

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL
102 ALLEN BLDG
CAMPUS BOX 90029

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday April 10, 2014

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Colleagues, welcome to the April 10 meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council; it is great to see all of you.

Approval of Minutes

Before I make a few announcements and bring you up to date on some important things that are going on, I would like to see if you have had a chance to review the minutes and make corrections or amendments to the minutes. We have two sets of minutes: one from the February 27 meeting and the other from the March 8 meeting. Do I hear any corrections? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Steffen Bass (Physics): So moved

Chantal Reid (Biology): Second

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The minutes are approved, thank you very much colleagues, that is much appreciated.

Announcements and Updates

I have a set of announcements that I would like to make; some of them are important but some of them are business as usual. One of them has to do with some new staff help; I would like to introduce Mary Nettleton to you. As you know, Shawna Kaufman moved on to a different position and Mary has stepped up and accepted a position as a staff assistant to the Arts and Sciences council. I really appreciate her work on a daily basis. We don't see everything that Mary is doing for us, but I want you all to know that when you get an e-mail it is usually coming from Mary and if you have a question about something that she can help you with, be sure to get in touch with her and me as you need.

The executive committee has been working all year on revising the bylaws and I want to bring you up to date on the approach that you are going to be seeing in council soon. It is not likely going to be this semester, but starting in our first meeting in September. ECASC has decided to divide the big project of amending the bylaws, which need to be brought up to date with our current practices, into three parts. We have already finished a part that deals with the Arts and Sciences council relations with other university organizations and offices, the trinity deans, and the dean and vice provost for undergraduate education. If we had time in our agenda this month to put it before council to begin discussing we could do that but unfortunately, our agenda was already full. We will probably put that to you beginning in September.

After that, we will have two other sets of amendments to propose for consideration. One has to do with the language describing the charges and composition of the standing committees of the council. Those committees needed to have revisions and the committees and committee chairs have already done most of that work. That will be ready for your consideration very quickly. The most difficult but certainly most interesting issue has to do with representation and voting, we have had several lively discussions about that on ECASC. You have heard a presentation and discussion about some of the challenges involving this issue. We will have something for you after those two other pieces are completed, so that will probably be sometime late in the fall semester if we finish our other work before then.

Second of all, elections are underway; they were interrupted by some computer problems and e-mail glitches, which I know plagued you as much they did me. We have a large slate of units that are electing new representatives to council, which is customarily an event that happens in the spring term. Twenty units are having elections and I am not sure if you are aware of how many that is but it takes an awful lot. Mary and I have been in communication with all of the units to be sure that there are at least two nominations from each unit for election to the council, and we need to be sure that each of those is willing and able to serve a term on the council. Even though the nomination process is complete, we are not quite finished with making sure that we have nominees who will actually be able to serve. We anticipate completing this process very soon, and units will then be able to complete the election process. We will be announcing the results of these

elections sometime in mid-April as soon as we can get this arranged which depends on winding up these communications. Some will be asked to serve two-year terms while some will be asked to serve three-year terms because over the years we have gotten out of cycle with having too many elections at one time and replacing what amounts to two-thirds of the council is not something we want to do on a regular basis. We need to have representatives who have experience and can represent some continuity on the council

Following elections to the council will be the election of four new members to the executive committee of the council. Let me briefly recognize the four colleagues who have been serving on ECASC who will be rotating off, meaning their terms are ending: Charlie Becker from economics, Bill Seaman from art, art history, and visual studies, Dalene Stangl from statistics, and David Malone from the education program. These four colleagues on the executive committee will be ending their service and we need to hold an election to replace them. What ECASC will do, being also a nominating committee, is nominate at least two representatives for each of the vacant positions. For example, we have one in the humanities, so we have to nominate at least two to stand for election.

Let me ask you as representatives to council to begin to do your homework on this. If you would give some careful thought to other representatives you know who are on the council right now that you would like to see serving on your executive committee, would you talk about it among yourselves or with that person to make sure they are willing to serve, it is a time consuming commitment, and let me know. In our next meeting, ECASC will begin discussing candidates and put before you slate of them for you to elect. We will also be entertaining nominations from the floor at that time, but it is helpful to begin the process early. As you know, the good citizens in particular are very busy people and we want to make sure that they are able to serve and represent us.

Right now I have a brief update on DKU and the Arts and Sciences faculty engagement there. I have heard from Nora Bynum that the committee that is identifying new non-Duke faculty for DKU it almost finished with its search process. The preparations are going forward for opening DKU for the fall semester this year. The Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Bullock will be on campus in early May and will be available to meet with faculty members interested in talking with her about preparations for the opening DKU, and if you have any other concerns please let us know. At this moment, we have identified courses that have cleared the course approval process, but we want to make sure that our colleagues who are going to DKU have our full support and help where needed.

On April 24 we have a specially called meeting of the Arts and Sciences council. ECASC and I have decided to do so, not for the mischievous purpose of deliberately crowding the end of your semester. It is actually a very special time as we invited Peter Lange to come address the council and give us reflections on the direction of the university here at the end of his 15-year term as Provost; to our delight, he agreed to do so. I will make sure that all faculty know about this moment with Peter Lange and I think all of us will want to hear from him. It is not often that a big research university like our own has a Provost with the kind of experience and leadership of Peter, and we will want to hear how he sees the state of the university and its direction as he starts the process of stepping aside. Of course, we also have the annual dean's address that will come at that time as well, so watch your inboxes for information about that meeting on April 24.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship Certificate Proposal

At this time, I would like to return to a motion that is on the floor. At our last meeting the curriculum committee had introduced a proposal for a new certificate. It is our first experiential learning certificate that will be in innovation and entrepreneurship; we had our first discussion of the certificate proposal early in March. This proposal was also amended at the time by Steffen Bass, and here [on the slide] is the amended language so you know the motion that we are taking up and considering. I would like to open floor for further discussion. Eric Toone, Kathy Amato, and their colleagues who are associated with the certificate proposal are present, so at this point rather than repeat everything that has been said about this innovative proposal I will just turn the floor over to representatives who would like to make comments or observations. You have had a month to continue to read the proposal and consider how it will work.

Discussion

Dean Lee Baker: Can you explain how this motion will work? Do we vote on [the amendment] first and then the whole proposal?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): The proposal that is on the floor is the proposal to accept the curriculum committee's proposal for the I&E certificate as amended here, so we don't have to vote on the amended language. This is one package, and basically if I can sum up Steffen's amendment it was to ensure broader participation and a review process.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I have a quick question. I read this, but I don't remember everything: where is this going to be housed?

