

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 November 14, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): I would like to welcome all of you to the November meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 10th meeting have been distributed in advance and are available on our Sakai site, and I trust that you have had a chance to review them. Are there any recommendations or corrections to the minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve them?

Margaret Humphreys (History): So moved

Steffen Bass (Physics): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The minutes are approved from the October 10 meeting

Announcements and Updates

I have a few announcements to begin our meeting for today. Let me start with a very happy announcement for myself, Shawna Kaufman, and the members of the Executive Committee. You all know that the work of the council takes place with lots of support, such as Meaghan [Shaw] who works over the minutes, but even that is not enough. We have just hired a graduate assistant, Israel Durham from the English department who will be working with the Executive Committee to make sure our minutes are in good order readily available. Also, he will be working on the council website. So far, Shawna has taken over that responsibility, but any of you who manage a website know how much work that is and you can recognize that we need someone who can dedicate time to it on a regular basis. I want to use the website as much as I possibly can to provide us with information, announcements, and so on. Look for Israel; he may be at the next meeting, and we are glad to have him as part of our team.

Let me also announce that we have a new representative to the council. Unfortunately, she is unable to come today, but **Professor Cheri Ross from International Comparative Studies (ICS)** has been elected to serve as the representative to council from that program following their elevation program status last year. That is a nice way of connecting to my third point about bylaw revisions, because the election of a representative from ICS to the council posed a number of tricky questions involving the bylaws and how council representatives are elected, none of which describe the situation of a unit like ICS and how it is to elect its members and be represented in council. We do have ECASC, which is tasked to interpret the bylaws and the election procedures. They ruled that ICS will have one representative but no alternate for the present time, and the reason why is that there is only one faculty member who has a primary appointment within ICS. We could invent a new procedure, and you will hear more about that, but this seemed to be closest to the bylaws that we currently have.

Along those lines, for the last year the Executive Committee has recognized that our bylaws are antiquated and have put us through some very difficult situations involving representation and voting. We have realized the need to update the bylaws, and we are working steadily on bylaw revisions. They are probably going to come to you in two different sets and we hope to begin introducing them to you in December. There are some that involve representation on council and voting procedures, and because they go to the heart of faculty governance, we want to separate these out from other considerations having to do with updating the bylaws to keep them up to date with the current practices of our committees. We want to separate out those different phases of the bylaw revisions, so stay tuned for that.

Let me call your attention to a proposal that is likely to be coming to the council's attention either in December or January. I have more to say and report to you about the online teaching innovation discussions that are going on and are supported by the council as first proposed in a resolution from last April. In December or January, a policy

recommendation is likely to come to the council from the Curriculum Committee regarding the number of Duke-originated courses that count for credit towards the 34 [required] units. In many ways, I wish we had this proposal behind us and were discussing online courses, but we realized we needed to disentangle all of these issues that are associated with online courses. **Suzanne Shanahan** and her committee have been working closely with **Inge Walther** on the Curriculum Committee, and I believe that the policy will be ready for us to look at [soon].

Before we go to the major items of business for today, I want to update you with all of the activities that the Executive Committee and you have been involved in regarding our online course discussions. **I want to recall for everyone the important outcome from the April 25th meeting, and whenever you hear this misunderstanding among your colleagues, would you tell them that the council did not prohibit online teaching in our resolution.** There still is misinformation and misunderstandings in some corners of the faculty that the Arts and Sciences Council voted to disallow online courses. Of course, that is not what we did; we simply declined participation in one consortium. **However, the resolution that we did pass was to encourage and embrace online innovation to help support faculty and departments that want to enhance their undergraduate education.** This is about pedagogy in its fundamental sense, and that resolution, if you can recall from our September meeting, became the basis for a plan that was developed by the Executive Committee over the summer, and finalized at our retreat in August.

I want to mention some of the steps that are being taken implement it as we are in the middle of that process right now. There are a number of policy development issues that are related to online courses, for example. The Executive Committee, working with Dean Walther, Dean Patton, and Dean Baker, has tasked the Curriculum and Course Committees with examining some of those issues. One of them you are going to be hearing about very soon is the number of Duke originated courses that can count towards the 34 courses for credit.

There are some other policy issues that need to be considered. One of them has to do with standards and practices for courses, which is still under discussion. The Curriculum Committee and ECASC in its discussions quickly recognized an important question, which is: Do we want to single out one particular kind of course format for types of standards, and not have standards for any other courses? As you know right now, there are no standards except the contact hours mandated for a course over a semester's term. We realized very quickly that we needed to consider this broadly. Dean Walther has been working on this, and we are still in the process of figuring out the right place for committee support, discussion, and best practices for online courses.

We also recognize that we would need to be a part of wider discussion because we have a lot of course formats right now that involve experiential learning, laboratory research, and field research and there are no standards at all for any of those courses. Why do we want to single out one particular type of course format, and not recognize that we are in a period of immense creativity in terms of formats? We want to tackle the whole gamut of issues, and it still needs to be decided how to handle that best and which committee that needs to go to. Dean Walther is also working on some interim approval processes for online courses. We have some ideas right now, but it has not been formalized. We realize we will have to transition it into a time when there are very clear procedures, but we already have courses that are being taught partially and completely online. I know faculty would like to have some guidelines, criteria, and standards for those courses so we know what we mean when we are talking about course credit.

That is the first part of the plan, the second part is to gather information and foster faculty discussions. I want to underscore this; I just came from a meeting of the Academic Council's Committee on Online Education chaired by Scott Huettel, and I thought they formulated it very precisely and well for us. The focus needs to be on pedagogy and what it is that your department and you as faculty members want to do that will enhance your teaching. Does that have online components? What kind? That is the nub of the issue, and there is no one answer to that. We already have a huge pallet of different pedagogical approaches that are supported.

We have been organizing a set of forums to help faculty who want to inform themselves about how some online or hybrid teaching is taking place. We have had forums in September and October. The next one will be taking place tomorrow at 9 a.m. in 217 Perkins. These are all on topics that faculty identified as issues they want to sort through to figure out what might be best for them in developing online components for their undergraduate teaching. That forum will highlight online courses for credit. We have several professors there who will be talking about it who have actually done this or are doing it. If you want to understand how it is done and what the possibilities are, I encourage you and your colleagues to come. This is the way to begin answering questions such as, "How can I in my department think in creative ways about making the liberal arts education better for us?" In December we are hosting another forum focused on students, student experiences, and perspectives. After the winter break, we are going to have a forum centered on the issues involving work, the relationships between institutions that generate content, and those that are purchasing it: in other words, the landscape in general for online education.

