission of some contact of the car, and what happens in those situations where there are allegations. I think that, and I'm quoting the News and Observer, that Duke is no longer party to the civil matter.

**Harvey Cohen (Clinical Sciences):** I would support the idea of tabling this, but would also react to the first speaker's comment about the vagueness of this. Tabling is one thing. I think this needs to be tabled and reassessed. Someone mentioned that what the purpose of this was to try to get a handle on what the procedures are. Well, that isn't said anywhere. If that's the goal, that ought to say that. I think that this motion, as it stands, is too vague. I don't understand what would happen as a result of this. What does "independent" mean? How independent? Who does it? Who is going to bring this forward to us? And then the issue of whether we really have representatives. I just think this is so vague that it's hard to react to it. I would favor tabling it and suggesting some edits.

**Haynie:** So Karla mentioned the Bowen-Chambers committee that the university brought in at the end of the lacrosse matter to look at the administration's handling of that matter as a model of what she intended.

**Brodhead:** At some point, and without any prejudice to this group's ability to decide however it wants, I do want to ask you to remember that at the March meeting, Karla raised this question before I had a chance to make remarks, which she then found very interesting when I made them. You'll remember that I told you at some length about the review process that had been put in place at that point. I explained to you how the police investigation had not, in fact, been ordered up the line through Kyle Cavanaugh through Tallman Trask, but would have reported out to the district attorney, had a case been brought forward. I explained to you about the OIE investigation, which investigated everyone who had been identified as a witness and they did not find evidence for one of the complaints. So it's not as if there is not process here. The other thing I would say to you is, I don't think even a faithful reader of the Chronicle would understand that there might be more to these stories more versions of these stories or more disputed facts of the stories and to decide a resolution on the basis of the simple truth of those facts would seem to me a problematic activity. The main thing I want to say, though, is you remember that on April sixth, I sent out a notice at the time of the occupation of the Allen Building. What I tried to do then was to lift the matter off the particular allegations about what people did or didn't, especially since those things are involved in court cases, how can this university get mixed up in those things

without jeopardizing or becoming involuntary party to the legal bases. So to bring it to some level of generality where they could be properly addressed. I will read to you something that has the full faith and credit of the President behind it. "While Duke has been frequently recognized as a leader of employee benefits and satisfaction," which is true, "the recent student protest is consistent with our own commitment to continually review and improve our workplace culture. I am writing to inform you that we will take the following steps to address issues of respect, civility, wages, and inclusiveness for staff. One, engage a recognized and independent expert to review the grievance and complaint procedures for Duke staff in order to assess their fairness and effectiveness." You will understand, there has been a student process and a faculty process. It's a structure and assessment of whether we have anything or whether we can do better. Second, Review the guidelines for contractors and their employees to ensure they reflect Duke's core values of civility, fairness and respect. Third, raise awareness of processes for the recruitment and review of senior administrators. Finally, initiate the process to further raise the Duke minimum wage of \$12.00 an hour." You remember that Duke was almost the first major employer in the state to offer such a wage. I would just ask you to keep in mind that there's some way in which issues that I understand the passion of when this comment was made on the 24<sup>th</sup> of March, there are things that have happened between then and now that constitute a formal address to it.

**Trina Jones (Law School):** With all due respect to my colleagues and friends in the Law School, I don't see this motion as

a vote of no confidence in the administration. I don't think we can prejudge any conclusion that an independent review might reach. I also think that the purpose behind this motion, as I understand it, was to underscore that the faculty are concerned about what happens to staff on this campus. I think that in terms of looking for documentary support, the fact that President Brodhead, you issued that statement on April 6<sup>th</sup> in response to student concerns, shows that even you think there is a reason to actually review the structures that are in place to look at.

**Brodhead:** I completely do believe it.

**Jones:** But I think it's important that we don't miss that the faculty are saying that it's important to us and that's what's animating this motion. One further thing I want to also speak to what Roxanne Springer said with regards to the Diversity Task Force. Our focus was on faculty and faculty concerns, but we did hear a number of concerns being raised by staff. We didn't have time to thoroughly investigate those concerns. Those concerns went to the adequacy of procedures that we have in place to hear from staff their concerns about their treatment at Duke University. So I think a number of us have been saying through the year that we should initiate some review of what is happening to this important constituent group on our campus. I see that as the primary impetus behind this motion, whether it passes or fails, I hope that university leaders, including ourselves, will acknowledge that this is an important constituent group and that we do need to be careful and attentive to their needs.

**Beale:** I would just observe that I heard

people say that the motion was about very different things. Was it about senior leadership and the processes when accusations are made? Was it about more general staff members? All the motion itself says is “the matters brought forth in the Chronicle” which clearly included a lot of different things. I would not be comfortable voting on this. And we know that things have happened since that time. An independent review of some of those things has already been announced by the President as an independent review of the process, which is the other thing that Roxanne mentioned. Is there a process in place? I would hope that if there’s a desire for the faculty to affirm something, that ECAC would bring forth a substitute more narrow and specific motion that I could then happily support because I understand that there’s some voice to be added on some more specific point. I think this is way too unclear and not updated for me to feel comfortable supporting.

