

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, February 12, 2015

Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): We have a full agenda and I especially want to get started now so that we have plenty of time to discuss the two main topics in our meeting today. But first I want to take the opportunity to ask if you have had a chance to review the minutes from our January meeting and if you have any corrections, then let's propose. They will be up on the website, of course. If you recall, we had an executive session with Provost Sally Kornbluth. If you were not here for that executive session, we encourage you to talk to a colleague who was here for that session. If you want to read the minutes of that executive session, you're welcome to come by the office of Mary Nettleton. Are there any motions to amend or correct the December or January minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve them?

Linda George (Sociology): So moved.

Margaret Humphreys (History and Medicine): Seconded.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The motion carries. I know when you prepare for meetings the minutes are really verbatim these days. You can review discussions of proposals that have already begun and prepare yourself that way. And I encourage you also to tell your colleagues when you return to your departments that they are welcome to do as well, and sometimes that helps other colleagues come into a discussion with some background information.

Announcements and Updates

I have three announcements. One has to do with our future council meetings. We have an awful lot on our agenda for this spring. We have a number of curriculum proposals and certificate proposals, which will be coming up from the curriculum committee. The executive committee has almost completed its recommendations on bylaw reforms. We certainly want that to take place. We have one last little bit to get into place, and we'll be able to turn to that very shortly. We also have to fold into our meetings a discussion of strategic planning. You'll hear a little bit about that as an introduction today. I have tentatively scheduled two additional meetings of the Arts & Sciences Council. I know the last thing in the world that you want is to attend an extra meeting, but please be mindful that this represents an opportunity to review and possibly approve the work colleagues who have been working on important faculty business throughout the year and in some cases it goes back a couple of years or so. Along those lines, we missed, because of the executive session, Lee Baker's report on student athletes in courses. He is unable to be here at this meeting and give that report, so he is going to do that at the March 5 meeting, just before we go on spring break. I know a number of you are interested in that. Some of those meetings are going to be voting sessions, so please be mindful of that. If you are unable to attend, please get your alternate to attend in your stead.

My second announcement has to do with the DKU joint committee. We recently approved two courses in neurosciences and psychology for a summer session at DKU. They were not courses that were in any way contentious or controversial. I want to announce to you the precedent that is now in place to protect departments in particular regarding their courses. The committee essentially formulated the policy that all courses, including courses that currently are in the undergraduate bulletin, if they are proposed to be taught at DKU, must first be reviewed and approved by the department,

that is, the DUS in that department. The recommendation for the course to be taught at DKU will then come to the DKU joint committee for review and approval. This is just an extra layer to protect departments, some of whom worry, and we don't have a policy regarding courses that are in the bulletin. Once they're in the bulletin, we do not have a policy for reviewing and approving them if they are taught again, by the way. Review and approval of courses pertains only to new courses, but this policy pertains now to courses in the bulletin offered at DKU. In conversations with Dean Baker, he thought it would be wise, although I don't know who would decide this (It may just become a practice), that directors of certificate programs should also approve in advance courses taught at DKU to count towards that certificate. So, just be mindful that is indeed going to be the case.

There's one more announcement and I want to ask Lee Willard if she would make that very briefly, and then I'll flesh out some details that involve the council. Lee, thank you. Dean Patton is unable to be here.

