

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL
102 ALLEN BLDG
CAMPUS BOX 90029

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, January 14, 2016

Call to Order

Anita Layton (A&S Council Chair): Welcome. Happy New Year. I just want to welcome everybody to the first Council meeting of the semester. If you're here for the first time this year, I am Anita Layton, your Council chair and the one who's been sending you all those emails. Actually, I'm very excited to see so many people here so I'm going to take a picture. This is rare. So anyway, this is great. I love the enthusiasm, I love the participation and this is exactly what we need for effective faculty governance here at Duke.

We have a super exciting agenda for today, so let's get started. First, as usual, we're going to approve the December meeting minutes which have been put on the Sakai site. Any requests for corrections or amendments? None? Okay, I need a motion for approval and a second. (The motion was made and seconded and the minutes were unanimously approved.)

Next, I have an announcement about our faculty research support. As you may know, the Arts & Sciences Council has money and funds that can support faculty research projects and conference travel. In the past, these awards were limited to regular rank faculty only. But this year, Dean Ashby has very kindly given us more money so we can extend our support to non regular rank faculty as well. I think Dean Ashby is not here, but nonetheless I would like to thank her on behalf of the Council for her generosity and her support of our faculty. An announcement will be sent out soon with more details, so please stay tuned.

Global Development Engineering Certificate Proposal

Layton: Next we have the Global Development Engineering Certificate Proposal. If you are new to Council procedures, the way we handle these major are like this: they are discussed over two meetings. For the first meeting, the proposal will be introduced and discussed. Then the Council rep will go home, talk to their colleagues in their departments, and come back to the next meeting, where we will address more questions and then vote on the proposal.

This proposal was introduced back in December by David Schaad and we had a good discussion. So what we are going to do today is see if there are additional questions that we want to talk about, and if all goes well, we will vote on this. I am quite sure that a lot of you were not there for the December meeting, and I am sure that you are here for the curriculum (discussion), right? So I will promise you to try to have as much time to discuss the curriculum as possible, so this is what I am going to suggest: How about we avoid re-addressing things that have already been talked about in December? If you were not here for December and if you are otherwise unfamiliar with this certificate, just sit it out.

So, a very quick recap of what this is about. This is a course-based certificate that is sponsored by Civil Engineering in Pratt. The major goals are to provide a cohesive curricular pathway to train engineers who are able to address technical and structural issues related to poverty, wealth inequality, health access, economic empowerment and such. The certificate provides a number of Gateway courses and Capstone courses and it also has a requirement for an experiential component. Does anybody have questions for David?

Sherryl Broverman (Biology): The certificate only requires one month in the community they are serving, and it is written so that the students go there after they have developed something to implement. That doesn't use best practices of human and community centered design to make sure the innovation is culturally anchored.

David Schaad (Civil Engineering): The idea behind the experiential component is, you're right, it could be limited to something you design or it could be brought before, and we said a minimum of a month although we expect most of these to be two months via DukeEngage.

Broverman: I am concerned that this would send the message to students that they could sit in a classroom at Duke and find things to fix other communities.

Schaad: So what we are doing is part of ... especially the course CE315 Engineering Sustainable Development and the Global Community. That's a service learning course where the students are actually working with a community partner for the semester before they're going to be implemented. So it's like a real engineering project where they're actually getting feedback from the community partner on delivering a design from them, receiving information back from them, and making decisions about what can be implemented on the ground in cooperation with the community partner.

Layton: Any more questions? So I can see you are all very agreeable today. So now, voting time. Can anybody give me a motion? (The motion was moved and seconded.) Great. Okay, so only the Council reps vote and you should have picked up a ballot as you came in. Please fill them out and Mary will collect them. The room is somewhat crowded, so you will help Mary out by passing them to the interior aisle.

So, what's next... the Duke curriculum! I'm going to get out of the way so Suzanne and her team can tell you all about it.

Imagining the Duke Curriculum

Suzanne Shanahan (Chair, IDC Committee): Today, at the halfway point of our committee work, I want to share a brief update and really take the opportunity to present an idea. This is an idea we are now inviting the faculty to think through with us. This is an idea in which the eleven members of the committee are genuinely excited. It's an idea that I'll outline here, it's a rough framework that we think responds to what we heard from faculty and students, from the data we examined, and from the national trends we looked at. But it is an idea. It is an idea that we considered amongst an array of possible ideas to respond to what we heard. We considered curriculums like Columbia and Chicago, core curriculums. We considered models like Brown and Amherst. We considered most of everything inbetween, and this has not been a linear process. These are a set of ideas that over time we kept coming back to and kept becoming more animated with. But it has been a process that we walked around and engaged in, in a variety of ways.

So, today's goals: What I want to do are answer three questions. They are, where have we been? Where are we now? And where are we going? With the aim of saving as much conversation with the many, many people who are now in the room. But first, I think an important thing is a thank you. Over the past 15 months, I have had the honor and privilege of working with ten extraordinary members of the Duke faculty. They are people who came to the table without preexisting agenda and have spent a herculean amount of time over the last year and a half considering a broad range of questions. This group was advised also by an advisory body of 22 other individuals, faculty, students and staff from across campus who also came to the table with great generosity and many great ideas, etc. I want to name the folks on the committee so everybody knows the range of people engaged in this process and knows really some spectacular individuals that we all get to be colleagues with. They are: David Bell, Gary Bennett, Sheila Dillon, Anita Layton, Mohamed Noor, Lee Baker, Liliana Paredes, Matt Serra, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Inge Walther. So, thank you to this great group of people. Not only have they done great work, they're a whole lot of fun. And they've done the work with, I think, a few snacks on Fridays, an occasional glass of bourbon, and some chocolate. Lots of work for little remuneration, as it were.

So, where have we been? In the fall of 2014, the dean of Arts & Sciences, together with the chair of the Arts & Sciences Council, jointly charged our committee. And they tasked us with looking at what's going on now and recommending suggestions for change. This launch actually began two years after initial conversations about whether a review of the curriculum made sense. I think many of the folks in this room were on that standing curriculum committee considering this over two years. I think during that time, Peter Lange's voice was in the back of our heads saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Right? The wisdom of Gunther Peck and his collective action genius when he said it's really hard to create change with the absence of an enormous grievance. So, with those cautions, we began the process. Our conversations have been loosely framed by an implicit question. That question is, how do we craft a liberal arts and sciences curriculum that represents Duke's bold academic aspirations and exemplifies the ethos of our shared scholarly community?