Eric Toone (Chemistry): Physically, it will live in Gross hall

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): Does that mean it will be its own entity with its own staff?

Eric Toone (Chemistry): Correct

Dean Lee Baker: It is part of the I&E initiative

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We also have Martin Reuf, who will be handling the management of it.

Charmaine Royal (AAAS): Some of our faculty [members] were wondering about page 3 of the proposal where it talks about enhancing students' abilities to handle and respond to the complex world problems and someone wanted an articulation of what those problems might be.

Eric Toone (Chemistry): I think the goal of the certificate is to help students think about taking an idea and turning those ideas into actions in ways that make a tangible and perceptible impact on the lives of others. I think it is about going

through the process of having an idea and thinking about what to do with it and how to actualize that. We will do that in virtually any context that you can imagine.

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): I want to give you some examples of the types of complex problems that we believe students will be interested in. There are several groups of students right now who are very interested in learning about how we can increase STEM education around the world. What can we do here in the United States? What can we do in emerging economies to get students more involved in this work? They are seeking ways to pull what they are doing in the classroom into world in a meaningful way. They are very excited about this certificate because they see that there is a way they can do some of the ideation work to help them come up with some good ideas and learn some of the entrepreneurial skills and be able to do things in that arena. We have another group of students who are passionately worried about water around the world, its cleanliness, and those sorts of things. They are also excited about this as an opportunity to come up with some ideas and have some impact.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): It's a great proposal that fits into Duke's overall drive towards experiential education and working in society, but there is one thing that I would love to see changed. It is very tiny but I think it is very important and that is on page 1 in the letter introducing the proposal there is a quote from this Atlantic article in 1936, "...unapplied knowledge is knowledge shorn of its meaning." I think that is a very provocative statement for Duke to put at the very front of a proposal like this, particularly since unapplied knowledge is one thing we do in the university in a safe place that is not commonly done anywhere else. I would love to see that quote removed.

Eric Toone (Chemistry): We can do that.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I just want to point out that would not be part of the proposal, it is just the letter to introduce, so it does not require a motion to amend the proposal.

Chantal Reid (Biology): I have a question after seeing the new program between physics and engineering that is going to try to do physics applications. How is that going to fit in?

Eric Toone (Chemistry): I am sure that there will be a number of students who are involved in that program who will work with us through the certificate program and we can help them actualize their ideas.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Isn't it often the case with certificate proposals or programs that students take the initiative and request to have a course considered for inclusion? They are very active in shaping it to their own needs.

Dean Lee Baker: That happens routinely with majors and certificates for the specific courses, but I was thinking in terms of interest. We hope that students involved in the I&E certificate will be pulling from their major and their other courses to inform the innovation and application of their particular idea, so I am sure it is not just going to be physics, but creative writers, musicians, and a range of different disciplines in the social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences.

Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): I have a question about what happens after we vote on it today. There are still changes made in terms of what goes up on the website, so how does that happen? I asked about the assessment text last time, and Linda Franzoni and I have talked and I recognize that was confused as to whether you were assessing the program or the students. I am curious about how that change happens after we vote.

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): The reason we did not make the change to the text that you suggested was because this proposal belongs to this committee, it does not belong to us. As I understand it, there are two ways we can approach this: you can make an amendment that we can vote on or we can do some of what we have said before, which is that we will tell you that we will change that text because your point of view was perfectly correct. That is an incredibly confusing sentence about the assessment and we can fix that, so our answer is that it is the will of this body on the way you want to approach that. We definitely want to make that change, and we deeply appreciate you reading it to that level of detail and catching that.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): I don't think this is a great proposal. It is the vaguest proposal that I have ever seen for an academic program of this size. I don't understand what it means and I don't see any academic rationale or what kind of liberal arts component there is. When I think about water I think human rights and public policy are the best ways to address water issues. When I think about STEM I think public policy and education are two of the best ways to address it. As an incubator for students I can see that, but I honestly can't grasp it. My one technical point is that it sounds like the capstone, which is a seminar, has three faculty [members]. A seminar 15 to 18 people and three faculty [members] are incredibly expensive for an 18 person class. Most of us are not teaching huge classes, but for 18 people there is usually one faculty member. That seems like a rather excessive allocation of faculty, unless they are going to triple up and count that as one-third of their course obligation.

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): With regard to the capstone, we do not envision that it will be an 18 student course. We will have more students enrolled in the capstone simultaneously based on the demand we believe the certificate is going to have. The rationale behind having three faculty [members] is the interdisciplinarity that is a part of this certificate. We believe there are going to be students coming in to this capstone that are going to need a faculty mentor who comes from the arts, engineering or from the arts and sciences tradition. The idea was to have a balance so the broader group of students would each have someone involved in the capstone experience who would be valuable to them. You are correct in that it is an expensive undertaking, but we believe it is worth it for the value of the certificate overall.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): So it is not a seminar...?

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): It is in some ways a seminar, but in other ways we believe we are going to have teams of students coming together with project work that they are going to be trying

to implement in these areas. There is a seminar component, but there is also a project where they will be mentored by these individual faculty as well as their mentors for the project.

Dean Lee Baker: It is not a small group learning experience technically, as it is defined in the curriculum. If it goes over 18 it can't be, so that is why I think it said "seminar style."

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): That is a good way to frame it. It will be seminar style, but it is not going to be an 18 person class.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Regarding the first part of her question about the vagueness of the academic rationale...?

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): What liberal arts body of work is this grounded in?

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): We will contend that there are significant bodies of work studying innovation and entrepreneurship as a part of the liberal arts.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): Usually one puts that in a proposal

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): We thought we did, and I apologize that we evidently did not.

Dean Lee Baker: The curriculum committee has looked at this, explored it, and gone back and forth and ECASC has looked at some of these same questions that have come up. Through an iterative process the faculty bodies up to this point have felt that it integrated many of disciplines, it worked on innovation and entrepreneurship, and that it satisfied the intellectual and academic bar for a certificate up to this point. I think that is an important piece for this body to understand. The curriculum committee has rigorously vetted this and they have wanted it to move forward and recommended it for approval.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I would like us to recall the amended motion before us, which already builds a review into this and because this is the first certificate of its kind, I think this body will want and need to have a report and an accounting on how it goes in the first few years. We can certainly look at it at that point.

