

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, January 8 2015

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Colleagues let me call to order the January meeting of the Arts and Sciences council. I wish you all a happy new year. I hope you have had lots of time to rest and recuperate from the fall semester and have begun this semester in a fresh way.

Approval of Minutes

Let me start with our minutes. At our last meeting in December, the November minutes were not available, but I indicated to you that they are now available along with the December meeting minutes. Do I hear any corrections or amendments to the minutes from November and/or December? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Steffen Bass (Physics): I move to approve the minutes

Margaret Humphreys (History): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The minutes from both November and December are approved. Colleagues, I would remind you if you want to call the attention of your colleagues in your department to sections of the minutes, they can be helpful to review. I do it all of the time up to get back up to speed about something. Hopefully, they are organized in a way that is useful for you to do that.

Announcements and Updates

There have been some changes to our agenda and the order of things for today. I am going to make a couple of announcements here at the beginning. I will keep them as brief as possible. The plagiarism sanctions review committee, which is being chaired by Sherryl Broverman is just about wrapping up its work. I understand they have been having very productive meetings. I have had some informal reports, and they are going to be reporting to ECASC shortly. We will be talking with Sherryl about when they will come before council with their report. The agenda for the next few months is going to be very full, so we will work it in as soon as we can.

Second of all, Suzanne Shanahan and the Imagining the Duke Curriculum committee completed its fall meetings with a joint meeting with the executive committee. I have been in touch with Suzanne about taking stock here in the middle of winter in the first year of reviewing the committee. She will be meeting with executive committee shortly, and she will be coming before council, so please tell your colleagues back in your departments and programs. She will have an introductory report on the review of the curriculum. It is interesting how there has been a developing convergence of views and ideas on the committee as they have engaged faculty, departments, and programs. I also know that she and the committee will be meeting with other faculty groups in the coming weeks. We will be looking forward to that as well.

As I focus on the curriculum this year, I should give you a heads up that President Broadhead will be coming to council March 5 to talk about curriculum in general. I was appreciative when he got in touch with me as he thinks very deeply about curriculum matters. He would like to come, knowing that we are reviewing our own curriculum, to talk before council about the importance of a curriculum for the identity of Duke presenting a way of understanding liberal arts in the early 21st century.

One final announcement is that the executive committee has been engaged with the provost about a newly formed committee on strategic planning. If you have some ideas or suggestions about how we as the Arts and Sciences council and the executive committee can work with the strategic planning committee to communicate our priorities to them please do so. They are going to be starting that work soon and we will be meeting with them. I know the curriculum, among other things, is a top priority for us.

At this point, I would like the council to go into an executive session as a prerogative of the chair. I know some of you may have come to hear Lee Baker's report on student athletes and mitigating risk strategies, but I promise you we will get Lee back before the council in February. I apologize to those who came for that report.

End of Executive Session

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I put Laurie Patton back on the agenda, because at the end of our December meeting council representatives hardly had a chance to ask her about the transition. Just to refresh your memory, Laurie announced shortly before Thanksgiving that she is becoming president of Middlebury College. We are so proud of her, but this sets up a period of transition. You got the email today from Angie O’Rand that the search committee is now up and running and doing its job. I asked Laurie if she would come back to council to give her a chance to talk with you about how you see the transition period. Colleagues, this is a chance for you to ask questions about the transition to the next leader of Arts and Sciences.

Dean’s Corner

Dean Laurie Patton: Thank you so much, Tom. I appreciate that everybody is open to a conversation. I want to begin by saying that I am looking forward to the next six months. I want to make sure that I do everything I can to honor the great work that we have done together and keep us moving in a direction that faculty, students, and staff feel is vibrant for all of us. If there is one thing I would love to be able to think about as a legacy, it would be that continuity, engagement, and vibrancy even in challenging times. I found that to be the most rewarding thing about our working relationship and the most transformative thing about the most transformative job that I have ever had.

With that said as an utterly heartfelt statement, I have been doing a lot of thinking and working with our staff about the kinds of things we need to get in order so that we can work well together over the next six months and make the transition as seamless as can be. I wanted to talk to you about two forms of continuity; the first is structural continuity, and the second is initiative continuity. I wanted to end with an exhortation for all of us as we work together over the next six months.

