

# 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, March 26, 2015

### Call to Order

**Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Let me welcome you to the March 26 meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council. I'm particularly grateful that you're here. I recognize what your workload must be like at this time of the spring semester as it always is, and so I recognize what an extra effort it is on your part, especially with your varied responsibility for important issues on behalf of your colleagues, representing your units and colleagues with regard to really important issues for the council today. First, some announcements and updates for you. I have a couple, and then I'm going to ask Linda George to make an announcement, and then our colleague, Laurie, to make an announcement, and then we'll get into the main part of our agenda today. These two announcements have to do more like of an update. The DKU joint committee had its most recent meeting, and just to refresh your memory, the DKU joint committee is composed of the Global Education for Undergraduates Committee and the Standing Committee on Courses, and that joint committee has been put together for the occasion of reviewing, vetting, and moving courses for DKU, and is chaired by yours truly. We met, again, recently to vet 10 courses that were proposed for DKU for next year. There were eight courses that were approved, I should tell you, and they are across a whole gamut of topics in history and physics. Haiyan Gao, by the way, is making a difference in getting some physics courses offered in DKU, just as we really expect her to. In global health, in film and in the environment. We have requested that one course go back to the faculty member who had submitted it and clarify the level at which the course would be offered. By the way, this is just one of the issues—I'll let you know—that comes up on the DKU joint committee meetings, and that is what courses are proposed at what level. We expect this to be pitched for undergraduates, and this course, it wasn't clear whether it was for students who are studying at the 200 level or 300 level, whether it could also have some capacity for graduate students or not. That's being clarified. Then, finally, we'll be reviewing one other course later, before the end of the semester. Just to let you know what this committee has accomplished over the last couple of years, we have vetted, approved about 45 courses, 45 or 50 courses with DKU. I want you to know this is over and beyond the usual workload that needs to be carried. It's making sure, by the way, that the courses that are offered at DKU meet faculty standards back here at Duke for Duke undergraduate courses, so I'm very, very pleased that our colleagues are undertaking the work. The second announcement has to do with DKU as well. You recall that Noah Pickus came before Council to talk about the general ideas, principles that he and the Liberal Arts in China Committee are developing for an undergraduate curriculum at DKU. There are a number of questions that you know from our session in January that are not answered yet, still, as of today. We don't know the nature of the degree at the undergraduate level, for example, but over the last couple of weeks, in particular, the executive committee and Laurie Patton had been discussing the best way to have our faculty in Arts & Sciences engage, vet and review the curriculum that's being proposed, and we have made the decision on the Executive Committee that this is what should be the task of the standing faculty committee on the curriculum to do. We were concerned about that because of the extraordinary workload that Curriculum Committee normally carries. We recognize, though, that the Curriculum Committee, because of the moratorium that's being introduced by these certificates, will have some space opened up in its workload, beginning in the fall, that will enable it to take on the extraordinary task of reviewing this curriculum and vetting it. We also thought that this committee has the faculty expertise, the faculty experience, and the reputation for maintaining the highest possible standards for undergraduate education to undertake this kind of review process. I think they have to respect the faculty have come to give it so that we can be assured the process would be thorough and rigorous as that goes forward. There are a couple of other announcements I want to make or want to have made. Let me ask ... Linda George is a colleague in Sociology. Linda, you can come forward and make your announcement, if you would, about elections, and then I want to turn the floor over for a few minutes to Alex Hartemink in Computer Science with an announcement.

**Linda George (Sociology):** Okay. This is the season for elections and some members of this council will be rotating off of their two-year term. In those departments, elections or whatever process is determined by the department will need to take place so that we know who's going to be representing those departments next year. So for those of you to whom these apply, and I'm one of them, please go back to your departments and explain that your term is ending and ask your chair or whoever is relevant to put in process the departmental election or selection process that will result in your department continuing to be represented in Arts & Sciences Council next year. I also know from experience that there is no prohibition, you can run again, you could be selected again. There are no term limits. Some people, I think, have been here much longer than I have, because they represent their departments so well. A later point in time, there will be an election among us to replace at least one position on the Executive Committee of Arts & Sciences Council, but that will take place afterwards. First level, elections within department, second level, department election within our group. In addition, Tom is completing his term as chair of Arts & Sciences Council, and a new event, there will be an election for someone to serve as chair beginning next year. That election is done electronically, and votes are sent to every Arts & Sciences faculty member who is eligible to participate in the election. Many people probably will not ... we all get inundated with emails, so I would ask all of you, when this happens, please encourage your departmental members to participate in that election. I have agreed to be the entrance point. We do need candidates for this election. If any of you are interested in running for, standing for election for chair of Arts & Sciences Council or you have colleagues who would be interested, please have them contact me. I don't know a more efficient or a better way to do it other than to just have people come forward.

**Wahneema Lubiano (Literature):** Forgive me if you've already said this. The person who is elected for chair has to come from among the representatives?

**Linda George:** No, it can be anybody who's Arts & Sciences faculty. Okay? All right, so reelection's coming.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Just to clarify, Linda is doing this on behalf of the Executive Committee. That committee serves as the nominating committee, the committee that oversees elections. Let me turn it over to Alex Hartemink, a colleague in Computer Science, and I understand Susan Lozier is also here. Susan is co-chairing the Provost's committee on strategic planning. Alex has an announcement for you about strategic planning within Arts & Sciences.

**Alex Hartemink (Computer Science):** Hi. Thanks for having me. This will be pretty brief today. I'm letting you know that we are going to have a session within the next Arts & Sciences Council meeting on April 9<sup>th</sup>. We'll devote 30 or 40 minutes to a conversation, but I wanted to introduce the conversation now so that you have sufficient to mull it over and also to talk with people in your respective departments and units. By way of background, with the new provost, Sally Kornbluth, she initiated a strategic planning process which was kicked off in the winter. The chair of the committee is Susan Lozier while the co-chair, Noah Pickus. This committee is charged with identifying directions for Duke, Big Duke, over the next 10 years. There's representation for most of the schools, primarily actually from A&S. A&S has five representatives on the committee. I'm one of them. I also have colleagues Laurent Dubois, Kristine Stiles, Adriane Lentz-Smith and Gary Bennett. Multiple of us, not just me, will be here on April 9<sup>th</sup> to have this conversation with you. The committee is starting with, in this semester, just trying to hear from people around campus what we think some of the big themes of the strategic plan and the next strategic plan ought to be, and in particular, we're undertaking a listening campaign in each of the schools. Within A&S—this is part of our A&S process—we've spoken with the dean; we've spoken with the chairs. We will speak tomorrow with the DUS's. We've had open invitations for any faculty member to come to a dinner or a lunch to speak with us. We've targeted certain faculty members, non-regular rank junior faculty members. We've spoken with undergraduates. We've spoken with graduate students, so we're really trying to hear. One of the things we want to do is speak with the A&S council, so that's what our time on April 9<sup>th</sup> will be devoted to, and I would just ask that you would use the next couple of weeks to think a little bit and to ask your colleagues and your units, "What are some things that Duke ought to be thinking about in the next 10 years as it lays down the strategic plan? I want you to think ambitiously, think about trends in higher education and in the world as we see it. This is not debates within A&S. This is more about a larger plan, how A&S, along with other schools at Duke contributes to what Duke, as a university, is all about. There are all kinds of tensions you could imagine thinking about. They might be about directions to go. They might be about interdisciplinarity versus disciplinarity. It might be about undergraduate versus graduate education. They might be about on campus in Durham versus our global identity. They might be about the role of online education. There's lots of things you could imagine and just think about the impacts of these types of tensions and these types of forces on where Duke is going and should be going, and we will be back in two weeks to hear a little bit and have a conversation with people. I'm glad to take any quick questions, but I know you have a very full agenda.