Charlie Becker (Economics): I will follow up on the last question. As I understand it, there are four new courses being offered and if the average cost for the university is 30,000 dollars per course we may be talking about a total of 150,000 dollars a year in instructional costs. This is basically a half-million dollar gamble that over three years this is going to be worthwhile. If the curriculum committee, which has endorsed this, thinks that it is a good idea than one half-million dollars is not gigantic in the Duke scheme of things. The question that also comes to mind is what kind of courses will people not be taking when they are taking this? Where are they going to be drawn from? Do we have a good sense of that? Is there something that we are giving up that we don't recognize?

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): Based on what we know from surveys of students, they feel very strongly that this supplements the work they are already doing. It doesn't take anything away it just adds, so there are some electives that they would have taken as a part of their course of study that might not have had the same impact on their future life, but that they would have selected based on that. We have not heard anything from the students to indicate that we are losing anything. I guess I would like to know more about your question.

Charlie Becker (Economics): So, this is an add-on cost but it does not reduce costs anywhere else...? There will be no costs reduced as a result of this?

Dean Lee Baker: To be frank, we are hopeful that the demand for our bursting markets and management studies certificate will be reduced by this. Having Martin Reuf as the director of both and having good advising can help our students discern which certificate to do. To me that is a net positive because students can't get into those classes until they are juniors, and I get the parents' phone calls asking if we can raise the seminar over 19. That is a real hope, so we don't know for sure but if we can ease some of the pressure on those markets and management classes that would be a net positive.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): I wanted to follow up on Charlie Becker's and Ara Wilson's questions, and I apologize that I am late to this discussion because I am the alternative representative. Why can these courses not be covered as Ara said out of public policy or environmental science? Why do we need a new structure for them? I appreciate gathering student information, but the answer didn't really respond to Professor Becker's objection, which is what departments are going to be losing classes?

Dean Lee Baker: You might need a refresher on what certificates are. They are interdisciplinary pathways of study that are explicitly interdisciplinary, which means they cannot be taken in one department or the other classes. Each one of the classes they take can also be counted towards a major, so a student can choose whether they want a class to count for the certificate, the major, or both. We have a limit that two of the four courses can be counted for the major and the certificate. In this sense, it is taking absolutely nothing away from students and many of the courses are in public policy. Only the keystone and capstone courses are exclusive to I&E, but most of the other courses, like all of our other certificates, are cross-listed. In that sense there is no zero sum game at all, because they are counted as a major and/or as a certificate.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): They are not entirely fungible in the other direction.

Dean Lee Baker: Do you mean the other electives? They would be taught in the departments anyway. The keystone and the capstone are about drawing these other courses together and pulling from their experiences, but we want the electives to be interdisciplinary like our other certificates. The only difference is that our other certificates have six courses, so there is nothing unique to this certificate per se because the classes can still be cross-listed.

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): One thing that I would like to add is that when you created the concept of an experiential certificate one of the goals was to create something interdisciplinary so students could link what was happening in their major to their experiences in the real world and to give them a bridge to

help them. The idea behind the certificate is to be that bridge so we are building on what they are doing and giving them that strong link to experiences in the real world, which students have said they want very much. The other thing that is the hallmark of this certificate is the sequencing. Students take the courses in a very specific order, the goal being that they are intentional about what they hope to learn and accomplish through the certificate. I would say in those ways that is something that can't be done in a given major because of the interdisciplinary piece where we have students who are in engineering learning some things from the arts that will help them bring together some idea they have. This is a way they can do that and have their experiences be a part of it.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I am not asking this as either a negative or a positive question, but I am curious about the requirements for the hours. One of the experiences must exceed 300 hours with another exceeding 150 hours. I wonder what this means for students who are also engaged in other experiential projects across the curriculum, such as Duke Engage. I'm asking here because I am curious about how much Duke students can extend themselves in terms of real time.

Dean Lee Baker: That is a great question and by putting the large [experience] and small one together, in some respects, this is our mitigation strategy. This fear of missing out extends our students so they do lot of things a little bit. This was an explicit strategy for our students to be more strategic as opposed to opportunistic and invest in a sustained project. This is not just for I&E, but for all experiential certificates with the understanding that those experiences are sandwiched in between two elective courses. Even if they had an elective course before they did the experience, it does not count. They have to choose one that is sequential, concurrent or right after. They can't look back into their transcript and pull one forward, they have to do it as they are doing these experiences so the curricular and co-curricular can bleed into one another. That is the explicit strategy. Will they do even more on top of that? Maybe, but this was an idea to tell students to make a commitment to this, have a long range plan, and stage these classes to provide more coherence in their curricular and co-curricular. It was a gamble, and the strategy was that by putting the time frame in there, it would enable and empower our students to do more sustained experiential work as opposed to a lot of different little things. We thought about it and we are hoping that with good advising and this long range plan students would provide a strategy to go in the opposite direction.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): These are all important questions because this is the first certificate proposal of its kind, so it is important that you ask them and get full answers. If this is our first proposal there are likely to be others and we need to think about every side of it.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): One of your goals is courage and resilience, so I am wondering what the evaluative metric for examining that is.

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): In terms of the evaluative metric, there are two things that are built into this that I think will enable us to measure that. One is the nature of the capstone course where they are going to bring forward projects that they will then try to turn into something in the world and they will experience some failure with that. We will be able to track and monitor students trying to move beyond that failure and ideally measure it. The other piece is the e-portfolio where students will reflect back on what they have experienced through the certificate and be able to articulate what they can say about their development in the areas of courage and resilience.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): I don't understand it totally, but it is hard to tell because I think the proposals that we have seen are clear about the academic rationale, the outcomes expected, and how they are going to be measured. This one is harder to evaluate. Is everything supposed to be about a large and complex problem or is that just one of many and it's okay if your project is to generate income from an innovation?

Kathie Amato (Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): We anticipate that there will be some students who come to this with the idea of generating income, but in all honesty, that is not who we want as our target market. We are hoping that the application process and the strong advising component will enable us to identify those students and encourage them to do something else. If that is the only reason they are coming to us, this is not program for them. That is not our goal; we want students who are pretty interested in academic inquiry around innovation and entrepreneurship and who have the goal of working with complex problems.