Lee Willard (Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education): Thank you so much. In the life of communities, whether it's religious or social or educational, about every 10 years, folks take time to do strategic planning, take a step back, look what we've done well, where we'd like to be, or the things we can improve on. Duke has traditionally done this in a number of ways. I would just like to outline a number of processes that are ongoing now and where we're going with those. Duke has intentionally, traditionally done this as a part of the accreditation process. We've done a quality enhancement plan. Two rotations ago we decided interdisciplinarity was our mantra. This last time, it was all focused on global education. That's the time where the university says "Where are we going to be? What are we going to do?" Our next one of these will come in 2019, so we're in between now, getting ready to put our five year update in. We've also done this with the curriculum every 10 years or so. It's been more than 10 years since we last looked, but you're going to hear today some of the Imagining Duke Curriculum. It's not unusual for there to be an ebb and flow of that process. Sometimes things are tightened, sometimes things are loosened. That process is well underway. It's also done at the time of transition. Sally has come as the new provost. What does she want to be the stamp of her administration? What are her priorities? As we look to a new dean, how can we provide some information for the new dean? Several of these are underway. Suzanne is out and about talking every Friday from three to five with faculty. I hear great food and drink go with that. The provost has an academic planning committee. We heard Sally up here last time where she listed her questions. Noah is co-chairing that with Susan Lozier. The provost committee is really looking at the big picture. What should Duke look like? What signature efforts should we pursue to get there? They are really beginning a conversation that will be university-wide. We have on Arts & Sciences Council five members that are on Noah and Susan's strategic planning committee. They are Gary Bennett, from Psychology and Neuroscience and Global Health; Laurent Dubois who is in Romance Studies and History; Alex Hartemink who's in Computer Science, Biology, and Statistics; Adrienne Lentz-Smith from History; and Kristine Stiles (from Art, Art History & Visual Studies). Those faculty members are also out and about, and they are conducting what I like as a listening campaign. I know that I've seen Noah in several venues and I know that Kristine has been meeting with departments in the humanities and beginning conversations. That process will continue through the summer and into the fall as Sally and the group work together to have a strategic plan. In Arts & Sciences, Laurie has written the departments on February 6 asking that each department devote a faculty meeting to reflecting on where they are, what the strengths of the department and programs are, who their partners are, what we can do to deepen quality without necessarily adding a lot of resources. What kind of facilities and infrastructure do departments need? What are the classroom needs? What are the technology needs? What are the library resources needed? Arts & Sciences departments will hopefully have a faculty meeting and will submit something by May 1. We anticipate that we will assimilate that in time for the new dean and to prepare the new dean in a very summary matter. That process will likely feed in an executive committee way into the university playing process, since we are such the heart of the university. In all of these opportunities are important that faculty participate and share your thoughts because I think they really matter. Everyone is out to hear faculty voices in all of these venues. It is a very yeasty time at Duke, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me just follow up with just two notes for you as council representatives. If you want to meet with strategic planning committee of the provost, please contact Susan Booth from the Provost's office. She's organizing lunches. Grab Noah Pickus after the council meeting and give him an earful about what you think Duke should look like in ten years. Noah is very accessible, as you know. Let me ask you to do this. The strategic planning process is an administrative process, but in conversations with Laurie Patton and Lee Willard, within Arts & Sciences, we want councilpersons to have a chance to air some of their views. Your chairs have already received a memo from Laurie with questions specific to Arts & Sciences about the type of issues that tend to come up in Arts & Sciences strategic planning. Please get in touch with your chair, and when your chair schedules that department meeting, take good notes, listen to colleagues, understand what's being said, pitch in where you can. I would like for those department conversations then to feed into a council session we're going to hold on March 26, probably – it hasn't been approved formally yet – where we hope to have all departments here, hearing what's going on within them. You may not have taken part in the strategic planning process before. It's new for me as well, but this is really important for you to pitch in and make your department represented in that discussion. I will send out a reminder to you. It's too soon to do it March 5th I think but March 26 seems reasonable.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): So each department will submit a report on behalf of each specific council member, and the chair will submit a report?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): You don't send a report to A&S Council. The chair does that to the dean. All we're going to do is have a discussion informed by discussions in the department. Any further questions?

Update on Curriculum Reform

I've been so eager to hear this interim report. I wanted to clear as much time as I possibly could in our Arts & Sciences Council meeting to hear it and especially to discuss it. The Imagining Duke Curriculum Committee has been meeting since September. It is composed of a bright, imaginative group of 10 colleagues from the different divisions. Their meetings have been really creative and interesting. I know a number of you have gone to some of them. They have come to departments. They've been having lots of individual conversations. They are currently having open meetings on East Campus and West Campus. No one can say that the work they're doing is hidden behind closed doors. In fact, it's been deliberately quite the opposite. Our intention is not to bore. Our intention is to draw you and your creative ideas about the curriculum out so they can become part of a curriculum review and reform. Let me introduce Suzanne Shanahan who will introduce an interim report. We're very curious to hear, Suzanne, what your committee is beginning to think about now that you have had 6 months.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): Thank you, Tom, for setting the bar fairly low. My objective is not to bore. I think that many people have heard me do a shtick in a number of different venues, whether it's our weekly meetings, departments, or some of the more open session. So what I want to do now is to provide a brief and informal update, not reviewing the basics but really talking about how we're currently thinking and where we want to move forward with our work as a committee. I think, as many people know, our work has had a three-fold approach. Lots of conversation with faculty, students, and staff, trying to understand the different ways people experience current curriculum. What they think is working well, what they think is working less well, and where we might take advantage of some great opportunities. Second, we're looking at a lot of data about Duke. I think we all have a particular understanding of what's going on. The Duke data rounds out that perspective. And third, we're looking at best practices here at Duke and at other universities to think about what we might learn from different programs.

It's important to understand that the Committee really proceeds inductively. I think of us largely as ethnographers trying to understand the dynamics on the ground and then think of ways to respond to them. This is not about a committee going into a room and divining a new curriculum. We're really trying to constantly get input from you all and proceed iteratively in that process. I think in the fall much of our work and conversation was organized around diagnosing some of the more of the significant concerns faculty had with current curriculum. This spring we're oriented by two questions. The first is: What is the promise of a Duke education? What is the opportunity we all have in this education? And second: What would animating that promise actually look like, in terms of a set of structures, programs, etc.? We're basically, at this point, trying to explore, tentatively, a set of possible ways to fulfill this promise. Note again, the committee is really a filter. We are constantly triangulating between different perspectives. I'll give you a more specific example when I talk about some of the ideas that folks have laid on the table. We're really taking what you all have to say and sorting it through and trying to move forward with it. I'd also say, as a person who is often prone to sarcasm and cynicism in life in general, this has been a phenomenal process. The way the Arts and Sciences faculty have stepped up, the way that they have engaged is really for all of us who are doing this crushing amount of work, truly inspiring. It's exciting, it's energizing, and totally humbling. When I talk both about the Promise of this education and what we are collectively beginning to ask for and how that might be embodied, these are really ideas of others that I am putting out on the table.