With that in hand, we did three things. We paired a thorough review of the different curricula in each of our Council of Higher Education (COFHE) years; recent significant revisions at Harvard, Stanford and Washington University; and a smaller set of innovations across the country. Matt Serra is the genius of finding everything new and dandy happening in the world, and we consistently looked at different opportunities. We also examined the longitudinal enrollment patterns at Duke, as well as data on different major, minor and certificate combinations as students presently pursued them at Duke. We also had more than 200 conversations with faculty, staff and students, and even a few alumni. We had weekly open meetings. We had meetings across departments, with department chairs, with Steve's undergraduate leadership group, with the Board of Trustees. We did lots and lots and lots of listening.

Working inductively from this material, three guiding principles of our work emerged. The first is a lesson I think the committee learned early on from Wahneema Lubiano and David Malone, who hosted a fabulous conversation about the curriculum over lunch. And what we learned from them was as a privileged institution doing great work, Duke actually has both an opportunity and a responsibility to stand up and speak up about the value of a liberal arts education. I think we all know in the context of North Carolina, it's much under siege. We see that from our colleagues in North Carolina, and I think we need to step up and re-articulate the value of a broad contextual education. And that was the first guiding principle.

Second, what we heard over and over and over again is that simple is good, intuitive is good, and if you can make it simple and scholarly, even better. What do I mean by this? Faculty and students alike have made it clear that the current curriculum is often an actual impediment to pursuing and taking full advantage of the range of scholarly opportunities that they have here at Duke. It limits the ability to

explore and experiment. And while there's much to admire in Curriculum 2000, over time its administration has encouraged an instrumentalism on the part of students and on the part of faculty. The past 48 hours for me have been an exercise in this instrumentality, as my senior advisees interrupt me in the hall and say, "Any ideas on an ALP, after 3 on Wednesdays, one day a week would be good. I don't get up early, I'm a senior. I'm out having fun." They're not coming to me saying, "I've heard of this great Dance class but I also really wanted to pursue this Documentary Studies class. Which makes more sense for me and what I'm trying to achieve here at Duke and beyond?" That's the kind of conversation I think we'd all love to have with our students. But in fairness, I'm the first person to try and find a code for my class, right? You've all experienced your DUS coming to you and saying, "Looks like you're doing a lot of writing in that class. Don't you think you need a W?" This happens all the time and I think what that has done is really undermined the meaning and value behind these particular codes and the original intent of the codes, and it's created a sense of ambivalence toward that. So again, the community overwhelmingly asked for something simple that affords more opportunities for intellectual exploration across the board.

Third, folks asked for a curriculum that might be a defining feature of the Duke undergraduate experience, like FOCUS, like DukeEngage, like basketball. Could the curriculum not be a reason that students came to Duke and why faculty stay at Duke? Couldn't this be a shared opportunity to do something new and cool? And I think the newness has been part of the conversation throughout. I think many people have pointed out -- Lee Willard has recently -- it's been almost 20 years since folks started thinking about Curriculum 2000. A long time has passed. The faculty in Arts & Sciences are two thirds different than they were when Curriculum 2000 came up. Lots has changed. The world our students are going to face has changed. And so how do we think about responding to those changes? But also, there's been an interest in new for the sake of new. Recent conversation with Michael Hardt, he said, it would be really fun to try something different that would be interesting and engaging. That was a theme we heard throughout. It's a fact that many folks here at Duke believe that Duke can and should review its curriculum.

So we've got three really, really broad guiding principles and we're sitting in a room trying to figure out, oh my goodness, what do we do? How do we think about this? How do we create a curriculum that responds to these principles and engages what's happening nationally, what's happening locally here at Duke? Again, very, very nonlinear. There were many a time where we took this idea, threw it in the bin, and a week later, came back and pulled it out. I think this has been a walking around it kind of thing.

So where are we now? That's a sense of our process. What we are imagining is a liberal arts curriculum that is an invitation to a scholarly community of faculty, staff and students. We are imagining an education that is a deliberative four-year intellectual adventure where what you do inside and outside the classroom are integrated into a coherent academic experience. We are imagining an education where students are challenged to articulate questions, ideas and issues that animate them. We are imagining an education that demands close reading, deep thinking and engaged analysis. We are imagining an education that both reflects the traditions of Duke's scholarly excellence and our shared values: diversity, equity, knowledge both in the service of society and for its own sake, moral purpose. We are imagining an education that celebrates both the global and the local. We are imagining an education that showcases what animates us as faculty, where disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship, mentored research, global education, local engagement, and community-based learning are all foundational elements.

We've come up with a name for what we are talking about, tentatively calling it, "Experience Duke Deliberatively." Mohamed is a fan of "Duke Deep," but we will take other suggestions as well. So what are we talking about? What are the elements of this framework?

We're talking about four requirements and five expectations which, through deliberative engagement, students will combine these nine elements and create coherent, mentored pathways through the curriculum. The goals are a broad, contextual education that embraces multiple epistemologies and scholarly traditions. An education that empowers students to think for themselves and work with others to engage the opportunities and challenges that they will face then wherever they will go and whomever they become, as an academic, an activist, an artist, or an entrepreneur.

So what are the requirements we're talking about? The first is something we're calling the Duke experience. This really responded to lots and lots of the student input that we received that asked for a common experience, asked for space to engage a common set of questions and ideas. They asked for a really rigorous introduction to the different epistemologies that represent the best of Duke's work here. So more specifically, we are imagining sort of a 10-month course, a course that actually begins before students get here, that begins inviting them into this scholarly community, that begins engaging them on what it means to deliberate about what they are doing, that asks them, "why do you want to take that course instead of this course," that really embraces the notion of their engagement. So, with modules online, a team-taught master lecture format, but also with weekly breakout, etc., some dorm-based enrichment, imagining a common experience for students. Not unlike the University Course format, I'm thinking it would maybe have a theme. We've heard lots of feedback about which themes made sense and which themes don't. Some of them that we've tossed about include things like race and inequality, climate change, economic development, artificial intelligence, mind and body. These are broad topics that faculty from different disciplines could provide a perspective on and their different disciplinary take. I think very much what the students asked for is an occasion to talk across different perspectives on similar sorts of issues. That's the first piece.