Wayne Norman (Philosophy): I just wanted to go back to the point about the quote from Whitehead, which I thought was a nice point, so I did what students do now and looked up the whole quote. If you embed that quote in everything that is around it, you would also get the liberal arts rationale. It is a long quote about transforming universities and Whitehead in 1937, "The ideal of universities with staff and students shielded from the contemplation of the sporadic life around them, will produce a Byzantine civilization..." maybe that is slander now "...surviving for a thousand years without producing any idea fundamentally new. We reject doctrine that students should first learn passively, and then, having learned, should apply knowledge...In fact, the applications are part of the knowledge. For the very meaning of the things known is wrapped up in their relationships beyond themselves." Here is the money quote, "Thus unapplied knowledge is knowledge shorn of its meaning." This is the least interesting sentence in here. "The careful shielding of a university from the activities of the world around it is the best way to chill interest and defeat progress. Celibacy does not suit a university. It must mate itself with action. Business requires for its understanding the whole complexity of human motives, and as yet has only been studied from the narrow ledge of economics. Also Art, Education, and Governmental Activities are gold mines..." I think you could fill that out a little bit and you might get some of your liberal arts rationale.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): The discussion might be winding down, so are colleagues and representatives ready to entertain a motion to bring this to a vote? The curriculum committee has endorsed this and ECASC has as well. In the

discussions on ECASC we expressed an interest in seeing the experiences because colleagues who are listening to this discussion are waiting in the wings to see how this experiential certificate will go. I understand that there are people who have asked for copies of this proposal so they can begin considering a particular experiential learning certificate as well. I think there are lots of reasons why ECASC endorsed it. Do I hear a motion to call the question?

Steffen Bass (Physics): I move to call the vote.

John Brown (Music): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): [A statement from Dean Patton on the I & E Certificate Proposal: With most of the commentary shared by faculty from all divisions at the last A & S council meeting, everything that needed to be said about the I & E certificate has been said. I will only add that, here too, our students have been asking for this kind of curriculum for many years, long before I arrived at Duke. Second, This has been a good process of curricular planning and negotiation and I am really grateful to Eric and Kathie as well as Lee Baker, Suzanne Shanahan and all the members of the A & S curriculum committee for working to refine both the document and communication overall. And I'll finish by noting that we have great leadership to start us off: Professor Reuf is someone whose expertise is in this very area, both entrepreneurship's history and practice. And he will be working to lead both in A & S and in I & E to get things off the ground. I am greatly looking forward to next steps.] The motion is not debatable, we have written ballots for representatives.

I am going to go ahead with our agenda. We now have a series of sessions that are very closely linked to each other one is on online courses as part of our year-long exploration of them. [It includes] faculty views on it and council representative reports before finally coming back to the course credits proposal. Let me recap where we are right now. This council has been intimately engaged and actively discussing questions involving online course for almost two years beginning in the fall of 2011. That goes back to the formation of David Bell's sub-committee of the courses committee that examined the possibility of a proposal to endorse the 2U consortium. As you all know, that proposal was voted down last April and if you have been following the news lately, you also know that the 2U consortium came to an end last week. That experiment is being brought to an end.

However, our council also endorsed the idea of further exploring online courses and their place in a Duke undergraduate education. To help the council and faculty members who wish to continue to pursue the issue, the executive committee proposed a year-long set of information sessions, forums, and council sessions that began at the beginning of last September. Late in October we asked representatives to join in this process by returning to your units and discussing with your colleagues the place of online courses in your curriculums. Those reports have been coming together and you have seen, read, and will now be discussing them. In January, at the suggestion of three colleagues here in the council, ECASC also organized a faculty discussion board primarily involving questions around online courses. That discussion board went live at the end of February and was moderated by our colleagues Chantal Reid in biology and Jack Bookman in math. It came to a conclusion on March 23, and I would like to ask Chantal to come up and give her impressions and her views of how the faculty discussion board unfolded.

Let me announce the results of the vote. There were 24 council representatives who voted today, and we have 18 votes in favor of the proposal as amended, four votes against, and two abstentions. The proposal passes; congratulations to Eric Toone, Kathie Amato, and all of the faculty members who were involved in this.

Kathie Amato ((Director of the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Initiative): I would like to thank you all. This is amazing process to have gone through, and I love Duke university even more after having gone through this process. From the very beginning everyone has been very thoughtful, intentional, and concerned about doing what is in the best interest of Duke University and the Arts and Sciences students. The way that we have been questioned and challenged to look at and consider things very thoughtfully and seriously has enabled us to come forward with a better proposal. Many of the things that we have heard here today will allow it to be implemented in a better and stronger way. I am looking forward to bringing it back to you for you to review it and see if we are on track. It has been an amazing experience to go through, and I cannot begin to thank you all for what you have given to this process and what you give every day to ensure the integrity of a Duke undergraduate experience. Thank you very much.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you Kathie; we wish you the best with this new certificate and we look forward to having you, Eric, and other students and faculty back to report to us about how it is unfolding.

Faculty Discussion of Online Courses

Chantal Reid (Biology): I am going to give you an overview of how the faculty discussion on Sakai went. As you can see, we had 19 percent participation out of 971 faculty members. The site included a forum with several different conversations including five that are still ongoing that are peripheral to the online discussion. The site included a glossary of terms, which helped in clearing up some misconceptions about the different terms that are used in online courses, such as the flipped class, MOOC, web-assisted, and face-to-face. It also had Arts and Sciences material that included the faculty forum we had last fall, a discussion of the Arts and Sciences faculty council, and various proposals and documents from the university. The relevant reading had a whole bunch of different articles that were related to online courses from the US and other universities with online courses. There was a lot of good material related to online courses.

I want to concentrate on the faculty forum where you could go to exchange your ideas. The main ones that we are concerned with today are related to online courses. One had to do with Duke-originated online courses and we had nine threads, not including the original prompt. There was one on non-Duke online courses, which only had one thread. I will come back to the main themes afterwards because they are all linked to one another. The goal of a Duke liberal arts

education had two threads while the curriculum committee course credits proposal also had two threads. Having said that, some ideas from these two discussions also emerged in the Duke-originated courses discussion, so there was a lot of mixing. We had two threads regarding the relationship with other institutions. There was a discussion on graduate training and professional development but nobody picked up on that conversation. Finally, the other issues and comments discussion addressed some of the technical innovation that you can do related to giving classes online when you have to make-up classes.