**Cox:** I want to thank Trina for reminding me of the parable of the blind men and the elephant. I think we can all find in this what we want to find, my initial point. I join Sara in thinking that the real resolution here is a motion to table so that we can have ECAC formulate a more pointed one, perhaps consistent with what Trina was saying, but also take into consideration what the university is already doing. Maybe it leads to nothing, maybe it leads to something. But this proposal is ill-conceived, ill-drafted, opaque, and therefore I’m going to make a motion to table.

**Jokerst:** There is a motion to table the question. Is there a second?

**Speaker:** Second

**Jokerst:** I’m not in the Law School so I have literally, as an engineer, identified every possibility that could happen here (laughter). This is the nervous engineer with Robert’s Rules. I want to thank our Law School faculty, especially Trina and Rich and Sara for helping me to wade through Robert’s Rules. So we’ve had a motion and a second to table the question. All in favor of tabling the question say Aye.

*(Motion tabled by voice vote without dissent)*

**Mary McClintock-Fulkerson (Divinity School):** What are the negatives of the delay? That was mentioned earlier. I mean, we’ve already decided to delay it.

**Jokerst:** My understanding of Robert’s Rules is that once a motion has been made to table, we have to go to a second and to a vote. Tabling does not mean that the motion has been defeated or dismissed, but I think that we’re going to continue to work on this.

**Schmalbeck:** I’m bearing a copy of Robert’s Rules (laughter). What this means is, simply, it is deferred indefinitely. It can be taken off the table by a vote of a majority of the body at any time. But I think, given the nature of the concerns raised, this particular motion might never come up again, but efforts along the same line with the same motivation will be addressed.

**Jokerst:** I guarantee that in the fall we will have discussions about inclusion and community at Duke. ECAC has already stipulated that as a topic for next year.

**Speaker:** But there was actually a somewhat more specific component to

the motion which had to do with requesting ECAC to reformulate this.

**Jokerst:** We can entertain a motion to instruct ECAC...

**Speaker:** I move that ECAC reformulate this motion to be more specific about what is being requested.

**Speaker:** Second

**Jokerst:** We have a motion and a second. We have negative two minutes for discussion (laughter).

**Beale:** That was something I suggested. I would not have made that specific motion. I would have asked ECAC to look at these issues and determine whether there was a motion that it could bring forward to this body.

**Speaker:** I like that motion better (laughter).

**Jokerst:** Do you accept the friendly amendment?

**Speaker:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Second

**Jokerst:** Okay so we have a motion for a friendly amendment. All in favor of the motion, with the friendly amendment, say aye.

*(Motion with friendly amendment approved by voice vote without dissent)*

I'm proud of this body for dealing, in time, with this motion.

**Springer:** I don't know if this is appropriate, but, Jim Cox has spoken

about Karla Holloway proposing a motion that was incoherent and inchoate. She's not here and I want to remind people that she is an English professor, someone who writes using persuasion and is probably not familiar with the legalese.

**Speaker:** She's actually secondary in Law (laughter).

**Jokerst:** With that, I'm going to keep us on schedule and move on and I want to thank everyone for your contribution to this discussion. It's an important general discussion for us to have.

### ***RESULTS OF THE VOTE ON THE HB2 MOTION***

**Jokerst:** I'd like to announce the results of the HB2 motion for ECAC to endorse the statement of the upper administration. It passed with 57 yes, 2 no, and zero abstaining.

### ***PROPOSED NEW MASTER'S DEGREE IN QUANTITATIVE MANAGEMENT FROM THE FUQUA SCHOOL OF BUSINESS***

**Jokerst:** Our next agenda item is a proposal for a new Master's degree in Quantitative Management from the Fuqua School. I spoke to Jennifer before the meeting and she said she wanted to get a sense of the room before she came up here (laughter). We will vote on this proposal at our May Council meeting.

Before we move to this item, I would like to share with you that the results of the Master's Implementation Committee will be presented at our May Council meeting. My ECAC colleagues and I did not want to delay the presentation and vote of this Master's in Quantitative Management for the Master's Implementation Committee

presentation for two reasons. First, the main degrees offered by the Fuqua School are Master's degrees, and not undergraduate or PhD degrees, and this obviates some of the general concerns about Master's programs that have arisen in other schools. Secondly, the Fuqua School does modify or retire its Master's degrees regularly, and so the general concern regarding the proliferation of Master's degrees without commensurate contraction of some degrees is also less prominent in this case. Thus, ECAC approved of the presentation of this Master's degree before the Master's Report at our May meeting.

With that, I would like to now call Bill Boulding, Dean of the Fuqua School of Business, and Jennifer Francis, Senior Associate Dean of Fuqua, to present the proposal for a Master's degree in Quantitative Management.