Linda George (Sociology): Is there a way that these forums can be videotaped and can they be available on the web?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Yes they are. The September forum is on the Arts and Sciences Council website, the forum tomorrow morning will be video recorded, and you will find it there.

Margaret Humphreys (History): Could it go online to the Duke.edu website, because I think more faculty [members] may look for it there.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Lynn will put a link there. One of the challenges that we have had, Lynne O'Brien, Dean Walther, and I is where will the faculty go for information? It is not necessarily the council website, and we want to make sure that the faculty knows the most obvious places to go to.

We also recommended mini grants for course development, which you may hear about from Dean Patton. I guess the nub of it is to identify faculty goals for using online components to enhance courses and the curriculum. The Executive Committee tasked you in September to meet with your departments, department chairs, your DUS, and your colleagues. We did not want to give you a specific set of questions to answer because there is no one agenda driving this. You are the ones who are driving this agenda. What do you need in the way of support to create the kinds of courses that will enhance your own department's course offerings?

There are department meetings that are in process this month, and we are asking that all of you draw together thoughts, recommendations, and observations for the Executive Committee in December. We have not suggested a format in how you give it to us, and I will give you a reminder at the end of the semester. We want to draw all of those reports together. If your department wants some help in how to have a pedagogical discussion about online learning, we have put together a group of faculty consultants who have a wide range of experience, and I have made that list available to you. They are waiting and willing, and some have already met with departments and department chairs. Some of them are whole teams who have a lot of experience with online teaching. If you just want to have them there to listen to your discussion, they are there for you. It is what you and your departments want to identify as your goals.

This is going on right now and we will be pulling this together in December. The winter is going to be the critical time because your reports are so important for us, so I encourage you to give them some careful thought. As the Executive Committee draws them together, we want to share them widely with you, the departments, and the chairs. We will share them with the Arts and Sciences committees who are involved in policy development issues. We will share them with the deans. We will probably want to distill some recommendations out of these to advocate on the behalf of faculty for whatever seems to make sense. We will look for themes and patterns of interest, and we will be meeting with the deans and CIT, both of which have been responsive and helpful in this regard. We need to know what you want, and only then can our council project be effective. We will have all of those recommendations in the spring sometime.

Let me pause for a moment to see if there are comments, observations, or questions that are coming up. Is there any way that we on ECASC or departments who are more advanced in this discussion might be able to help, listen, or suggest solutions?

Dean Patton: I just want to say that the folks who have been coming to the online forums have been wonderful. There have been times when we have been feeling like we are preaching to the choir, and we want folks who have some deep concerns and who were part of the conversation last spring to encourage all of your colleagues to come. Otherwise, it feels like a lopsided conversation, and we want to engage every point of view around this.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): Why don't you have a panel of the critics?

Dean Patton: I think that is a great idea

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We will note it down and have the critics come. Other comments?

Linguistics Program Proposal

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let's turn to our first item of business today. Last month, a recommendation came to the floor involving the linguistics program. As you know, "program" has multiple definitions and the recommendation is to change the status of Linguistics from a major to a program that can make secondary appointments and joint appointments, none of which will be primary in Linguistics. Let me ask Professor Edna Andrews to come forward, as there may be some questions that colleagues have about the program proposal before us. You have seen the recommendation and the report, and you heard last month from Edna [Andrews] and Dean Lee Baker about the proposal. Dean Angie O'Rand is also here to answer questions. Edna, do you want to add anything?

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): I thought the discussion last time was very good, and I have nothing to add.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I sense that the council is ready for a motion regarding the linguistics program proposal.

Dick MacPhail (Chemistry): I move that we approve the proposal

David Malone (Education): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We have ballots that will be distributed. Let me indicate that a "yes" vote means you approve Linguistics Change in Program Status, allowing joint and secondary appointments. A "no" means you do not think this is a good idea, and you may abstain. I would like to point out that if the council is to approve this, it does not go to the Academic Council or the Board of Trustees because we are not transforming this unit into a hiring unit. This would be the final approval were you to approve. We will announce the results in a few minutes.

Strengthening the Curriculum through Assessment

Thomas Robisheaux (History): In the meantime, I think we can move to our next order of business, which involves the Assessment Committee you may have been perplexed by the title that David Malone gave to this session: "Strengthening the Curriculum through Assessment" because if you are like me, you think about assessment as a bureaucratic procedure that you have to comply with. I do it grudgingly, but what I have learned in working with David [Malone] and the Assessment Committee is that it does not amount to that at all. Actually, there are now units that are leading the way in transforming the way that assessment is used to think creatively about how to teach better and teach more effectively. In other words, how to use assessment to line up with our pedagogical goals and whether we are reaching them or not.

As a way of introducing this session of the council meeting, I want to thank the current members of the Assessment Committee. I cannot tell you how hard they have worked, because all of these colleagues have done so though the last SACS reaccreditation process, which is just the tip of the iceberg. There is a lot of other work that goes on in the

Assessment Committee. Dick MacPhail has served on it, as well as Jerry Reiter, David Rabiner, Kristen Neuschel, Edna Andrews, and Barbara Dickinson. You are going to hear from Kristen Neuschel, Edna, and Dick in just a moment. There are ex officio [members], such your deans and me who sit on it too. The committee has broad support.

I also want to take the opportunity to announce that the new committee has been appointed. We have one last appointment to make, but the committee is pretty much in place now. Professor Julie Reynolds in Biology will be chairing the committee; she has extensive experience and interest in assessment. She is going to be joined by Marcia Rego in the Thompson Writing Program, Elizabeth Marsh in Psychology and Neuroscience, Kristen Stephens in Education, Scott Huettel in Neuroscience, and Anita Layton in Mathematics. There is one other member of the committee that I want to appoint who would be a faculty member interested in assessment, who has the time, and is also from a small department in the humanities. You can see the range of possibilities is narrow, and the colleagues I have turned to so far have been unavailable. We try to appoint a whole spectrum of members who represent different kinds of departments as well as being spread across the three divisions of Arts and Sciences.