The second and third piece are a major and depth in the second area. I think here, we're really working out of existing patterns that are happening here at Duke. I think it has been, for some time now, featured centrally in admissions literature that 83 percent of our students do more than one thing. They do a major, a second major; a major, a minor, minor; a major, certificate, minor ... and they put them together in different confluences. So 83 percent of our students currently already do two things. Thirty-five percent of our students already do three things, and they put them together in ways they find meaningful. What we also saw is an emergent pattern in the student course plans. Herein, students are increasingly putting together what you might call the parents major and their passion major. They are putting things together in different confluences. But not only that, students are really reaching across the curriculum to engage physics and dance, or sociology and literature, and putting them together in ways that make sense to them. And in some sense, the requirement for a major and secondary depth is an attempt to reinforce what we saw as a great pattern. I'd also say, really importantly, that the one sacred cow in this process has been y'all's majors. Really early on, we made a decision that departments know what they are doing, and it's not a place that should be interfered with. It didn't make sense from our perspective. I think there has been a lot of conversation, really since I've been here at Duke, about some majors being too large, others majors being too small, can't we right-size everything? I guess you know when we started to look at the data, there's such heterogeneity in what folks require across. So we've got at the upper end, it's 19, lower end, it's 10. If we're talking about reducing by two, but then Sociology has eight, and Neuroscience has 17 or Global Health, it's 19. So it's not clear what that does. I also think that a major needs to reflect the scholarly objectives of the discipline, it needs to reflect peer institutions, etc., so that's the one piece we didn't really engage.

Secondary depth. We are not imagining people just double majoring. That's not what we're imagining, and in fact, when students do more than one thing, the lower percentage of them are actually double majoring. What they're doing is putting together things in different pieces. So secondary depth could be a major, it could be a minor, it could be a certificate or it could be a six-course self-designed sequence.

These are sequences we imagine students coming up with; departments can come up with them if they so choose. So that's two and three.

The final piece is a mentored scholarly experience and here, we really are trying to play on the fact that we are a research university, with great traditions of scholarship in arts that students should really experience and have those opportunities. We are not suggesting that we be anything like Princeton, we're not talking just about (inaudible). About 25 percent of our students do distinction projects, or is it 30? Always increasing. But we're really imagining a range of opportunities that students can participate in. They can participate in a Bass team, it could be a directive reading, it could be working in a lab over the summer. It could even be some of the more research-oriented public policy internships that they have in the summer months, etc. The idea is to have it be a mentored scholarly experience. Sociology actually requires engagement with research of all of its students currently, right? It'd done so in a class format. We're not saying these have to be one-on-one engagements, but we do want students to have a relationship with a faculty member around what animates us as faculty. Jerry Reiter, in a great note this morning, sort of said, geez, we could have 1,800 students doing these kinds of projects every year and with only 600 of us, that's going to be a lot of work. We're not talking about just that one-on-one relationship, right? We're talking about students like I have in DukeImmerse, so it's a dozen kids at a time. Things like that. So lots of ways to think about this. We're also imagining that what they produce and what they're engaging in can be different. We're not imagining all scholarly papers coming out of this, we're not imagining all single-authored work. Lots and lots of different things, whether it's a scientific report, policy brief, short story, performance, etc.

So those are the four requirements: the Duke experience, major, secondary depth, and a mentored experience.

We are combining this with what we're calling five expectations. These are different ways of knowing and understanding the world that we think every Duke student should cultivate. They are achieved through experiences inside and outside the classroom, over time and with robust, strong faculty mentoring, professional advising, annual intellectual statements – thank you, Erdag (Goknar) for that idea – (inaudible) and self reflection. Students are expected to create their own deliberative and coherent pathway. Some of those will be more deliberative and coherent than others, and we expect that. Some students will be better able to do this out of the gate, other students will need to practice, like all things here at Duke. Over time, with mentoring, this is what we're expecting.

What are these expectations? I think I've outlined them and the committee has detailed them in short paragraphs in what we circulated. I'll just list them here. They are: to communicate compellingly, both written and spoken; to understand other languages, cultures and civilizations, past and present; understand different forms of scientific thought and evidence; understand creative products of the human imagination – Inge, I think we need another name for that; and to evaluate, manage and interpret information. Again, what we're hoping is that students will combine these nine elements to create deliberative, coherent pathways.

So what now? This is really just a conceptual framework and it's the next step in what has been an ongoing conversation with faculty, staff and students. Lee Willard recently told me there were 24 versions of Curriculum 2000, so we're at number one here. It might even be zero. So lots and lots more iteration and conversation to happen. As a conceptual framework, it's really a set of aspirations. It's not a user's guide. What we are asking for now is to invite you all to try it on and think it through with us in what makes sense and what doesn't make sense. We deliberatively sketched this in broad strokes, knowing we need the faculty to try it on and walk it through. That's what we need at this moment.

How are we going to do this? We're setting up another set of small conversations like the ones we had during last year. I think they were incredibly powerful. Folks like Paul Manos who teamed with Rob Mitchell; Mike Munger and Deborah Jenson. These were great occasions for the faculty to think through the issues from their individual perspectives and in conversation with the different perspectives. We know from our visits to each department that people see the curriculum from the perspective of their discipline and their students, and this is a way to help cross conversation. We're going to set up a set of weekly office hours so that anybody can just come on down and say what they think, whether they like it or they hate it. And we're going to have another round of department visits. And frankly, if somebody said, "you should do x, y, and z," this is the kind of group that would say, "we're on it." At least I hope they are.

So that's where we are. We're making a simple request at this time. It's an idea, it's a thought, it's a concept. Think it through, try it on, see where it can go. We're hoping that, over the next nine-10 months, we're going to get lots of feedback, lots of input, and in a perfect world, by next September or so, we're going to come back with something more fleshed out and see what people think.

That's a kind of general sense. Where we've been, where we are, and where we think we're going.

Layton: So are you ready to take questions?

Shanahan: I am, indeed, and I have my comrades here.

Layton: So a few comments. Given the size of the crowd, this is how we're going to do the Q&A session. If you have a question, please come up to the microphone where everyone can hear you. Don't raise your hand, just come up to the microphone. If you need to, form a line – I see it's already forming – and state your name and department, then ask your question. I see there are a lot of people, a lot of people want to talk, so keep your questions short and to the point. In other words, channel Anita. One final comment, like Suzanne said, this is a concept, so focus on the big picture questions. Details are important, I promise you we will get to the details, but today we are talking about the concept, the overall framework and the big picture. High-level questions only.

Robert Wolpert (Statistical Science): You said that at least 83 percent now do at least two, and as I understand it, all will be required to under the new proposal. What do the other 17 percent do now? Do they do more intense work in their one field? Do they do sports? Tell us about those.