Let me begin with the structural continuity. If you looked at the staffing of the search committee, there are great leaders from across Arts and Sciences, and a couple from outside Arts and Sciences as well. We are very pleased to see the staffing of that committee so conscientiously done. As you know, Angie O’Rand, who is the dean of social sciences, is an extraordinary leader who has both vision and evenhandedness. She was so relieved to be able to turn back to her own work, but she was immediately roped back in. She and I have had some intentional conversations; I am going to be meeting with the search committee. I have asked for two and a half hours with the search firm, and I got it; we had a wonderful conversation. I have asked for at least an hour with search committee, and I will be talking with several of you who, in your leadership capacities, have reached out to me to talk about how we can think about continuity in other ways.

A lot of what we have done together has been funded by my discretionary fund. In addition, we have been working a lot on getting our finances in order. I am pleased to be able to have turned that battleship around in a difficult financial situation that all universities were dealing with. One of the things that Sandy Connolly and I have been working on very closely with Sally Kornbluth is to make sure that Sally understands the kind of funding that will remain going forward for the commitments I have already made in the out years. If I have made a commitment to you for five years, that is going to remain.

In addition, even if I have made two year commitments, I have been talking closely with Sally, Sandy, and folks involved about things that have been in start-up mode that are going well that we would like to continue. At the same time, because we want to be honoring where the new dean might want to go, we are going to be looking at a separate fund for making sure there is good continuity around many of those financial commitments that we have already made. I wanted to let you know about that; that is a very important part of it.

The second thing is that I feel it is important to keep in place this great working relationship that we have between the Arts and Sciences council, ECASC, and the dean of Arts and Sciences offices. We have created two new committees, the budget advisory committee and the assessment committee as part of Arts and Sciences. Those are going to continue; that is something that you have made as part of your governance and we are thrilled that those are now part and parcel of faculty culture.

The third, and most important thing, is several folks have been wondering about the curriculum tweak and Imagining the Duke Curriculum. It has already been communicated in a number of informal and quasi-formal contexts, but it is clear to everybody on that committee as well as to everyone in the administration that we continue with the work. Everyone is very excited about the work; I have never seen such great morale and high energy around a project. I think people have been waiting to do this for a while, so there is real excitement around it. I have been very pleased to see how many great ideas have already come out of it. We have designed a very iterative process; Suzanne is with us every step of the way. She meets regularly with Sally, with me, and with all of you and other faculty.

There is no plan to either change the charge to the committee, which are those three basic things. Those questions were developed over time in consultation with many faculty members. It is as much your charge to that group as it is my charge for that group, so we will continue as usual. It might be that the details have not emerged yet, so who knows what is going to happen to the high morale and energy. We are hoping that even when the details get there, there is a lot of excitement about it.

Of course, there is Kunshan. I do not think I need to say much about that because you have already had a great session with Sally. I will add that the Liberal Arts in China committee is extraordinary and Noah’s leadership has been wonderful. They have said they want to keep talking and designing something that, whether it is minimalist or maximalist, there will be many things we need to know, such as what kind of degree it is before we move any further. There are lots of creative things that can be done no matter what kind of degree it is, because it is going to have the Duke name on it. We are

going to be very much excited to move forward cautiously, with the very real caveat that when it comes time to move forward with the specificity of what kind of Duke degree it is, we move into that specific mode. I am pleased about that as well, and I am thrilled that Noah's leadership has gotten us to this point.

In terms of structural continuity, I also wanted to tell you that I will continue to fundraise for Duke until June 30. I have to close several of the gifts that we have open on behalf of Duke. I am pleased to say that in December, we crossed the 305 million point out of 435 [million]. That is about 70 percent of our goal, which is extraordinary since we have about two and a half more years in the campaign. We are very pleased about that as well. Those are all things that I will continue to do throughout the next six months.

The final thing is a really important one, because we want to hand off something clear and yet in medias res to the new dean, which is a strategic plan. As I mentioned in the last Arts and Sciences council meeting, what we plan to do is not overly burden faculty, but come up with four or five questions that we think are the right questions to ask the various units in Arts and Sciences to consider. These are not Sally's questions, but Arts and Sciences specific questions, and have those units send us back a one page document that we can summarize and hand to the new dean so that he or she can continue with the strategic planning process. Nothing will stop with our strategic planning process. We will continue with the beginning of that and communicate clearly what the Arts and Sciences results are by June of this year.

Those are the basic points that I wanted to make sure you knew about and how we have been thinking about the transition in terms of structural continuity. In terms of initiative continuity, I want to begin by mentioning several of the initiatives that we have been working on together in the last four years with which we have been vibrantly engaged.