I am going to go through this very quickly, but if you want to have more details we can talk about it. Basically, I broke the threads down into four different kinds of information. The first is the curriculum in a broad sense, which included the discussion about the goal of a liberal arts education. One of the main points is that discussion should precede the discussion on online courses and the discussion on the number of course credits for a Duke degree. That should be the base, then we can use that to educate where we are going to go for transfer credit and online courses. There were some issues about the number of transfer credits for a Duke degree, which relates to the discussion we are going to have later. Some of the arguments made there were that a lot of those transfer credits were for convenience rather than for increasing the breadth of a Duke student's education.

In terms of labor relations, we had an issue about faculty replacements. A purely online course might mean that not as many faculty members are needed on campus. If we are forming new scholars but there is not going to be enough employment, then why are we doing this? Another issue was competition with other universities; if an online course is taken at another university, then it is not taken at Duke and even having competition between departments at the university was an issue because some departments that might have more online courses could be competing with departments that were not offering as many. That comes back to the convenience for the students. Would the students go for what is easier for them to do in their schedule? Athletes were mentioned in that context.

In terms of the globalization, online courses are becoming available everywhere so we are having a homogenization of education. That means that a select few views are going to be taught everywhere around the world. Also, there was concern about the importation of the American model. In this context, that was viewed in a negative way because it was described as one where you have more private institutions, more administration, faculty having greater demand, and students getting more debt. The American system means normalization for having debt while getting an education, which is being imported everywhere.

In terms of technical issues, there were several threads related to the number of contact hours that would count for online courses. Should we count pre-recorded lectures as contact hours? Is that diluting the education? Face-to-face time is very important, so how are we going to count contact hours? There was also an idea of using technology in re-scheduling cancelled classes. The faculty in general embraced the idea of using online technology to be a tool in teaching. Face-to-face time is very critical, and some of you have pointed out the survey from the freshman students indicated they were not in favor of online teaching. Would we be diluting our ability to recruit students if we use more online teaching?

That is a very broad overview, but having said that there were not many posts. In the content, there were a couple of department's reports there, so you can read it. One of the comments was that the reports on online teaching were bringing more information to the discussion on a liberal arts education and a lot of missing that because those reports are not available to all of the faculty. Some departments went ahead and posted their reports there.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Given that this focuses on online courses and the council representative reports do the same, why don't we hear some observations from John Brown and the executive committee about the council representative reports because a lot of the points are going to be reinforcing. Then we can open up the discussion to online courses in general and what has turned up on the faculty discussion board, the council representative reports and the council representatives' observations. I should say that John is representing some observations that the executive committee had in its discussion of the council representatives' reports alone. We were not reviewing the online discussion board, but the 20 or so council representative reports that were sent in and that have been made available on Sakai.

John Brown (Music): In our review of department reports we noted, not surprisingly, mixed opinions about the effectiveness of online teaching. There is definite uncertainty surrounding the implementation of the mechanism of online teaching as a way of enabling our faculty and aiding them in delivering course content while maintaining the integrity of their courses. As one might surmise, each department had a wide range of views and opinions about online education as a whole.

Three main things emerged; the first is the diversity of approaches to accomplish adding online components to existing courses or creating online course. It seems that dividing departments and faculty into categories did not really work. The second point is a strong interest in maintaining the high quality of instruction. There is a similar strong concern over whether online courses are appropriate to aid in accomplishing that goal. The third point is that there seems to be a blanket sentiment of reviewing the objective of creating online courses and doing what makes sense to aid in our instruction.

We know there is a great diversity among approaches to online teaching and learning and colleagues use varying tools to accomplish adding online and digital content to their teaching. The faculty spared a range of opinions on online courses for Duke credit from disinterest to fully embracing the online teaching idea either as a main mode of delivery or for a significant portion of their courses. I thought I might pull out a few of the positives and some of the concerns. Among the positives, a colleague stated that online teaching aids in collaborative efforts with colleagues at other institutions. Colleagues are able to use Sakai for reading and video assignments, which makes their work more efficient. Some use it for

pre-class reading assessments and for formative assessments within their own courses. Colleagues noted using devices such as Google Docs, the MOOC model, word processor, Duke capture, and TedTalks just to name a few that people are using.

One particularly noteworthy comment that came up was treating different pedagogies (i.e. traditional versus flipped classrooms, online courses, etc.). Putting them on equal footing is not regarded to be a particularly controversial topic. The key question is will the individual departments retain their authority to determine whether a particular course, including its pedagogy, meet the standards that it wishes to uphold with courses contributing to its major or its general education mission? Concerns obviously range from these efforts and include disconnecting students from faculty, which seems to be across the board, loss of control over curricular decisions, and in person faculty-student interactions, which are critical to the student learning process and are highly valued by our faculty. Online delivery of course content doesn't rise as a notable replacement for face-to-face time with professors that echoes what I have been hearing in the online forum where students spoke out about that.

One department particularly noted the loss of the Duke brand of small classes where there are many opportunities for in-person interaction with our distinguished faculty members. Another department noted some concerns about offering Duke credit for courses that are fully online, whether those courses are taught by Duke or another institution. "This model seems to leave a strong incentive, which is graded credit, for academic dishonesty as it removes a primary tool for proctoring exams in physical classrooms used to combat such dishonesty, in many cases. In the absence of a compelling solution to this problem, we would be highly opposed to online courses for Duke credit because this likely invites questions about the legitimacy of Duke credit and perhaps devalue the Duke degree." These are available in the reports, but I will pull out another one that struck me. One department noted with some numbers that between 56 percent and 100 percent of the respondents to their own survey, which represented 20 percent of their faculty, expressed a deep lack of interest in participating in primarily online and noted that two-thirds of these responding faculty members stated a disinterest in creating or making courses that were designed to be solely online.

I would say this brief summary indicates the state of things. The conversation continues and we recognize that many are simply unclear about the next steps in the effort to make this initiative more visible. I think that is one part to stress, because it really is unclear what to do next. Colleagues share the obvious concern about maintaining the high quality of instruction, and that is another strong sentiment. As I read these reports, everybody is deeply concerned, and frankly it was refreshing to me to note that colleagues care so deeply about their courses and about how they approach the delivery of their content to students. While there does not seem to be overwhelming support for online education, one good thing to come out of this is that our faculty do seem to care much about how they are teaching and what tools are going to help facilitate what they are trying to accomplish.