Let me turn the session over to David Malone. I hope some of you might find inspiration and ideas to take back to your own department that might be useful as you think about assessment and course evaluations, not just some paper procedure to comply with. It is something you can really put to good use to make the work of your departments better than it is.

David Malone (Education): I want to begin by thanking the members of the Assessment Committee. This group of people began working together in the spring of 2010, and we have Ruth Day to thank for this. As the former chair of Arts and Sciences council, she and Lee Baker put together the first committee, which was new at that time. We gave it the name Arts and Sciences Faculty Assessment Committee, and we refer to it as ASFAC. One of the joys of Arts and Sciences to me is the collegiality and the shared sense of purpose, and I think this group has exemplified that. We have had a lot of fun and we have dealt with some tough issues, but we have stuck together.

I also want to thank the Office of Assessment: Matt Serra, Jennifer Hill, Evan, and Whitney. That is a tremendous resource for Arts and Sciences, especially for the Assessment Committee. Every committee has a formal charge as indicated in the bylaws. Our charge is on the screen; I just want to say a few remarks, then we are going to hear from three departments about the work they are doing in assessment, and then we will have a discussion about assessment. First of all, the members of our committee met with each of the forty departments and programs that offer majors and minors. We might have only talked with global health as a process of the creation of the global health major. We met with many of the certificate programs, and we provided feedback, ideas, and strategies to each of the departments. We want you to know that if you think we can help you with your department; it is easy for me to say this because all of us are stepping down, but the new committee is very willing to meet with each department and program.

We also established expectations for departmental assessment activities. We created a timeline, and we will not go into all of the details of that, but essentially during the academic year, departments collect data from their students that they think will help inform decision making about their major, courses, and their departmental academic activities. Then in May, they analyze the data and begin having discussions within their departments about how that data might inform curricular decisions. They are asked to report on that data and their assessment activity by December, so hopefully departments are working on that now. I think Dean Baker came up the idea to tie assessment to the chair's budget conference, so in your chair's budget meeting there will be a small amount of time dedicated to discussions about assessment.

We have offered support in terms of promoting integration of assessment. Last year we came up with a good idea, which was to throw a little money at this. We had an assessment mini grant program, and between our good friend Keith Whitfield, who is the vice provost for academic affairs and also attends the meetings not as an official member, but because he loves assessment so much we were able to have 31,000 dollars that we awarded to six different initiatives. The new committee will be repeating the mini-grant assessment program, so if your department is interested in doing some innovative things around assessment, that is an opportunity to get funding for that.

We also provide feedback to the forty departments. I would say the vast majority of those departments are now beginning to embrace the use of assessment as a way to inform decision making. On the ASFAC committee we have special language that we use in describing departments, so we have "embracing," "developing," and our third category: "hard nuts to crack." Our goal is to move everybody up to the "embracing" [category], and earlier I ran some data between 2010 and now, and I think our trend is that more departments are finding out about the usefulness of data collection and analysis.

Finally, we do stay in communication with the deans, the Arts and Sciences council, and the vice provost. Our SACS fifth-year interim report is due in March of 2015, and there are step-back dates when we have to have certain things done by, so we are working hard to do our share. This is a university-wide effort, and we are just representing Arts and Sciences so we are really asking departments to embrace this and join in the fun. Now we are going to hear from Kristen Neuschel, Dick MacPhail and Edna Andrews about the work that they are doing, and then we will have time for questions and discussion.

Kristen Neuschel (Thompson Writing Program): I have several different universes of assessment that I have been a part of; one of them is the ASFAC committee. To begin, I was the DUS in the history department when the first mandate that we start working with systematic assessment came along some years ago, I led the effort to develop the first assessment plan for the department, and I began to implement it. I learned that what we had to do first was articulate standards for research, and that has become what we still assess. As our baseline, what we did was look at the research of our best

students to find out if we were asking the right questions, so we took a rubric that I now realize was incredibly primitive and evaluated the senior theses that were written out. For those of you who do not know, for more than thirty years the history department had a very robust senior thesis program. Even though I could see pretty quickly that it was a primitive rubric, with it, I quickly discovered some pretty clear gaps in our student's research and writing skills. To put it another way, they were not doing work that was as good as we thought it was. That taught me right away that there is a mismatch that we needed to pay attention to between what we thought we were communicating, what they were getting, what they were able to do, and our ability to see what they were able to do

As distressing as that mismatch was what was really surprising to me and what got me to love assessment was that with those rubrics in place, it enabled me to read their work and notice things that I otherwise would not have noticed. That is to say, I was noticing that students were accomplishing things like being intellectually adventuresome, doing original thinking, and being particularly adept at source analysis that I would have otherwise missed because the apparatus of their research was not well-developed, and I would have overlooked what was original and important if I had just been focusing on the things they could not do. I learned from this that we have an important question: how do we foster what is good once we notice it while working on other things? How do we foster independent thinking when working on research skills? My conclusion for the purposes of assessment was also important for me, which is that assessment is, in the very basic sense, successful when if, nothing else, it gets us to ask better questions about student work to enable us to see more and keep the cycle going.

I had also learned working with my colleagues in the history department how transformative it is just to have the initial conversation with your colleagues about what we should be valuing in fostering students' work. We learned that we disagreed with each other; not about the key components of what constitutes research in our discipline, but about how we should teach it. I think this is a particularly interesting lesson for those of us in Humanities and interpretive Social Science departments that have a decentralized curriculum, because we had to accept that kind of curricular anarchy. It was going to exist. We had to agree that we would disagree about in what order, with what emphasis, towards what individual standards, and what curricular levels we were aiming for. We had to work to some degree on a course-by-course basis, even in a curriculum that had comparable courses at certain levels.

But what was really important was that in this little faculty working group, we had a big moment of what can be termed metacognitive awareness about our discipline and ourselves as teachers. We learned to see things in stages that we were not used to dividing and looking at in that way, and I think it became fruitful because we could share that perspective with students who were only going to get a piece of that at one time. I was able to walk into the classroom and say that in this class we are going to emphasize these three things, in other classes you are going to get other things that we also value. That enables students themselves to have an overarching view of their education that they were not otherwise getting.