Let's talk about what I mean by the promise of a Duke education. Here I'm going to outline five things. First, we really do mean a liberal arts education. Really we do mean a liberal arts education for all Trinity students. Liberal Arts. For all students. An education that is about, if we quote Lee Baker, who is not here so we can quote him at will, "learning to learn for a lifetime." Or, as one of the smartest Duke students I've met in a whole long time at a recent DSG conversation said, "The knowledge and experience necessary for a thoughtful and meaningful life in the big, ever-changing, and quite frankly scary world." An education that will prepare students for a world we do not yet know. Or, per the Duke mission, that will prepare students to be thoughtful, engaged citizens, serving and leading. That's what we mean when we talk about liberal arts. Second, we mean an education where majors are a rigorous, robust, centerpiece of the intellectual experience. Put differently, and here I'll channel a little bit of Dan Kiehart: "We're not messing with anyone's majors." We understand departments and disciplines know their own business. This process is about understanding how the major might better be integrated with other experiences students have on campus, both inside and outside the classroom. We're talking about integrating general education with the major. We're not messing with people's majors. Third, we mean an education that really is an invitation to a scholarly community that faculty and students alike are really excited about. That they're both excited about and committed to. We understand that there's lots of genius behind the matrix. It's really hard to get behind something you don't understand. We need more simple. We need more straightforward. We need something people can get behind.

When we talk about this scholarly community, it is a community that values academic exploration, meandering, and adventurism. We want students to go out there, try new things that they may not have expected trying before. But it's also simultaneously, a deliberative, reflective pursuit of a coherent pathway. I don't mean that to be a contradiction in terms. It's a little adventure and a little coherence. It's adventure in the service of coherence. An education that encourages students to articulate and pursue their passion. That encourages independent and faculty-mentored, scholarly, broadly conceived, signature work. An education that values greater student self-authorship. We want them to own their education here, and that provides the structure and mentoring to facilitate it. Ray Li, who's the academic VP for DSG, is a beautiful example of this. He's a double history and political science major, but he describes his experience here as being filtered by a passion and an interest and a commitment to American educational policy. It's the way he's experienced both those disciplines in a really profound way. That's really what we're after here. Fourth, we mean an education that reflects the fact that Duke is a research university with strengths in global education, research, interdisciplinarity, and experiential and community-based learning models. Duke should look different from Swarthmore. Liberal arts at Duke are not the same as at a small liberal arts college. Substantive engagement with research is a signature feature of what we can offer. This is something we should all promote and be proud of. The goal is not simply to reproduce little mini-me's. I know many faculty would like their students to go on and pursue the things that they pursued. Certainly if a few more students went on to get PhDs I think we'd all be thrilled, but I don't think that's really simply the goal here. I think we want to invite students into what we love and what we spend our time doing, and show them the promise of that research and why it's worthwhile.

Fifth and finally, we mean education that we understand is our shared social contract. Faculty, staff and students together. An education that promotes the best in our students and in ourselves, that encourages us to live up to high expectations. I think several people have gone to the conversations that ten faculty have really generously agreed to lead. There was a phenomenal one about two weeks ago with David Malone and Wahneema Lubiano. At the end, David Malone said whatever happens here, faculty are going to have to step up. And if we want change, faculty are part of that change. This is my point about this being part of a social contract. If we want to have high expectations of our students we need high expectations of ourselves. We should be excited about being able to Step up and do something vis-à-vis our curriculum. When we started there was a lot of ambivalence. People don't really know what it is we're doing or why it is we're doing it. If nothing else happens we can generate an intuitive, intelligible curriculum that people can be excited about. That would be great. Maybe we have a curriculum that's a reason why students actually come here. Currently, they come in spite of the curriculum. It would be great if students would come here because of it.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): When you talk about a social contract are you talking about at the university or are you talking more globally, like social justice issues?

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee) It's interesting because the conversation with David and Wahneema was really about the broader social obligations of higher education in society that I think I'm talking about here. What it is we're trying to achieve here with our students, collaboratively with them. If we take these five principles and we provided data metatags for them, they would be liberal arts, major, deliberate, integrated, coherent, self-authored, signature work, research, and social contract. So the question is: What on earth do we do and how do we think about moving forward? What are some of the structures that we have been talking amongst ourselves and with others about? These are all things that are kind of out there on the table. We're trying to push them a little further and see where they go, if anywhere. So nothing is in fact an actual proposal.

The first is to consider limiting the number of transcribed credentials a student can in fact get at Duke. There's an oft-touted statistic on the admissions page: 83 percent of students do more than one thing. We know that students can major, they can double major, they can major, minor and certificate. They're currently allowed to do three. Perhaps it would make sense to say, "Let's not do three. Let's just do two."

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): One and play. One and play.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): Maybe it makes sense to say one. Maybe it makes sense to say if you're going to do some second thing, do it in a different area, someplace radically different. One of the things that I think the committee was quite surprised at when they look at the data was that, by and large, when students do multiple things, they're not double majoring. Somehow I thought this was all this double majoring in cognate disciplines. No, that's not what's happening. Students are majoring, they're certificating, minoring, and they're doing so in different divisions and different areas by and large. Maybe we should encourage more of that, but less of the collection of certificates. How do we get students thinking about their education, creating their own pathways, without resorting to credential-seeking behavior?

