

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 9, 2014

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Welcome colleagues to the January meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council. I hope you all had a good holiday, at least some rest, and that you are refreshed and ready for the spring term. I know, having just had the first meeting of ECASC on Monday for the spring term, that we are going to have an interesting set of meetings this semester, and it starts today. If you are slow getting into the semester, hold on to your seat because we have a lot of work to do.

Approval of Minutes

Let me first ask if you had a chance to review the minutes from the December meeting. Are there any corrections or amendments to the minutes? By the way, these are all archived and some of these minutes are really important, for example I think the December discussion on online education is really important, and you might encourage some of your colleagues who are interested in some of these issues to go back, review them, and get background information. If there are no motions to amend, do I hear any motions to approve?

Linda George (Sociology): I move they be approved

Margaret Humphreys (History): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? The minutes are approved.

Announcements and Updates

I have a few announcements to make before we move to our first item on the agenda for today. First off, I have been in contact with George Truskey about the search for a new provost. I am going to be the last person to hear, but I thought on your behalf I should be asking if there are any updates that I can share with the Arts and Sciences faculty and George, in his usual very diplomatic and polite language said, "We are at a very confidential stage, and we will let faculty know as soon as is appropriate." There is no real news, but I know that is something that is on a lot of colleagues' minds right now.

Next month in February we will have some updates about DKU, the opening of the first semester in the fall, and the courses that we are mounting. Also in the February meeting I will call your attention to a presentation/discussion that we are going to have on a new title for professors in a generic sense that has been approved for use within Arts and Sciences; it is the title of senior lecturer. I know Dean Patton wants to be here to introduce this for you and also Kevin Moore, so put that on your agenda for the February meeting. It will be interesting.

We will have an update on online course evaluations as all of us just went through our first experience with it. I will be in touch with Matt about getting some of the first feedback about how it went last summer since we need to hear about that.

The most important announcement actually involves our ongoing series this year on online learning and teaching. This was established as a priority item on our agenda from late last spring, and we have been working on it through the fall. We had a robust and very helpful constructive discussion of where we were with everything in the December meeting. Out of that have come one important thing and another you already know about. First about the thing that you were working on; ECASC has asked each of the representatives to submit a report about their department's interest in online learning. We intentionally gave you no format or set of questions. This is entirely up to you and your department because this is coming up from the faculty. We really want to know how your faculty is thinking and we are not trying to ram things into some mold or form. I have received six reports so far, and I was deliberately vague about the deadline, but ECASC would now like to have all of the reports by January 31.

These are reports that will be shared among the representatives, and I think you will find it really interesting to read what your colleagues in other units are thinking on this very important issue that we have been having this lively discussion about. I will, if I have not already, start to put these reports up in a separate folder for representatives to look at. These are not department reports, they are not official, and I want to set aside that language altogether because department chairs report to the dean. This is representative's views and input' however you want to shape it. If you look at some of these you will realize that some have conducted internal departmental polls, some have just had discussions, some have talked with chairs only, and some are written in the first person, so there is a wide variety. I will put them up and if you want to look at them to see how you might get some ideas for your own that is fine, but I will send out a reminder note that these are due January 31.

The second much more important step that came out of our December discussion of online learning is the need to bring together all of the disparate discussions about online education, teaching, and innovation. A really constructive suggestion came up from Jocelyn Olcott, Wahneema Lubiano, Micaela Janan, and Linda George in that meeting and Micaela drew it all together and sent [it to] me, other members of ECASC and ACO, which is the academic council's committee on online education. She put all of this together and made the suggestion that we need to have a coordinated general discussion among the faculty, and the best way to do this is to set up a discussion board. We all got this note just before the ECASC meeting on Monday and we loved the idea and enthusiastically support it. ECASC is in the process of setting up a faculty led discussion, which will put all of these discussions [online] and open it up for further comments. Let me just say this about this discussion: we have no experience with this in Arts and Sciences as faculty members. This will be the first time, and I consulted our archivist and memory of the institution David Malone about this, I think this is first time an exploration and discussion of an important issue before the faculty has been carried out on a discussion board. Am I correct on that David?

David Malone (Education): The first time this has been sponsored by the council.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): It is time to do that because we can really use this technology and we all have busy lives, so this can work for us. Also, one has to be very careful, deliberate, and intentional in setting up such a discussion. Yours truly is a complete novice and I am completely ignorant about these things, but this week I have been gathering information and meeting with many of those who know about such things. I want to point out that there are several things such discussion boards, when they are successful, need to have, and ECASC and I are making sure that is set up.

First off, the discussion has to have clear goals. It is not just some open-ended place to express all kinds of opinions about all kinds of topics. Having said that, the challenge that we have always had with this issue is that it is entangled with so many questions and issues [that are] at the heart of the curriculum and teaching, which is really what we do on a day to day basis, but we can also disentangle that into different parts of the discussion.

Third of all, the discussion will be layered so that if a faculty member has a particular interest in one substantive issue, say online courses for credit, around which, I think, is the most controversy that will have its own section. I do not know how to set this up, but we have good technical people, like Shawn Miller, to help us do this. It will be layered into different parts of the discussion, and we will also have a place where you and all faculty members can suggest other related topics, so we can organize it as we go along [and add] things that have not been identified as particular issues.

Another thing that is important about this is to have a fixed period of time for this to run, because I have been advised by those who have done this quite a bit that discussion boards have a lifetime like a parabolic curve. They shoot up like a meteor, level off, and then rapidly decline and die out like dinosaurs after a certain period of time. Knowing this in advance is helpful and we will set a time limit. I am not sure what that is going to be, three weeks, one month, or longer. I should also tell you another couple of things about this.