Under the rubric that no good work goes unrewarded, I have gotten involved in two grant driven projects about assessment: one with the Teagle and Spencer Foundations, and the most recent one with the Spencer Foundation. My experience as a DUS in history has reinforced in the strongest terms the centrality of faculty to meaningful assessment, by which I do not mean faculty doing the work, but faculty doing the intellectual work of assessment. Both of these projects have worked off of that, and the Spencer Foundation one that I am currently part of is a three university study not of how to go about doing assessment, but how to make sure we close the loop in assessment. What affects our ability to make meaning out of the results we get when we do assessment, and put them into use to improve student learning.

We have been doing that work at Duke with smaller numbers than the people at the University of Nebraska and the University of Kansas have been able to gather, but we have been doing some interesting work with small groups of instructors in departments as varied as philosophy, English, and biology. Our conceptual approach is you can weigh a pig all you want to, but it will not make it fatter. In other words, you have to do something with what you learn in order to have an impact on education. Our particular question is: if we affect how the faculty makes meaning out of the results, are we increasing the likelihood that they will do something with those results and that the loop will get closed?

What we have discovered is, as I was implying before, part of the crucial answer to how assessment can be made meaningful is, not surprisingly, giving it to faculty to do. For us that has meant giving the faculty the time and resources to do the reflective work for their own courses, to think about what they want students to learn in their classes, and how to determine if the students are learning it, which means in part learning to set up their courses with the end in mind; to set up the course itself to provide the kind of information that can yield information in real time to have an effect on the course. This is how we are teaching our graduate students to teach and to set up courses; learn to teach with the end in mind and work backward from the goals of student learning that you have, which revolutionizes the way you organize courses.

What we are doing is taking teaching as a process of inquiry and making it into a map for how to create your course. These [on slide] are some of the questions we ask, "What do I want my students to know?" The key part here is that the instructor in the classroom gets to answer that question; nobody else. "What do I want them to be able to do? What does it mean to think like someone like me? How can these skills be modeled? How is learning occurring? How am I helping it occur?" In the writing in the disciplines course, which I am involved in, [asks] "How can writing help foster that kind of learning?"

Those are some of the questions we are asking. I am excited about how much impact this has on what we do as individuals, but the dilemma is: how do we link this effort by individual faculty with assessment at the departmental level? That is something we have to think about. I am talking about assessment from the bottom up, but how does that inform the

inevitably top down process that focuses on majors, which is what we have to work with, and I think that is going to be an important conversation.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): David, do you want to take questions as we go along, or do you want to wait until the end?

David Malone (Education): I think we can wait.

Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): I am going to talk very briefly about some of the things we did in chemistry to try to improve student outcomes in our gateway sequence, which was assessment driven. [There was] a lot of collaboration with the dean's office with Bob Thompson and Lee Baker, and the Office of Assessment with Matt Serra and Jennifer Hill. This goes back a long ways, so I am going to try to give you the Cliff Notes version.

Back in 2005 as part of an assessment of STEM success, Bob Thompson and Matt Serra were looking at student outcomes, and they found that students who took the introductory chemistry course, Chem21, and Math25 at the same time in the fall had substantially lower grades, as designated CDF, and matriculation out of STEM. In collaboration with them, we decided to see whether it was just a matter of having these two courses at the same time, so we started offering an off-sequence version of Chem21 to decouple these two. After a few years, since it takes a while, it became clear that this had no effect.

What else do you do? We had been thinking about changing our curriculum anyway, so we decided that as part of that revision we would put in a new course, which is a skills course for students who come in without the background in chemistry that a majority of our Duke students have. It specifically targeted these students, and as part of that, we had to think about how we were going to determine placement for these students. With help from Jennifer and Matt we developed a diagnostic quiz that students take at the beginning to decide where they are best placed, and Math SAT scores were found to correlate very strongly with performance in this. We used these as placement, but also as a way to do assessment after the fact.

In fall 2009 we started this new curriculum. Dorian Canelas began teaching Chem20D, and one of the things we had in place was the diagnostic quiz that the students took before they took that course, and in the spring I was teaching Chem31, which is the following course, and we had them do the diagnostic quiz again. That gave us a pre/post measure of learning gains in that course and how they did. Then we looked at grades and exam scores in Chem31, which is the next course in the sequence, going back to things we had seen before, and we are in the process of trying to look globally over several years at retention success through these gateway courses. This is a very big project that Jennifer Hill in particular has been helping with a lot.

So this [on slide] is an example from one year, and these are pre and post diagnostic scores. This is the group that went into fall 31 and they have 7.5 so you know they are good to go and they have the background. This is our 2.5 group that went into Chem20, so these students do not have the background or skills to do the basic things they need to be successful in 31. This is what we got after they took Chem20, and this result is robust from year to year. That is nice and it says the course is doing what we anticipated it would do. That was something we really had to know.

Here [on slide] is another piece of evidence. The next question was [whether] Chem20 had an impact on grades in the next course. What we have done here is take [a look at] students in the lowest quartile of the Math SAT group, which is the group that we found struggles more. These are the students in Chem31 in the spring who started with Chem20, and this is the equivalent cohort that did not take Chem20 before that. You can see that, at least in this year, those who took Chem20 were more successful in terms of grades. There is some stuff from fall there, and I was involved in teaching that course, but it is hard to compare fall and spring semesters. This was another piece of evidence that this course seems to be doing what we want it to do. I will say that these fluctuate from year to year, so this is the kind of thing where you have to collect a bunch of data to see whether it holds up over time.

I taught a TBL version of this course last spring, and the results do not look as good as this. I do not know what that means, but that is something else to follow up on as we go. This is just an example of how we have used bits of assessment to try to change our curriculum and improve things.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): What is TBL?

Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): Team Based Learning; it is one of the flipped classrooms.

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): Last year the chairs of Slavic, Romance, and Linguistics submitted a three-way proposal to look at four years of curriculum in the Spanish and Russian language courses and do an error analysis of the final exams in each semester. That is also working backwards so we can see, first of all, what kinds of mistakes and problems are happening in the first year sequence. Are they being corrected? In the second year sequence there are other things happening, but we are tracking through the entire curriculum for both of these languages, and we just started the analysis this semester. We are hoping that we will be able to come back, take the results that we found, and re-integrate into the program to improve the language acquisition of our students in these languages. We also hope that because we are doing a comparative analysis between two different families, Romance and Slavic, that some other things will come out of this comparative analysis that will be useful and generalizable to other languages in the world.