We observe and have taken the time to go through these, so I am encouraged by the faculty concern, but I am not so encouraged by the fact that we have gotten there or found a way to get there. Faculty members seem to be interested in having the conversation, and perhaps faculty are in a good place to receive whatever is offered to make it easier for them to implement these online teaching tools into their teaching practices.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I want to open the floor for discussion and observations. This is about the council representative reports, the faculty discussion board, or some other observations that you may have made about the discussion that we have been having.

Discussion

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): Tom gave me an assignment, so in looking over the reports and thinking about the conversation that the faculty had in psychology and neuroscience, it was clear that the reason the discussion can go in different directions is that there seems to be four categories and sometimes these get overlapped. It might be beneficial for us as a council to think about how particular issues fit into a category, and if we can resolve them at that level.

The first category was clearly about student needs in learning, innovation, and teaching, which includes flipped classrooms and hybrid classes. When you look through the reports, there doesn't seem to be much controversy. As a whole, departments were in agreement about wanting to know and learn more and be innovative in teaching. One of the things that was brought up was having CIT come visit departments and do meetings with tutorials, which might help get the word out about what is available, what can be done, and how long it takes. A lot of the concern was that there is not a lot of knowledge if you don't have people who have done it in the department.

The second part seems to be where the discussion goes to online classes with no class contact hours that are at Duke, taught by Duke faculty, and offered for Duke credit. This includes classes within Duke that have Duke faculty teaching them that are either 100 percent or 50 percent online. That category included some discussion, but there seemed to be fewer differences across the departments in terms of the reports. If you limit that discussion, you could resolve things, come to terms, and find agreements. That is how it seemed when reading the reports.

The third issue is online classes for credit that are offered by non-Duke faculty, in terms of a consortium and whether it counts for credit. Those issues were where people were all over the place. A distinction for some was Duke originated and Duke taught for Duke students versus Duke students taking classes for credit from non-Duke faculty. How would that count? If the consortium what would be the platform? Then it started becoming more diverse in terms of opinions.

The fourth part that people fell into were institutional and administrative concerns about paring down faculty size, values, and how classes will be counted in terms of teaching loads. Will lecturers and senior lecturers be paid differently if

they are teaching online versus in-person? Within departments will it be viewed better if you [teach online]? Those I clustered in how this will look, who will get counted, how resources will be distributed, and across all three of the previous [categories] some of those issues fell in. Will I be recognized if I spend the time doing a flipped class? Will that hurt me in terms of the way my scholarship is viewed? I think this fourth category is where it gets confusing when you look at the reports. In the discussions in psychology and neuroscience as well as in reading these reports it was easier when I had these four broad categories to put issues into. [For example,] if it's talking about a consortium and who is going to pay for it, that falls in three and four. That is different and that doesn't take away from online innovation in the classroom, so I think those four [categories] might help us move the conversation further so we know what we are debating as opposed to debating all of it.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I think that is very helpful. I won't repeat the four categories you just mentioned, but the one that I see as offering the most productive focal point is Duke faculty originated online courses for Duke course credit. The other issues seem, to me, to be of less significance. This seems to be something that I would like to highlight.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I would like to make a number of comments. First of all, I like this categorization and I think it is very helpful. When I was reading through these reports, and I encourage everybody to read through the original material, I actually didn't think in those categories, but I was incredibly encouraged by the diversity of thought that I saw that all fell into one common theme. No matter what the individual departments were thinking or approach they were taking, they were always looking at this in terms of the best way to teach our students. How do we improve the quality of teaching? How do we go about doing a better job? No matter whether this was department that said they had no problem with the various kinds of online courses and tools or department who said in the way they teach it doesn't make sense to go down this route the primary motivation was always the same: deliver the best possible teaching. We should be mindful of that.

There is a large diversity of thought about what tools work best in individual departments and we have to be respectful of our colleagues in both ways. Some of them want to teach and have reason to teach in the classical way while others have reason to explore other teaching methodologies. I have two more ancillary comments. The first goes back to the comment of having the center for instructional technology come visit departments. CIT can be very helpful in laying out what kinds of tools are available, but if you want to go deeper and study learning outcomes and how you best teach you are probably better off looking at educational research in your specific discipline.

As an example, in my discipline in physics there are faculty around the US and the world who specialize in doing research around how students learn physics. They have conducted studies and experiments over the last decade or so about how to best teach a certain kind of introductory physics course, for example. Why does a flipped classroom set-up work better than a regular classroom set-up? If you want to go deeply into teaching innovation, I think you have to do that in the context of research within your discipline. That most likely means you have to reach out to those people who do research in that, and they may not be at Duke. They may be at different institutions and it may take you some time and effort to seek them out.

The last thing is a comment; everyone has seen the Chronicle article, which loves to quote me out of context, about the demise of the semester online consortium. This consortium did not die because we didn't participate or because it had a poor quality product; it was too soon to establish that. It died because, frankly, the customers were not interested in it. I see this as an interesting sign about our own fears and concerns, which may be overblown. Our first-year student survey shows the same thing; the students may not be that interested in online courses if they don't see a specific educational benefit. What do I get out of it for all of the tuition that I'm paying here at Duke? Students in general seem to be very critical of the value of that, so that will, in a natural way, limit the excesses of whatever comes about in this new world of online education. I think we can all remain fairly calm about that. This is going to self-regulate to some extent.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): At some point I think it might be helpful to hear from Suzanne Shanahan and the curriculum committee who has had some probing discussions around this particular topic, especially the kinds of principles that are at stake in the mounting and support for courses.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I don't want to talk about Makeba's categories because I am not certain they help us a lot given what is not included in them, but I do want to go back to something that Chantal said when she was describing the online forum itself. That is the interest in a number of people on the issues that should come before the details of what kind of engagement we are all talking about. Those are the larger issues that are the hardest to address online because my colleagues in both departments, AAAS and literature, were concerned with the silo nature of the conversation. The reports were only available to those of us who are representatives. That means the people who are being represented don't have a strong sense of what was going on in those reports, because it was more work than one representative could do to adequately summarize all of those reports.

We had a continuation of the things that many of us who opposed 2U and who pushed for more open discussion were still looking for: a chance for many people to hear many people, as opposed to a few people to respond either to their own reports or to the very few that got into the online discussion. I am not sure how we can have a meaningful discussion about the curriculum with that silo in place. I think it still requires that we slow down the discussion and open it up. So much of this discussion is still being driven by a momentum to figure out how we are going to do online instead of thinking about the larger context of what it means to have a curriculum being discussed.