First of all, send me advice and suggestions about how we can do this in the most intelligent and useful way. Useful for you guys, for ECASC, and for anybody who needs to know at Duke about what Arts and Sciences is thinking about online education. If you have experience with online discussion boards, would you let me know? This is really yours; ECASC is sponsoring and organizing it on behalf of council, but this is really for all of your benefit. The other thing is that I have asked Wahneema, Micaela, and Linda George and they have all agreed to meet with me and the graduate staff assistant to ECASC, Israel Durham, who is going to be helping with the technical parts of this so we can get some input from them directly. This is where the ideas come from, and [we need] to make sure we get as many of the good ideas together as we can so it can be structured properly. Let me know in the next week or so, and I will be drawing all of this together. ECASC meets again on Monday morning, so if you have ideas the best time is tonight, Friday, or the weekend. Just send me some notes and I will make sure they come before ECASC on Monday morning.

There is one question that I want to ask you about. If you would, you do not have to respond now because we have to get to our agenda, but it would be very helpful if you had an opinion or view about whether students should be included in this discussion. I say this because actually, in the forum discussions from last fall, in my own personal experience with no disrespect to colleagues who organized the other forums, the student one was by far the best, the most thought-provoking, and incisive. I encourage you to watch the video from the December 3 forum on this. In any event, send me a note about whether you think students should be included as well. In the end, they are the people we want to educate best. I will leave it there, and let me know afterwards. There is no decision about this now, but it would be very helpful to know. Are there any questions, comments, or observations about this?

Discussion

Linda George (Sociology): I just want to make the suggestion that as the plans for this discussion board develop. I think it would be really helpful to use the four category definitions that were passed out last time. I think using those clarifies a whole lot because I think there are only major concerns about one or possibly two of them, but we can use the same language more if people are instructed on the board to refer to traditional courses, hybrid courses etc. I think that would be very helpful.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you, Linda.

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): We are having a summit to talk about this but the discussion that psychology and neuroscience is having is about technology in the classroom and innovative ways to use technology. The word “online” is implying something very different. Our department wants to talk about innovative ways to use technology, and flipping courses, but we are not yet at a place where we then want to talk about or make decisions about online or offering classes elsewhere. How does that fit in to whatever discussions or the discussion board you would like to have?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I have no answer for that, but Steffen Bass, if you do not know him he is always first up with suggestions, from ECASC will be taking this up, and I appreciate that because that is a very important point.

Steffen Bass (Physics): I think what you guys are talking about also has a place in this overall discussion that we are organizing. The reason for that being that among the definitions, which I think were shown last time and which may require some fine tuning to really make the point, is that so-called hybrid or web-enabled classes are a subcategory of online. If you flip a classroom, the distinction would really be what are you doing with the contact hours with the students? If you still have full contact hours with the students, then I think as far as the university is concerned it would most likely be considered a traditional class. If you were to reduce the contact hours with the students in the context of flipping the classroom, then that could be seen as something that is fractionally online. This kind of discussion, and also when does it become something else than a traditional course, is certainly something we are very interested in in the context of the overall discussions here. I think what you are doing is very relevant and we would like to have some kind of sense of what you are talking about and what conclusions you are arriving at.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): That is really helpful because part of the challenge of these discussions is that it is entangled with so many other closely related issues, and we have often had difficulty disentangling them. One way we want to structure it is so faculty [members] like you Makeba, and your colleagues, can suggest things, and I think we will take it under consideration, is to structure the layers of the discussion in a way so these issues can be drawn out too. Part of the difficulty is in discussions that are across purposes about different issues, so I think this is important for us to do. You're your colleagues that we want them to be a part of this discussion too. I think there are other colleagues who are not ready to make a decision about this because there are so many things that are associated with it. You will be hearing more from me about this, and it will be outside the normal procedures of communication where I just send an email to all of you in advance of the council meeting because this is something that we need your help and support on. I need to let you know what the parameters are, and you can help the council take the next step with this discussion.

Council Representation and Voting

Let me turn to our first item on the agenda, and I hope this does not put you to sleep. We had it on our agenda for last month, but given the importance of our discussion I decided to postpone this issue about council representation and voting. This will not be the last time we discuss this if you feel it is necessary. Let me give you a bit of background about why ECASC wants to bring this to your attention, begin to initiate the discussion, and hear your viewpoints. I think you will quickly recognize how vitally important this issue is as it goes to the heart of faculty governance and how it is set up in Arts and Sciences.

This issue came up from the very first moment I became the chair of the council. It was put on the agenda in our summer retreat from 2012. That is one background issue that we have had; before that we had a number of small amendments to the bylaws over the last ten years, but we have never had a thoroughgoing look at the bylaws as a whole to see: Do they meet faculty governance needs for Duke and Arts and Sciences right now in 2014? Another part of the background of this that has always been awkward, and there are a number of situations that I can illustrate this with but I will not right now... undergraduate education is not just an Arts and Sciences affair. Undergraduate education is carried out in the Sanford School of Public Policy; in fact, the largest Arts and Sciences major is housed and supported by the School of Public Policy, not Arts and Sciences. The Nicholas School also supports an undergraduate major and finally, of course, you know that the Pratt School of Engineering is a very substantial part of undergraduate education. We actually have four schools that take part in, and are affected by, undergraduate policy issues.

Arts and Sciences has been the gorilla in the room. We are the largest and our bylaws have made the council responsible for undergraduate policy-making in general, but consulting with Pratt, the Nicholas School, and Sanford on a host of issues is always complicated. It is really vital, but sometimes I admit that I think about getting in touch with colleagues in Pratt, like over this online issue, not in an organic way but almost as an afterthought. Our Pratt colleagues are keenly interested in this issue and they would be profoundly affected by policies in undergraduate education in general that are decided by Arts and Sciences. Coordinating that has increasingly been a problem and undergraduate education has broadened out over the last period to include these other schools.