The first has to do with lesser taught languages as well as languages across the curriculum. I have begun conversations about that; Sally knows what a commitment that is for us and is working on ways to continue to fund that for at least five more years before we make an assessment. Vanderbilt is interested in our consortium. I think Tom has put in place a wonderful faculty based set of conversations around online learning, and I think we are going to be continuing in that mode to working with faculty on helping them be creative. My guess is that anybody interested in serving this community as dean of Arts and Sciences is going to have to be engaged, interested in, and committed to a faculty based conversation around online learning.

Second, many of you know how interested I have been in gender diversity in the sciences. I have seen a great response from the faculty in that area. It has now become a provostial committee that is working on this, as well as a great deal of commitment from the central fund raising offices. We have had three grant proposals go in; we have been successful thanks to the efforts of Lee Willard in getting the HHMI grant for this in our pedagogical approaches. We are very pleased about that, so if anything is baked into the next stages of the university ride together where Arts and Sciences is leading, it would be that. Lee Willard and Dan Kiehart are going to be helping with that provostial commitment. Larry Carin, the Vice Provost for research, has also committed a number of funds to that.

Third, as you know, we have this new initiative in public scholarship, and we are working on mechanisms for continuing to fund that. It is already funded for the next two years, and we are hoping to continue that as well. Mike Schoenfeld and I called a group together, not only of that outfit of scholars, but in addition several other units that are mainly housed in Arts and Sciences who see their role around public scholarship. This includes Mark Anthony Neal's media focused work "Left Black" as well as Duke Islamic studies center that has a Carnegie grant to create a different conversation around Islam. There are many other outfits as well. We are now in the beginning stages of creating a council that is university wide for public scholarship. Again, that is becoming integrated in a regular way into our lives.

You also might remember that there were hires in China and South Asia. We have done much better on the China front; we have hired six folks. I think I have mentioned on a couple of different occasions that we have hired two major people, and we are working on an offer that is out to a third person. One of them is among the top four historians of China in the world, Prasenjit Duara, who comes to us from Singapore. The other is Melanie Manion who is coming to us from the University of Wisconsin. They are both senior hires whose commitment is to build global Asia, so that is going to be continuing as well. Those are the kind of initiatives, and there are many other things I could be talking about in terms of grants, decanal initiatives, and so on that are run at the level of the divisional deans. Those divisional deans will continue to work with you on those in some very exciting ways.

That is basically the outline of what I see, but I wanted to talk a little more about some of the opportunities that we have in the next six months. The first is, as you can see, Sally Kornbluth is very excited about working intensively with Arts and Sciences. I remember telling you, when you were nervous about a provost coming from the medical school, that Sally is very much engaged. She is hungry to work with Arts and Sciences, because she knows what the medical school is about. She has a wonderful energy; we talk four or five times a day, and I have been impressed with her leadership. As you can tell, her style is very consultative and open. She will be meeting more with ECASC, Arts and Sciences council, the divisional deans, and departments. It is a great opportunity for you to work in an entirely new way with the provost's office as we move through this transition.

Secondly, and this is one of the most important things that I can say. I will be working intensively with the new dean whenever he or she arrives no matter where I am. I will create a special hotline to the Middlebury president's office if the new dean comes on in late May or early June and I am in the middle of transition. It is very important to me that I be 100 percent available to that person as that transition is made. It is also important to me, and I am in the midst of creating it now, that there is a public record of every single promise I made to anybody in Arts and Sciences. My staff knows about it

so we can move forward with no surprises for the new dean or any of you. For me, that is a continental issue; excuse the metaphor but that is how strongly I feel about it. I wanted to make sure you knew that.

The final thing is the exhortation. What I want to say to folks is that the spirit is on continuity. I hear that from the search committee, from Sally, and from everywhere. We want to continue the brainwork that we have done together. The most important thing is that we are moving forward with a strong governance structure, in my view the strongest that is has ever been in Duke history. We have a vibrant, creative voice in the university where we are continuing to lead in some creative and wonderful ways. The only question for us is how can Arts and Sciences faculty help the dean get with their program. Thank you.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Knowing Laurie, she is very accessible and you can talk with her at any time.