**Bill Boulding (Dean, Fuqua School of Business):** I'm going to quickly get out of the way and let Jennifer take over. Jennifer is the person who has worked with our faculty in developing this proposal and shepherding the proposal through the process. Let me just say a few quick things about why we're here. We fundamentally believe that this program is a great fit on the following dimensions. Number one, it's a great fit with the intellectual interests and capability of our faculty. Our faculty have a great deal of quantitative sophistication. That sophistication typically does not have an outlet in the MBA classroom to the degree which our faculty feel they could express themselves. This program gives them that opportunity. So it's a great fit in that regard. The second thing is that it's a fit with our overall portfolio of programs. What we're doing is creating an entry

point for someone moving into the business community who's going to be working in the data analytics area, but they will have the same potential for assuming leadership roles as someone who takes a different entry point. So it's not inconsistent with our overall goal to produce business leaders and people who will manage and lead organizations. Then the third thing is it fits with the market. There is clear demand for this kind of Master's degree. What we've seen is that the other programs that are out there fall short in the following sense. They're producing people with great data science capabilities, but they don't have the context of business, which helps them understand what to look for, and when they found something, they do not necessarily give them the communication skills so they can work within the organization to communicate with people to help express the ideas and the insights they've found.

**Jennifer Francis (Senior Associate Dean, Fuqua School of Business):** Thank you. Bill told you all the really good stuff really quickly (laughter). For any program that we want to try to think about starting at Fuqua, we try to think about all the objectives we want to meet. This has a lot of objectives to it and we worked through each one to see if we were going to meet those objectives, how strongly we were, and if we weren't, where the weaknesses were going to be. Bill mentioned those in a summary and I assume everyone has had a copy of this report to read through, so I'll be quick. We did a pretty intensive market analysis, as you might imagine, with the Fuqua School. We kind of know what we're doing there. We have no desire to propose a new program that is not going to be met with demand, not only by the student side, but we have a

really sharp focus on the recruitment side, so that's very important to us. We did a pretty extensive analysis of the programs that are out there and they basically break down into two types. Those that are much more deeply technical, and those that are more applied. Deeply technical programs tend to be in departments of computer science, statistics, math, et cetera, and that is definitely not what we are doing. We are more on the applied side. Those programs tend to be in a variety of places. We identified about 40 of which that were in business schools. I will say that, at the time we drafted this proposal, none of those business schools were what we consider to be our direct peers, but about three weeks ago one of our direct peers, MIT, announced a program coming out of the Sloan School. We think this is actually a wonderful opportunity for us. It's very innovative, would really push our innovation at Fuqua, as Bill mentioned, is a very strong fit with our interests. There are some related programs at Duke and this question has come up from a number of different committees that we have been through. Most of those programs, in fact, all of those programs, are much more on the deeply technical side or are combinations, either of economics and math or economics and statistics, that are focusing on a very different route from the route that we are looking at, which is to appeal directly to the business community. Bill mentioned something which we think is really important because we have vetted, if you will, the structure and the ideas behind this proposal with a number of different audiences, including people who are in industry, including our Board of Visitors, et cetera. These three pieces are really critical. What we learned is that this program depends on three really solid

pieces of the stool to be leaning on. One of those is, it must be able to articulate to students and help students understand the data analytic capacities that we need. Second, it must help them understand the functional business knowledge that they will need, whether that be in marketing, or logistics and supply chain. Third, which we do not want to forget because it's very important, we must help these students develop very good communication, collaboration, and critical thinking skills. All three of those skill sets are going to be essential for the kind of person we graduate to be able to work in an environment where they can help understand the deep analytics, but also explain that to others in the organization who they are working with and understand that functional domain that they're in. Each of these domains has become very rich in recent years with the rise of interest in data science. Our target job opportunities are for entry level analysts in these different organizations. I'll come back to this later, but when we have talked to our recruiters who are recruiting some of our MBA and MMS students, obviously not for the same positions, and talked to our Board of Visitors, we got incredibly enthusiastic response to the demand out there for this type of a graduate, if you will. What does our program do? It is a curriculum that is built on all three pillars. It is a one year, and I put a little plus there, for the possibility of an optional certificate in research, which might allow the student to extend their program by a semester. I can come back and describe that. We don't anticipate very many students going through that path. It might be for a student who decides they have an interest in pursuing a PhD, or possibly a student who needs to do an internship over the summer for that work. The large part of

the program will be a one year program beginning in the summer, July, and graduating in May, having the common theme of data analytics, a common theme of communication and critical thinking skills, and students will also choose a track that is the functional track that they want to go in. As you'll see in the next slide, we've identified four tracks that students might want to go in. Our target audience are STEM undergraduates. We believe this program is going to require students with fairly strong quantitative backgrounds to do this and we think STEM undergraduates represent that. Very likely we're going to be targeting this to people who have about zero to three years' work experience, or what we would call pre-experience. The coursework, as I said, consists of a number of items. The data analytics, the communications, whatever business discipline in their track, and then, as you're going to see, we're going to be able to allow the students to choose an elective from other tracks. This is the general way this looks. Each of the tracks is in a color. There is a track-specific course associated with that particular track. There is a general data analytics or data science course. There is a general communication course. Then there's the possibility to choose an elective. That's pretty much how each term in this curriculum will run. By the way, at Fuqua, we run our classes on six week mini terms, two of which fit into each semester. So a student does this in a summer term, what we call Fall 1, Fall 2, Spring 1, and Spring 2. The whole thing together looks like this. For example, if you were interested in going into the field of marketing and data analytics, which is an enormous area right now because of all the data one can gather about marketing and consumer preferences, you would apply to the pink track and these