**Lee Baker (Dean of Academic Affairs):** We have many DUS's in the room, and tomorrow's meeting will be in 0014 Westbrook. We'll just give a preview, and it'll be from the DUS perspective.

**Alex Hartemink:** Yeah. Thank you so much for your time. We'll see you in two weeks. Thanks.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Are you and Susan hang around or you have to scoot off? You're welcome just to...

**Alex Hartemink:** How about if you send us an email if you have any questions. Alex Hartemink and Susan Lozier. Thank you.

**Tom Robisheaux:** See you on April 9.

## **Civic Engagement & Social Change Certificate Proposal**

**Tom Robisheaux:** Our first item of business today is a proposal, a certificate proposal approved by the Curriculum committee in civic engagement and social change. Let me just state a couple of words, if I may, to help frame the discussion, and some of it may be very personal, from my point of view. We're all aware, as faculty members, how important civic engagement and volunteer activities are for our students, and especially how much this has grown over the last 15 years or so. I can still remember, 15 years ago, when students were volunteering in all kinds of activities but perhaps in a more individual and less organized kind of fashion. Over the years, there's been more structure given to it and of course DukeEngage was established a few years back, and the students now are routinely taking part and not just DukeEngage but the civics of learning and activities and a lot of it in play. One of the faculty concerns that I have heard expressed in many quarters is that the volunteerism among our students is done, really, in a one-off fashion, an activity here, an activity over there. It goes on the resume. You're going to compile it all. Those are wonderful and everything, but there is no integration with the academic portion of a student's life. Many faculty members think critically that civic and social engagement, as it takes place within a university environment, really should have a rigorous academic component that integrates for students or offer students the opportunity to integrate that with their academic lives in order to make them more reflective, to think about wider implications, to make some theoretical or historical or ethical connections that they may not in that moment of activity itself. This is a certificate that aims to address that problem, and I'm going to turn the floor over, first, to our colleague, David Malone, who's chair of the standing Committee on the Curriculum. He'll explain some of the processes and procedures that were followed in the usual fashion. He's going to step aside. I should say this very quickly if I can, full disclosure here, because David also is one of the key faculty leaders who has worked hard to put this certificate together. He's just going to talk about the processes, and then we'll turn to Eric Mlyn and Jan Riggsbee who will be introducing the certificate. David?

**David Malone (Education):** Thank you, Tom. This academic year of the Curriculum Committee -- which includes several folks here today, Dick MacPhail, Leslie Digby, Inge Walther, I think that's all that's here today -- we have been meeting to review proposals to revise majors, to revise minors, to create new majors and to create new certificate programs, and I want to thank Leslie Digby, by the way, because I recused myself from the processing of this particular proposal, because I was involved in the creation of it. The Curriculum Committee met without me during the times in which they vetted this proposal. This proposal was first submitted to the Curriculum Committee before my time with the Curriculum Committee. It was submitted in the fall of 2013, so it's been two years in the vetting. It's been through several iterations based on feedback from faculty and from the Curriculum Committee. The proposal was, in part, a response to an action of the Council in February 2013 to create Certificate version 2, if you all recall that, and Certificate version 2 is a variation of our interdisciplinary certificate programs. As you know, as Tom says, the purpose of Certificate 2 was to provide some student intentionality around integrating their curricular experiences with their outside-of-the-class learning experiences, which I think has become something that many students are attempting to do in defining a coherent educational pathway for themselves. Certificate 2, as you know, requires four courses. One of those courses has to be a Gateway and one has to be a Capstone, and -- Inge you correct me if I misspeak -- two, thematically related co-curricular experiences, one exceeding 150 hours, one exceeding 300 hours, and these are non-credit-bearing, non-course co-curricular experiences, and it also includes something that I think has great potential, and this is all Certificate 2.0, a public-facing self-authored e-portfolio which a student begins at the initial steps of their participation in the certificate and they complete in their Capstone course. Let me now turn it over to Eric Mlyn and Jan Riggsbee, and I believe Bob Korstad is here to present the proposal and answer questions that folks have about it.

**Eric Mlyn (Director, DukeEngage):** I'm glad to have the opportunity to present the proposal for the certificate in Civic Engagement & Social Change. I want to say a couple of things at the outset. First, a number of people have been instrumental in putting this together, and one of the really nice things about this proposal, I think, is that it's brought together people who have led co-curricular efforts in civic engagement and volunteerism and curricular efforts. We have a lot of the key players around the table who have been working on this for a number of years, and so I first want to acknowledge a really central role our colleague Elaine Madison has played. Elaine's way in the back, but Elaine has been involved in civic engagement longer than some of us who are more recent to the field and had an idea for curricular recognition of civic activities way before anybody would have even thought that that was a possibility, so we've evolved, and Elaine has been instrumental in this, in DukeEngage, in the Duke Community Service Center and worked very hard on this proposal, also my colleague, Bob Korstad. Bob, who's been at Duke 25 years, has been doing this work before this work was as prominent as it is now, and his role in our leadership program and running the BM2 program has also led a lot of efforts here. The five people who put this together are Elaine, Bob, Jan, who is speaking in a minute, David Malone and myself. David alluded to this, but I also want to say that I think Duke, in the creation of the experiential certificate, the