A third background for you is that the offices in the Allen building have changed significantly in recent years. We no longer have a dean of undergraduate education, but that is a position written into our bylaws. There are committees that are to report to, or include, this fictitious office on our committees. We have a vice provost for undergraduate education who is nowhere included in our bylaws. We have a dean of academic affairs who was not included in the bylaws when they were first imagined; this is Lee Baker right now. Just to give you an idea of this, these offices have all changed, which affects our reporting, nominating to committees, the populating of some of these committees, and who to consult for suggestions about faculty members on committees. In any event, our bylaws do not reflect these institutional changes.

There are even some other issues, and I want to point out the more awkward ones to you right now. This has to do with representation on the council. The bylaws have us structured to represent academic departments and programs. We have 35 representatives on the council in three different divisions, but in my way of thinking it is more awkward than that. We have 14 humanities representatives who represent 14 units from Theatre Studies to Art, Art History, and Visual Studies; [this] includes 216 faculty members in those academic departments and programs.

We have 10 representatives in the social sciences from AAAS to Women's Studies. You will already notice some awkwardness in this list because the Global Health institute is not a department or program of Arts and Sciences, yet they house and support a major. We have no way of formally working with the institute in our bylaws. ICS has been a very interesting case, and in many ways it was the case that made ECASC think very carefully about the implications of how representation works. I will come back to that in just a minute.

The natural sciences have 8 representatives, and they have between them 206 faculty members. One of the interesting situations here is that the Duke Institute for Brain Sciences, which is the co-sponsor of the neuroscience major, has no representation in this body, but they are advising our undergraduate majors. This is largely handled administratively with psychology and neurosciences, but again, it points out an awkward situation. I will draw this together in just a minute, but there are other curious features of the bylaws in our representation.

We have one representative for military science [who is] representing three departments [because] that is the way our bylaws are written. In the Nicholas School we have Charlotte, who is the representative of the Nicholas School, and she may vote only on issues that ECASC allows her to vote on. This is never an issue, but I want to point out how this works. Pratt has no voting representative in this body. They have ex officio representation by Linda Franzoni, but for example, when it came to the vote on April 25 on online education, Pratt had no voice or vote in that even though they have a large number of faculty members who are keenly interested in online education. The Sanford School of Public Policy can vote on curriculum issues as determined by ECASC.

There is awkwardness; Cary Moskovitz is sitting here representing...who? He is a colleague; Cary is a professor in the Thompson Writing Program and he is also co-chair of the courses committee. If you know Cary, you know how much work he does on behalf of the Arts and Sciences faculty and administration yet he has no voice. None of our regular rank faculty in the Thompson Writing Program have a vote on undergraduate issues at all. This has been the consequence of a de facto practice of representation in the council that allows representation to units that have a major. There is no major in writing, so that is the reason why Thompson is not there, but there is an anomaly. David Malone, I do not want you to squirm too much, but education does not have a major, yet they have a representative. In fact, David Malone is not just a representative, but he is our memory and he sits on ECASC. It is an anomaly and it raises the question of representation and what is happening.

Let me give you a couple of examples, and then I want to hear your views. This is really important for several reasons. With some of our interdisciplinary programs it has created real dilemmas. You remember when ICS became a major? We voted last spring to approve International and Comparative Studies as a major, but here is an interesting consequence of that.....Correction: we made it into a program.

In the spring they could not elect a representative to council. Why? Only units that have primary appointments within that unit may elect a representative according to our bylaws. On July 1 when Cherri Ross became the one and only primary appointment in that unit, ECASC decided, following the bylaws, that they deserved to have representation on the council. They have a lot of majors and they have a strong voice; you all know the work of Frances Hasso on behalf of ICS and all of the affiliated faculty. Look at the curious situation we on ECASC had when we set up an election for them. Cherri Ross, the one primary appointment, could vote for herself to represent her unit or not. This is comical, but we have lots of faculty with a deep interest in ICS who are committed to it, but they have no voting rights for representatives from ICS, so Cherri votes for herself.

That is one example. When we passed the Global Health co-major...the relationship of Arts and Sciences, formally, to the university institutes like Global Health has never been clarified. It is a dynamic and complex one. We have an important new co-major that is now a part of Arts and Sciences and we allow for representation from these units, but there is no provision for how they should elect their representatives.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): Under 2A of the draft of the bylaws...

Thomas Robisheaux (History): It is not a draft. This is how the bylaws look right now

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): It says, "Members of the Arts and Sciences council shall be elected by the faculty of Arts and Sciences departments or programs, or faculty affiliated with undergraduate majors as appropriate." Doesn't the program itself elect them? Isn't that what the procedure is?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): How do you interpret this wording? The Global Health Institute has only some faculty members with a primary appointment in Arts and Sciences. In fact, the majority of them have no appointments in Arts and

Sciences. ECASC interpreted this provision to mean that only those who have an appointment within Arts and Sciences could vote in electing Gary Bennett. That was an interpretation of the bylaws and in the relationship with the institutes, for example, who should be voting to elect representatives? Part of the reason this is an issue is that many of the faculty are research faculty only in the institutes.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): I agree that it is confusing and a mess, but it seems to me, in terms of simply the process of electing a representative, to say, "...undergraduate majors housed outside Arts and Sciences as appropriate," allows the program to make the decision. That is the one part that does not seem quite as murky. It sounds like programs decide in their own way. The rest seems truly uneven.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I have a slightly different question: neither of my two departments votes for the representative. Either someone volunteers or the chair strong-arms someone.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me explain, because this is a council election; ECASC and Shawna organize the elections, but when departments do not do that then I talk with the heads of the units and figure out what is going on and who is to represent [that unit]. You are exactly right; there is nothing in the bylaws that prohibits a faculty member like you from being the representative of two different units. What I am trying to say is: the bylaws are a problem.