are the courses that you would take. You'll notice that in each one, there is a yellow elective, and at that time the student could take fixed income, product management, or information security. So they get to choose from other ones that are offered. This gives us a very nice structure which is not too highly leveled. It's actually very risk-reducing for that reason. That's the idea. There are communications classes, classes on presentation skills, culminating in a team project. One of the other things that we've heard from recruiters out there is that these students really need to know how to work in a team. So we're actually very good at that at Fuqua. That's something we teach our MBA students very rigorously, and we're going to bring that same set of skills to this program. Why this structure? As I noted a little bit earlier, there are some common courses and track-specific. Common courses allow us some leverage points, which, as I said, are risk-reducing and also financially more risk-reducing on that side as well. We want to have tracks because these students coming into this program are very likely to start recruiting in early fall. They need a way to signal to the recruiters what their interests are going to be and a track allows them to signal what their plans are as opposed to just taking a bunch of electives. Why these four tracks? We've chosen finance, marketing, general business analytics and forensics, based on our study of what is out there and these are of the industries and companies that are doing this. We think we have picked the right tracks, but if we haven't, we will understand what that will be and the response will be dynamic as we go forward. We are also planning to spend a lot of time having our faculty talk with companies and members of the industry to really understand the

nature of the coursework that needs to be taught here. We've gotten a lot of interest from companies to be involved and to participate. I think our faculty are very excited. Our financial model, I'll show you a forecast or a budget coming up. Our financial model assumes the fairly high tuition of \$65,000. That is, in part, because MIT announced a tuition of \$75,000 for their program (laughter), which will begin in the fall. The closest competitor after MIT would be NYU, whose program began a year ago and they have a tuition of \$68,750. We want our program to be positioned within a peer group, and so it seemed appropriate that this be the position that we are in. All of the programs that we think of as peers, whether it's MIT, NYU, University of Texas in Austin, and University of Southern California, those are the four that would be closest to us, have only begun in the last one to two years. These are very new programs and they're very exciting to see what's being done. I will tell you that ours is unique in having these three different pillars. Most of the other ones don't have the strength on that communications or critical thinking at all. If you put all of our assumptions together, if we were to get 50 students in the first year, we would be looking at a loss at the Fuqua School of a little bit less than \$500,000. That's not too bad for a start up in the first year. But obviously, we'd rather not have 50 students. We'd actually like to have 57 students. 57 students, assuming all of our costs and revenues, we would break even at 57 students. We think we've been fairly conservative about the budgeting for this program because I'll also note that, as part of our assumptions over here, we assume that this program was completely standalone. By that, I mean we assume that there would be no sharing of resources that might be available, for

example, in our Admissions or Career Services at Fuqua. We assume there would be no sharing of courses. So everything in here is assumed to be built from the ground up. If we need to hire more career counselors, we've embedded the cost of that. So I think, if anything, this is probably a conservative budget, not an overly-optimistic one. Lastly, let me come back to something. We thought of this and said, have we met this objective? We think the answers are as follows. We think we've got a yes on all of these. Our one concern, which we've gathered a little bit of data on, is, might we possibly cannibalize some of our current MMS program, which is a pre-experience Master's program as well? But it is not data analytics-focused. It's a much more general program. We think the answer is probably not. The reason for that is, that program has now been in existence for six years and we asked our career management center to go back and identify how many positions students from that program take over the past five or six years that looked anything like these jobs. They said maybe four. So that's four students over five or six years. That program has about 130 students in each year. So I don't think there's going to be much cannibalization with respect to that program. Let me touch on the last point and it's something that, Nan, you brought up. We know that there are questions about other Master's programs at Duke. I just want to reiterate what Nan said. We understand there are questions whether there are too many or too few. Master's programs are our livelihood at Fuqua. That's all we do. As Nan also said, we have been sensitive and very good stewards of that ability to bring programs forth. We bring them forth and we kill them and we will kill them as necessary. Just as evidence of that, just in my time, I can

recall that we no longer have an evening MBA program at the Fuqua School. That was sunsetted a number of years ago. We also no longer have a program with Duke-Goethe. We stopped that program a number of years ago. You'll recall we also have basically worked with the School of Medicine when we realized that the Master of Management Clinical Informatics was not really a good fit for our portfolio. That program has moved to the School of Medicine. So those are just three that I can recall. We revisit our programs, by the way, periodically, to determine whether we should consider sunseting the programs for that purpose. Finally, we think it meets all the objectives and we think it makes Fuqua stronger.

**Robert Wolpert (Statistics):** How many new faculty will be involved?

**Boulding:** This is the typical way we do things given that we're totally dependent on these programs to keep the school's lights on and the faculty paid: we don't add to the faculty until we're convinced that the program is sustainable. So for now, we've told our faculty that we're not adding to faculty hiring, but over time, as we show that it is sustainable, we'll begin to hire faculty.