template of 2.0, is at the forefront in American higher education in trying to figure out how to connect the curricular and co-curricular. I'm actually heading to a meeting tomorrow morning in South Bend, Indiana for the Research University Civic Engagement Network, with about 50 research universities that do civic engagement. I'm going to talk about the experiential certificate. What all these universities are trying to do is figure out how you connect the curricular and co-curricular and how you build pathways for students to do that. I know there's some concern amongst the faculty and others that there's too many options for our students, and navigating those options can be very difficult. While I think that is true, I think the experiential certificate is actually something that's going to create very intentional pathways and help them unite things that they're already doing. I think as Duke implements the experiential certificate, we have the template. Now, we're looking at proposals for a variety of them. We have the opportunity to do something that not many of our peers are doing, I'm very excited about being involved in this. At the heart of this, at the heart of the proposal for a Civic Engagement certificate, is the notion that we want to problematize civic engagement, not advertise it. I think that's really important for those of us who teach in this field. I lead a focus cluster on Knowledge in the Service of Society, with Jan and David, and our purpose is never to tell our students that civic engagement is what they must be doing, is necessarily the role of American higher education, but instead to say there are questions about this. What is the place of civic engagement in American higher education, something that's fundamental to this certificate? What is the impact of civic engagement on the students who serve, on the communities that are working with our students? We have to pay attention to the language of civic engagement very much as featured in Gateway and Capstone core civics. What does it mean when we say "service?" What does it mean when we say "serve?" All of these things problematize civic engagement, which I think, in a very positive form and in the best rendition with what we want to do with the liberal arts education and in helping our students approach notions of what it means to be a citizen and something that American universities are being urged to do from lots of different courses around the country. A couple of things about the certificate, I know you all have received it. Some of you have all got a chance to take a look at it. We took the definition of civic engagement ... we won't get to spend a semester arguing about definitions of civic engagement, and there's a million things I'd rather do than undertake that particular exercise, but we took Thomas Ehrlich, one of the leading scholars in the field as something that motivated us. Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference and promoting quality of life in a community through both political and non-political processes. I think that was a very intentional choice of ours, because there's some debate in the field, and we want this to come out in the certificate about whether civic includes the political. There are some who define them separately. We're looking at this as both a civic, which refers to volunteerism, and political, which more often refers to electoral politics or things done to influence policy in some way, so we think this definition does a nice job of motivating. There are three different categories of intellectual traditions that motivate the certificate and all of the electives that have been identified within the certificate are classified in at least one of these particular intellectual approaches, the democracy, citizenship and political participation; civil society and volunteerism; and social change and social movements. Those three are, by their very nature, by including these three, they make the certificate quite interdisciplinary, and colleagues from Political Science, Public Policy, Cultural Anthropology, Sociology, the Program in Education, obviously, and others have agreed not only to support the certificate but to offer their courses in a variety of ways. The learning outcomes of the certificate that we've identified include students demonstrating an in-depth understanding of the major tradition of democratic theory, both historical and contemporary. Students will be able to evaluate currently the role of an individual in relationship to the governmental agencies, voluntary associations and non-profit organizations which help shape civic life. Students will demonstrate knowledge of how citizens work for social change across time and culture, and they'll be able to use their intellectual understandings of civic engagement and social change to understand our co-curricular experiences with organizations and communities. Again, as you'll see from the structure on the next slide, this certificate very intentionally forces students to think about what they're doing co-curricularly through an intellectual and conceptual way, which is what I think has been missing. The requirements, and David really went through the template, four went to the requirements of this particular experiential certificate or certificate 2.0 are the same as all experiential certificates, but we've of course narrowed that down. We've identified a Gateway course, Engaged Citizenship and Social Change, and the learning outcomes and topics of that course are identified in the proposal. There are two electives that students must choose from the three themes identified, and we have ... I don't remember the final count ... 30 or 40 elective courses that are already being offered that count as electives. The Capstone, Lives of Civic Engagement will be a seminar that enables students to connect co-curricular experiences, intellectual traditions, and as David said, there are two sets of experiences: one 300, one 150 hours. Again, students don't get credit for those experiences in any experiential certificate, but that is a necessary component of the experiential certificate. Then, as a public-facing e-portfolio, Chalk and Wire had been administered by the Program in Ed, which Jan will be talking about in a minute. Sequencing is also a very, very important part of the certificate. I'm not going to go into the details of that other than to say the Curriculum Committee was very intentional about sequencing this so that students do not have their experiences before they do the coursework, and so it's very clearly laid out in the template for experiential certificates when students have to declare this, the doctrines they have to write to three-person committee that will then, in a sense, accept them into certificate. That's the basics of it. The certificate's a lot richer than what I'm presenting here, and you could see that in the proposal. I'm going to turn this over to Jan now, who's going to talk about the administration of this certificate in the Program in Education, which is a very logical place for this, given not only the Program in Education is focused on pedagogy, but also, it's been a home for the Service Learning Program, which is a major source of civic opportunities for our students. After Jan, we'll take questions.

**Jan Riggsbee (Education):** As Eric said, the Program in Education is the logical academic model for the certificate program. We have a long-standing commitment to integrating academic coursework with field-based experiences. We enroll about 650 to 700 students in our courses each year, and all those courses typically have a field-based experience. We handle, as Eric said, the Duke Service Learning Program, as well as the International Center for Service Learning for Education. On behalf of the program, we are excited about being the administrative home, and so we will oversee the administrative functions, in collaboration with, really, four other offices (Office of Civic Engagement, Office of Assistant Vice Provost for Civic Engagement, and DukeEngage) to provide support. When you look at the different components of the administration, of course, we have the home of the certificate, which, as I said, we will oversee the administrative functions. We have an advisory board, which will oversee the curricular aspects and also provide intellectual leadership to the program. We will have faculty committees, which is specifically a three-member team which will provide student advisement. And then we will have a cohort of teaching faculty who will offer the Gateway elective and Capstone courses. This is a very short way of saying that we're very excited in terms of this certificate and housing and offering administrative support in collaboration with these different offices to really provide this connection between co-curricular and curricular experiences. We feel like it's really important work, and we're now going to take a question.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you Jan. Bob, why don't you come up here?

**Eric Mlyn:** Let's have Elaine join us as well.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Elaine, yes. Why don't you come on down, Elaine, too? That's a really good idea. I think one of the things that's good about Council is a chance for you to see your colleagues who have actually been working, in this case, for at least two years. The floor is now open for questions, you have a copy of it, colleagues, on our Sakai site. By the way, just a reminder for you, when I send out the announcements for a Council meeting, I don't attach all the documents for Council, because most faculty members are not interested and don't want to have all those documents, but please, if a colleague of yours is interested in seeing the proposal, would you print up a copy, or show them a copy? That's exactly what you're there for as representatives. Sherryl Broverman, Biology...

**Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** Thank you, Tom. Bridge off, guys, amazing program, something people will really enjoy doing. I just had a really interesting talk last night with a group of students who were interested in how to find social justice programs on campus. Social justice is slightly different from civic engagement, but they were saying that they come in as science students in their premed, and they don't get to see any of it once they get into the science and premed curriculum. I think it'd be really wonderful, as this evolves, there could be some opportunity with recent health courses, health and equalities classes into this. Obviously, they can take it as a separate parallel program, but I think there's a lot of interest in, whether it's global health or biology or premed, in social justice and civic engagement issues, and in looking through your list of electives and courses there's almost no health- or science-oriented classes, and so maybe if you go in reiteration and start looking expanding to make opportunities for the kids who feel they have to study science or they have to do civic engagement because never the two shall meet.