Shanahan: I think it's actually a mix of things. I do think some students are really doubling down where they are, and I think a lot of students are pursuing other activities, whether it's athletics or other extracurricular activities, work in the community, etc. It's a mix of things. Would that be correct, Matt? Yes? So a range.

Jennifer Ahern-Dodson (TWP): I'd like to share the Thompson Writing Program's response to the new curriculum proposal:

The proposed curriculum has much to value. In particular, we enthusiastically agree with the goals of the Compelling Communication expectation--that graduates should be able to "craft ideas and persuasive arguments in written and spoken form." However, research in writing pedagogy shows that this does not happen without explicit, required writing instruction. Although it is not made apparent in this proposal, it has been made clear to us over the past two weeks in direct conversation with members of the IDC committee that Writing 101 will be replaced with the course currently called the Duke Experience. Thus,

despite the Compelling Communication expectation, there are no requirements for either first-year writing, or for writing instruction beyond the first year.

Among our peer institutions, Duke would be alone in not having such writing requirements. Even Brown, which prides itself on an open curriculum, introduced a writing requirement in 2014 to address the recognized weakness of student writing.

High-quality writing instruction cannot be folded into the Duke Experience. This MOOC-like course is incompatible with best practices in writing instruction including sequenced, scaffolded writing assignments, discussion of writing in class, and the kind of feedback that enables students to grow as writers and thinkers. The proposed curriculum decimates writing instruction at Duke by relegating it to one small component of a course with many other aims. While the Duke Experience course could be a valuable part of the curriculum, the curriculum must include a first-year writing course, decoupled from the Duke Experience.

Beyond the evisceration of first-year writing, the proposed curriculum also minimizes upper-division writing. Effective writing instruction requires continued opportunities to build on one's writing capacities. In the proposed curriculum, upper-division, writing-intensive courses would be among a number of courses students might choose to meet the Compelling Communication expectation. Students could graduate from Duke without any explicit writing class whatsoever. They will not be prepared for upper-division writing projects or for the senior thesis, much less for intellectual contributions in graduate and professional schools.

The Duke Experience and Compelling Communication features recognize the importance of analytical writing, speaking, and critical thinking. However, to ensure our students graduate with these capacities, and to realize fully the values articulated in the proposal, the curriculum must include both a first-year writing course designed by writing studies experts and an intentional, required plan for student writing beyond the first year.

And because we are the newest member on Council, my colleagues and I put together a handout which backs up the research, how we built our program, and what some of this is based on. Thank you.

Shanahan: Thank you. I think that's precisely the kind of feedback we need at this point. I think it's really important that everybody understand this is a concept, right? It's a concept that will change and morph with feedback.

Reeve Huston (History): I personally really like the broad outlines. I like the idea of a common experience and emphasis on competencies rather than disciplinary or divisional emphases. I think the question that comes up for me and for a lot of people I've been talking to is the devil's going to be in the details. How does this work? The biggest one is how big are the sections of the Duke Experience going to be? Who's going to lead those sections? Can you get a really good taste of a discipline from a video? Things like that, and I understand that's going to be discussed later and this isn't the place to do it. So one thing I want to ask is have you all thought of mechanisms by which you maximize the deliberate ... the sort of opportunities of make the course through the curriculum deliberate on the part of students? What changes would there be in advising? And that applies to the competencies as well, the expectations. How do you know that a student, by the time she or he has gotten out of here, will communicate effectively? This could conceivably really change the advising system or the evaluation system by individual professors.

Shahanan: So throughout this process, I think we've recognized that without a fundamental change to our existing advising structure, this is simply not going to work. And if that change does not take place, we're taking it off the table and we're going with what we have currently, because our current advising really matches what we're doing currently. I think this would require a level of faculty mentoring and engagement with the kind of mentoring that we all like to do, which is about ideas and readings and research. Not the kind of advising that says, "Here's a list of US/Non-US courses that you might want to consider." We want to engage our students in serious ways. I think this needs to be supported by perhaps broader professional advising, the kind of great advising that's going on now with PhD-level advisers, etc. I'd like to turn it a little bit to Steve Nowicki. Rethinking advising is something he has done a great bit of work on already ...

Steve Nowicki (DUEVP): I'll just say briefly that there is a need to fundamentally change advising even if we don't fundamentally change the curriculum. So this change in the curriculum isn't really the driver of improving advising; that has to happen anyway. And there is a move afoot, there has been a process but it's been slow but the end game will require more resources and does involve a cadre of professional PhD-level advisers working in support of and in concert with faculty advising. I believe Anita has me lined up for later in spring to come and talk about what we have begun to do. It's taking longer than we like, for reasons that I don't want to go into here, but advising has to change anyway. If this curriculum is adopted, then the specifics of how advising changes will morph into that as opposed to supporting the current curriculum.

Mohamed Noor (Biology): Just wanted to add to what Suzanne has said. Her presentation was outstanding, by the way. With respect to the advising, some of the things we've been thinking are, for example, going to a more portfolio-based system of going through the student thinking about their project. Even starting into the Duke Experience, starting towards the end of that class, people start to think at that time, "What am I going to do? How do these things connect? What are the directions I'd like to explore and why do I want to explore them?" As opposed to just box ticking and things like that. So that's one of the things we'd do, possibly even going into the transcript. We haven't figured out all the details on that yet. But with respect to expectations, one thing to note is the expectations are expectations rather than requirements, so in theory, a student could just say, "I'm not going to do this." However, then they'd have this big blank spot on their transcript if they have not fulfilled this, so given the need for students to be competitive when they leave here, they will be incentivized to do this and they will be very heavily advised to do these things. But that helps, they don't have to worry about, "did I tick the box exactly this way or exactly that way?"

Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): First, I'd like to thank the committee for all of your efforts and add my endorsement to the idea of these regular curricular reviews, which most universities undertake about every ten years, not just because knowledge changes but because of what Neil Meltzer calls "accretia." Universities tend to accumulate a series of programs, seldom shedding any, and every department in building its major, especially in the natural sciences and engineering, sees itself as competing with peer institutions and not wanting to be embarrassed by their students being better than ours. So they add requirements and add demands, and this sort of accretion works at odds with our hopes for a liberal arts curriculum. So it's really nice to have a body like this where we can all discuss issues broadly like this and talk about the big picture. But I'd just like to point out the elephant in the room that if we take the idea of revising majors and revising the dozens of academic programs and minors and certificate programs that we vote on here, if we take those off the table for consideration we're really expecting the impossible of ourselves to build a liberal arts curriculum that's coherent.