Discussion

David Malone (Education): I think we have a few minutes if there are any questions.

Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): I think this is for Richard. When you talked about the initial work that was done by Matt and David, you also talked about students moving out of STEM, so what did you mean

“moving out of STEM” was it about forces or dangers? You showed some new test data, so I wonder if you have any data about moving in or out of STEM.

Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): We are working on that, the problem with that is that you have to collect data over a series of years, so we are doing a big study where we are looking at student pathways, since there are a bunch of pathways through the chemistry gateway, and how these students are faring, where they are withdrawing from, and how their grades fare as go through. It is a long thing, and you have to go back before you change your curriculum and look at data from that. That is where we would really like to get, but it is complicated and it is a long process.

Margaret Humphreys (History): I am very interested in what you are doing in the chemistry program, and I just want to understand; so the previously normal cycle was Chem21 then Chem31?

Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): It was Chem21, Chem22, then organic. We have scrambled our sequence now, and the first course lops off some of the old background stuff where eighty-five percent of the students were lulled into complacency and falling asleep, and the other fifteen percent were struggling. We changed other parts of our curriculum as well as we looked at issues related to that. These students start with this basic skills course, then they move into the next course, which is the one that the bulk of our students would start at in the fall.

Margaret Humphreys (History): Now that they are out of the sequence, can they take organic or do they have to take another chemistry course to get caught up?

Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): They are effectively one semester behind students who start at Chem31 in the fall, and that is an issue, but most of the students who have done this seem grateful to have the opportunity to come up to speed.

Dean Lee Baker: We call it a red shirt year.

Dean Laurie Patton: I will say that the red shirt phenomenon as a strategy is good for thinking about inclusivity in the STEM fields, and Lee has worked incredibly hard on supporting that. The more we can work on creating curricular innovations that can be modeled across not only STEM fields, but other fields, the better off we will be.

David Malone (Education): One of the things that Dean Walther has done is that we now include a requirement for assessment in proposals for new programs, so that has been helpful too.

Dean Inge Walther: Kristen, you have been successful in getting your whole faculty to be involved in these discussions about learning outcomes at least that is what I understood you to say and I was wondering how you did that.

Kristen Neuschel (Thompson Writing Program): I should have been more precise; I was speaking about the work of the undergraduate curriculum committee that I, as DUS at the time, chaired and in fact started because we had no structural mechanism, and I know as a member of ASFAC that some other departments do not either. It was a small group, and part of the problem becomes: how do you make the conversation more general. We have two places where it happened; once in that committee, and once when the whole department got ahold of the plan. It was interesting, but just staging the conversation felt revolutionary.

David Malone (Education): That brings up a good point. One way that the council representatives could be helpful would be to have conversations about who is the point person in your program or department for assessment, or do you have a departmental curriculum committee that might look at assessment. How does assessment occur in your department? We could use your help in starting those conversations.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Are there any other questions or comments?

Dean Lee Baker: I would like to make a comment. David, I know as chair you have really taken this job seriously. If anyone read Kathy Davidson’s article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, she was talking about institutional leadership instead of service, and this is a prime example of you and every member of this committee providing stellar institutional leadership. I think Keith would join me in saying that you have really tried to be effective in changing the faculty culture around assessment and not having it imposed from the top down, but leading through intellectual engagement and demonstrating through evidence that this can change the culture of teaching and make teaching better for our students. I just want to applaud that.

David Malone (Education): There is money and people available to help you, so now is the time to jump in if you want to. It has been a fun committee to work with, and they have worked very hard. Thank you for saying that.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you David. This is an opportunity for me to follow up very quickly. Last month representatives voted to approve the new online course evaluation questionnaire, and along those lines as we have discussed in ECASC that is going to be followed by some reporting early next semester. We can learn quickly what it is that we are capturing, how we can improve it, and continue to use that as an instrument to make the curriculum and our courses better.

Voting Results for Linguistics Program

I would like to make an announcement about the vote. The council representatives have voted twenty-seven in favor, no votes against, and two abstentions regarding the linguistics program proposal. Edna, now you have our support, we wish you well with the program, and we are looking forward to those new secondary appointments.

Duke Kunshan University (DKU) Courses

There is one other item on the agenda before we go to the dean’s report for November. I guess I am supposed to introduce myself as the chair of the DKU Joint Committee. I wanted to report to the council as a whole about this committee, and we wanted to be very clear about how transparent the process is to be and the accountability should be there, as well. We wanted to bring our first report to you about the process for approving the first batch of courses for Duke Kunshan University.

First let me go to a process question for you, and then I welcome questions, comments, and suggestions from you. I want to explain to you a little bit of the history of joint committee. About a year ago when it became clear that the DKU campus would be putting together its first set of courses, I was asked as council chair, and I quickly turned to the Executive Committee of the council, to develop what we thought would be the best way to have a regular course approval process for courses that would be offered at DKU. I want to make it clear at the start that the relationship of the Arts and Sciences faculty to DKU in the first phase of development is an advisory one. This is a separate institution that is in the making, but for this first phase, we were asked to use the normal course approval process that we use for all of our courses and adapt that for the DKU courses. Thinking that over, I very quickly realized, with help from colleagues on the Executive Committee, that this was an unusual request in that these were not just going to be new Duke courses offered at Duke Kunshan, but there were questions and considerations about offering courses at DKU that required wider expertise than just the course committee itself.

All of you have gone through the process of having your courses submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Courses Committee; that is done routinely for all Duke courses. Our approach to this was to combine the Courses Committee with the Global Education for Undergraduates Committee, drawing upon the expertise of that second committee in reviewing courses and programs that are offered in study abroad programs. We have a number of colleagues there, and I think Ken Rogerson is a member of that committee, as well as Linda Franzoni from the engineering school. They can speak to the fact that the kinds of questions that come up in offering a course in another country are sometimes quite different from offering them on our home campus. We thought by putting the two committees together, and having some ex officio members, we could approach the course approval process using an identical process that all Duke faculty members go through in submitting a course to teach.