**Eric Mlyn:** I think that's a great point. We see the list right now as a preliminary list, and I think you're right, Sherryl. It's been really interesting over the last, maybe, decade of watching premed students who now have this other interest, which is in justice and global health and equality, and there's a lot of interest in that at Duke right now. I'm sure you see that a lot more than I do, and if we can figure out a way how those students might find that this certificate would serve them well, now that would be great. As you probably know, there's some controversy in the field of civic engagement, about whether we use the term "social justice." Some campuses are very comfortable in using the term "social justice," some campuses, less so. You can walk into the Haas Center at Stanford and say "social justice." You're less likely to see that here.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Right, and I'm not saying this has to be social justice. That was just the meeting I was at last night with students, but there's an untapped audience that this isn't necessarily positioned for, which is still fine—Big Duke parallel -- but a lot of great opportunities make a few connections.

**Jan Riggsbee:** I think that's a really good point. Yesterday, I went to a presentation about civic engagement and environmental sustainability and the speaker made some really good points about our citizenship and, really, the engagement of our students around sustainability, and the important questions that you really ask them, and that's really the focus of this research and something I think we really need to talk about. That's great.

**Bob Korstad:** I think like anything new, one of the things that are going to be really important is that we educate pre-major advisers, and that we have ways of publicizing this on East Campus who we had ways of oversizing this on this campuses, because if you don't get in relatively early, then you're not going to be able to take advantage of this program. So I think doing some advertising, talking to people who teach science courses where they get a lot of first year students, so maybe we can come in and do just a little quick presentation or hand something out to students, because I think you're right. I think the demand is going to be there for that.

**Jan Riggsbee:** I think administratively, if you think of the demand and as a small program, we think about how you can manage that. I'm really comfortable that we have the support of the four offices, and I think that that's the way it's going to work that one academic unit, especially a small one, cannot handle all of this work as one entity. I really appreciate the support of those...

**Eric Mlyn:** And the drafting of and the centralization of what would be a mark of collaborative amongst a number of units that focus on this. I also have to say I have a feeling, and hopefully, I'll be wrong in five years, but the experiential certificates enrollments are going to be relatively small. I think the experiential requirement is quite high. I don't disagree with it, but I think it's quite high, and we'll see. We'll see what happens, and maybe have to make adjustments or likely, we'll feel like we need to, but I think where we are is a good place to start.

**Ron Grunwald (Trinity College):** So I have some questions about implementation of the experiential certificate. One is a general question that I should know the answer to, and I apologize that I don't. For Certificates 1.0, there are overlap rules, that restrict the number of courses that can overlap with majors. How does that get implemented with regards to the experiential certificate? My second question is a parochial question. Let's hope and assume that, in fact, the demand is very high, enrollment is quite high, it might be possible to anticipate there will be a demand for funding or a request for funding to support those co-curricular projects, particularly those summer projects. Does this certificate have built into it a funding line or you have ideas for funding lines?

**Eric Mlyn:** The template that was accepted about experiential certificates was quite explicit. There is no funding available for these, and so my sense is there's lots of funding for these kinds of experiences at Duke, and we're going to bring those into this pathway. Where we're going to have the problem that it generates additional funding, we'll go to Lee. Inge, you want to answer that first question?

**Inge Walther:** Yes, I wanted to address the overlap. For certificate 2.0, version 2 certificates, the rule is only course overlap.

**Ron Grunwald:** No, I'm talking about the non-credit experience. That accounts in that regard as well?

**Inge Walther:** There's no credit.

**Sherryl Brovermann:** Yeah. You meant, can they account it for their global health experiential and this or both of the programs?

**David Malone:** It can be either internship for their public policy program or their global health experience.

**Lee Baker:** I think we decided yes.

**Ara Wilson (Women's Studies):** Thank you for a proposal that acknowledges the academic and intellectual initiative for Arts & Sciences at Duke. It's really great to see that. One of the things that you say here is that you expect public policy and political science students to be the ones most interested or naturally gravitating towards this, and I have to say if I were going to list the majors, I would be more parochial, and that's what I think is necessarily ... wouldn't be where I lay my money of lifelong civic engagement, necessarily, particularly without a salary, but perhaps I'm wrong. I don't know West Campus as well. But what I would say, looking at the demographic up here, it's 2015 and diversity is not in here at all. Yes, you consulted some people who might represent diversity, and yes, of course, your list is, but there's a kind of neutrality to how you're describing civic engagement that is not in step with the teaching of money but the teaching of value. Musicians, we have a course of political theory in women's studies. There's other relative courses. That neutrality is out of step without having conversations, but I realize that students could integrate that and do that on themselves, but I think I would like to see diversity not just as an add-on but as a much more entrenched element of what thinking about civic engagement in what nowadays some people call "settler society" and marked by some other kinds of thought conditions and endings for it. I would push for diversity, not as an add-on, not it's like an open class but as a much more thorough, central driving element in reflections on civic engagement and the framing of problems and the engagement.

**Eric Mlyn:** What I would say is that I think in some ways we are limited by our own fields and experiences, but from the very beginning of the drafting of this certificate, we were committed to problematizing the notion and want to be open as much as possible. If you look at the Gateway course, I think it has a pretty wide diversity of perspectives on this, whether it's a diversity of people, I know less, but a diversity of perspectives including post-colonial perspectives. We are open and welcome you and others who have various perspectives on this to join us in this. There's no doctrine behind our own regards to civic engagement. We have our own limits, but that doesn't mean we can't include you or others who want to broaden the scope.

**Ara Wilson:** No, you haven't consulted us. There's no AAAS, there's no Latino Studies, there's no Women Studies, there's no Sexuality Studies in the consultation phase in the development of this. So diversity, I see that ... I know the identity, some of the faculty, and we enlist that, of course, but I don't see diversity written into the bottom of it.

**Eric Mlyn:** Well, we would welcome consulting with you and including you in the planning committee as we implement it.

**Ara Wilson:** That's not what I'm saying, but okay.

**Eric Mlyn:** Okay. And others, too.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Other comments, observations?

**Karin Shapiro (AAAS):** I know that this thing has been a number of years in the making, but we also have the Big Tweak going on, and so how ... is this just looking parallel with that or anything in consultation with Suzanne Shanahan? How is this all going ... or is this going to come up and then you'll suddenly have a new pattern mixture or the year after as the new curriculum comes into play?

**Eric Mlyn:** Karin, I've been wondering the same thing. To the extent that Suzanne was the chair of the Curriculum Committee when the experiential certificate was created, and I've gone to one of the forums that Suzanne led and said that I hope that the curriculum moves in the direction of uniting the curricular and the co-curricular. It would be a shame if the tweak didn't do that, but is this, at this moment, moving parallel to that? No, but Suzanne is well aware that this is happening, and then Duke has opened up this experiential certificate pathway. I can't imagine they're going to create something that doesn't at least account for this, if not encourage it.