Graduation Course Credits Proposal

Our final item on the agenda is a very important one. I know a number of you are new representatives to council, and you were not present in the spring of last year when the curriculum committee came forward with a proposal to establish a new bottom line for a Duke degree. This is the course credits proposal, and we have discussed it three times in council. At the end of the spring semester, the curriculum committee decided to think about the comments they had received from colleagues, modify, revise it, and come back with a document that reflects the input from the spring semester. I will now turn the floor over to David Malone, who is the chair of the curriculum committee. He will introduce the document, and this is not the only time we will be talking about it. It will come back on the agenda because this is a significant proposal in a fundamental kind of way.

David Malone (Education): I will try to keep this simple. Given Sally's comments on DKU, Laurie's comments on the energy around the Imagining the Duke Curriculum, and the work we have been doing on this, it is a period of Duke history that could be called, "What is a Duke education?" It seems like that question is coming up more. The curriculum committee has a proposal before you on graduation credits, and I want to thank the members of the curriculum committee for their hard work. Today's proposal is an effort, as Tom said, to follow up on an initiative that Lee Baker started in September of 2013 that involved answering the question of what constitutes a Duke education in terms of the number of Duke originated courses that a student needs to graduate.

This came before the council several times, but the previous proposal was problematic and it did not meet with overwhelming support. It was kicked back to the curriculum committee, which I became the chair of in September. One of the concerns of the previous proposal was that it dealt with how many courses a student needed to graduate that were Duke originated courses, but it also talked about course formats, delivery modes, and references to pure online courses. The current curriculum committee looked at this and tried to decouple the question of what are valid course formats or delivery modes from the question of how many Duke originated courses does a student need to graduate. We took that tactic, and created this proposal, which is relatively simple. If you had a chance to look at it, Inge put in bold the sentences that were new that were not existing policy, and there are very few. We need your help in looking over this. It gets complicated once you dive into the bulletin and see the rules and regulations that exist.

The first part of the proposal is, "Of 34 course credits required to graduate, at least 24 course credits must be Duke originated courses." We got away from the question of valid delivery modes or formats, because we felt there were mechanisms that already exist for departments to vet the courses that they offer; there is a course committee, DUSs approve transfer courses, etc. So, Duke students will have to take 24 Duke originated courses. We define Duke originated courses as courses that are taught by Duke affiliated faculty, offered through Duke University, and subject to the approval processes of Duke schools. Duke originated courses include DKU courses and Duke originated courses offered at "Duke in" study away programs. That would be study away programs that are "Duke in," which are Duke courses.

The second part of the proposal is that students would be limited to 10 non-Duke originated courses. The rest of the proposal sets out what the limits and guidelines are for those 10 non-Duke originated courses. Most of that language is existing policy. Additionally, students may count up to four inter-institutional courses, which are part of an agreement with UNC schools. Dean Baker knows more about that. It is an existing policy, but we limit it to four. Of course, we spell out things like Robertson scholars who are exempt from the rule because of the nature of their program.

Dean Inge Walther: I do not have much to add, other than as David said, this is a simple and straightforward proposal here. I wanted to go back into the history to let you know the reason for having this discussion and thinking about this. Before, the policy let students take half of their courses away from Duke; there was nothing to prevent that. Very few students did that, except for transfer students coming into to Duke. In the context of our discussions around online courses, a lot of anxiety was created around the fact that students could take courses where they do not have to be on the campus where the course is offered. There was anxiety because that could allow students to take, potentially, more courses that are not really Duke courses. This came up in the context of the 2U consortium that was being planned, so we started thinking and asking ourselves what constitutes a Duke education and how many of the 34 courses required for graduation should be Duke courses.

That does not prevent students from taking more than ten non-Duke courses, but only ten can count for the 34. I wanted to make that very clear. Also, with our inter-institutional agreement, they are not counting as Duke courses, but since we have an agreement that states students can take one course at an inter-institutional university per semester or summer term, they can still take up to eight. Only four of those will count towards the 34. I wanted to let you know the inter-institutional universities include UNC, NC State, UNC-Greensboro, UNC-Charlotte, and NC Central University. Those are the five in the inter-institutional agreement.

Discussion

Thomas Robisheaux (History): This council has developed a practice of vetting a proposal for at least two meetings, so there is no plan to call the question today, but it is very important. I think it is an important one for council representative to understand in all of its dimensions. Why don't we begin the process of discussing it, and expect that we will continue this in our February council meeting. The floor is open for comments, questions and suggestions.