Let me point out the steps by which this process actually works. An individual faculty member who is interested in offering a course at DKU has an idea for a course, as you will soon see from the courses that have been approved. Most of them at this stage are courses that are already offered and taught at Duke, but they have gone through a supplemental approval process in addition to having already been approved for teaching at Duke. The DUSs and department chairs were asked to sign off on this, review the course, talk with the faculty members, and see if there would be issues involving staffing in the department with that person being away at a particular time. These courses as a bunch were bundled together and brought to the china faculty council; they reviewed the proposals for the academic content and fit with the DKU mission. From my vantage point, I came to understand the role of the China Faculty Council and the Liberal Arts in China Committee [LACC], which then gets the proposals, like a department or hiring unit.

When a course is approved, it is not up to the Course Committee to put it on the schedule for the next semester. It is the unit that is offering it that decides when that course is going to be mounted and taught. That is exactly the relationship that the DKU joint committee has with faculty members who are offering these courses. After these proposals have been generally vetted by these two different china committees, they then come to the joint committee. Maybe some of you who are on the joint committee can identify yourselves. Ken Rogerson from public policy and the global education committee has been there reviewing these course proposals, Susan Wynn from the courses committee, and Cary Moskowitz. Are there other members from the course or global education committee who are here who serve on the DKU joint committee? I just want to identify you, because this is extra work. I want to make this clear; our course committee works extraordinarily hard. I do not know how many of you have time to meet every week in the academic year for two hours on a Wednesday afternoon to review course approval. That is what our Course Committee routinely does, and we were asking them to do extra work. We met several times in the spring semester to review the course proposals.

I should say there was a particular template that was developed that we asked faculty members proposing courses to use so that the LACC would have a pallet of courses that they could quickly look through and see what the course titles were, brief course descriptions, and so on. These discussions on the committee were fascinating, very quickly questions come for which we do not have immediate answers. Let me give you a small sample of the questions that come up in our committee meetings. Many of us not yet sure at what level to expect English language proficiency, and that for different kinds of courses, whether it is in the humanities, in the social sciences, or in the natural sciences. An interesting question also came up with regard to our natural sciences and mathematics courses, or our quantitative based courses; it has been pointed out to us that we can expect the students who will be taking these courses will have higher proficiency than our average Duke students. There is a whole set of interesting questions that come up.

In a couple of the cases with the course proposals, and Susan [Wynn] and Cary [Moskowitz] can correct me if I am wrong, do you ever return a proposal to the faculty member and ask them to revise and resubmit? We have done that with a couple of those proposals in light of some of the questions. Several of them have to do with team-taught courses, for example, and how they were going to handle team-teaching. Some have to do with the seven week term in which these courses are going to be offered. As you know, these courses are going to be offered in seven week units as opposed to a fourteen week semester, and we were asking some colleagues to think about how to teach a full fourteen week course within a seven week format. This is just one of the challenges of teaching at DKU. When the courses were approved, we would pass them back to the departments because they have to be approved again. I believe a note has gone out to the DUSs that these courses for DKU must get proper coding for our curriculum.

Let me give you a list of the courses that will be offered next year. The DKU Joint Committee received a total of eighteen to twenty course proposals, but I may be wrong about some of the exact numbers. Here [on the slide] you are going to see the courses that we have approved and decided to offer in 2014-15. Some of the courses we have approved

might not be offered in 2014-15, because this is the decisions of the DKU administration. Let me give you a very small sampling; they come from global health, history, the Nicholas School, the Thompson Writing Program, a course in bioenergy from Pratt, human cognitive evolution, Greek civilization, mandarin, ethics, population and environment in global health. Here is another way of looking at these same courses by divisions. In the physical and natural sciences, we have these courses that have been approved and will be taught. For example, a dynamic earth course and the frontiers of 21th century physics that Haiyan Gao in the physics department will be offering. There is a whole separate slate of courses from the global health institute that are being offered. In the social sciences we have history, human cognitive evolution, rethinking ethics in leadership, which is a team taught course from the Kenan Institute faculty, and applied primate cognition and economics, which we do not have instructors for yet. Some of the offerings in the humanities are mandarin language, and the Thompson writing program has made a long-term commitment to developing courses for students at DKU, and Greek civilizations.

I asked the faculty members whose courses have been approved if they would come to the council meeting and we could introduce them. Most are away on conferences, however, so I do not have many to introduce to you. I wanted to do so because I want you as Arts and Sciences faculty representatives to begin to associate DKU with people, and not with some faraway place on the other side of the planet or some abstract Duke enterprise that you know mostly from slides. It really has your colleagues who are now committed to this project, and I have made it clear to all of these faculty members that on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences council, we are here to support them just as we are here to support all of you in your departments and in your work. At this point, could I introduce to you one colleague? Denise Comer is from the Thompson Writing Program, and it has put together a whole set of commitments to the DKU project. Denise, could you say a few words about what it is that the Thompson Writing Program is doing?

Denise Comer (Thompson Writing Program): At the encouragement and support of Lee Baker and Deedra McClearn last year, the Thompson Writing Program worked to design a proposal through the Eric grant. My colleagues Cary, Jennifer Kristen, Vicky Russel, and Marcia proposed to learn more about writing pedagogy in China, and we earned the grant. Vicky Russell, who directs the writing studio, and I traveled to China to conduct focus groups about the teaching and learning of writing and to talk with faculty and administrators at Chinese universities.

The result of that work was the proposal of two courses from the Thompson Writing Program for DKU. We are really excited about these, because we see writing as a central endeavor in critical thinking, inquiry, and research that is going to enhance and make meaningful the global learning semester for the students at DKU. The first course is box number three [on the slide] and it is a US academic writing course for English foreign language students. For that course, we designed the syllabus in collaboration with Edie Allen in the graduate school; she runs the EIS program. The course is going to offer students practice and experience with US academic writing conventions across a variety of genres, and DKU is hiring lecturers to staff that, because we do not have the faculty expertise to teach the course, and we did not have time to learn it. We knew it was a need based on what we had learned about the level of English proficiency that the Chinese and other international students would have there.