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): I know sometimes I am here for both departments, but I am interested in the part where it says we are elected by our units because neither of my units holds an election for the representative.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I was just referring to that. This was really awkward in the run up to the online discussion in the spring. I did not tell everybody about this but there were some units that did not have a properly designated alternate. The representative was gone and the alternate was not available. Our bylaws do not provide for proxy voting or electronic voting, but ECASC worked with me in a generous way, because we knew every unit wanted to vote in that, to make sure that we had people here who were officially representative of the units. If we had interpreted it in a technically correct way, I think we would have been violating the spirit of what we do here.

Margaret Humphreys (History): It seems to me that we could wander a long time in this dark forest, quagmire, swamp, or other ecological analogy and everybody is going to have questions. We need a better way to approach this problem. Are you just acquainting us with the confusion today? Do you have a proposal for where we should go next?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I just wanted to bring you into the discussion because ECASC has been talking periodically about this, but other things usually shove it aside because they are more urgent and pressing. It really is embarrassing and it is potentially explosive if we have the wrong set of circumstances. We do not have a proposal but we wanted to get a sense of any ideas you have. Our very strong sense is that we need a revised set of bylaws governing representation and voting but we did not want to spring that on you. We want you to know what we are talking about and solicit your views. Do you think this is a problem that we need to fix? That is what we would like to know on ECASC. What do you think?

David Malone (Education): What about this idea? If ECASC takes it upon itself to solicit input from council representatives, and then it takes some time to develop a proposal on how to go about addressing this problem?

Linda George (Sociology): It seems to me that the central issue, or at least the issue that needs to be considered initially, is what to do about the Nicholas School, the Pratt School, the writing program, and Sanford. If they are to join this group in a major way, then we should not even be called the Arts and Sciences council anymore. That is not what we would be, and I just think that is central; deciding whether we want an integrated council of the units that have major roles in undergraduate education or whether we want to keep a specific Arts and Sciences council and find another way of dealing with the representation these units should have.

Dean Lee Baker: I think that is absolutely correct when you are talking about the faculty issues with which this body grapples. However, when we are talking about the undergraduate issues, Arts and Sciences is the curriculum. Whether it is Sanford, Nicholas, DIBS, or Global Health, those are majors, which is a component of the Arts and Sciences curriculum. We have faculty issues, and Laurie no say over Nicholas faculty, but the students are all Trinity college of Arts and Sciences students that happen to major in these other units. They pay tuition to Arts and Sciences and they are Arts and Sciences students. Pratt is the only one that is different. They are Trinity college students that take classes in these different units, but that would be an argument to continue to call it Arts and Sciences council because if we are dealing with student issues, they are Arts and Sciences students.

Linda George (Sociology): I have no real opinion on this; I was just raising the issue.

Dean Lee Baker: Conceptually, that is important because we deal with student issues and we deal with faculty issues. The student issues cross all of the schools because our students take classes to help round out their liberal arts and sciences curriculum. However, they remain Trinity college students. Each faculty has their own faculty bodies; we would not presume to do Nicholas faculty governance, so we have to be clear when we are talking about students issues, which are Arts and Sciences students and faculty issues that circumscribe Arts and Sciences faculty only. That is an important conceptual framework.

Dean Lee Willard: I am going to reiterate what Lee said as the bureaucrat in the room. We have two undergraduate colleagues: Trinity College of Arts and Sciences and Pratt School of Engineering. They are two degree-granting units, so Trinity has a BA and a BS and engineering has a BSE.

Steffen Bass (Physics): Now that we have acquainted you with discomfort in this situation, let me ratchet this up to a whole different level. This has to do with the core of faculty representation. Right now, we are working under a senate principle; a department or unit with one primary appointment carries as much weight as a department with 50 faculty

[members]. In some questions that affect every single faculty in Arts and Sciences, there can be a fundamental unfairness to this kind of representation. The question is whether we should continue in this mode of representation and just fix it at the edges where we see obvious things to fix, or whether we should reconsider and put in a mode that at least allows, in some instances, for one faculty-one vote type of representation.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I do not know if there are any other comments, but I am mindful of our time issues and we have a very important proposal for a new major that I want to turn to.

Edna Andrews (Linguistics): I just wanted to mention that linguistics fits in this picture. It is a program with joint and secondary lines, and it is all regular rank. There are a lot of people in the major that have been around since 1993, but it has never had any representation of any kind. We could also vote not to send anyone, but if you are going to include that conversation you might want to talk about that because it is a vibrant major and it is only in trinity.

Dean Lee Baker: We have to be clear about majors because some departments have multiple majors and they spill and share it, for example Biophysics. There are other majors that are clearly interdepartmental, like medieval and renaissance studies. It is a small major with no primary faculty, but [it is] a vibrant major. I think it is important to say and a nice line to draw is do they appoint primary faculty? Thompson Writing does, education does, but medieval and renaissance studies does not. Maybe that is a way of thinking [about it]. ICS and linguistics did not but now they do, so I just wanted to throw that on the table as a clear conceptual line.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I see this as the beginning of a few more discussions about this. We were, as Steffen was saying, letting you share our pain. I study the Holy Roman Empire, so institutions that lumber on for centuries that have a vague and outdated constitution...I love them, and we are a little bit like that. It does not mean we do not get our business done and we may be more effective because of this. For our successors, it might be helpful to reform to the extent that when you and I are no longer here, we have a set of bylaws that really fit the way our university, and Arts and Sciences in particular, works right now and that the faculty needs for governance. Let me end that discussion; let us say it is the opening and the first of a couple of these discussions.