The second one is something that's kind of been around in conversation for a good bit now, and that's the idea of modularity. We currently have a 15-week semester irrespective of your learning objectives. Could we imagine accompanying the current 15-week semester with forms of modularity, where you could have just-in-time courses, where you could have courses that are more intense for short durations, where we might bring in a practitioner, for example? This is something that students in our bi-weekly conversations have raised. The idea of having some courses that are shorter -- maybe a half credit -- that provide certain kinds of skills: introduction to coding, supplemental language support. Lots of

students are now doing research in a language, and they may have some facility with the language but they are going into the field and want to be able to use it in those terms. How can we provide these additional opportunities for students? The basic logic is, shouldn't the structure of our course be more commensurate with our actual learning objectives? We're not imagining that everyone is moving to a Colorado College model, but rather some flexibility within the existing system.

The third is how we might better use the Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory mechanisms that exist currently to better encourage this adventurism that I talked about. This is something that actually first came from a DSG initiative. The students really wanted to understand how we can use these mechanisms to get students to get out of their comfort zone, try something that they wouldn't otherwise try. Could the ability to take something pass/fail encourage you to stretch in a way that you might not otherwise. Here is a very interesting example of how the conversation has been very iterative. I think DSG came with a very conservative proposal about allowing students to take a couple general education classes pass/fail. The committee had a conversation with Brown (University), and there you can take anything you want, so we think maybe we should expand this wildly. We go back to the students and they say you're crazy. Moreover, they suggest not just a more conservative allocation of satisfactory/unsatisfactory but they think unsatisfactory should be considered anything below an 80. They want to ramp up what is considered satisfactory because they want to be in classes with students who are really trying their best. Is this a mechanism we can use to encourage this adventurism and exploration?

The fourth idea is of informal, templated pathways. This has come up repeatedly in conversations both with faculty and with students. You can really see when a student has experienced a profound overlay pathway in their academic program. A student was talking about their work with Peter Feaver through his Grand Strategy program. He has really through that program created a trajectory for students to engage in really intense and profound ways. How do we develop more of those opportunities? How do we imagine, perhaps, having departments template something like an interdepartmental major? I'm always thinking in Sociology, "Why aren't there more sociology/statistics students?" Could we imagine putting together an interdepartmental major collaboratively with Statistics, and saying for students who are so inclined, "Here's a package that you could pursue."?

Another thing on the table is alternative transcribing including living transcripts, etc. This is an idea that's emerged in different places, basically saying if we want students to imagine their experience here at Duke as more of a set of credentials, maybe our outward facing statement of their education should reflect that. How could a transcript embody these things in really interesting and profound ways? I think this is coupled with a realization that it would be great if students were more deliberative and reflective in course selection, in their major selection, in their minor selection. Tom Nechyba threw out at a meeting recently that wouldn't it be great if we just asked students before they registered for classes, before they had that conversation in your office, to kind of say what they were thinking about and how the particular choice of classes they imagines was going to answer the questions they were grappling with as a human being. How they were thinking about perhaps connecting that set of classes to a global education experience or a summer internship. I know Beth Fox is working with some really great ideas around portfolios, etc. and so we've been talking a good bit to her on those issues.

One of the things that's come up in different sorts of ways is the first-year experience. I think everybody we meet says there is something magical about that first semester FOCUS experience. Students are bright, shiny, clean. They come to campus and they'll read anything you ask them to, and they'll rewrite any paper you want them to. There's an energy, an enthusiasm, but I think part of it is that that's an invitation to a scholarly community that the faculty are excited about, that has a living-learning dimension to it. How do we create those kinds of invitations? Also, how do we create a set of generalized exposures for some of the big picture questions and some of the different disciplines in that first year? We all know that to generalize and make FOCUS required in some sense would kill the spirit of focus. What are other mechanisms one might put in place that are FOCUS-esque? Can we imagine clusters of courses that introduce students to big ideas, that are along the model of the signature courses Inge (Walther) has developed but are really catered more to a first-year audience, that engages with different disciplines, that engages them with the different modes of thought in really capacious ways. Maybe they ask big questions about global warming and then explore it from different divisions. It's really creating a differential first-year experience that is really about an invitation to this scholarly community, not about checking as many things off your matrix as you can when you have the chance. I recognize fully that there are constraints on students, students pursuing pre-health, students in different disciplines, who need to get rolling on things, but I think we need to have a kind of softer entry to this experience; not an experience that jumps you headlong into a discipline, but that introduces you headfirst into what's thrilling about it, introduces you to why we all pursued these different disciplines. We need to make students excited about that before we jump students into the mechanics of those particular disciplines. The final two things I want to note are the idea of signature work. In all of our conversations with students this has come up as being important. Students like the idea of being able to pursue an idea of their choosing in collaboration with faculty or in collaboration with other students. They want to take this education that they're getting here at Duke and put it someplace. It may be a serious piece of research that they go on to publish, it might be producing an app, it might be choreographing a dance. They want to be able to walk away from Duke and say, "Here's my deliverable." This was the magic and the promise of a Duke education. Students are really hankering for that ability, and that's one of the things that a place like Duke can best offer. Finally, to simply note that in parallel to the work of this committee, I think there are lots of other efforts on campus where people are really thinking through how we can do what we do here in more exciting, invigorating ways. For example, this is some of the work in the humanities through the Philosophy, Arts, and Literature group. This is spectacular work about how to invite students early on into what's thrilling about the humanities and how to create a set of