The last thing I want to say is about the last point Steffen made that students weren't overly interested and that our fears may be overblown. That is entirely true, but Duke and the upper administration also seems to be driven by moving into this new world that will attract students in particular ways. If we are not being driven by our fears, then it seems to me

we are being driven by some extreme understanding that there is something we should be doing. It is the exploration of what we should be doing that I wanted out of the online discussion and that I would want from a larger circulation of the reports.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): Thank you for that summary; it reminded me that we have been having this strong focus on online courses in this body for about a year now and considering the fact that this discussion has moved in the direction of teaching as opposed to starting with technology and tacking teaching onto it. It seems to me that with this vote that we are going to be conducting on this new proposal about credits, we could say goodbye to this discussion about online courses and begin to talk more about teaching in this body and elsewhere at Duke and communicate that effectively to the administration because I think the faculty has stepped up in this conversation.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I agree completely and that is exactly the change that I have observed over the last year. I've seen a progressive focus on the goals of a course and of a liberal arts education. Let's focus on that and then everything follows behind it. That is what the reports are saying too. I would really like to ask Suzanne [to speak] since she has taken time out of her schedule to come. We are obviously not going to have a full discussion of the course credits proposal yet. It has taken a long time because we are a faculty of 640 tenure track professors with an additional 300 in other ranks. Having a discussion where you have periodic checking in with a very complex subject in higher education takes time. Frankly, in talking with colleagues at other institutions I am fairly pleased with the way in which we have conducted the discussion on this very complex subject with a faculty body that is incredibly diverse.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): I think this discussion about online courses can't take place entirely cut off from the discussion on the course proposal for this reason. One mode of delivery in the course credit proposal is non-Duke originated online courses. We have allowed students to take non-Duke courses before, however the logistics of them were formidable in trying to make your schedule mesh with NCSU, go to Greensboro, or do whatever you were doing. There was a certain practical limit to how many they can take. One of my theories is that non-Duke courses don't affect the GPA and our students are intellectually curious and driven, but they are also rightly afraid to preserve their GPA. My fear is that with the ease of taking non-Duke courses, Duke courses come under pressure to match those in perceived ease and not threaten their GPA.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Colleagues I am going to ask for your patience for an additional 10 minutes or so. This is an important discussion that has been prepared for over a year and we have all invested a great deal of time in it. Over the last few weeks since the course credit proposal was discussed in council, the curriculum committee has gone back and has some reflections, comments, and observations to help us think about the proposal and online courses within the context of this proposal.

Faculty Discussion of Course Credits Proposal

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I am going to try to be brief and lay out some thoughts the curriculum committee had in response to the latest set of conversations you had read. I was not here for your last discussion, so I got to read the minutes and sort things out that way while talking to some folks who had participated. In terms of the course credits proposal, there were certain points of clarification and certainly in any amendment we will make those clarifications. I would say that in reading the minutes, the most problematic dimension did have to do with the online piece in two different ways. One had to do with Makeba's category three: Duke-originated courses that were 100 percent online for Duke students' credit. The second category had to do with non-Duke classes for credit and the extent to which students can get credit for online classes and how that affects things.

My sense is in reading the minutes and talking to folks previously, there seems to be much more limited support for transferring in online credits. That seemed to be a somewhat straightforward idea. Before I talk about the 100 percent online Duke originated courses, I did want to articulate the logic that the curriculum committee first used in putting this together. We had conceived of online learning as a pedagogy and as one of many different pedagogies that are available to Duke faculty. I am someone who probably will never teach an online class because I am a sociologist who teaches ethics, so I do not imagine that will work well for me. I am someone who does lots of experiential and service learning; those are pedagogies that are really important to my teaching. I think there are a range of pedagogies that we all engage in and I think we wanted those decisions to be originated in what faculty members were trying to achieve in their particular classroom so that a faculty member makes decisions based on their learning objectives. Those learning objectives are vetted through the department in terms of whatever internal mechanism they had. As a committee, we did not want to distinguish between online and not online.

I'd also say that part of that decision was not just about the nature of pedagogy. It had to do with the nature of faculty autonomy. It was really important to the curriculum committee that we preserve faculty autonomy in making decisions about what they do in a classroom. Certainly these are decisions that are always made in collaboration with their department and departments have different perspectives on what makes the most sense in their department. It was very important to us that we not go down the road of second guessing faculty's pedagogical choices, understanding all of the issues associated with introducing a very new form. We still felt that in the same way I would loathe someone telling me that I can't do a Duke immerse program because they don't think that is the best pedagogy and they know better about my learning objectives, I don't think I or anyone else should be telling someone that we have in place a set of mechanisms to do that. They are faculties, departments, and the course committee. For the curriculum committee, we understood that there were mechanisms in place to do that. I think that is part of our position.

In reading the minutes and looking at this issue of online learning and how to think about it, I sense strongly that the council thought very differently. People felt strongly both ways about whether it was a good thing or not and how to proceed. In conversations with the curriculum committee the sense continues to be that perhaps what we need now is to understand these as faculty department decisions in the same way we have always understood pedagogical choice. If physics thinks online learning enhances a liberal arts education in physics that should be a decision the physics department could make. I wouldn't necessarily be a decision the Kenan Institute for Ethics would make. It would be a conversation that would have to be made among those faculties. One question is whether in the context of the course credits proposal people are still comfortable with the fact that we have framed this as another pedagogy. The implication of this is, with a revision, that a 100 percent online course created by Duke faculty for Duke students would be for credit. That would be a decision that the department and the requisite faculty would make.

This is really different and there seem to be varied positions on it. In talking with various folks, we thought, if people felt comfortable with this, [we could] perhaps try this for a couple of years while also putting in two important steps. Right now, if I want to teach a course I bring it to the DUS, we have a conversation, and I submit a course form. We all know this procedure. I still think it would be very important that any online course goes through that procedure and they would have to argue why it is online in the same way they need to argue why it is experiential learning or any other thing. They need to make that case.