Linda George (Sociology): I understand you said that you wanted to decouple the number of courses from the mode of delivery or type of courses. My question is, if you do not cover that, then where is that covered?

Dean Inge Walther: One of the reasons we wanted to get this done first, is because we have not yet had a full discussion around the other issue. We thought this could serve as a foundation on which to base those later discussions about online courses and course delivery formats. Currently, our working policy is that we allow purely online courses where students do not have to be physically on campus. We allow those to be offered during the summer term, but we do not allow those to be offered during the semester.

Linda George (Sociology): If they are offered here during the summer, they are considered Duke originated courses.

Dean Inge Walther: If they are taught by Duke faculty and approved through the Duke course approval process.

Linda George (Sociology): Can courses that are non-Duke courses include online courses that are offered by other universities?

Dean Inge Walther: No, they cannot. Currently, until we change there is bulletin language that says, "Transfer courses may not be taken in an online environment."

Dean Lee Baker: You cannot take an online course at UNC-Greensboro and get Duke credit.

Dean Inge Walther: I think it is time to revisit that and maybe start allowing it, but we have not had those discussions yet. That is why we wanted to get this through first.

Linda George (Sociology): I can understand that, but I think a lot of people will not feel as though they really understand the rules of what it takes to graduate. I would like to be able to reassure my colleagues that those discussions will take place.

Dean Inge Walther: If the faculty wants those discussions, I think they will.

Dean Lee Baker: I want to say that I really appreciate all of the work the curriculum committee put into this, as well as Inge's leadership over this. I feel guilty because you said I caused the problem when I asked this question early on, but I am glad I did. The real question was the maximum non-Duke credits that count for graduation, and I think the curriculum committee smartly flipped that on its head. They asked about the minimum number of Duke credits. What the council has to realize is that Duke, even relative to our peers, is very conservative in terms of taking AP credits and straight transfer credits. We allow two of each. The other eight usually come from these high impact learning practices, like study abroad and other interesting configurations our students put together in interesting ways. The baseline of the general transfer credit policy at Duke, which we are not messing with—two transfer and two APS—is actually quite conservative. A lot of students do early college or come in with 16 APs. If that is important to them, they go someplace else. Sometimes we hear from admissions that it does not impact our yield or anything, and in that sense we are more like our peers, but that is the baseline. I think it is important for this group to know that ten is constrained by only two transfer credits and two AP credits.

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): Not just AP credits?

Dean Lee Baker: All pre-matriculation credits.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I want to say that I am all for this change in policy because I think it strengthens the Duke degree, but I wanted to come back to Linda's question and make sure I understand this correctly. You are not messing with the restrictions you have on the ten non-Duke courses?

Dean Inge Walther: For the time being, because that has been our policy forever. It might be time to revisit that at some point. Right now, that is still in place.

Dean Laurie Patton: I agree with the drift that people are going with this, and I wonder if we might frame it for all of the faculty in Arts and Sciences that this is a first step or a prelude to that bigger important conversation. I think we should and can have that in a productive way. Does that seem friendly?

Linda George (Sociology): I think that would be wonderful. I also support this, but this is not where any push or, in my opinion, heated feelings are going to come to the surface. It does strengthen the Duke degree, and I do not think anyone is going to have concerns about that. What counts as courses in different boxes...and taking this to my faculty, they are going to ask those questions. I would love to be able to say that there is a second step coming in which those issues will be looked at and policy recommendations made.

Dean Laurie Patton: The way we could think about it is that we are strengthening the Duke degree first, and then we go from there. That was the spirit.

David Malone (Education): One question I have for Inge is that currently we do not have a strong mechanism for knowing whether a course is online or not. As a DUS in the program in education, if I get study away programs or transfer courses I do not really know unless I have a conversation with the student on how that course is taught. I am not in the habit of asking that question.

Dean Inge Walther: I think there is general agreement among registrars across the county that they do not want to designate courses by mode of delivery. On the transcript, you cannot tell whether a course is online or not. Oftentimes, you

cannot even tell in the bulletin description. It could be that our students are taking online courses and we would never know, but I do not think there is a reason to be terribly concerned since the limit is two anyway.

David Malone (Education): One issue that came up when we talked to the executive committee was the notion of should you go further and require that students have a certain number of courses on Duke's campus as opposed to Duke originated courses. When you get into this, it opens all types of questions. The 24 that are required are just Duke originated, so it is still open.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I remember our discussions in the spring, and the faculty was concerned about added financial burdens on students with this change. I wondered if your committee had come back and done any investigation into that issue. I know we do not have many students who take 17 Duke courses, but are there additional burdens on them because of this?