**Lee Baker:** I think that's right. We've been working throughout the time with the understanding that these new types of certificates and our commitment to interdisciplinary will be accounted for in the new curriculum, unless there's a wildly radical—which is a possibility—redo of the curriculum. Realistically, these are one of my highest priorities. We're going to work to make sure they're incorporated and supported. They're a really important way of realizing the liberal arts in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and we are leading the country in doing these. My hunch is it's going to be incorporated.

**Bob Korstad:** I actually think that proposals like this will provide a certain kind of intellectual leadership and direction for thinking about the curriculum. I think having something like this to use as to thinking about what curricular requirements are and all the different kinds of things we're thinking about, this has got to be a potential component with the direction that Duke is going to move in the future or going back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. I don't know. I think this is really important, because I think we're getting out on in front on some things that I'm hoping the whole process of curricular review will be able to learn from this, and some other things are going on too, and just the whole process of creating this, just as Lee said, I think has been very important in thinking what the curricular review should be about.

**Tom Robisheaux:** We have time for one more question. Again, just a reminder, that practice of the Council is when a new proposal is being proposed, there will not be a motion to vote in the first meeting, but I do want to make sure that all of you have the chance to have questions answered to understand the proposals put before you.

**Lee Baker:** I just wanted to extend my hearty endorsement. This is one of the really exciting curricular innovations. It hits on so many of our priorities, whether it's Knowledge in the Service to Society or the way that we try to distinguish what we call the "Duke difference," with undergraduate research, civic and global engagement, and interdisciplinary learning. This is both civic engagement and interdisciplinary learning. I think it's really just an exciting way of—"harnessing" isn't the right word—directing, guiding, I guess, our students who are doing all of these wonderful engagements that have to do with civic engagement but making sure that their course work informs their civic engagement, their civic engagement informs their course work. I think this is one of the really high priorities of Trinity College. My one question is: who's the director?

**Eric Mlyn:** We will decide on who that director is.

**Tom Robisheaux:** It would be nice to know before the vote on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Eric Mlyn:** Okay.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you very much. Again, colleagues, we have a copy of the proposal. Share it with your colleagues in your units, if you will. Form your opinions, and starting with the next meeting, we've got on the agenda further discussion with possible motion to vote.

## Plagiarism Sanctions Review Report

**Tom Robisheaux:** Our next item on the agenda is, in my personal view, in fact, one of the most important ones that we have looked at all year long. We had last session of the Council before Spring Break a report from Sherryl Broverman who's chair at the Plagiarism Sanctions Review Committee, who presented her report. I want to ask her to come forward, and we will continue our discussion of the report and the recommendations. Very briefly, the committee found that the sanction that the university currently has is appropriate and that it is most clearly applied and consistently applied by the Office of Student Conduct. Where the problems tend to be is in the unevenness and the lack of transparency among the faculty, especially regarding the grade sanctions policy. In some cases, there is no clarity, whatsoever, until the student finds themselves in the uncomfortable position of an accusation of academic misconduct. A third finding is that there is a very weak student and university culture, in general that fosters academic integrity. The second thing I wanted to summarize for us is the recommendations that they have made, which tend to fall on three lines. First off, there is a need for improving faculty education, from the moment a faculty member comes to the most senior faculty member. Faculty need to be educated in a regular fashion so there are not lapses in knowledge. One of the things that I noted in the report was that from an individual faculty point of view, it may not be a problem, but collectively, students experience a very gross lack of transparency, not to mention an inconsistent and uneven application of policies across units within Arts & Sciences. There are recommendations that we have here we can discuss involving faculty education. There are recommendations too that we, as faculty, make more clear our sanctions involving plagiarism either as individuals and/or as units, which is not currently a practice in Arts & Sciences. We can talk about the grade sanction. We know there are two different levels of sanctions. There is the grade sanction that the faculty members and departments have control over, and then of course, there is the university sanction that is applied by the Office of Student Conduct. Those are two different levels in which the sanctions take place. They have specific recommendations there. Then, finally, there are recommendations involving improving the university culture involving academic integrity. Among them is to have the Office of Student Conduct become more aware and educate itself and its personnel more clearly about the cultural perspectives that, and social conditions that feed into and foster either a culture of integrity or acceptance and toleration of cheating on the part of students. Also that the Academic Integrity Council be reinvigorated. It has been dormant for a couple of years, and that they undertake a series of things in order to make this a more visible part of the university culture as a whole. Then, finally, I was urged to mention, too, to you—Laurie Patton was unable to be here, but she and the deans—Lee Willard is here—have been thinking that if the council were to endorse this report -- and that's all we can do; Council is not an agency for executing policies. It's not what Council does, but we can endorse the policy, or we can choose not to endorse the reports and recommendations. Were we to endorse the report and its recommendations, these then will go to the dean of Arts & Sciences, and probably with some other parts of the university as well, and Lee Willard has been tasked with drawing up a plan for implementing the recommendations of Council, and then the new dean, whoever that may be, in the fall, will return to Council to explain what that plan will actually entail. Sherryl, why don't I turn it over to you at this point to lead the discussion of it and you may have some additional observations or comments for us as we carry out this conversation. I think that's a very, very important issue that goes right to the heart of what we're about here as faculty members and students of Arts & Sciences.

**Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** Exactly, so Tom did a great overview. I think faculty really should own this conversation and help direct what's happening on campus. We're all here because we're passionate about ideas. We want to discover our own, we want to comment on others, we want to see how they relate to each other. I think we're doing a much better job in teaching students about how to think about this both coming in, whether the Academic Integrity Council can work to teach students better, or teach faculty how to convey this, and I know that's a provostial decision on how that committee gets formed and functions. For me, there's a big urge to try and have that happen. Then how the other half of the pipeline -- when someone misuses an idea -- how do we educate, reform, and sanction them? I think, when our committee met with Laurie at one point, she said, "Why don't they believe us when we say we care about this?" It's because they never either get caught or they never see anyone else getting caught. This charge when first was given to us was: is there a perverse incentive to cheat, not get a failing grade? Our committee started to think that there was a perverse incentive to cheat, because your grade goes up, you almost never get caught, and it's a lot easier than turning in a blank homework, and so I think we really need to flip this conversation around. I'll just say I've been on an academic conduct board recently, and there were no faculty element, the tribunal. There were great students on it. There were staff from across campus, one in academics, one in fraternity/sorority life. Great people, but I think faculty need to be on this committee. This is something we need to own across all things. I think whether the Academic Integrity Council becomes the champion for that or something, that that's something we need to step up more. Going through our report, and I don't know if people have questions about it, we had a long discussion last time about it, I just think that we owe two dominant things: consistency would be delightful. If we can't do that, transparency should be the minimum, and right now, we're not doing either.

**Tom Robisheaux:** As we open our discussion, let me just recognize Karin Shapiro, our colleague who is also on the committee, by the way. Steve Vaisey and Melissa Malouf are not here today. Karin is here, and may have some additional comments to make about the reports. Our colleagues, the floor is open for additional discussion, observation, comments, questions, editorials.