Brazilian and Global Portuguese Studies Proposal

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I am running a little late on the agenda, but the two items we really need to discuss involve curriculum proposals. Let me turn now to renew our discussion of the major from the romance studies department that was first discussed and introduced in the December meeting. Gustavo Furtado and Luciana Fellin, who is the DUS are here. Our two colleagues here from Romance Studies can answer other questions that you may have had in the intervening time. I remember there may have been one question that we could not answer about courses outside of romance studies that might count. I want to continue the discussion, and if you feel that it is time to call the question we can do that. If you wish to continue discussion, we can, but our colleagues from romance studies need some direction today so they can continue thinking appropriately about their plan.

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): Since the last time we met, the Brazil lab was approved and it is now going to come to be. That is going to be a real boon for the major and the university. I think one of the questions last time was about course offerings for Brazilian studies, and we are going to see a lot of courses emerge through the Brazil lab, some of which will continue after the lab is done some of which will not, and I think that is going to be the norm. There is going to be a core of courses offered regularly and a bunch of courses that will come and go, both in the Brazil lab and right now in the writing program we have people that work on Brazil that are teaching freshman writing seminars on Brazil-related topics. I think we covered most of what we needed to last time, so I will just answer questions.

Luciana Fellin (Romance Studies): As a DUS, I think the enrollments are pretty healthy and we see an interest from freshman, so I think that is looking to the future.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me throw open the floor for comments, questions, and observations.

Linda George (Sociology): I need a clarification; in the letters of support the program is referred to as the luco-Brazilian studies program, so did these people who wrote the letters of support actually see the same thing we are looking at under a different title?

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): They saw exactly the same document, but in the curriculum meeting there was some dispute that the term "luco" might be too esoteric or cryptic for most people. There was a quick discussion about that among the core faculty involved and someone proposed Brazilian and global Portuguese because we really want to include Africa, even though right now we cannot, in the long run we would like to be able to think globally about the major. It is a totally understandable universal term and nothing else in the document was changed.

Margaret Humphreys (History): If we are ready, I move to accept the proposal.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Is there a second?

Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS and Literature): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): There is no further debate that we can have. We have 20 representatives that are present. All those in favor, would you raise your hands? Only representatives can vote. Do we have votes against? Abstentions? The motion carries unanimously, congratulations. I love to see our young colleagues who are coming on to replace old timers like me making their mark on the university by reading student interest and creating new programs. Please communicate the support of the council to your colleagues in romance studies.

Undergraduate Course Credits Proposal

We have one other substantial proposal that is new to you and I want to introduce this. There is no urgency with this; we need to have an initial discussion on this proposal that has come from the curriculum committee. I want you all to not feel rushed at all, but ECASC wanted to get this before the council when it came to us in the form that it did from the curriculum my committee. Before I introduce Suzanne Shanahan, who is the chair of the curriculum committee, let me briefly mention my knowledge of it, Suzanne knows more, in introducing this very significant proposal.

The curriculum committee, as all faculty committees do, responds to charges given to them by the deans of Trinity College, or from ECASC, or they take up their own initiatives, so they can come from three different directions. There had been a long-time discussion about the need to revisit the issue of courses towards graduation for a number of different reasons. Last spring, Lee Baker charged Suzanne's committee to revisit the issue, and if they could, come up with a proposal. There was a lively discussion on the curriculum committee about this.

In some ways, personally, I wish that we could have had something in place before we even entered into our online discussion because I think it would have helped provide us with a framework that a lot of us are longing to have, but sometimes you cannot control the sequence in which proposals come to the council. Suzanne, if you would come introduce the proposal. I want to say that ECASC discussed it thoroughly at its meeting. Our job with regard to proposals that come from the faculty committees is to make sure that they have consulted and deliberated appropriately. While we have views about a particular proposal, our real job is to make sure that when it comes to you folks, other committees, faculty, deans or whoever needs to be consulted are built into the process, so we save you all of the time of seeing an incomplete proposal. ECASC has approved this, and we need to start talking about it. A number of us really like this proposal, but that is not an official endorsement. Let me turn it over to Suzanne Shanahan, who is the chair of the curriculum committee, and she will introduce this proposal.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I have two prefatory comments that echo Tom. First, as Tom mentioned this question has been around for some time and Lee officially charged the committee earlier in the fall to take this up. Second, this is a proposal that the curriculum committee discussed, it was also brought to the global education committee for conversation, and the trinity deans have had some conversation about it, but what you see before you is still very much in draft form. ECASC thought it was really important that we begin having a broader conversation with the faculty about this conversation, because clearly it affects all departments very significantly.

In terms of what we were charged by Dean Baker with, the question was essentially how many Non-Duke originated courses should Duke students be allowed to take? As you know, Duke students take AP courses, transfer credit, study abroad, and a variety of courses over their four years at Duke. Pretty early on in our conversation, we actually inverted the question deliberately and began to ask not how many non-Duke courses should students be allowed to take, but really how many Duke courses constitute a Duke degree. I think for us, this was a really important reframing. What we want to do is set a floor, not a ceiling for students and really create opportunities for students to pursue their interests within a rigorous framework, so we felt the floor was a more appropriate way to proceed.

What this proposal does is recommend a minimum of 24 of the 34 courses be Duke originated. There is a definition here of what we mean by Duke-originated. These are courses offered by Duke faculty or Duke-affiliated faculty through our approved processes. These are courses that departments and units say are a good thing, they are put into our bulletin, and they are officially "Duke" in every ways, shape, and form. There are a variety of study abroad Duke-in programs that this would be a part of and there are different pedagogies that this represents, but these are Duke-originated courses. A faculty member decides they want to teach something, they bring it to their unit, and it is approved through official channels.