Next, I'd like to ask for some big-picture consideration of something that ethnographers of higher education know very well, and that is that the ideals of professors and of curricular review committees are

regularly almost diametrically opposed to the priorities of students. Students are inevitably instrumentalists, no matter how the programs are designed and with what genius and intellectual creativity they are designed, they are facing multiple concerns that we have to empathize with. One is careerism; they need to get a job. Two, they don't necessarily want to... they are not curious about the same things that we are curious about so they have to figure out a way around our priorities. And they also want to have fun socially. Most of them came to college, at least 50 percent, because they wanted to have fun away from their parents for the first time. So as we revise the curriculum, I think we have to think about the practical logic of being a student as well as the practical ideals of those few of us in the world who decide to be scholars and have as a priority the intellectual thinking out of the world. And we might be more effective in impressing our concerns upon them if we consider the other priorities in their lives.

Shanahan: A great set of comments that I think are really important. Starting with where the students have situated. I think it's really important, right? I think we're here because we think it's fun. Our fun is perhaps a bit different than their fun, but understanding where they are coming from and what they want to achieve while they're here, and where they need to go, right? I think we need to acknowledge that students spend \$66,000, they want to get a job. Your mom wants you to get a job, right? Those things are really important. I think what we're trying to do is invite students into a way of thinking. Larry Moneta often talks about making students a little uncomfortable as they come in, challenging them to think in different ways and enabling them to realize that there are lots and lots of ways to get into law school. And showing them there's opportunities, and encouraging them to think them through. I'm not saying that the average 18-year-old who's worked their butt off getting into Duke, checked very box imaginable, is going to be able to jump into this environment and take off, right? This is something we'll need to work on with them and excite them about, still realizing that college is about meeting new people, making lifelong (inaudible), so keeping those together (inaudible) as we develop the new curriculum. And also saying, while I've been into departments, I think this and any curricular review is an opportunity to rethink what you (inaudible). I did a whole series of all through the year meeting with Natural Sciences with Dan Kiehart and Dan would start every meeting – Mohamed was at one of them – with, “We're not messing with (inaudible), right? At the Natural Sciences chairs meeting yesterday, Dan Kiehart says to me, “you know, I'm beginning to think a little about what a Physics student is (inaudible), right?” Maybe we should think that through. (inaudible) I think what I'm trying to say is we're not going to tell you (inaudible), but we're going to invite you to think about how this curriculum responds to what you are or are not doing or what you might want to do.

Christina Gibson-Davis (Public Policy): My comments actually dovetail with yours and I could actually not say my comment, but I'm academic and I like to speak, so I'm going to go ahead and say it anyway. One interpretation of this curriculum reform is that the current intellectual level is not sufficient and we need to move the intellectual needle, is one interpretation. I would like the committee's thoughts as to whether or not that was sort of, because it makes two assumptions. One, it makes the assumption the intellectual level is not adequate, and two, that the needle can be moved. And it is something of a cultural shift. Then that leads me to my other point, which goes to this fun issue, which is, to what extent does this overlap with the drinking culture that we have at Duke, and is this at all supposed to ... did you think about that at all?

Shanahan: So I'm not sure we had an a priori assumption that Duke students need to be more intellectual. I think what we thought was there are a lot of students who are, in fact, quite intellectual. I think everybody has had, or lots of people have had, a fabulous experience in FOCUS. Students come to Duke as bright, shiny new pennies, are ready to read whatever you ask them to read, to revise and revise and revise what you ask them to write. They're dying for scholarly engagement, dying for it, right? I just finished grading a set of papers in the past few weeks for my FOCUS class. I finished reading them and

said, "I'm not sure I can finish reading FOCUS anymore. I'm simply not smart enough." They're totally ahead of the game in so many ways, and I think what we're trying to do is right-size the environment between students who are coming to go from A to B, they don't care what they're engaging, they don't want to engage, with students who are really eager to embrace everything that Duke has to offer and we want to deliberately show them those really good things.

Drinking. I think ... I'm looking at Anne Allison here. We've had many a conversation about this over a decade. I think a lot of faculty do have concerns about campus culture. This wasn't a direct way to address this. I don't think it's a direct means to do so. But I think in a meeting with the Chronicle editorial board, a number of Duke students said, "you know if students spent a little more time working on their scholarship, there'd probably be less problems on campus." That was a student statement, not one of ours. So, if there are benefits there, I think we'd all agree that would be a great thing. I don't know if that's the goals or objectives of a curriculum, if it should be? Maybe others have thoughts on that.

Mark Chaves (Sociology): This is super impressive and exciting, thank you so much. My main reaction is jealousy that you all have had time to think about these big things and we ... but thanks for letting us in now. My biggest big-picture thought that I want to share is that this framework seems to very highly value coherence. The word "coherent" appears over and over and over again; Suzanne said it lots of times. I think it's possible to over-value coherence in undergraduate education and I'd kind of like to hear some reaction to that. Concretely where that came up for me most is in the requirement for the second concentration. It seems to me there's some potential downsides of requiring that other 17 percent of students to do a second thing when they're not otherwise inclined, and we can imagine what those are. More generally, I assume part of the point of that is to get some breadth. I presume another obvious way to get breadth is kind of an old-fashioned distribution requirement: if you're a Humanities major, you have to take four Social Sciences, something like that. I was an undergraduate at Dartmouth College with that system, and I'd say that I loved it. I was a Philosophy major but I had to take four Natural Sciences courses. I took an Astronomy course, I took two Biology courses, I think, and they were some of my favorite courses and they were designed for Humanities majors. So, to make this a concrete question, why not that? Why the requiring the second thing instead of a simple distribution requirement that, no question, would produce less coherence, but maybe we overvalue coherence in this. So kind of big concept with a concrete implication that I'd be curious to hear your thinking about.

Shanahan: So I think I agree with you on the coherence versus exploration balance, and we've perhaps tilted a little too much in one direction on this. I think that would be fair. A lot of our conversation actually focused on the exploration dimension of things. And I don't think we're imagining really tightly couple coherence all the way throughout. I would also say that we're imagining students need to experiment to understand how to create coherence. So the two really have to go together in our imagination, but certainly we may need to right size that balance in thinking about things. The question of whether distribution requirements or secondary depth. Where's Leslie Digby? This was actually a question that we debated for two years in the standing Curriculum Committee. Do broad distributional requirements where students take one of these and one of those and put them together make more sense than secondary depth as a way to achieve breadth. Ultimately, I think, in that committee, we went back and forth. In this committee, we went back and forth. Maybe Gary, could you speak to the issue of expectations a little and how wide we thought of that? Then I think Lee has a really interesting way of thinking about putting these two pieces together and really allowing the students the freedom to explore something that maybe Grandma doesn't think is going to get them the best job.