gateway structures for students who might have an interest in the humanities. This might be something that's exciting for students, but also that becomes a signature feature of what happens at Duke, much in the same way that FOCUS does.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): What do you think, colleagues? Now we have time for some questions, comments, observations and so forth.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): Great, interesting work. A lot of the challenges you identified could be solved using some projects like Program II. I wonder if that came up in any of the discussions. It's self-designated, it usually has their own capstone, a research project. It's interdisciplinary. I've been a really strong advocate, and I have the greatest number of Program IIs right now. I was wondering if the idea of moving towards having more open-ended, self-created pathways like that was discussed at all and where it fits.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): This is something we've absolutely discussed, and we've discussed it in two different ways. We've discussed how to proliferate the opportunity of Program II in general, how to do that in different ways that may be more user friendly for students who would like to create a pathway, but say to themselves, "Creating this really intense pathway is very overwhelming." Are there ways you Program II in certain areas? Can you Program II your own mini minor or something? We've also talked about would it make sense to Program II the general education requirements. We've also put on the table, as I've said, this notion of interdepartmental majors, which are really an underutilized opportunity for students. Given that so many disciplines are intersecting in really exciting ways that might be something that we can put out there as an opportunity so that students wouldn't be overwhelmed. As I'm sure you know, it's not an easy task to outline that.

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): It's set up now to be slightly daunting to self-select only the students who will be very dedicated. Students often say that they feel dissuaded when they see how challenging it is. I think there are ways to lower the bar to make it more accessible to more people.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): I think that's actually very consistent with what we're talking about.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): A lot of these resonate with things that we're saying in Women's Studies. First of all, a comment, and I think you've acknowledged this, but there are contradictions among these different goals. Second, I don't endorse lowering bar for Program II. I don't know that I'm always impressed with what I see for Program II. You're talking about majors, and self-authorship, and other pathways. Liberal arts must consider a certain depth and space for reflection. Secondly, I haven't heard a mention about diversity. Is there a way that is written in from the ground up?

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): I think we've only had a very brief conversation about the values implicit. So issues around diversity, sustainability, moral purpose, and a cluster of things like this and how they get written in: We haven't engaged in that in a substantive way, but that's not to say our intention is not to do so. It just hasn't happened yet. If you have ideas in particular about how that might be best structured, it would be super if you would bring them on down at some point, and we could talk.

Margaret Humphreys (History and Medicine): A couple thoughts. When you talked about double majors, certificates, the obvious point is that we now have majors that have to be double majors, so you can't just say a single major because then you destroy that whole major structure. The other point, and I love FOCUS and used to teach in FOCUS, is that I felt the pressure coming from my department that these classes are too small, and you need to get enrollment up, and you need to do all of these things that are not my particular department's limitation, I don't think, in that all of this stuff that talks about intensive experiences for students, almost invariably requires small group face time, but we are being told we must shrink our faculty. How can we expand these things in the face of shrinkage? I assume you're thinking about that.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): While it's not clear when I talk about the progress of education, this is a fairly pragmatic group of people. Yes, we absolutely think about it. Two things to address your concern: First, I suggest you join Steffen Bass at 11:30 for lunch, with Mona Hassan. He's leading the next conversation with faculty, and really one of the themes of that conversation will be about how to balance across disciplines the needs of those disciplines. You have needs, given your department, to teach large classes. Then we have these exciting, sexy, high-impact opportunities that only cater to a few small select group of students. So the question he's going to pose is, "How do we think about this?" So, hopefully Steffen will solve that problem for us.

Steve Nowicki (Biology): I love the notion of modularity, making bigger units like Duke immerse and smaller units, because of the arbitrary-ness of the 14-week semester, but I'm wondering if your committee has or would be able to wrestle with some of the logistics. Some of the issues we have at Duke, and really everywhere, seem to be really logistical issues. One is that at Duke we have this course credit approach. You can have a course or a half course, you can't even have credit hours, which it would seem makes it difficult to think about modularity. We could change that but that would probably be a

lot of wrestling. The other is the logistics of how you map student and faculty schedules on the reality of classrooms and stuff like that, so I'm wondering if the Registrar would be involved with that or if there are other universities that have done it.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): So, we're doing a couple things. I think somehow the committee did somehow get bamboozled into dealing with the course credit/hour and how to actually do this. I think on how to do it, we actually have a freakish store of talent on the committee who find those sorts of questions thrilling to explore, like how could we code this. Certainly both issues are things we intend to look at. In each of these the issue is what's the idea and what are the mechanics, and how might we proceed in doing that.