Dean Inge Walther: We were not able to find any extra financial burdens on the students. So, the answer is no.

Josh Socolar (Physics): Can I ask what the rationale is for 24? It is good that it is bigger than 17, but is there a reason it is 24 rather than 26 or 22?

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): As I recall, we wanted to acknowledge that some students do take a full year to study abroad, so we wanted there to be at least eight credits there. Plus, they can use AP or transfer credit, so we were not really thinking about 24 but about ten as a limit.

Josh Socolar (Physics): So, it is to accommodate students who want a full year of study abroad that is not a "Duke in" program?

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): Right

Dean Inge Walther: I know the process that the former chair of the curriculum committee, Suzanne Shanahan, started the conversation by asking the committee members to go to their faculty and ask how many courses they thought should count, not knowing any of our policies. There was a difference, some people said 20 or 22 but there was a convergence around 24. When we started looking into it and got the information on what our current policies are, we ended up with 24 for the reasons Leslie mentioned. It seemed to be the best number.

Josh Socolar (Physics): This raises the follow up question of whether making this this limit negatively impacts students who do a full year [of study abroad] because they have used up their limit. They cannot do certain other things that other students take advantage of.

Dean Inge Walther: We looked at data, and we found that very few students take more than ten [non-Duke courses]. We did look at a lot of data, and we did not feel this would impact anybody. Many students take more than 34 courses anyway, so we are not preventing them from taking advantage of these other opportunities. This is only regarding the 34 that are required for graduation.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Could I ask Linda Franzoni, who is the associate dean from engineering, how does this look from the engineering school?

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): I was thinking about this, and we do not have a similar rule in engineering. In fact, I think we are a little more generous than this rule, because we do not have the two AP or transfer credit limit. I think our students can have more than ten non-Duke courses that count in the 34 because of the way we allow AP.

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): I do not know all of your students; I know the ones that I deal with. They take five or six courses [per semester], so even if they get more than 10, are they fewer than 24 Duke courses?

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): No, because they have the continuation requirement, so they have to take at least three....

Dean Lee Baker: They have to take trinity classes, too.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): It helps for the breadth of getting some of those. I think, for us, the takeaway message from this is that our DUSs, which is our education committee in Pratt, ought to come up with something similar. A lot of times, we try to have parallel chapters in the bulletin.

Dean Inge Walther: Right now, Pratt has a separate section in the bulletin.

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): I noticed that you mentioned the AP credit could be used for distribution credit. That is still true under our current, "only two credit" rule. They can have 16 and have all sorts of requirements; it just does not count for graduation credit. The fact that we limit it does not make those AP go away.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt): In Pratt, they can literally count them.

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): If you make those adjustments, you can clarify that they still matter.

Dean Lee Baker: And they are still on the transcript

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Please, bring this up at your department meetings and bring back feedback and things we have not yet been able to identify. We will continue this discussion in February, but I will turn to Chantal Reid who has the last word today.

Chantal Reid (Biology): I remember last spring when we had that conversation, and as a faculty representative, we had several questions and problems because of some inconsistencies in the proposal. This last version that I saw as a member of ECASC takes care of it. In fact, that proposal is straightforward and it strengthens and increases the requirements, so I fully support this iteration. I think in ECASC, we had a consensus that this is a pretty good proposal.

David Malone (Education): One last thing about what we are going to call "the Linda George question" about course format and delivery modes; I do not think that should be a curriculum committee task. That needs to involve the whole faculty.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): ECASC has had conversations about this, and it is complicated because we wish to establish regulations involving one mode of delivery. Why are we identifying one as opposed to other types of pedagogical formats and modes of delivery? Is the faculty ready to do that? We have not yet come to a resolution and discussion yet.

Dean Laurie Patton: I have a quick point of information for everybody, which is that although I do not have more detailed data than this, I did have an initial exchange with Matt Serra. The questionnaire for incoming students about their inclinations about taking online is the same as the results we reported to you last year. Roughly 20 percent of our students would take an online course, but a large majority of those would do so only if they were away or indisposed. Students are clearly continuing to signal to us that they do not come to Duke to take online courses. The culture seems to remain the same among students.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We will continue this discussion in February, so I look forward to seeing you soon.

Meeting Adjourned