The other course, which is box number four [on the slide] is writing across cultures, which will be an advanced writing seminar that will be theme based. Vicky Russell is teaching the first iteration of that in the fall of 2014. Her theme for that semester will be visual rhetoric: the language of photographic texts, but thereafter we will staff it with post-doctoral faculty from the Thompson Writing Program who have expertise in teaching writing, and they will design it along with a theme based on their disciplinary expertise. The concept of that course is that it will enable students to continue working on developing arguments and working with evidence, but also have an explicit multicultural element, so situating writing for multicultural audiences and thinking about cross-cultural communication through writing.

Discussion

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Are there some comments, questions, or observations? I would be happy to take them back to the DKU Joint Committee.

Linda Franzoni (Pratt School of Engineering): My question is about scheduling, because I know you mentioned that the format is a seven week format, and I am wondering if instead of saying fall and spring, maybe we should say fall A, fall B, spring A, and spring B, because what if all of the fall courses are taught in the first seven weeks, so there is nothing to take in the second half and similarly in the spring.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I am going to make sure that the minutes get back to Nora Bynum, Donna Lisker, and Deedra McClearn.

Dean Inge Walther: I have been working with Deedra on this, and she has been a master in figuring this out. It has been quite complicated, especially when you figure out the number of contact hours that instructors need to meet with students. Trust me, she has done a wonderful job with that, so it will work.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Are there other questions you have for me, as chair of the committee? Ken Rogerson is here along with Susan and Cary. Thankfully we do not have a slate of courses we need to approve, I know Cary would be happy to hear that. We will meet when the next batch comes in, maybe some time in the spring. Cary, Susan, or Ken do you have anything that you want to share with the council and representatives about being a part of this process?

Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): I am happy to be part of the process; it was gratifying to see. I think there was initial concern that people would not turn in course proposals, so we were happy to see the breadth of topics, disciplines, and issues that are being addressed. I am certainly happy to look at as many more as will come in.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): The courses that will be offered by the faculty that is to be hired for DKU will be going through the same process because they are Duke courses. Let me say one other thing about the process, and it should be obvious looking at this list of courses that are being offered: this is not a curriculum. These are courses on a wide variety of topics. At this point, this is what the Duke faculty can do, and this is what can be mounted. It is the liberal arts in China committee's job to develop a curriculum. This is just for 2014-15, and the goal is to begin to develop a cohesive curriculum, which is determined by the LACC.

If there are no other comments or questions, let me turn to Dean Laurie Patton. Last month because the agenda was so full, she hardly had a chance to give you one of her routine updates to the council, so I wanted to give her an opportunity to do so today.

Dean's Corner

Dean Laurie Patton: I will probably do some speed talking, but this is just to give you update on all of the work that we have been doing together. None of the topics will be new, but some of the developments might be new. I want to begin by reminding you where we are for Certificate 2.0. Remember that we approved that last spring, and this is a mechanism to integrate course credit for experiential learning into our vibrant certificate program, as well as think about Duke Engage and service learning. Currently, we have an Experiential Certificate in Ethics and we have new certificates going through the approval process in innovation and entrepreneurship and civic engagement. I just wanted to make sure you knew that was happening, and those things are in medias res.

Second the Global Health Co-major that we approved last year has launched as a new co-major and minor. We are pleased to report that we have 65 students that have enrolled in the major or the minor since September, which is kind of big and fast. I just want to remind you that the Global Health Co-major is designed to be paired with a primary major such as biology, history, psychology, or any major offered by trinity. We now have students from all three divisions enrolled in the co-major program, which is very exciting. This will also allow students to customize their educational experience in a number of creative ways, and the program includes an experiential and service learning component, which has been resonating well with our students.

I also want to report on Bass Connections, which we launched this fall. As a reminder, we did not have the number when I gave the Arts and Sciences address in September, but we have thirty-five and now we are pushing forty new research groups and a wealth of opportunities for our students. I have two advisees who are engaged in Bass Connections research groups, and their lives have been transformed with the vertically integrated teams and horizontal research focus. The key thing is for us to be sure that departments are supported in this in a number of different ways through Bass funds. We have a Bass funded director of academic engagement that we are working on, which is exciting for us. It will not be the only thing that person does, but that will be one of the primary responsibilities in advising. We were thinking about an open faculty forum in the spring looking at how departments need more support or how we can do a better job of integrating Bass Connections, because I know that has been a big topic of concern. We are going to be working hard on that in the spring now that we have data, student experience, and faculty experience to go on.

Those are the updates on the things we have been working on from last spring. I also wanted to remind you that I will be sending out one of my usual newsletters in the next couple of days. The Forum for Scholars and Publics, which focuses on public scholarship more broadly and all of the work that Arts and Sciences faculty are doing in that area has opened. They have had several events already, and it is very exciting work. We had a panel on open access and the open access movement. We will have panels on the Arab Spring focusing on our Durham partnerships as well as what faculty are doing more broadly. I am very excited by that, and that is led by Laurent DuBois and Mark Anthony Neal. Please go ahead and engage with that; there are many ways that you can. I will be sending the website around in my newsletter in the next couple of days.

I wanted to alert and update you on the Liberal Arts in China Committee (LACC), and share with you some news. The first is that Nora Bynum will be taking a three month leave, and we all wish her well. She wanted to make sure that I told you she will be back, and that she is looking forward to being back. In the meantime, the person who is going to be stepping up very much out of the spirit of service and engagement with all of us is Donna Lisker to keep us on track logistically for the next three months. She will also be helping more broadly in Nora's position, not just with the LACC, although that is where we are concerned, but also with the Office for Education in China and for DKU more broadly. Donna is here today, and please feel free to chat with her and talk about anything you might want to around LACC.

I want to give you an update on our conversations in the LACC. There are two things I want to say that are important. The great news about this is that we are trying to do this a little differently so that we have five years to create a cool curriculum if want to. We are also doing this by starting with a semester abroad format, which we then get to reshape and reform, so we are going to have a lot of data on the ground as we continue to think about liberal arts in China, and create a long-term high faculty engagement faculty-led iterative process to create a DKU curriculum. That is incredibly important for me as a leader here to create a different kind of conversation that is much more long-term and fully backed up by data on the ground. That is the first thing I wanted to remind you about. Our focus in the Liberal Arts in China Committee is going to be getting out ahead of three different issues as we start. We actually have five and one-half years, because we are not even starting until the fall of next year.