Gary Bennett (Psychology and Neuroscience): Just a couple of thoughts. You know, I think we certainly struggled with this issue of distributional requirements versus expectations and I think saying we struggled with it is a bit of an understatement. So this issue also of the area of secondary depth is one

we've struggled with and I agree with Suzanne. I think this is one we really want to think about because of course we were trying to balance these two, maybe not competing may be too strong a word, but two perspectives, one of which is really saying we want to try and open up the curriculum and allow students to explore it in its richness versus we also want to try to provide opportunities for students with scholarly interests, perhaps some of those 17 percent, to dig deep and to effectively not be forced to have more breadth than they may otherwise be interested in. And so this issue of expectations really emerged out of our interest to really allow us as faculty to do a good job by our students, to allow our students to essentially enable them to make decisions that are really consistent with good advising, with their own scholarly interests. You know, the thing for me with the scholarly expectations issue, and that we kept coming back to time and time again, I think maybe for me, what I really enjoyed the most about this is it just fits so nicely with what I enjoy doing as a faculty member whose mentoring my students. So certainly I can help them figure out, in a distribution model, which courses to take in each of these divisions. But what I'd really like to do is to ask them, "What excites you? What animates you? What motivates you? What did you take last semester?" I want to be able to point to a faculty member who I heard at a seminar and say, "You might want to consider this perspective. Why don't you go take it?"

One of the things that happened in this last 18 months that I've really enjoyed the most is that I've learned we as faculty are extremely good at being able to articulate why our discipline is really essential to the liberal arts experience. We are really good at that. In that process, though, you know, there are so many moments in the process where I said I really wish my students could have heard that. Through good advising, through the Duke Experience, I think we have this opportunity to really model for our students why our respective disciplines matter, how they might contribute to an individual student's scholarly experience, and then those expectations afford students the opportunity to go ahead and take those courses without the kind of rigid constraints that I think are currently in C2K, and also to which have a potential to present themselves in a really tightly constructed distributional model.

Lee Baker (Trinity College): I think in some respects having the two concentrations of the major and the other secondary depth is our attempt to get at the breadth through the liberal arts, and the distribution model, I think, is also important, and it clearly will not preclude it. But one of the reasons it won't preclude it is because some of these expectations may actually be satisfied through rigorous co-curricular activities which then we're not reducing the 34 classes. That just opens up more degrees of freedom to take classes that are not either tied to a major or the secondary depth. And again, with good advising, hopefully students will avail themselves of the opportunity. They will avail themselves of the opportunity, however, with an affirmative decision to do it, opposed to just satisfying a requirement. And even psychologically saying I want to take something outside of my comfort level because I think it's going to be good for my depth is going to be an important way for students to engage all of these classes. I think we've all had students in our class, you can tell they are there satisfying a requirement, they're less engaged, and hopefully by moving this in this direction, they will be more engaged.

The other piece of this is we know we have students that have passion and also maybe a utilitarian approach to this. What this will do is it will not only encourage students to take a Humanities class if they are majoring in a science, but they can tell Mom and Dad it's a requirement; I have to do this. And that actually sort of saying that Duke values this, it's going to open up not just a justification but a real rationalization and a way for students to make a compelling argument to not only their parents and peers, but then subsequent employers or graduate schools and professional schools as well. So that's kind of a factor. We weighed the distribution requirement back and forth and we sort of said at Duke we want our students to experience the liberal arts, the breadth piece of it, by getting depth in something else.

Michael Gillespie (Political Science and Philosophy): First, just a little bit of background. I run the A.B. Duke Scholars program, I run one of the FOCUS programs, I sponsor another one, and earlier I was

chair of the Athletic Council, and I can tell you one thing about Duke students. One size does not fit all. So I think that's one thing we really have to be cognizant of as we go through making requirements, because some things that are going to really appeal to some kids are not going to appeal to others. So I'm hopeful that the committee will think a lot about the flexibility of that. As I see it, there are going to be three big questions that are going to come back to you over and over again, and it might make sense to deal with those up front. First is the language requirement, second is a math requirement, and the other is a writing requirement. Now, as I think the only existing person on here who put the Thompson Writing Program together when we were formed as a committee – and Steve was there, yes – so I take it all back. The program we have now is not the program we put together, right? The program that we first put in place was going to be coordinated with the FOCUS Program, so there are lots of different ways to ... I was going to say skin a cat, but then I'd run afoul of PETA ... there are lots of different ways in which we can do things. So I don't think the committee meant to abandon writing all together and I hope that they'll say more about how this would coordinate.

I have one big question and one concern. My big question is how this first-year course is going to be possible, given the FOCUS Program. We already have problems with the FOCUS Program with students who are pre-med who have a lot of other courses they want to do. So I really hope to hear from you how you think the first-year program, which sounds wonderful, how that's going to work so we don't drive people away from one of the things that I think really is the source of intellectual excitement, as Suzanne pointed out, which is the FOCUS Program. The other big issue behind this, and Steve mitigated this somewhat by talking about a professional advising course, this requires faculty buy-in. I mean, faculty are going to have to do a lot more than they do now. Having served only one year as chair, that's really hard to get faculty to do. It's hard to get faculty to do advising. I remember when I first came here 33 years ago – Steven, I think, came in the same year – we didn't get paid for doing pre-major advising. To get more people to do pre-major advising, they offered us \$100 for our research account. That's all skyrocketed now, right? Now, we're talking about hiring professional Ph.D. advisers, another level of bureaucracy that will shut us off from students. So I really would like to hear ... I mean, Princeton, for example, has a whole lot of incentives to get faculty involved with undergraduates, so I would also like to hear a little bit about what you think we are going to need to do in order to get faculty to really participate in this, well, what seems to be a really positive change?

Shanahan: There were quite a few things there. Let's actually start from the advising question and then move forward. I do think what we are imagining is pairing faculty mentoring with professional advising in some way and maybe Gary could talk a little about the Global Health model, which I think has been quite successful. It's not super dissimilar from what folks are doing at Notre Dame, I believe, vis a vis advising, and if you could address that a little bit. I'd also say, this is a group of faculty, and as a group of faculty they are hyper attentive to not increasing other faculty's work load because it would make them profoundly unpopular. Mohamed is a chair, right? So he thinks a lot about this. So I think what we are trying to imagine is different ways we teach our students, and I think whatever happens, if there are additional mentoring expectations, those need to be considered as part of your overall teaching in a really direct way. I don't mean imaginary credit toward that imaginary accelerated sabbatical that you will never have. I mean real time combination for the fact that you are mentoring students. I think that's been a part of our conversation, but Gary maybe you could talk a little bit about the Global Health model because I do think it's informed a good bit of our thinking.