In terms of the other 10 classes, we realize there are several categories in which students currently take classes that are not Duke-originated. These are pre-matriculation credits; in that particularly category we are largely talking about AP credits. Another category is non-study abroad transfer credits as lots of students transfer in a course or two. Another category is something called inter-institutional courses. There is a fairly long standing inter-institutional relationship with a number of UNC schools, UNC Charlotte, UNC Greensboro, UNC Chapel Hill, State, and Central. These are institutions where Duke students, if their department approves and if that course is not offered at Duke during the same calendar year, they can take that course. Currently, the rules are that they can take one per semester. The other category is non-Duke study abroad transfer credit, so these are the categories where we currently allow students to take non-Duke originated courses.

What we have done is said, "Students take up to 10 total [courses] toward the 34." As we all know, some students take 36, 38 or 40 classes, so this is just up to the 34. If a student wants to take more in one of these categories above the 34, that is fine. What we are saying to students is, "You have 10 non-Duke degrees of freedom that will count toward the 34. These are non-Duke originated degrees of freedom, and you can figure out the best way to expend those."

Then we put particular constraints on that. Up to two can be pre-matriculation credits, and I know a lot of people have been talking about whether it is time to say no more to the AP credit issue. We had a conversation about this, I think we felt strongly both ways within curriculum, but essentially we deferred to the fact that most of our peer institutions continue to do this. [However,] this is a particular issue for discussion. We also said up to two non-study abroad transfer credits and with both this and pre-matriculation credit there is no changed policy. There is change, however, in that only 10 total [courses] can be non-Duke originated. We also said up to four inter-institutional courses can be part of the 10 mix, and up to 10 study abroad [credits]. It is 10 total, so a student could not do two, two, four, and ten. They can mix and match and decide: do they want six study abroad and four inter-institutional? Do they want two pre-matriculation, two transfer

[credits] etc.? It is up to the student to establish a coherent pathway and figure out what makes the most sense to them. This is much more...the students have freedom within a rigorous set of constraints, and this is the basic framework that we have laid out. There are a variety of footnotes, are there any questions?

Discussion

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): Under the rules now, if a student were deliberately trying to max out non-Duke credits, how many could they rack up now?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): My understanding is that, and Inge can correct me if I am wrong, currently students can take 10 Non-Duke study abroad classes, they can take 12 inter-institutional courses, two non-study abroad transfer credits, and two APs.

Dean Inge Walther: Under our current policy, students could take up to half of their 34 courses, that is, up to 17 [courses] that are non-Duke originated.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): So this 10 is actually a reduction in the number of non-Duke originated courses

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): Maybe I am not remembering properly, but I thought that if you took a college course before you matriculated to Duke that essentially, that is unlimited. It is not a limit of two.

Dean Lee Baker: It is different for Pratt and Trinity, but right now it is two.

Valerie Konczal: Anything that was taken as a non-degree candidate, i.e. they are not an official transfer student, is a total of two credits of IP, AP, or transfer [credit].

Thomas Robisheaux (History): As you can tell, this is a really important proposal, and I know getting up to speed on the way our current requirements actually work is part of this, so I really encourage questions.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): I have a point of clarification; under the changes from current policy....number 1: of the 34 course credits, there is a paragraph there that says, "...no more than 6 of the 34 course credits from the graduate and professional schools." Is that of the 24, or is that of the 34?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): That is of the 34, and that map onto current policy. That is not a change.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): In current policy, does study abroad differentiate between Duke and non-Duke?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Yes it does.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): One of the things that I think we have to mark is that, although it seems unlikely at this point in time, this is a way of establishing a policy where students could take eight online courses. Although only two of those could be originating non-Duke as well as other limits on the study abroad and inter-institutional, but this would allow eight online courses, most of them at Duke, to count towards the degree.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): It said that in essentially two different places: under Roman numeral 4 and also in the description of what a Duke originated course is. This is something that people need to consider really carefully, because essentially what the curriculum committee said was, "We are going to look at Duke courses understanding that pedagogies are treated equally." It is up to the individual faculty member to decide if they want to teach a course with a section, an online course, or an experiential course, and that should be the prerogative of the faculty member and their department. That is how we came up with this discussion. I understand that there are people who say [otherwise], and this can certainly be amended, so maybe we should limit those. Personally, I teach a lot of experiential classes, and if we put a limit on online classes are we going to put a limit on experiential classes? Are we going to put a limit on lab classes? I do not know if that is a good idea.

Diane Nelson (Cultural Anthropology): I am just curious about the stakes of this, because my sense is students try to manage financially by taking AP classes, going on study abroad [programs] that are cheaper than Duke, and also doing summer school in their home town where they can live at home and work while getting some of their requirements out of the way. I am just wondering if there are stakes that are going to affect students, making that harder.

Dean Lee Willard: I want to ask sub-question about students graduating early, evoking six AP [credits], and how that impacts this.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): What we have said here is that they still need to do 24 Duke originated classes, even if you are graduating early; it is still 24 Duke-originated classes. What we are saying to students is that this may cause you to be more reflective and deliberative in how you organize your choices. To be fair, we have not done an analysis of what the implications are for students who have financial issues, but certainly we did not eliminate the ability to do AP courses. My understanding is that Val produced some interesting data for us on study abroad participation, and there are not that many students who do the full 10 courses of non-Duke study abroad. If they do a year, they tend to mix and match it with some Duke in and out, so my sense is that I do not think that would be the case, but I think it is absolutely critical that we examine it.

David Malone (Education): I like Diane's point because I think sometimes we make policies that differentially effect students and we have some unintended consequences. I wanted to ask Ara's question about study abroad just to make sure we are clear on that. There are some programs, like Duke in New York, where students take courses at NYU but they are part of the Duke program, so that is one question: how does that fit in? The other is for Dean Baker about the role of the DUSs in approving all of these and how that is going to work. I know there is a meeting tomorrow for DUSs on study away.