Linda George (Sociology): I have two issues I'd like to raise. The first, and this is actually from a report that Steve Nowicki gave to the executive committee of this group. I've become increasingly concerned that the opportunities Duke offers be available to students of every socioeconomic background, and I am very concerned about students in the doughnut hole, meaning students who are above the threshold for getting substantial financial aid, but also have restrictions on what they or their parents can invest on their educational opportunities. I would hope that your committee would pay some attention to accessibility and cost, and what this really implies and whether this could lead to some kind of stratification of what students can take advantage of what opportunities. The second point I would make would be to follow up on Margaret's point. I've been here a long time. The duties that faculty are expected to do have grown vastly over those past 40 years, and exponentially, I would say, in the past ten years. If we want a curriculum that isn't great just on paper but really lives up to promise of what it can be, somebody, not your committee, needs to look at if it's feasible given the current expectations of faculty, whether those expectations will have to change, look at what faculty get rewarded for, which is not always investment in the best education one can give to undergraduate students. I hope you will look at the broader context. Anything that looks wonderful on paper has to go beyond a beautiful plan that faculty would endorse and be thrilled to pursue, but may not have the resources to actually invest in as one would hope.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): The first point, I think about the unanticipated consequences and whether what we might put in place could create inequalities across populations. I think this is something we're really attentive to. One of the things we think about when we think about a transcript is how we think about undergraduate experience as four years, and how there might be complementary information between the curricular and co-curricular experience. Co-curricular experiences are in fact a system of inequalities on campus in lots and lots of ways. If we imagine this as integrative we need to be really attentive to that dynamic. I think it is something we're looking at, and I totally agree that we need to be really attentive to implications of any faculty workload or any student workload. The point that's not here that's actually on our checklist of points is actually how do we adjust financial model and faculty model in terms of any changes we may put in place. We're not thinking that through entirely until we get there but this is not a committee who are going to create a set of things that are going to create extra work for everyone else. That's really, really critical. We've also talked about a shadow curriculum at Duke – Bass Connections, Duke Engage, Duke Immerse – that in many ways are phenomenal experiences for faculty to participate in but that aren't understood in the ways departments want them or need them. A lot of people do it for free so when we talk about integrating the curriculum, it's also about integrating the faculty experience of it. In making that more of a centerpiece, other stuff has to go. This isn't add to add the promise on top of the matrix and all be crushed by it.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): Just a clarification to clarify what you meant when you said inequality across the board in co-curricular requirements. I'm unsure what that phrase means.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): No, I just think that there certain experiences at Duke that require money.

Steve Nowicki (Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education): It's not requirements. It's potential experiences, so if you want to be in the Greek system, which is big here, it costs a lot of money. Spring break trips, stuff like that.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): This has been an exhilarating conversation. This is what I thought I would be doing when I became a professor. My real question is: this committee goes on for three years but we won't have a curriculum at the other end of it. When do we expect a new curriculum?

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): We can't go on forever. This has to end. My understanding is that three years from last fall there would be a new curriculum in place.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): The first part is where we assess where we are, and to get some principles about where we can improve, and we're getting the interim report of that. The final report will be done at the beginning of the fall term.

Ken Rogerson (Public Policy): There's been a discussion about advising and revising the advising process. Have you engaged with them at all? It sounds like some of the things that they came up with, especially regarding a complete, four-year advising process, could fit very well.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): Absolutely. I think less that entire body, but Steve is on that advisory committee.

Steve Nowicki (Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education): We're working on that, and it should be incorporated at various levels into advising later in spring. And, of course, it is not a parallel. It's a fully interdigitated set of issues because if you don't have good advising, the curriculum is going to be hard to do.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): I think it aligns very well.

Lee Willard: I want to make sure that the committee is thinking closely about a commitment for infrastructure that goes with this. I've been thinking a lot about how the university is underprepared to deal with students that have little personal social capital. For a highly motivated student, I had a privileged background, my parents provided me multiple opportunities, but if we're increasing our diversity, if you're from a rural community that doesn't have AP, it's going to require an infrastructure so that all students can succeed. On one hand, we're putting these numbers out there, and we're so proud of them, but on the other, we have to enable success for all of our students. There's an infrastructure under here, and I hope that would be one of the guiding principles.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): I think through advising a lot of this is being considered. We don't want to create a structure that is going to systematically disadvantage any community that we have here.

Karin Shapiro (African and African American Studies): This is purely anecdotal, but I have a sense that students have become far more anxious, and so I wonder if your committee has gone to psychological services and has tried to get a sense from them why they come in so frazzled, which has enormous implications for their ability to explore and do interesting things. Are they being brought into the conversation? I would hope so.

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): They have not yet been brought into the conversation. But I think it's March 20th they are coming in (to meet). David Malone and I are on a thesis that's exploring this issue. It's ever-present in students' minds, so lots of thoughts there.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Suzanne, thank you. Let me make one announcement before we go to the course credits proposal. The curriculum committee is discussing a moratorium on new majors and new certificate programs. In the light of what you've heard from Suzanne, the development of these new curricular initiatives needs to slow down so we can develop the Duke curriculum. Wait for a decision on this very soon, and if you are part of a faculty group that is putting together a certificate proposal or a new major or minor proposal, please get in touch with David Malone or tell your colleagues about this because we don't want anyone to be blindsided.

Graduation Credits Proposal

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Council has been discussing a graduation course credits proposal for a year. Last year it got tangled up in the question of online courses, and David's committee has gone back this year and reconsidered. From my impression of our discussion in January, they have separated out the question of pedagogical formats. We need to return to this question because if Council wants to make this a foundation upon which a new curriculum could be built, we will want and need to vote, if not today than sometime this spring.