Bennett: I invite my colleagues David Toole, Sherryl Broverman, Kathy Sikkema, and other faculty who are in DGHI to chime in as well, but as many of you know, a Global Health major is a co-major and in fact many of our faculty who are advising students in Global Health are advising students on top of their regular load in their home departments. We also have faculty who are advising for the professional schools. But most of the major course selection advising in the current C2K model goes through

professional staff. Those initial contacts go to professional staff, which allows our faculty to have the time to advise students on issues they are particularly well suited to do, issues related to career, research, experiential activities, what do I want to do in the world, what do I want to do with my life... The kind of things, frankly, that I think we enjoy doing as faculty and that I think we do a good job at. I think one of the decisions we made early on in Global Health major discussions was to really accept that we are not well positioned to make course selection recommendations in the current C2K model for a wide variety of reasons. But we certainly couldn't ask faculty to do that on top of their loads in their current departments. This new model, I think, works very well. It allows us to be responsive to students, to allow professional advisers to be responsive to students, and again, it allows faculty to do a good job at what they do. I think that model is increasingly common at other places, and you know, Suzanne mentioned this, but let me just underscore it to amplify the point. We really recognize that advising is the key to successfully rolling out this curriculum and it's something that we are all committed to. I'd say the thing I enjoyed most about this committee is it's extremely non-partisan. You have a high degree of variability in disciplinary backgrounds, and we also have a high degree of variability in the way we do our work every day. I run a pretty busy grant-funded lab, I don't need more to do on a day-to-day basis and I can say the same, confidently, for the rest of my colleagues. But I think the thing we are all committed to as a committee is that mentoring is part of our job. This is what we do as faculty, it's what we should do as faculty, but I think that the current model, the current curriculum, really constrains our ability to do a good job at our advising, and I'd argue that that's one of the things that makes it more challenging for most of us and I think one of the advantages of this new model is it will really open up the ability for us to do what we enjoy doing, which is forging strong connections with our students and helping them to identify the questions that animate them.

Nowicki: Can I just follow up a point about advising? I just think as we think about advising, as I've already said, we do need to change advising regardless of whether we change the curriculum. It's important to bear in mind that there's advising and there's advising. Advising in the major is different from advising that first-year student when she walks in on the second day, and I think it's really critical to understand that distinction, because if we want to aspire to the liberal arts ideal, we have to invite students in who have no idea that they want to be a global health major or a public policy major. I went to college to be a music major and ended up, through a distribution requirement not unlike Dartmouth's, finding a biology course and it changed my life. If I had been assigned in some advising model that said, "Look it, you said you're interested in music, that's all you get to talk to," it would have been a different outcome. That doesn't answer the question, but I think it's important as we think about the complexities of improving advising that we understand that there will be different levels of advising that students will need across their journey through any curriculum.

Mine Cetinkaya-Rundel (Statistical Science): I have a question about the Duke Experience course. So from what I understand, that would be a course that all incoming first-year students are taking. So I feel like all throughout high school, students have experiences where they are not individual, and they come to college and I feel like in their first year, that's the time when they're looking to have more individual experiences, like when we talk to FOCUS students, they actually like saying, "In my FOCUS Program, we do *this*. What do you do in your FOCUS Program?" Because they are thinking about honing in on their interests and stuff. So while I actually think it's a really creative and great idea to have this common experience, I am wondering if the committee has thought about does it take away from getting started with that individual experience that a lot of them are probably looking for in college, especially those that have chosen a liberal arts college to begin with.

Shanahan: I think that's a really great point. Lee wants to volunteer to get that.

Baker: I'd love to volunteer to take that one. So I think students are going to be exploring identity (inaudible) and their interests, but the one thing that our students actually have as a common experience in the first year is East Campus. East Campus has worked brilliantly. So they share the cafeteria, they share a lot, they are in similar dorms and have similar experiences. We want the Duke Experience to be one more East Campus component, where at least students have something in common to talk about other than tenting or what sorority or fraternity they are going to pledge. Having the shared experience integrated into the residents life as really part of the East Campus first-year experience I think will not take away exploration on the individual side, but enhance a sense of community and a sense of shared experience which also is a component for the class, if we will. I think we've thought about that many of us have taught in the FOCUS Program, didn't want to compete with FOCUS. We will continue to have the line in the same residence halls that FOCUS Program is a half credit extra course, it's not going to interfere with Engineering or FOCUS, we hope and we'll have to implement that, but we thought really carefully about this, that we're all committed to enhancing FOCUS, but having that as one element of the first-year experience as both academic and residence hall is a benefit.

Inge Walther (German): I just want to speak to that point. One of the points of this half credit per semester Duke Experience course is actually to fully expose students to the different disciplines and how different ... because students coming in, they think, like Steve said, they want to be a music major, and that's where they want to individualize and explore their passions. I think part of the reason for this Duke Experience course is to expose them to these other disciplines and how they can contribute to solving various problems of the world and so on, so that they'll have an idea. Because many of our students just don't know and a lot of our advisers who are in a particular discipline don't know how to articulate the value of these other disciplines to students. So it's just another reason why I think it's a good thing.

Chris Walter (Physics): I had a quick question related to the third and the fourth requirements. So, you know, when I first joined the Council, I guess not very many months ago, I heard this word "instrumentalism" for the first time. It's a word I hadn't heard before, but it's actually a word I was looking for, because often when I talk to students, I find that they feel they have to check off on these boxes and they also feel like, especially because of the process some of them have gone through to get to college, that they have to do everything to get accepted into a place like Duke, right? And when they show up, they still assume that has to be true. So one of the reasons I came to Duke, I wanted to come here, was that I really do believe in what a liberal arts education means, which is that everyone should be exposed to Latin and calculus, and in a deep way, not in a soft or weak way. So sometimes I have students who come and they talk to me, and I would like them to be able to have that exposure by taking general classes but not necessarily having to check off on something as a requirement. Sometimes I have students who come and talk to me and they'd like to be more involved in research. So that's the scholarly experience, and in my field that requires a fair commitment, especially because there's usually a pretty long lag time. Just getting yourself up to speed ... and I think that's true in a lot of places ... but students have to spend a year before they can really, really do a search and all and really do the work. And a lot of them feel they can't do that because they have these other requirements that they need to take, and it's not requirements in the sense of, "I have to check off for the curriculum," it's requirements of "I have to have a second major" and "I have to have a certificate." So I worry a little bit that requiring this second major or minor in concentration ... I heard a little bit even in the conversation at the beginning of class, what is that other 17 percent doing? So I'm sure people didn't mean it that way, but I think if one of the students was sitting in the room who really wanted to concentrate on research and take a general education requirement, they might sort of take that in a negative sense, right? "All my other colleagues are majoring in whatever, why is it not good enough for me to take history and African American studies and be a physics major and do research? Why isn't that good enough?" And so I wonder a little bit about whether or not the relationship between the scholarly experience and the concentration ... I can imagine sometimes those might be the same and I guess my request and question about what you thought about is

how you've thought about the separation between those two things, because I just worry a little bit about the impact on some of the students, especially those in the Natural Sciences.