Dean Lee Baker: As we discuss this specific proposal, right now some of our Duke-in programs that are wrapped in a Duke-in....we have Duke-in programs that are hybrid programs and programs that are straight Duke-in programs. That is

already stated policy and we would keep that. It sounds interesting and we could revisit this in, but for our Duke in LA program that partners with USC and the Duke in New York program that partner with NYU they come in as Duke credits.

Dean Inge Walther: That is changing.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): You see how technically complex our course requirements are.

Amanda Kelso (Office of Global Education): I will clarify the new hybrid situation for a lot of our Duke-in programs, but I will ask Inge to follow up with the decision. In recognition of the fact that some of these programs are partnering with both foreign institutions and with USC and NYU the curriculum committee asked us to consider changing the programs to hybrid programs. As a result of that, a lot of the Duke-in programs, including some signature programs like Duke in Madrid, are going on a hybrid system. All of them have gone hybrid now as Duke in Madrid is the last one in the fall. The program originated courses will be Duke-in credits and the local university courses will be transfer credits. Duke in France went this way in 2005 and it has worked very well. We feel it is a more honest representation as far as course by course and what we should be looking at. Then, we had to consider, with the new graduation requirement proposal coming along, what to do with those hybrid programs. That is where I am going to have [Inge] refresh me.

Dean Inge Walther: In terms of this policy and those hybrid programs, the courses that students take at the local universities come in as transfer courses, because that is what they are. They are not Duke originated courses and they are not taught by Duke faculty [members], so they would fall under the category of study abroad transfer credit. We have a lot of programs, like our Duke in Berlin program that have been hybrid for a long time. It has not deterred students from going on these programs, so I really do not think it is going to have that much of an impact, but we will have to monitor the situation. A lot of students really do take more than 34 courses; we are only talking about the floor of 24 to 34 [courses], so students can still take more of these transfer courses in study abroad programs. We are not limiting that.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me point out that in the process in which this proposal has come to you, you see for very good reasons why Suzanne's committee sent it to the global education for undergraduates committee. Talia Boatwright, who is the chair of that committee, would be able to tell you the suggested amendments and changes that take into account study abroad courses.

Dean Lee Baker: That would mean two would count toward the 24 and the other two would count towards that 10, so the Duke-in is hybrid and it is split. In terms of the approval process, I do not think anything changes for the DUSs. What will be interesting would be something like....could it count for the major, but not for general education [requirements]? Have we thought that one through?

Dean Inge Walther: That happens now

Dean Lee Baker: For the DUSs, and particularly the major advisors, you will have to be mindful as they start piling on and going above the 34 and if this is going to count towards their general education [requirements]. That is a trinity college dean's responsibility, and I think DUSs will need to be mindful of this policy, but essentially nothing changes in the process.

Charlie Becker (Economics): I would like to endorse what Inge said. First, I would like to say that I am highly supportive of the curriculum committee's proposal and I think they have done a great job. Also, the important thing in thinking about this is not to focus on the extreme outliers. There are very few people who are going to be....most people will take more than 34 courses, very few people are going to try to take 10 non in-Duke classes, and to have the rules of the curriculum determined by a few outliers is a mistake. Among other things, it would be very difficult, at least in my department, to conceivably take 10 courses outside of Duke, get a major, and get all of your requirements. This is certainly true in any of the sciences, and the idea of taking 8 online courses is unimaginable to complete the degree.

Dean Lee Willard: Something to be investigated in this, though I really like the flexibility of it, is Phi Beta Kappa because there are certain limitations of how many courses have to be at the institution, so I just want to make sure that is not an unintended consequence if somebody doing 10 would not be eligible for Phi Beta Kappa. I do not know what the role of graduation with honors is and how this impacts it, but those are two things to investigate.

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): I need a clarification because I have heard different people talking. On one hand, it says there is a limit of 10 no matter what, on the other hand people say if you take 38 courses....

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I am sorry if it was unclear. It is 10 [courses] between 24 and 34 [courses].

Owen Astrachan (Computer Science): So the limit is, you must take 24 courses at Duke.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Exactly, but I do think as you get to the 34....there are limitations in the categories. You could not, as a Duke student, have 10 AP credits transferred in, sub-limits still apply.

Makeba Wilbourn (Psychology and Neuroscience): I think one thing I would like, echoing the comment on financial aid, the question of these 10....what will it look like for students on varying levels of financial aid? Are there are different price tags for these non-Duke 10, and is this then limiting students [on financial aid]? What will Duke financial aid cover and what will it not? How will that affect students who are on full financial aid? Will they be able to have opportunities, or are we limiting them by this? I think that would be helpful in evaluating the proposal.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): I think both you and Diane are raising a set of critical questions that we simply did not engage with, but we really need to do so.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me point out that at the top of this, it says "draft proposal." We are dealing with a very complicated proposal, so this is what we are here for. Thank you colleagues for doing your job.

Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): I am looking at Roman numerals two and four, and I have a clarifying question and perhaps a follow-up. For number two: “up to two non-study abroad transfer courses” does that mean someone who transfers into Duke as a sophomore?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): No, so there are two transfer credits that you can take and transfer in from UPenn, Harvard, or wherever. In addition, you can take up to 10 or you can take only 10 non-Duke study abroad credits that operate as transfer credits.

Charlotte Clark (Nicholas School of the Environment): What if you spend a whole year at the University of Pennsylvania and transfer in?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Then you are a transfer student

Dean Inge Walther: I just wanted to say, in my opinion, I do not think this is going to affect financial aid students whatsoever. The data that Valerie provided shows that currently, there are hardly any students who matriculated at Duke who take more than 10 non-Duke courses, or even come close to that. I doubt that is going to have that effect, and also, our financial aid is for Duke courses, it is not for non-Duke courses. I do not see it having any effect at all; I might not be seeing the full picture, but I do not see how it could impact this.