**Josh Socolar (Physics):** I'll start the conversation, I hope by pointing out what I see as an important gap in the report. I agree wholeheartedly with Sherryl that the faculty needs to own this issue and I'm concerned that there are structural reasons that they don't, and that the recommendations of the report don't address one of the crucial points where slippage can occur in this process. The concern is that the interpretation of the egregiousness of offenses and then the sanctions that are applied at the level of the judicial process--I forget always the acronym, the judicial board, the honor council—that my concern is that they are inconsistent with the faculty's collective sense about how, what the discipline should be. I'm particularly concerned about first offenses, and apparently, if you read the website--well, I won't say automatic--but the appeared default sanction being suspension for a semester, it strikes me personally as overly punitive rather than rehabilitative. I have lots of anecdotal evidence from talking with faculty that a lot of people agree and that there is a resistance to sending cases up because of that. The first line of the report says that the committee concluded that the response to egregious offenses is appropriate and reasonable, and my quibble is with the fact that there is no definition of the word, "egregious." We can all agree that a second offense, a third offense, a sort of blatant lying, whatever, that there can be such a thing. But I've seen cases in which we're talking about things for which I think there should be a clear policy that indicates there's some judgment that can be applied. There's a large space between not caring and suspension, and one can take these issues very seriously without concluding that they're deserving of suspension.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Yeah, I think there are two issues. One is ... well let me first speak of it for Steven Bryan from our conversations. The fact that a student goes before an undergraduate conduct board does not mean they are found responsible. Students are often found not responsible or only partially responsible, there is no automatic suspension. It is a hearing and where students have their own advocates, and it doesn't automatically lead to anything. It is a process.

**Josh Socolar:** Just to clarify, I'm talking about cases where the student admits to having ... it's not a case of whether they did it or not. It's a case of how egregious it is.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Yeah, and they take that into account. Again, I'm speaking, I'm not on this board, but from our conversations, because we investigated some of this, and we'll get back to the word "egregious," in a minute ... and they take into account mitigating circumstances of the student's stance, how they talk about it, how they think about what they did. They try and take many things into account. I know from having gone through this personally, there are students that I thought surely should have been suspended and they've gotten off with probation, so it is clearly not an automatic. The "egregious," I think, we put in there because there's a sliding scale of what is plagiarism. Are we talking about missing footnote? Are we talking about one sentence copied from Wikipedia? Are we talking about a whole paragraph downloaded? Then there's the whole paper that they plagiarized and the Office of Student Conduct has a sliding scale, and they try and be consistent. Anyone who has done this, there's some balls are cut off goes through a faculty student resolution. I am embarrassed to say ... I'm not going to say "I'm embarrassed." I'm sad to say I'm involved in 12 inquiries right now for my course, and so I'm now figuring out where that scale is. I'm like "Okay, here's one sentence from Wikipedia. Here is two sentences from Wikipedia. There's a paragraph. Where is FSR and where is an inquiry?" It is a challenging issue, but they try and be consistent about what we can do, so on to saying it's not an automatic "you did this, you're suspended." Your real question, I think, is: should the faculty think a first time plagiarist, whatever, someone's misconduct should be suspended?

**Josh Socolar:** My real question is does the policy that Steven Bryan and that office carry out reflect the collective judgment of the faculty? Do we know whether it does or not?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Right, and I can't say; that wasn't our charge. I think that's a different charge.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Representative wants to speak to that issue. I've seen several hands did go up. Sherryl, are you finished?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Sure, unless you want to say anything about egregious or anything.

**Tom Robisheaux:** We can come back to the egregious. Karin, did you want to say something, because you were on the committee.

**Karin Shapiro:** Yes. It's just that I think we did tug to tussle with this, and there was great division, so much so that the good cop turned into bad cop and vice versa, just trying to construe, so it is clearly a very, very tricky issue and I appreciate what you say. What we could do, the things we could do is really try to facilitate greater consistency, both within the faculty, within departments, and within the faculty in particular departments. I think it would be reflected in the Office of Student Misconduct as well.

**Wahneema Lubiano (Literature):** This is not about egregious. This is about what Literature has been talking about with regard to its own process. We've even appointed a couple of faculty members to come up with boiler plate that we're all

willing to share on our syllabi. But the problem that we have with what goes on non-Literature is because we're in the work of exegesis, and so it's the lines of what it is that requires a student to synthesize lots of different kinds of thought in order to produce an original argument means that sometimes, students need a little more guidance so that they're willing to go out on a limb and do that work without fearing every moment, "Is this cheating?" When I'm in classroom for example, and I encourage my students to meet outside the class to talk about some of the questions and issues that are raised in class and in assignments, I get a lot of nervousness about how much can we talk to each other before we make ourselves vulnerable to a charge of cheating? In agreement with Josh Socolar raised is our, not fear about the word "egregious," but whether we're even willing to go beyond the department to think about how we are guided by the report, if that makes sense.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I think the whole appropriate versus inappropriate collaboration is a whole nother story. It is something that absolutely needs to be defined and is not clearly defined. I have on every single assignment what they're allowed to do and I give examples, like "You can talk about this but you can't talk about that," because we tell them, "Your peers are your best mentors to learn from, but don't talk to them when you're doing your homework," so I think that's a different conversation, perhaps, when we're looking at writing and the citations.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** See in my classes, I am encouraging my students to take each other as thinkers and seriously, or maybe not quite as seriously, as scholarly resources. But when you're putting together an argument, and then you're writing that argument, sometimes it's not very clear exactly, especially for the students at the beginning of their work, to figure out, "Am I properly attributing all of my ideas?"

**Sherryl Broverman:** Then your department can come up with its own policy.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** That's what we're doing, but our problem has been: what is our policy in relation to the larger policy?

**Owen Astrachan (Computer Science):** I just want to follow-up on what Josh is saying. I think I understand what you're getting at which is, if this is an opportunity to be heard by the powers that be, should we make sure that the report has all elements in that it might, because there's a lack of--from my perspective, just kind of riffing a little on what Josh said--there's a lack of transparency understanding what the Office of Student Conduct does, so Josh said "Well, we all think that they're going to get suspended, so we're hesitant to put it up there," and you say "Well, it turns out that hardly anybody is suspended," and part of this is there is no police blotter.

**Sherryl Broverman:** That's a recommendation of ours.

**Owen Astrachan:** Is that in the report?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Yes. Anonymous, but it would be like X number of people reported for these types of issues.

**Owen Astrachan:** Are these recommendations toothless? You make a recommendation to the Office of Student Conduct: they don't have to take it. The only one that has to take it is the department, as I understand it. I've read through this kind of quickly, but we have to make a policy, but that policy isn't about plagiarism or misconduct. It's just about the grade penalty. The only thing we're asked to do is say "What is the grade penalty is if you are found ..."