**Wolpert:** Teaching in your spare time, then?

**Francis:** You might ask where we're going to teach this right now. Our programs at Fuqua are taught with an extraordinarily high percentage of tenure-track faculty, relative to our peers. Our peers' classes are taught at around 65-70% tenure-track faculty. Ours are well over 90%, so we have ample scope. For some of these courses, we would

want to bring in people with more industry-relevant experience for that. Our faculty are keen to do this. So we can redeploy faculty across a number of programs. So it's not the sense that we're going to have to staff all of this with people who are not part of our faculty, but create a better mix. Does that make sense?

**Wolpert:** I still don't understand. You're offering new courses to 100 new students. I assume you need new resources and faculty.

**Boulding:** It's a mix of the tenure-track faculty teaching overloads for a short period of time, but also bringing in non-tenure track faculty out of industry settings and so on, to change the mix of faculty. So we don't have to make long term promises or commitments to those faculty at the start, and then we can make decisions once we see the success of the program.

**Prasad Kasibhatla (Nicholas School of the Environment):** I was interested in your philosophy of the choice of tracks, the choice seemed to be MBA-type tracks, as opposed to a different model where the tracks might be something like healthcare or energy or sports management. I just wonder whether you've considered that and why you chose this particular type of track?

**Francis:** Absolutely. That's a very good question. I'd like to comment that there were a number of faculty who were involved in thinking about all these pieces. We did think about some of these industry tracks that you've mentioned and when we thought about those, we were also trying to think about a number of tracks that we felt comfortable working

with. When we talked and thought about the potential opportunities in the career side for folks, they were coming up much more as being functionally related as opposed to being industry related, notwithstanding the huge rise and increase in healthcare. We also felt that our strengths, particularly in our current faculty, lie more with these tracks and we wanted to use those to sort of get ourselves started.

**Boulding:** Another version of that is, if you say you're going to offer the healthcare track or the energy track, not only do you have to give the business context in terms of the functional capability, but you have to give the business context in terms of the industry setting. There's no question that in the health space, there are lots of people who would like to hire graduates out of these programs who are interested in data monitoring and predictive analytics, consumer behavior, and so on, but they'll find the students without being labeled as a health program.

**Darrell Miller (Law School):** Can you speak to the application process? Is the idea that you're going to have a separate application process and a separate set of metrics for the intake for this program as opposed to the MBA? Are you going to have people who apply to both and then choose based on a unified set of metrics?

**Francis:** Separate application process, completely separate from our MMS program as well.

**Kathy Andolsek (School of Medicine):** Two resources I'm curious about are space and career advising, which I see would be important with the number of students. The other question I have is the

percent scholarship support, particularly for students who do not have means.

**Francis:** First of all, space. The Thomas Center, which we are close to and we use, will be opening in February 2017 and will provide two more classrooms that we'll be able to use. So physical space at the Fuqua School will not be an issue. You also mentioned the career advising. We understand career advising will be very important. We plan to do all the Career Services work at Fuqua. The budget embeds the increased cost of having counselors and other folks to do that and to be connecting with recruiters. Some of those recruiters are part of our current network and some of them are different. So we have resources there.

**Boulding:** What we've learned on the career side is that we have different career counselors for our daytime MBA versus executive MBA. We'll have a different group for the MMS students and we'll have yet another group for the MQM. Because they'll have to know the industry and the functionality requirements so they need specific capabilities.

**Francis:** In terms of the scholarship support, we had originally budgeted around 15% of total tuition for that. When we thought about increasing the tuition, we moved that number up to 18%, and that's embedded in the budget forecast that you saw before. If we need to go higher for that purpose, we will.

**Andrew Janiak (Philosophy):** I do mourn the loss of Duke-Goethe because I think business will be less poetic (laughter). I do have a question about your budget model because it went by very fast. I thought you said that you built in the assumption, which seems to be

incredibly conservative, that you're not using any existing staff and you do that for every program.

**Francis:** For any new program.

**Janiak:** Presumably, the budget will look better because there will be some sharing of resources, staff, counselors, career advice, et cetera.

**Boulding:** We will have to add people to Admissions, Career Services, but because we have an existing infrastructure, you don't have to build it from the ground up. So it is conservative in that regard. But one thing that we felt was very important is that the classes will be independent. That won't change. The classes will be just for the MQM students as opposed to blending in the MBA together.

**Francis:** One of the things we're most excited about for our MBA audience is that we do think that at some point there's going to be spillover in the sense of creating more courses and ideas in data science that would be of much interest to our MBA students. But as we start this process, we'd rather not have a tremendous amount of blending.

**Boulding:** We want to learn where the opportunities are to combine.

**Rosenberg:** SSRI contemplates a Master's in data science in the relatively near future and we'll be bringing it up to the process for approval and I wonder how open this program will be to synergies with the resources that are already available in SSRI regarding data sciences, which are considerable, and which we certainly do not want to see duplication.

**Francis:** The question is about a program that I believe is not yet at this point, but

will probably come to Academic Council sometime in the fall. We've been in contact with both Tom Nechyba and Robert Calderbank about it. We think the programs are highly complementary. Our program is obviously much more business- and applied-focused. Theirs is more on the Social Sciences side.