David Malone (Chair, Curriculum Committee): So, as Tom mentioned, in fall 2013, when Suzanne (Shanahan) was chair of the Curriculum Committee we were asked to look at this challenge we have of not really having a guideline in place for the number of Duke-originated courses students are required to take in order to graduate. The faculty became aware that it was possible to take even 16 courses and graduate from Duke. How many Duke-originated courses should be required for graduation? As we talked about in our previous meeting, we tried as a committee to decouple questions about course delivery mode and course format from the question of how many Duke-originated courses are required for graduation. Based on the previous Curriculum Committee's work of establishing 24, this committee agreed with that assessment that we have 34 courses required for graduation, which leaves us with 10 credits for other courses. In our proposal, we set certain limitations on the number or types of those courses that can count for graduation, but in no way do we restrict students from taking as many of those types of those courses as they desire to take.

Dean Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): We've had a number of discussions about this in the Council, so if anyone has any remaining questions, this is the chance to ask us.

Karin Shapiro (African & African American Studies): How did you come to the number of 24?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): It was a mixture of things. I think Suzanne, who was chair of the committee at the time, had the committee members ask colleagues. How many Duke-originated courses should count. As predicted we got a number of responses, anywhere from 20 to 26. Then we started looking at our current policies and what they are in regard to transfer credit, study abroad credit, and it seemed 24 was a reasonable number that wouldn't prohibit students from studying abroad or taking advantage of other things, but it would insure that students were getting a good dose of Duke faculty in their education.

David Malone (Chair, Curriculum Committee): To be clear, "Duke in" programs that are Duke study abroads are Duke-originated courses.

Micaela Janan (Classics): Under the current system it says up to 17 courses could be taken by students. A certain number can be study abroad and a certain number could be transferred. Could you break that down, if you wouldn't mind?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): They can take a maximum of two non-study abroad transfer credits. They could take up to 10 study abroad transfer credits. They could take up to 8 inter-institutional courses.

David Malone (Education): And they could have up to 2 Aps or IBs.

Linda George (Sociology): I really like this. I really appreciate the work you all put into it. It Strengthens the Duke degree by requiring a greater number of Duke courses. I'd like to see the question called.

Margaret Humphreys (History and Medicine): Seconded.

Course Proposal Process

Thomas Robisheaux (History): What Inge Walther is going to talk about is a process for proposing new courses which will go into effect in May.

Linda George (Sociology): Is the council going to vote on this?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): This is not being voted on. This is an administrative procedural matter but I would nevertheless like your feedback. What I would like to talk about are changes to the course request procedure that the Arts & Sciences Council Courses Committee has been discussing for a number of years now. I'm going to explain a bit of the background behind these changes and also tell you a little bit about why they are particularly opportune. The current online course request program that we have in place since 2004 was basically just a wholesale putting online of the old paper forms. Those of you may remember the former course request procedure required a one page document. You fill out a form, put in a bulletin description, think about the number of course credits, the DUS signs it, and the chair signs. It was required that a physical signature goes on there from the DUS and the department chair.

Now that the university is undergoing all of these changes and growth and innovation and transformation, it has become clear to the courses committee that current procedures are no longer meeting the needs of the university. As you know, we are now engaging in deep conversations about strategic planning and curriculum reform so this also comes at a welcome moment that will allow us to go with the flow of these changes. I think there has been a clear need for a new program that allows for streamlined processes that can adapt as we go along. I know part of the strategic planning will be how to better integrate the schools across the campus. The grand plan is for this new course request program to be available to other schools across the university.

A little bit of history: until 2004, we had these paper forms. Then, what we found even until now, is that some of the faculty are still filling out these paper forms. Then they give them to the DUS or the DUS assistant and they provide all the information. They fill out the forms electronically, and in some cases, the faculty delegate that the DUS or the faculty coordinator choose the codes. The result has been that it's no wonder that the faculty don't know about our curriculum because they've never had to fill out their own forms. The forms actually have links to very specific guidelines and criteria for the curricular codes. We hope that some of the codes will go away with the new curriculum, but we still have to live with this curriculum for another two or three years. No matter what, whatever curriculum we end up having, we need to have a course request process that faculty take ownership of. Faculty need their own decisions about how courses fit in to any curriculum that have and not delegate it to staff assistants. I hope that's clear to everybody, and that's also one of the major goals.

The Courses Committee is charged with insisting on the highest standards, ensuring proper and appropriate academic credit, and appropriate classification and labeling of all courses in accordance with the stipulations of the current

curriculum. This is our charge, and yet, our forms are so inadequate to this task so they require minimal information, there's no information on course goals or course requirements. How are we supposed to decide that this course is up to the highest standard of a Duke education? There's no way. It's almost pointless to have a courses committee. The online forms also provide no information regarding expectations with regard to course credit, course duration, and workload. How are faculty supposed to know what is supposed to be worth one credit, a half credit, or how long a course is supposed to be? There's no information. Many course requests are submitted without department or program review. This is one of the reasons why some faculty remain relatively clueless about the curriculum. The committee has frequently had to go back to faculty or to departments requesting more information. Should this really have a CCI? Or is this really enough to warrant the Ethical Inquiry designation? So this creates a lot of extra work for the members on the committee, for me and my staff, and a lot of aggravated faculty. It's turned into a very frustrating process. Some of you may have been the victims of my emails. It's been rather frustrating. We now have been in discussion with Trinity Technology Services. How this came about is that the committee asked Trinity Technology Services if they can change our course request forms to allow faculty to provide more information. They said no, that their program was so cumbersome and it would take so long, so they decided about a year ago that they could build a whole new program from the ground up, which is quite an undertaking. I cannot tell you how complex this course request system is, but since there are so many users involved it's just an incredibly complex system. I would just like to give a huge shout out to Gabe Fahl and Trinity Technology Services who built this and has just been an absolute dream to work with, and we're really grateful to him. This has allowed us to implement the kind of changes we need, and I know you're all waiting to hear what those will be.