Prior to that, [we need] some broader review wherein a department, such as cultural anthropology, would have to submit some document detailing the ways in which 100 percent online courses will enhance liberal learning in cultural anthropology and saying, "This is the due diligence we have done and this is how we understand it would forward what we, as cultural anthropologists, think is the best education we can provide a Duke student." The other thing they would need to describe are some of these logistics. Cultural anthropology would need to state the implications for graduate students in cultural anthropology. Is this a way to cheap out on paying people in terms of courses? What are the rules if you are teaching an online course? Does this give you a free pass to spend the semester in Paris or not? That is a decision that cultural anthropology has always made; it has always had the autonomy to make those decisions. They decide the course loads of faculty, who gets a buy-out, and under what circumstances. That would all be retained in the departmental hands as it is now.

From our perspective it was saying, "Let's think of online as what we already do." It is what we have been doing, and for me I know I am not going to do an online course. To me, it seems like an awful lot of work, but we have always preserved the notion that faculty are in charge. They get to decide what makes the most sense in terms of their own courses, and that seems like a hugely important precedent that I want to protect, whatever the mechanism. What I wanted to do today was float this [idea] because we have to continue this conversation at another time.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Suzanne, thank you very much for laying out the big principles at stake in this discussion, because I think some of us need to have this clarified. I certainly do.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): Departments don't operate in isolation from one another. What happens if the history department decides they want an online course on Empires through the Centuries? Now they can't do it because they don't have the personnel, but if they do an online course that affects classics directly. Do we get a say in what they get to offer?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): My understanding is that this would operate in the same way, so I don't believe that we allow departments to offer things that fundamentally overlap with what another department is offering already.

Cary Moskowitz (Thompson Writing Program): While it is not something that the course committee likes to see happen, we certainly see from time to time situations in which this does occur. When courses are offered in one department, we have no way of knowing. It seems clear that people either don't know that people are teaching related courses in other departments or are doing it in spite of that. It is something we are trying to discourage, but we don't have the authority to do anything about that.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): The principle at play here is the department is an autonomous sovereign body in deciding what courses its faculty members are going to teach in any given semester and how they are going to teach them. The course committee primarily reviews for coding in the curriculum as opposed to telling a faculty member, "Tom you're teaching a course on German history but someone in political science is teaching that too, so you can't teach it this semester."

Cary Moskowitz (Thompson Writing Program): We certainly don't have the authority to tell them that, although we are increasingly trying to let people know they ought to have those conversations.

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): We haven't regulated it in the past because we haven't had to when we had flesh and blood faculty in the classroom and we had to have those personnel on campus. Online is a whole different ballgame.

Cary Moskowitz (Thompson Writing Program): I just wanted to say something related to what Suzanne said. It makes good sense to me that the conversations about whether or not online is appropriate at the level of the department would...at least for the first few years, we would want to ask faculty to propose online courses on a course by course basis in the same way that they justify service learning. Rather than that decision just being done at the department level...

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I apologize that wasn't clear. I actually imagine a two phase process, and this would be asking more of units to say what the literature and thinking among a particular faculty is about the use of online in general. This would be something a faculty would need to vote on as a department before a particular proposal would come to them and they would do their process. There would need to be some sort of conversation about whether it fits or not.

Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): If that was to be implemented, something would need to be done on the course submission form that would add-on to the justification. The other thing I wonder is if a particular department, say cultural anthropology, decides that it is not in the interest of that collective, does that mean that any individual faculty member within that unit could not propose a course?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Not in cultural anthropology

Dean Lee Baker: They would have to cross-list it.

Chantal Reid (Biology): This is unrelated, but I want to go back to a comment from Wahneema about the departmental reports not being available to the faculty. On the website in the Arts and Sciences materials, there is a folder for departmental reports but it is empty. I think one reason there are no departmental reports is that we didn't ask if they could be made available, so can we ask the representatives if they want their report to be made available?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): That was exactly the issue. When ECASC asked for the reports, they were intended for council use, related staff, and deans, but not to be read across the whole faculty. Several representatives said they would write this very differently if it were going to be read. That is why ECASC wouldn't go there.

I just want to make clear, if I understand what Suzanne is saying, is that our current system relies upon the creation and enforcement of standards for teaching in all kinds of ways at the level of the individual faculty member, the department, and the DUS. We have no centralized review process for any time of pedagogical format at all, and if we accept your logic that fully online Duke originated courses for Duke students for credit is just another pedagogy but it would be subject to central regulation that would be a very strong break with the precedent for our current practices. Do I understand that correctly?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I think that is exactly right. I think there was concern that we flip the conversation the way Carol had suggested to be a conversation about how we enhance liberal learning for our students. This shouldn't just be about technology, but it should really be about developing mechanisms for us to do the best for our students. That is why there was the suggestion of having some initial consideration on the part of departments as a whole to think this through and think about what makes sense in a particular department. People aren't certain what the implications of this are. I think you raised an important point about course overlap. I think there would have to be some mechanism to prevent those things, and in any departmental consideration they would need to speak to that clearly. It is also why we say it would make sense to try this for two years alone and revisit so we don't stymie those departments who are chomping at the bit, because they do believe that what they are trying to do will be enhanced by online learning.

Dean Lee Willard: I just wanted to make an advertisement for Shawn Miller in the Center for Instructional Technology for their showcase and workshops. They have a very robust assessment mechanism and a lot of things that people are doing are on their website. It is a great resource, so as we are talking about not having information, there is information out there that would be very important to this group.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Suzanne, you mentioned an important point that hasn't come out yet. Those who are innovating in this area are a small number. Innovators are always a minority, and what you are pointing out is that right now we don't have a policy, which is creating uncertainty in individual faculty members, even within departments who strongly oppose online courses, because they don't feel they have any support, so they're postponing trying out something new. There is a balance here between preserving the space for innovation and departmental autonomy.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): Online changes many things, including the upper administration's relation to departments. Resources are being made available for online technology that are not being made available for traditional technology. That is one thing that tells us this is not business as usual. Secondly, I agree there should be some consideration or mechanism to address this and some of that mechanism will have address disparate effects by virtue of the attractiveness of the technology to students that rings a bell that other things don't, regardless of what they say when they are thinking idealistically about their education. The third thing that we have to come back to is what it means for us to be a liberal arts university. I think that in and of itself is a conversation worth having so that when we come to a conversation about the uneven distribution of resources we come to it with some clarity.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): That concludes our council meeting today, and obviously we will continue to discuss this issue of the course credits proposal. It is still before the council as it has been moved and seconded. Thank you very much colleagues, I will see you on April 24th.

Meeting Adjourned