We have begun thinking about three subcommittees; we have not formed them or charged them yet. One is on Liberal Learning in China, and that is very exciting because it is a big topic in China and Asia more broadly. Second is Pedagogy Assessment and the Student Experience, and it should be obvious what that is all about. The third is Academic

Freedom, what those issues are, and how we take charge of that issue in a way that folks feel comfortable and it is something that we talk about on an everyday basis. Those are the three subcommittees that we are shaping with LACC, and we will keep you regularly updated on what is happening in our conversations and how we are moving forward with that. We are thinking that this year will be a year of learning and in the summer we will be working with the Arts and Sciences Council to create a faculty led committee to think about the next steps on curriculum and begin a very long five year process. We do it differently from our two peers, Yale and NYU, as well as at Duke.

I wanted to give you an update on where we are with online. Thomas Robisheaux has also given us a very robust report on that, so there is nothing more for me to add except that I endorse all of it. Arts and Sciences in general is very pleased with the faculty based conversations that are happening. I would encourage department chairs to work with all of you as representatives to have some good conversations. The most important thing that I want to underscore and I said this is an Arts and Sciences address, and I will say it fifty times because it needs to be said in fifty different ways, which is that the point is not to go online. The point is to figure out how online pedagogies help liberal learning and how they do not. That is the key way we want to shape the conversation, and I think that is very important because online has a huge range of definitions. It can be anything from an entirely online course to courses with online shared content to one or two sessions that involve online. That range of definitions is also something the faculty has been grappling with in ways that we are in Arts and Sciences delighted to support.

In the realm of support, Matt Serra just got some results back that he does not even know yet from our student survey. We are going to be learning what students actually think and expect around online learning in a week or two, which is very exciting. Also, Tom mentioned that there will be a request for proposals coming up for mini-grants. I am delighted to support that as well. The principles for our mini grants are slightly different from the ones that Lynne O'Brien and her office have circulated. I just want to clarify that those are two different RFPs: one coming from Lynne's office, and the second is coming from Arts and Sciences, and that will be coming out in the next couple of weeks. We wanted to give a little bit of time between them so it does not seem confusing.

That RFP is the following, and again, deeply in the spirit of supporting faculty where they are, study after study show that pedagogical effectiveness and satisfaction for the faculty across higher learning lands in that sweet spot where faculty are teaching about their research. Our RFP will be looking to support research partnerships amongst Duke faculty with someone at another institution teaching a class. In other words, who is your cool research partner at another institution outside Duke that you are excited to work with? Let us help you support a class taught with that person, and how might we use online pedagogy to help that endeavor? That could be anything from a few lectures that are jointly shared through an online format to something like the UVA partnership that we are already doing in which there is a shared classroom. There will be two classrooms, one at Duke, so there will be online classroom content at Duke, and one at the partner institution. We are very excited about this, and I have been trying this in my various peregrinations around Arts and Sciences, and people have been responding positively. We are still working on refining the RFP, so I wanted to share that news with you and welcome any feedback you had for that.

I wanted to give you an update about the Trinity Board, which met last week. We focused on how we shore up our revenue and create good patterns for generating revenue in a non-profit environment. The board had some excellent suggestions for various units that they met with. They also raised something very important, which is how can the board help us get through our short-term financial challenges, and we are working on some very productive conversations around the board helping us in this arena, not just raising in the campaign funds for long term chairs and program endowments. We are very excited about that, and we will be getting back to you about how that conversation ends and what kinds of recommendations we are going to be doing for fundraising moving forward.

I have two more things; I wanted to say that we have met with the Curriculum Committee. As you know, Tom Robisheaux and I have created a practice where we meet with each of the major Arts and Sciences Council committees and talk about directions for the coming year. We have had so much on our agenda so we are still working through that. We did meet with the Curriculum Committee and we talked a little bit about how we move forward on thinking about curriculum and the next steps in rethinking our curriculum strategies. Last year we asked them to be diagnostic: what works and what does not. This year we are going to be deepening those diagnostic [thoughts] with some studies around how students make their way through the curriculum. We are just in the beginning stages of that, and we have not begun to think about the data that we want to look at, but we are going to be moving forward with that this year and really deepen the diagnostics.

The question will become, with our new provost next year, what kind of work do we want to do on our own curriculum? How granular can we get around what is working and what is not? As Suzanne Shanahan, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, says everyone knows that there is stuff to be improved, and it is getting way too complex, but no one has the appetite for a big huge curriculum reform. That is where we are as a faculty, whether we do revision or reform, the great term that was suggested by my friend and colleague Bill Seaman on the Curriculum Committee is "The Big Tweak," and I really like that idea. We may think about it as a big tweak, and your faculty colleagues will be in touch with you about that. I am underscoring times one hundred that the faculty own the curriculum, and that is where faculty will be driving the next steps.

I also wanted to remind you that in one of my newsletters a while ago we announced an extraordinary gift of \$5 million dollars for a program we are calling LAMP: Language, Arts and Media Program that is focused on helping students communicate in online environments, in in-person environments, and in writing. The Thompson Writing Program is going

to be designating some fellows from the Bacca Foundation, which is the foundation that gave us this particular grant. They have their first meeting [soon], and there is lots of excitement around that. We will also be naming a faculty director that will be looking at faculty initiatives in that area of improving our students' capacity for communication in a variety of environments. In addition, there are two endowed chairs who will be focused on this particular area. We wanted to remind you that is up and running, and Kristen Neuschel, Denise Comer, and Jennifer Ahern-Dodson, three extraordinary faculty leaders, are moving us forward with this.

Finally, I have a reminder to do your course evaluations online. That is from my boss, Lee Baker, make sure you do your course evaluations online because we are launching this, and we need robust participation. The final thing to let you know is that I will be visiting Arts and Sciences committees in addition to Tom Robisheaux, but also [I will be] starting again visiting all of the departments. I took a semester off, but just as in the quotation of Governor Chris Christie that showing up is showing respect, we are going to always be in your face in departments, and visiting and talking with where departments are. We will be starting that process in the spring.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Are there any questions or comments? Thank you very much.

Meeting Adjourned