Dick MacPhail (Chemistry): Since online courses seem to be a thorny issue around here, there is this mention of one purely online course per semester, which means that somebody is going to have to be labeling these somehow and keeping track of them. That is going to be an issue.

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): Yes

Dean Lee Baker: I think being able to identify which ones are and which ones are not [online]...we are able to identify focus courses, and I am confident we will be able to come up with a mechanism. What is a little more tricky is the online transfer courses, which is being made eligible under this new policy shift. Currently, we will not accept an online course from Harvard University, but we will accept an in person class from Miami Dade, because it is no longer a community college, it is a four year college. This is shifting that dynamic so DUSs can now feel empowered to approve an online course for transfer credit, but many of those courses do not let...in the syllabus or on the transcript, it is hard to discern whether they are online or not. I think that is a strategy for many of these colleges that are doing this, and we are going to have to keep our eyes open, or it might not matter at all. The DUSs will have to do more discernment. That, to me, is going to be more of a challenge than the former.

Steffen Bass (Physics): Directly in response to your question: right now, I do not really see online happening because we do not have any rules or regulations in place to meter out quality standards for an online course and approve it.

Linda George (Sociology): You mean for an online transfer course?

Steffen Bass (Physics): Also for teaching an online Duke course, we have not yet had the discussion of, “Within Duke, what are the standards we wish to uphold for an online Duke course to give credit to our students?” I urge you all to spend some time in this discussion forum that we are setting up to actually engage in this question, so this body here can actually legislate the quality standards and expectations that we have for an online class for Duke credit. That will be complementary to these more general graduation requirements. These two will work hand in hand for that question.

Wayne Norman (Philosophy): DKU?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Would a DKU course count as a Duke originated course?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): For example, the courses being taught next year at DKU will be considered Duke originated. In fact, you and I are co-teaching a course that we are putting through the approval process right now. We are Duke faculty, we are going through the Duke trinity college course committee, and it will appear in the Duke bulletin. Therefore, that is a Duke originated class.

Wayne Norman (Philosophy): Will we re-define this as DKU will be offering different categories?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): That may be the case, and like the Duke in/out hybrid programs, we will have to make some adjudication at that point. What we are using now is Duke faculty, Duke mechanisms of approval, and the Duke university undergraduate bulletin.

Dean Inge Walther: I just wanted to respond about the online issues. I think there were members of the curriculum committee who felt very strongly that online or hybrid [courses], like you were saying, is just using technology to improve your pedagogy. It is an issue of pedagogy and course delivery format, it is not a question of having to have separate standards for approval. The standards are determined by the faculty and the department, just like any regular course. The faculty looks at the quality of the course, the syllabus, the objectives, the type of assignments, and the amount of work that students are doing. That is determined by the faculty, and we still have faculty freedom to develop courses, but with some oversight by departments to monitor the quality of those courses. There is a view out there that online should be treated no differently than any other kind of course. The quality is a matter of the department and the faculty member teaching the course. The only thing that I think needs to be worked out and I think we have some plans to do this, is to determine if online...because the only thing that affects it are contact hours. If we no longer have contact hours that are face to face, which is traditionally how contact hours have been defined, then we still need to work that out. How do we re-define contact hours and course credits? I think the only issues that we need to think about for the future, and I am not sure how relevant it is to this proposal, but we will, at some point, have to think about how we determine course credits in an online environment.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me pick up the other side of that issue, Inge. There is also a voice out there that says there should be firm standards for online courses. What we need to bear in mind is that standards now rest with individual

faculty members, departments, and DUSs for approval. Each of you have submitted your courses and there is no review; the course committee is not authorized to review your course format for standards. We have never done that for any type of course offered at Duke.

Linda George (Sociology): If they do not review the standards, what do they review?

Dean Inge Walther: The courses committee really operates under the assumption that the course quality is being reviewed at the department level. When it comes to the courses committee, all of the information that the courses committee has is the bulletin description. That is all it has, and the only thing we do is review the requests for Modes of Inquiry and Areas of Knowledge, i.e. the curriculum codes. However, we are now creating a new online course request program and we are going to start asking for more information. Not a full syllabus, but a lot more information than we currently have so we can look at quality, pedagogy, and that sort of thing. Stand by for more about that from me and the courses committee.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): You can see when you open this box how many interesting things pop out. We have time for one last comment, but we will continue this discussion, colleagues.

Charlie Becker (Economics): My question goes back to Lee Baker and Inge, which is don't we already have in place the possibility of accepting online transfer credits since we are part of a consortium with NC State, which offers a lot of online courses? Isn't it possible that if someone takes a poultry science course over at NC State, we do not know if they are dealing with live or virtual fowl?

Suzanne Shanahan (Sociology): That may well be the case, and I do not know if that actually happens, but I think it is important to note that when you look at the item on the inter-institutional courses, we are saying that it can be four inter-institutional courses, and these are not to be purely online courses. We understood these to be somewhat like study abroad. It is important for a Duke student, if they are going to take a course at Central, to go hang at Central with those students. It does not make sense to take an online course there.

Dean Lee Baker: This is an important change. Currently, we do not accept online credit as transfer credit, so this will change that rule.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me bring this meeting to a close. You are back in the full swing of things, and you have been doing your job brilliantly today. I thank you for engaging the issue so thoroughly, and let me give you one more thing to do. Would you take this back to your departments? This is at the heart of what do as faculty, and it is our faculty responsibility to know and approve course credits for graduation. You as individual faculty representatives need to be informed about what you are approving if we decide to approve it, or not. There is no urgency with this proposal and we are going to have time to discuss it again. We will come back to it in February, but thank you for beginning the discussion in such a robust way.

Meeting Adjourned