**Rosenberg:** I was concerned that it sounded as though you might be sealing this off, at least initially.

**Boulding:** It's my mistake that when I talked about the intellectual fit, I failed to mention the intellectual fit with the university as a whole. This is a space that the university has a great deal of interest in creating more of a reputation and presence and the way we'll do that is by working well with each other. We very much have been in touch with our partners over there and they're supportive of this program.

**Francis:** We've also spoken with Engineering and some other parts of the university as well.

**Springer:** I think when Josh Socolar was chair, we started this process of figuring out if the discussion of Master's programs could be fit into some larger plan and we had a report from the Dean of the Graduate School, Paula McClain about the impact of some of these new Master's programs on their resources. Can you speak to that?

**Francis:** Nan was referring to that before, to the final report.

**Sally Kornbluth (Provost):** I've just seen a bit of the draft. They're delivering the report from that committee soon. I think the points that Nan spoke to at the

beginning are of less concern for programs in Fuqua because of the nature of the resources they are needed to serve the program. I think a lot of the things in the report from the Graduate School had to do with common services, Career Services, et cetera, that might be overburdened. We'll be talking to that much more. Nan and I talked about this beforehand and felt that, given the nature of this program and the extensive work that was done to make sure that there were not duplicative courses or competitive offerings, plus, I think the market research and the conservative budget in terms of the adequacy of the proposal, I think we all felt that this was sufficiently freestanding and not concerning. So it was okay to consider the discussion of the Master's general report at the next meeting and proceed with this.

**Boulding:** I want to reinforce that freestanding point. I do understand Paula's pain around the proliferation of Master's programs. This is not a program that's run through the Graduate School. It's run through the Business School. So all of those services that Paula is worried about providing do not apply to this situation. There are university-wide resources that do come into play, eventually, as the overall student population goes up. But overall, this is a freestanding effort, in large part.

**Jokerst:** With that, I will thank Jennifer and Bill for presenting today. We'll be voting on this at the May meeting and we'll also be hearing the output of the Master's Committee.

### ***PROPOSED NEW PhD IN COMPUTATIONAL MEDIA, ARTS & CULTURES***

**Jokerst:** I would like to now call on Professor Victoria Szabo, from the Art, Art History and Visual Studies department to present a proposed PhD in Computational Media, Arts & Cultures. We will also vote on this at our May meeting. And Deborah Jenson will also be joining Victoria.

**Victoria Szabo (Art, Art History and Visual Studies):** Hi everyone. I may look familiar to you all. I was here recently for our MA in Digital Art History and Computational Media. This is the PhD, the culmination of all our efforts in this area. I am joined here by Deborah Jenson from the Franklin Humanities Institute. I'll give you a brief overview of the program and then we'll be happy to entertain questions. I should also note that Mark Hansen from the Department of Literature is one of the co-sponsors of our project. The PhD that we're talking about is Computational Media, Arts & Cultures. The proposal is for a PhD focused on the intersection of media, arts, and humanities, sciences, and technology, both in theory and in practice. At the core of the proposal is the computational revolution and its implications for how we live, think, work, create, and communicate within and across the various disciplines. Being in the Humanities, I feel obliged to help pull out notes with citations from things that are coming in from our proposal, but the rest of it will not be like that. This is just to give you a sense of an overview of what we're trying to accomplish. The PhD is a collaboration. It's interdisciplinary and interdepartmental between Art, Art History and Visual Studies, the program in Literature, the Information Science and

Studies certificate program, and the Franklin Humanities Institute, and specifically, the Digital Humanities Initiative within that. It also has links to Bass Connections, the Information Initiative here and the Libraries in the form of Digital Scholarship and Data Visualization services. This project is part of a Mellon grant that we received several years ago to create a PhD in Media, Arts and Sciences, and it was building upon the Visual Studies Initiative that took place beginning in 2006 and then developed into a series of reforms for our undergraduate and graduate programs, including the development of the MFA in Experimental and Documentary Arts and the MA I mentioned earlier. I should mention that this PhD already exists in an informal form. Over the last several years as we've been trying to evolve the perfect form for this, we've had students coming in and working on it in the form of the Visual and Media Studies track in the department of Art, Art History and Visual Studies. We have seven students currently enrolled. Two have already graduated, one is a tenure-track professor, and the other is a post-doc in media studies-related areas. Right now, what we're anticipating, is that our small program will enroll three students over five years, so that means one student every other year, roughly, with the endowment income that we have and the matching funds from the Graduate School. Our hope, of course, is that we'll be able to expand, but really, right now, this is a small, interdepartmental experiment that is formalizing some of the work that we've been doing across various programs and departments. You may ask, when you hear this, we already have these students, why should we have a new program? For one thing, we wanted to have a place that is explicitly