**Sherryl Broverman:** And education.

**Owen Astrachan:** Education, we already do. What you're saying is do it some more.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Yeah, let's operationalize how to do it more effectively.

**Owen Astrachan:** Josh, did I miss that this is an opportunity that we should make sure that everything is in the report, that the faculty wants to be in there is in there?

**Sherryl Broverman:** We were given a narrow charge and we tried to answer those three questions.

**Josh Socolar:** If the report contains useful and important recommendations that we all can agree with, then I don't think we should hold it up, because clearly, it doesn't answer every single question you might ask. But I still think that this particular distance between what the faculty might decide and what this other body takes to be its standards is a problem. If we did what the report says and each department develop very clear guidelines, grading-only guidelines, there would still be a question of ... suppose a student and faculty member are involved in a situation where there's a question about the grading and the departmental norm is we would impose a much weaker penalty than we know the student conduct board would, but

for whatever reason, the faculty and the student just can't agree to do a resolution. Then, it goes up to this board, and you get a result that's different from what the department would have said.

**Sherryl Broverman:** The department has no decision-making over prosecution, to be frank. Department only has decision. Faculty members should not be deciding, "I see a misconduct," and ignore it. That should not...

**Josh Socolar:** There's such a thing as faculty-student resolution.

**Sherryl Broverman:** If approved by the Office of Student Conduct because it's their first time and it's not serious.

**Linda George (Sociology):** Yeah, just a very brief comment. I agree that the faculty has little understanding in, perhaps, a fair amount of misconception of what happens at Office of Student Conduct. Our department had those people come to the faculty meeting and tell us what happened, what they do and so forth, and I can tell you that most of the faculty in my department had the kind of assumption that you do, Josh, that even first-timers get expelled, and they don't. In many cases, faculty are actually somewhat disappointed that there isn't a stiffer punishment rendered. If we want to understand, we have to have contact between faculty and this unit, and they're happy to come and tell you and listen to you as well as tell you what's happening, and at least in the case of my department, there's a lot of misconceptions, and people were feeling a whole lot better after those people attended a faculty meeting and told us what they do.

**Ron Grunwald (Trinity College):** I got two points and a question for Sherryl, so Sherryl, correct me if I'm wrong, but to Josh's point, number one, when a case does go to the Office of Student Conduct for verifications and sanctions, my understanding is that they don't impose sanctions in regards to grades.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Grades are strictly faculty.

**Ron Grunwald:** So any standards that might send them to department or for that individual faculty member are still implemented by that faculty member, the department of faculty and start the grading process. I don't worry about that. The concern, though is well, taken, though that when it does go to the Office of Student Conduct, and it's not about grades anymore, it's about being expelled or being suspended, and so...

**Sherryl Broverman:** Most of these are expelled.

**Ron Grunwald:** Right. The point I want to make is that if indeed in fact it was the faculty through the Arts & Sciences Council a number of years ago who voted for, implemented and voted for the faculty-student resolution as a way of dealing with the first-time, not-so-egregious offense, so at least in a limited sort of way, there was formal structural faculty ownership of that part of process. That being said, Sherryl, my question for you is I was disturbed although not entirely surprised to see on the conclusions of the committee that faculty implementation of sanctions, which I assume was in part, or at least all part of the faculty-student resolution, was what was identified as being the weakness and the problem in terms of consistency. That's kind of predictable and expected. Was there any discussion at all about doing away with the faculty-student resolution or revising the faculty student resolution process and parameters?

**Sherryl Broverman:** No, that wasn't seen as so much problematic. Well, there are faculty who see misconduct that sometimes isn't egregious, they're like "I don't want to be bothered and ignore it. I don't want to be bothered with student conduct. I'm just going to fail them. I'm just going to fail them, because I don't want to deal with it. That's my sanction. It doesn't matter if they are on probation. I'm not even going to think about that." So ignoring a lot of the policies because it was either too onerous or unpleasant, and it's not the most pleasant process. There were people who waited on it too long and so the students had a sort of double jeopardy -- not being able to withdraw, or suddenly, they had two sanctions against them because they got hit with the first and the second at the same time as the faculty members didn't follow policy. I actually tried to make a flowchart of all the places faculty create chaos and it was too complicated. We can speak to some of that too. If Laurie's quote is always when it's egregious or transcendent, I'm not going to comment or deprave or transcend it, and it is almost always a faculty member not following protocol. Then, they get to the lawsuit level of us not following the Faculty Handbook. The FSR didn't seem to be a problem. You get told, "Here is what I observed as a witness." They say "This is appropriate for a faculty student resolution. You do what you need to do." Right now, it says "Do whatever you want grade-wise." I think faculty should have on their syllabus, "If I see this, I will do this grade-wise," and it would be consistent. That's one of our recommendations. If it is too serious for an FSR, then you are a witness now and other people take over the game for you, and you're just the witness saying "This is what I observed. This is the situation."

**David Malone:** I want to respond to something Wahneema said that resonates with me and that is: some of the difficulties and challenges we face are more cultural issues and there's a lack of clarity and understanding among our students in terms of what constitutes collaboration, what constitutes entering the conversation with scholarly literature, and at what point

have I entered into academic dishonesty? For me, we think of academic dishonesty as being an individual act, which it is—it's a choice someone made but they made that choice in a certain context and in a certain culture, and I like the work that the report does in talking about our need to attend to these cultural and contextual factors, but I don't think it goes far enough. I think it relies too heavily in some ways on sanctions, punishments, education and marketing, and this is a broader general point. I appreciate all the efforts. I do think this is a significant step forward, but I think as a faculty we need to begin to attend more to these cultural issues, because our culture, from my perspective, is so high stakes and so competitive that it creates an environment in which we've moved away from students seeing their purpose here of engaging in a community of learners and more of their own individual attainment. I think this is an opportunity as we reimagine the curriculum, to reimagine all the ways in which that high-stakes culture, which we kind of inherent in many ways from the K-12 experience that much of our students understand, but I think it is just an opportunity for all of us to be also thinking about the way we could reimagine the culture that we're inviting students in and the clarity they have about what they're going to be doing here. That's just a broader point. I just don't want us to rely on sanctions punishment, and like when you use the word "marketing," somehow that...

**Sherryl Broverman:** Social norms marketing, it is creating a culture. It's what you want to do.

**David Malone:** I just think we need to be very intentional about the ways we go about this and it is more than just putting up signs in Bryan Center. It's about what our admissions website says and what we do in the very beginning.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I agree with you 100%, and like I said, our charge was really narrow. It was sanctions, and we actually broadened that and said, "We need education. We can't just do sanctions," and so we actually try to sneak in some more stuff beyond our charge and say, "We were told our sanctions are appropriate and consistent and appropriately incentivizing behavior." That's all we were asked to address. We said "Yeah, here are some things you need to do, but oh my God, upstream in that pipeline, we need to change culture and education," so I agree with that.