Some of our goals will be that these new changes will empower the faculty, and the departments and programs to take more responsibility of their own courses and their own standards. It will provide the courses committee with more complete information to guide our decisions and it will allow our programmers to accommodate changes that come as a result of a new curriculum. Those are the main goals and, as I mentioned, this program can be potentially available to other schools across university.

All faculty and staff will have access to the online forms through their net IDs and passwords. Faculty will fill out their own forms online. If you need help from your staff that will still be possible, but we'd like faculty to take ownership of their own course requests. It will ensure a department review procedure by requiring electronic signature from a DUS or a DGS.

Forms now will include contact hours, workload, and expectations for credit. This information about contact hours and workload reflects current policies, not any proposed policies. Those who are thinking about modularity or possibly moving back to a semester hour from a course credit system, all of those things are up in the air and can be revised, but at least we have a place for it on the course request form. Whatever policies we have now are put in place. It will be here. It will be explained. This will also give everybody the opportunity to know that we really do expect that for a full course credit, students will be spending about 10 hours per week in and out of class on that course. We do know that students don't spend that amount of time, at least that's what they say on their end of course evaluations, but that is the expectation.

We have also discovered that Duke is really unique in not requiring a syllabus to accompany a request for new courses. I know that's been the Duke culture for years and that's really hard to overcome, and I, as a faculty member, know how hard it is to write a syllabus 6 months before I teach a course. I usually don't write my syllabus until at least a month in advance. We're not going to require a full syllabus for every course request, but it would be so helpful to the courses committee if we could require some basic information: a fuller course description, course goals and objectives, so that if you do say your course fulfills the Ethical inquiry requirement, we can be sure that that's going to happen. A bit of an idea about course texts and materials will be used. This will just be a tentative list. It doesn't have to be the final list. We'll have a better idea of what the course is about. What are the course requirements? Faculty will just have to fill out these boxes, but have the option to submit a full syllabus. Also, there will be a review process. The DUS/DGS will have to say something about the rationale for the course. Is this a Bass Connections course? Is this a Duke Immerse course? Is this a signature course? Some information about how often the course will be offered, and how regularly over the next four to six years. Then, issues of course overlap. The course committee has had to grapple with this. There are a lot of courses offered by different departments that look very much alike.

What we're planning to do is to start a soft rollout around mid-April, asking some of the larger departments to start using it, to iron out the bugs. This is the time of year when we don't have many course requests anymore, during April and May. Nevertheless, we'd like to ask a few of you to submit courses, even if they're dummy courses for the moment, to try it out. Then, May 11, we will go live. Then we'll be fully online with this new course request program. The look and feel of it will be quite different than the one we have now, so it'll take a bit of getting used to, but I think it will work well and serve our purposes better.

Please, if you or your faculty have any feedback for me. It's not set in stone completely yet, so I welcome feedback before spring break.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): Will there be a means for a person who's considering, for example, to register a course for ethical inquiry to look at titles and descriptions of other courses that have been offered historically?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): That's a good idea. I'll look at that over the summer.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): Secondly, if you assign ten hours of reading in your class, they get intimidated.

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): Ten hours refers to in and out of class. The federal guidelines that are based on the Carnegie credit unit say that for every hour that is spent in class, students expected to spend two hours out of class. So, if you meet three hours a week, that means six hours outside of class.

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): If we're not all coordinated on this, faculty will lose students if they fulfill that standard.

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): That's why the standard is there, because that is the expectation.

Chantal Reid (Biology): Will there be a way to see if it duplicates courses on campus?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): You'll be able to see the courses in your own department. I think what I would like to do is provide links to exemplary justifications.

Chantal Reid (Biology): How do you know if a course being offered is similar to your own?

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): There is, and I'll give some suggestions. Right now the bulletin has a keyword search online, and that's probably the easiest way to do it.

Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School): I have to confess that I was excited about the thought that you would require a full syllabus. There's some value to having to put something down on paper. I confess that I worry you won't get substantively better information with this form.

Inge Walther (Dean for Curriculum & Course Development): This is kind of a compromise at the moment. We can see how it works. I really was afraid of having rotten tomatoes thrown at me were we to require a full syllabus. These course requests also come at a time when faculty are just really, really busy. Having to sit down and write a full syllabus really takes a lot of time.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We are now going to announce the results of the vote. Before I tell you the result of the vote, just a small editorial as chair of the Council. Sometimes we consider some of our business to be so well prepared in advance that it seems that you as representatives simply validate what has already gone on. That isn't at all the case, especially with the course credits proposal. You have been at work on this, or your predecessor in office last year, for over a year on this particular process. Council representatives gave a lot of pushback on this. It takes time, I know. We're all very proud of the results. Thank you colleagues for all of your attentiveness. This is what good faculty governance is all about. The results of the vote: 21 representatives voted in favor of the course proposal, and 1 against. The proposal carries.

Adjournment