addressing the computational term in the Humanities disciplines and finds a place where we can combine theory and practice in creation of new media. It's also going to be tailored to individuals who cross the art-science boundaries in their interests. It focuses both on theories of media and computation and on critically engaged practice. These are not typically things that are comfortable for most Humanities disciplines. We might study or understand new media or technology, but yet we still want formal, written, traditional work. We still expect and want that of our students, but we also want them to be engaging actively in computation and in programming and in the creation of media forms. We're also seeing this as developing a space for collaborative, interdisciplinary innovation in a way that brings together people from around campus who are interested in these topics. It's really what we call a new kind of work in the Humanities. Broadly related to Digital Humanities, a term you may have heard, but also encompassing media studies and science and technology studies. Who are the anticipated students? One type of student that we're already seeing in our program is MFAs who are interested in pursuing a PhD. They have the practice components, but they want to be able to theorize it more deeply, to engage with the scholarly opportunities at a place like Duke, and have the PhD credential so that they're more effective in the job market. We're also seeing computer science grads who are interested in the application of computer science taking these topics. So they're not so much, necessarily, interested in theoretical computer science, but in using computational tools to address a problem, topic, or idea. Also, as I mentioned earlier, the Digital Humanities constituency. Competitor

programs: We did a very extensive market analysis and we saw that there were different types of programs that we could consider competitors. One were the types that were primarily interested in media theory, another are the kinds that are mostly about media practice, so the creation of media objects, and the third would be information science programs. We identified some of the programs that would be most likely competitors for us as being the Rhetoric program at Berkeley, Comparative Culture and Media at Minnesota, Modern Culture and Media at Brown, and Media Arts and Practice at USC. Each of those does not have a dimension of what we do, which is this mixture of theory, media practice, and also information science and rigor and focus on computational production. What we see our differences being is that we have a broad and deep commitment to interdisciplinarity across units and schools and that it goes beyond the interdisciplinarity that we sometimes see amongst ourselves in the Humanities, which I love, but really trying to reach out to the broader community. In terms of the requirements for the PhD, what we're anticipating is that all of our students will have to take a team-taught seminar, intro to computational arts and cultures, which is a course that's very similar to that which is already being taught now, two practice-oriented classes, which could range from creative coding to 3D modeling, to statistics, depending upon the interests of the students, and then electives with our faculty. Practicum experiences that would take place in our interdisciplinary labs, either in the Smith Warehouse, in the Arts side over in the Franklin Humanities Institute, or potentially in Bass Connections projects. Then to focus on picking two languages, one traditional language, most likely

human language, and then another computational language, but that would be broadly defined based on the nature of the student's interests. Finally, there would be a hybrid theory-practice dissertation, meaning that really they do double the work, in the sense that they're creating a media object, a database, a system, but then also writing about it in a critically informed and engaged way. Some of the labs that we already have that are working within our zone within Smith Warehouse, and again this has been developed over the last several years through the Visual Studies Initiative, are the Complex Systems lab, Duke Art Law and Markets, Digital Archeology lab, the Emergence lab, which is focused on new media art, Information Science and Studies, who are really focusing on public Humanities and global computing, the Speculative Sensation lab, which thinks about taking media theory and then instantiating it through physical computing, the Wired! Lab for Digital Art History and Visual Culture, which is focused on cultural heritage, the Digital Humanities Initiative and the PhD lab, which is focused on the production of digital technology itself, and then, of course, as I mentioned, selected Bass Connections projects. This is the core, and this is where the faculty live who are part of this program. In terms of having a larger cohort, you may be thinking, one student every other year, and a few who are left over. That's not much of a cohort. But, we have a much wider community of people for them to be involved with. For one thing, we'll be culminated with the Art, Art History and Visual Studies PhD students who are currently there, including our seven PhD students who are still here with us. The CMAC graduate certificate students, this is another important feature of the program. I

mentioned information science and studies as being a core partner. We've had a graduate certificate for several years, but, as it turns out, it's all the same people who are the core faculty for this program and have the same interests. In the interest of consolidating and harmonizing and moving into the future, we want to align the existing certificate with the PhD, thereby also providing a cohort of students who are interested in Computational Media topics, but who are in English or History or Languages or some other area. In addition, we have our MA students in Digital Art History and Computational Media who will share some of the practice-based courses with the students. We have the MFA in Experimental and Documentary Arts, and then, again, the FHI and the relationships that these students can have with each other in the PhD Lab for Digital Knowledge as well as in other interdisciplinary lab projects on campus. Here are the core faculty. You can see here that many of them are in Art, Art History and Visual Studies and in Literature, but we also have people from other disciplines as well. The core faculty are making the commitment to teach to the primary course, the introductory seminar, and also to be advisors in the program and they're also committed to meeting regularly, doing admissions and being part of the regular team. The affiliated faculty are people who expressed interest in participating as committee members and being involved in the larger community as we develop co-curricular activities and such. The key supporters, I have to mention, I have wonderful letters from all these various people, and we hope that you choose to read them in your leisure time. For now, I'd like to ask if you have any questions.

**Wolpert:** A quick first impression: this is heavy on art and light on computing and science. Is that the intention or should we be concerned about that?

**Szabo:** Well, it's true, it's Computational Media. And I probably could have done a better job talking about the different types of computation taking place. What we're anticipating is that some students will be more interested in simulation and virtual reality, and in their application to cultural heritage in art would be learning about 3D modeling and coding for things like the DiVE.