**Karin Shapiro:** One of the things that we suggested was more education, but the education piece is critical at every level. I think undergraduates get one shot at this in the midst of getting a package of coming to Duke and so on,

**Sherryl Broverman:** They just have to click buttons online. That's their training. Plagiarism, or not to plagiarize, tutorial, I love the "plagiarism tutorial."

**Karin Shapiro:** So the point is that just seems to actually be kind of woefully inadequate, that this needs to be either repeated or done in a different way. How we think about what plagiarism is and what is collaboration and so on, these are tricky areas. They are grey, but we need to provide some sort of balance, and just to go to Linda George's point, I think it is an important one. I went into this process, and I haven't really looked at what the Office of Student Conduct really does, and we don't really know. But they do need to be out, and we've asked them to be out and about more than they are, and actually getting out into departments and saying, "This is what the process is. This is what it looks like," and trying to have a debate and discussion about these kinds of issues. Even raising the general level of discussion on campus, will move, I think, some of these issues forward in a positive direction.

**Sherryl Broverman:** We greatly overstepped our bounds in of our mission to say "Yeah, sanctions, here is the challenge," but there's so much missing, and whether or not this body has the ability to implement all those, we thought we should at least raise them.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Do any of the units in Trinity introduce and educate faculty members about plagiarism? I see Math does. Are there other units that do this? My unit does not. We have faculty isn't necessarily oriented and educated into the policies, let alone the culture. I think that's kind of interesting.

**Inge Walther:** Yeah just, I was surprised to learn... I always thought that the student conduct board had faculty on it. I was really surprised to learn that that's not the case.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I think they do. When I was heard from Steven is that we can never get enough people, enough faculty to volunteer, and I think that's something, again, we need to step up and take ownership of.

**Inge Walther:** The other point that Josh raised was asking who created whatever the guidelines are in respect to sanctions and was that created by the Student Affairs folks or did faculty members implement it?

**Lee Willard:** We used to have an Academic Integrity Council that Judith Ruderman chaired and that was developed in collaboration with that body.

**Lee Baker:** And your recommendation is to bring that back?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Yeah, I think it is a really vital piece of campus that can do a lot.

**Lee Willard:** There used to be, there used to be a lot of faculty participation on the board.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I was on it, Owen was on it, Jim Bonk was on it. It was huge.

**Karin Shapiro:** Just one small thing: it is uneven. So for example, Pratt is very underrepresented, and that seems to me to be problematic, that it's got to be representative across the university.

**Lee Baker:** Just to respond to Josh's a notion of collective, I think I have a different sieve or filter when it comes to me. I see the really crazy misalignments and there are many faculty -- I don't know how many, but the ones that I have to try to clean up and talk to the parents -- who really want to throw the students a suspension and an F, without a question, with no latitude like "This is a learning." It's striking, and they have the authority to just give them an F, not even allow them to withdraw. It is pretty stark, let's just say, and so I'm just curious how one could operationalize what the collective faculty ... it would be interesting to try. It would be an interesting experiment, but I see one tale of it, and it is stark and harsh. I don't know what the other tale looks like, but I think one thing, it is important. This we can work with Steve Nowicki. We can work with the Provost. We can get faculty who want and are committed to this to sit on these conduct review boards, as well as the integrity council to then shape the policies and the rubrics that they use and they will ... they're responsive, but it is not a governance sort of issue in that same way, because it fits in Student Affairs. So anyway, my question was, I don't even know how they think what the collective will of the faculty looks like, but I would be willing to do the experiment.

**Josh Socolar:** I think this is a slightly tongue in cheek in that I know faculty don't respond to surveys, but has anybody tried to make a list of three or four representative cases without saying what the sanction currently is and giving a list of possible responses and just asking faculty which one they think would be appropriate, just to get a sense of whether they're all over the map or whether they tend to cluster away from what the current standards would suggest, or whether they're in line with them.

**Sherryl Broverman:** There's a huge bias in who responds, because who is passionate about it...

**Josh Socolar:** I understand that it's not that easy to do in practice, but that's what I would like to have, some confidence that the policies are such that faculty feels comfortable referring cases to the board.

**Sherryl Broverman:** That could be another committee that investigates that. I think faculty might be more comfortable if they do as Linda suggested and talk to the Office of Student Conduct. Many of the cases here, particularly ones that were contested get anonymously passed to 13 different peer groups to look at to say, "What would you do at your school?" to try and get ... now, unless there's a cabal of people in conduct at multiple schools, we'll have a more severe penalty. It's like "Yeah, that person will be suspended for one or two semesters at our school as well," so there is an attempt to triangulate values among our peer schools of what's acceptable or unacceptable conduct.

**Josh Socolar:** Okay, that's kind of interesting. I did use the routine chapter about that, and if you read the Princeton website, the Harvard website, yeah, plagiarism equals suspension, but if you read many of the smaller colleges, the good, smaller colleges, Notre Dame, other places, their websites suggest that there's more gradation of the possible sanctions depending on ... the suggestion is that they're not ... when you read the websites, they sound like people are not trying to be as punitive, they're trying to help figure out what will be the most helpful for the students.

**Sherryl Broverman:** We need to change what our website says to reflect what we actually do, because there is no automatic suspension. Anyway, I'm sorry. I'm just saying this. It's an education, and you're proposing a new project which I will leave in other people's hands.

**Dick MacPhail:** Real quick, I was going to follow up on what David said, there are places like Davidson where the students really own this. They get to take their exams whenever they want to during finals week and they really, really own the honors system and that would be a really amazing culture if we could somehow foster that here. I don't know how you get there, but...

**Sherryl Broverman:** The Academic Integrity Council worked for a long time to try and get to that, like we talked. It's often a multi-decade process to get there, and that's why the Community Standard says if you see misconduct, it's your responsibility to act. The ownership of self-policing is on the student, which is how you get to an honors.

**Dick MacPhail:** I'm not sure that's really the culture. That's the problem.

**Tom Robisheaux:** This has been a really important discussion to have. It's late in the day on Thursday towards the end of the semester. I think it is certainly too soon to say the Council is ready to vote to endorse or not endorse or whatever, so we will continue with this issue on our agenda for the two remaining meetings. Unfortunately, we didn't have a chance to get to the final item of the agenda. It's the proposal to add a new standing committee of the faculty, which would be a budget committee which has never been done before. We will leave that for another meeting with Council. I realize, colleagues, there's an awful lot on your shoulders right now, but one of the things that's really important right now that's even more difficult this time of year, is your role as a communicator with your units. Meeting with your unit, talking with your department chair, we had Alex Hartemink in with us in earlier in the discussion. It's so important that you come to Council sessions, representing not just your own voice, but those of your colleagues as well, and when we convene again, April 9th, it would be important that you have had a meeting with your colleagues or casual conversations, or at least a discussion with your department chairs about the planning process, and I will look forward to seeing you then. Thank you very much.