Shanahan: So I think this is a great, great cluster of questions that are riffing on discussions that we had with the Physics faculty, but also a conversation that Kathy Sikkema weighed in on. I would say we started this process saying, "Ew jeez, that statistic is just wrong. Why are we applauding students being dilettantes and picking up here and there? We should be applauding a student who doubles down in a particular place." Why is it that we allow students to do three things? Why would that make sense and I think it was actually a conversation with Kathy who said her best students are the students who are putting the three pieces together really creatively and in an engaged way. And so I think what we wanted to do was say that what you need to do is think about why. Why are you putting the pieces together? And I would actually say in our imagination that a student could make a compelling argument how and why that third piece may not exist in their particular repertoire. I call also imagine that us saying, geez a student needs to really skill up. Scott deMarchi is always saying that you can't do serious research in political science without 12 courses in statistics, or whatever it is, right? That over time, a student might need to skill up to do that project, and that will be the six-course concentration. So I can really imagine these things coming together in different kinds of ways, but I don't think we want to a priori preclude either Kathy Sikkema's students or the students you folks in Physics talked about really wanting to encourage and cultivate.

Walter: To be real clear, I'm not saying all the students are like that. A lot of students want to do a lot of other things, too, and I'm just saying for some of those students, especially sometimes ones who may be more interested in the academic track, that we need to accommodate both of them.

Shanahan: We absolutely do.

Noor: Building on that, if you look at the numbers, even you even take the heavier majors, let's say there's something that requires 19, including pre-reqs and co-reqs and things like that. Add secondary depth and let's take it high and six for another, you're at 25. Add Duke Experience, 26. Let's say each of the expectations are satisfied by a completely different course, you still have multiple courses left for exploring. Part of our whole objective in doing this was to allow students this opportunity to do exactly what you're describing. They can go out and say, "Hey, I've fulfilled these requirements. Let me take classes I'm really excited about." We really want them to be going outside their departmental major and to be able to do what they want to do even with the heaviest majors, even beyond fulfilling the expectations proposed. I think that there's still a lot of flexibility because they don't have the Nat Sci, ALPS, etc., and Modes of Inquiry they used to have to take before. There's more flexibility with what is proposed than with the current model.

Layton: So in the remaining few minutes, we'll take two more questions.

Joanne Van Tuyl (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): My view of learning has always been that you need to move from being really confused and messed up to making sense out of it, and then once you get comfortable with that, someone needs to mess with your mind so that you get uncomfortable again, and then someone helps you out, and it's this process. As a pre-major adviser, my motto is always, "Disturb the comfortable and comfort the disturbed." I've always loved that. That's just sort of my first little note. But the other one is my concern about the word "major" and it seems like and I'm sure that you've discussed this, but I haven't heard it so far, that we're talking about, well there's the major and then there's something else in depth. Well, what is the major? Again, as a pre-major adviser, I spend a lot of time and I was mostly concerned with talking to students about what a major is, why do you choose something to be a major and granted I'm in sort of a literature humanities mode all of my life, but I see it

many ways, not just as fulfilling requirements, obviously not just as this is what, this is the job I want. But it's a form of self identity so that no matter what you do in life, 30 years down the road, you'll be saying, "Yeah, but I was a cultural anthropology major" or "I was a biology major" and everyone else in your neighborhood is like, "Yeah, he's the bio major" and it's kind of an identity thing.

So my question is, is there some place, and I don't think we should do away with majors by any sense, but I think that's one of the key parts to the advising that we've all been talking about here. That advising's important because if we're saying yeah, there's the major and then we want everyone to do this, then what the heck is the major? And so I just wanted to ask about that.

Shanahan: So I think these are a great set of questions. We did talk a great deal about majors. Even at one point, I think somebody threw it on the table, should we get rid of them? I think we quickly said no. I do think what you've identified are an interesting cluster of things, and the identity one I think for me is really important. We are imagining that the major is a gateway to the scholarly community. It creates an incredibly important foundation. What we're hoping is that students have that foundation, it gives them an opportunity to look elsewhere and ask a different set of questions, understand a different set of theory a different set of evidence, a different set of research methods, etc., and that would help reinforce the major. But also just to enable them to kind of creatively put pieces together. But I do think you're absolutely right, these two last questions I think we really need to think through those four requirements and what's the meaning behind them and what are we going to try and achieve there?

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): It's a beautiful vision. I know how hard you've worked and it's been an amazing process, and I'm excited about the next year and a half. So I want to thank you so much for what you've done. We all know that advising is key to this and I think there's sort of an empty place that we have a full place, a full thing to put in it. And that is, the intellectual vision of this unique Duke curriculum would require, I think, engaged intellectual scholarly professionals in the discipline who are invested in Duke itself, and the idea of offloading advising onto a cadre of professional advisers recruited from somewhere else who have trained how to be advisers, who don't know about our curriculum, who are not part of this institution and not engaged in it I think would be a way to derail the curriculum and all of its beautiful potential. One thing I would suggest is to keep in mind that we have people here who are non regular rank faculty, non tenured faculty who are passionate advisers already – I speak to you as one and I see many here in the room who are ready, I think, to commit to advising students in the discipline as scholars. All we need, I think, would be to be rewarded for it in a coherent way.

Shanahan: All I can say to that is amen and amen again.

Layton: So thank you, Suzanne. Let's give her a round of applause. So I want to emphasize that today is the beginning of many, many discussions about the curriculum. Suzanne is arranging many meetings, so I hope you join them.

Can you just give me one more minute? I need to report the vote result for the certificate proposal. We have 23 for, 4 against, and 1 abstain, so congratulations. Now you can go home.