**Wolpert:** And you have the resources in place at Duke?

**Szabo:** Right, we have them already. We have Regis Kopper, who is the head of Duke DiVE, as a faculty member here, as part of our core faculty. And he is going to teach a class this fall in interactive design for the DiVE. We have people who are interested in data sciences and beginning statistics, we can have them take courses, of course, within undergraduate classes. That's part of the requirements that students have the option to take these undergraduate courses. But then they can also go on and pursue additional studies. Then if they're interested in other types of more experimental computation, those are things that are happening in the labs that I mentioned earlier. So it isn't that they're going to get a really advanced credential on the computational side, it's more the computational inflection of the media. So it is fundamentally a Humanities program, but that adds dimension to it. We did have the debate over whether we should call it Digital Media, Arts, and Cultures, and decided to call it Computational because we wanted to acknowledge the history of media that

comes before the digital as a computational component to it. But also because we wanted to encourage algorithmic thinking in the way that people enacted the creation of their projects.

**Deborah Jenson (Director, Franklin Humanities Institute):** There's increasing interest in the theorization of computational Humanities from cognitive perspectives and a variety of others. People are interested in pattern recognition and basically trying to understand the qualitative and quantitative divide around campus.

**Lee Baker (Trinity College):** I want to applaud your efforts. This is a great example of interdisciplinarity. As someone who has a lot of experience managing interdisciplinary programs without departmental homes, is there sort of a strategy put in place where faculty are seriously committed to this, so that if the leadership and enthusiasm over five or six years wanes in one level, there is refreshing of faculty? Because without a departmental infrastructure, a lot of times, interdisciplinary programs are difficult to manage.

**Jenson:** We think that Smith Warehouse is already a great home for this program because between FHI, with all of the graduate students in all the labs putting on their own programs and all of the amazing arts and technology labs at the other end of Smith Warehouse, there already is a mass of people with interest in media arts and cultures.

**Szabo:** I'll just add that the courses and the activities that would be supporting this program already exist and they have been going on for several years. It's really

an instantiation and a formalization of activities that have been happening already. So it seems that the energy is there and we do regularly meet and talk and we work together. So it's kind of the cherry on the top of the ice cream to actually have the official program and to be able to have students able to specialize in this area. So I do think there will be continuity but, as Deborah points out, we're also thinking of the FHI as being a space to bring the group together, the core and the affiliated faculty, to think about these topics more broadly. Again, with the certificate program, we have a wider community involved as well.

**Cohen:** Let me just follow up on that question. I think, at the moment, there is a great array of faculty to do this, but they're all in various departments and if one of those key faculty leaves tomorrow, do you have the commitment of the chairs of those departments to replace those faculty? Otherwise, you have no power to bring in somebody in that key area.

**Szabo:** I think we won't take in any specific graduate students who don't have a faculty member who can be an anticipated mentor for them. So, in that sense, it will continue to go on as long as the faculty are interested. And it is an experimental program. But I think, also, because Media Studies and Computational Media are broader topics that are occurring across disciplines, it seems highly unlikely that we won't be able to find other people to participate. In fact, it was kept deliberately close when we created this first round in order to have something that we could bring forward as a presentation, but we've already been hearing from some other faculty members who have said that they would like to see, for example, more

emphasis on global culture and technology brought into this. Cultural Anthropologists, people from Sociology, potentially from History, I think there are ways that this can morph and change, and it's deliberately flexible enough so that it can do that. That's part of what makes it distinct from the other programs that exist now. It may be like some of the Fuqua programs and get sunsetted in ten years. But we're seeing it as the place for experimentation and flexibility where it will only be what people want it to be. However, I should say that there has been this outstanding commitment on the part of all the faculty involved and the enthusiasm of the FHI to be a participant as well.

**Klein:** I'm just following up on the question. I'm familiar with the university program in Ecology with various types of PhDs that cross schools and so forth. I see this is described as interdisciplinary with a small "i," interdepartmental, but did you consider this sort of university program designation? I actually don't know how it is designated at the Graduate School level.

**Szabo:** Well, we called it what it is, interdisciplinary and interdepartmental, at the suggestion of the Graduate School. So when we were beginning to formulate this program several years ago, it was a little bit grander in the aspiration to have something that would be approaching its own unit. There were hopes that we would have additional resources and that it could become this larger thing. We deliberately screened it down to something that was smaller and sustainable with the people that we already have and the resources we already have with the idea that we could grow larger eventually. So the specific structure is because the Graduate School

encouraged us to think smaller.

**Jenson:** And Mellon was very interested in the specific strengths of Duke in interdisciplinary theoretical inquiry so I think Mellon partly directed this.

**Szabo:** It really started out with the Visual Studies Initiative. So we went from visual to realizing that visual could not be understood in isolation of other media, and that media today was often relation to computation and it grew in that particular way, but it still had this nucleus.

**Klein:** It was more of us trying to figure out if there was some sort of benefit to other university programs. That's fine. If you're getting that advice from the Graduate School, that's fine.

**Jokerst:** Thank you everyone. That adjourns our meeting. Our next and last meeting for the academic year will be on May 12<sup>th</sup>. Have a good evening.