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 April 25, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me welcome you all to this called meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council. I want to thank you colleagues here at the end of a busy semester for taking time to come to the council meeting.

Approval of Minutes

We have distributed the minutes from the April 11 meeting. I have made a couple of minor corrections that have been noted, are there any additional corrections to the minutes before I hear a motion to approve and second? Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I move

Professor Charlie Becker (Economics): Seconded

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? Thank you, representatives.

Online Courses Policy Proposal: Amendment

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): We have one item on our agenda today, the proposal from the Courses Committee governing online courses. Before we turn to this, let me say that as Chair of the Council, one thing that has deeply impressed me over the last several weeks and months is to see how deeply and passionately Duke professors care about undergraduate teaching. Our students are our future, after all. This is the ground that we all share. Everyone that I have talked to wants the very best for their students, and everyone that I have talked to has made a commitment to make their teaching the finest liberal arts education we can offer for the early twenty-first century. Our views differ. Some views differ strongly from others. Some of us are concerned about [online courses]. Still other faculty members are still deciding and want [more time to] think about it. From my vantage point, it is has been an extraordinarily healthy debate and something very good for the Duke faculty.

Before I go on and introduce some additional information for you, let me add one personal comment. Back in September 1973 there was a young man sitting at the very top row of this auditorium. This young man had just come back from study abroad and was closed out of all of the courses he wanted to take at Duke. There was one extremely popular course with a well-known Duke professor that he really wanted to take, so he would steal into the lecture hall, even though he was not enrolled, and sit up in the corner. I still have his lecture notes. [Of course] the young man was me. I do not remember much from that class, but I do remember one thing. I remember that history professor's passion for teaching, his passion for his subject, and his profound care for his students. [That experience gives me] a different perspective on these deliberations. I look at them [not just as Chair of the Council but] as a Duke alum, Class of 1974. When I talk with my alumni friends and associates, I can say that I am proud of all of you as my colleagues and the entire Duke faculty who have engaged in the discussion about this particular undergraduate proposal before us. This [commitment to undergraduate teaching] is what brings us together.

Some faculty and departments are ready to commit the time and resources to experiment with teaching courses online. Some want, and deserve, more time to consider how or even whether online courses might be a part of their pedagogical approaches. Some departments and some faculty members do not have a position, one way or another. I have talked with all of them. This [range of opinion] has become very evident over the last several weeks as the executive committee has met in endless rounds of meetings talking with dozens of DUSs, department officers and chairs, faculty of all ranks, deans, provosts, and technical specialists. Around the [conference] tables I have seen something that I am very

1

proud of, which is very much a part of our Duke culture: a shared commitment to undergraduate education, and doing it right.

The proposal before us is designed to enable faculty to do precisely that. [It is meant to] empower faculty who wish to innovate and experiment with a new technological platform, or make it possible for other faculty, if they wish not to engage [with it], to learn about it or carry on with their established methods of teaching, which are brilliantly successful as well. This proposal allows those who may wish to take advantage of an opportunity to do so, and others who find that they are not ready for it, wish to debate it further, or who do not want to engage with it at all, need not do so. No one will be forced at all [to participate].

I want to point out that this process has been dynamic from the start and fast paced. All of you probably have first-hand experience with how dynamic and fast-paced this process is. I know the faculty [members] who have been involved since last May and the faculty committees that have been involved have felt this. I could scroll through all of the meetings that have taken place at the level of the Academic Council, ECAC, and the Online Advisory Committee on all Duke's online initiatives back to [last] September. The formation of David Bell's committee in October brought yet more meetings, and each step of the way the emerging policy recommendations changed. Back in February there was a meeting of DUSs with David Bell and his subcommittee.   What came out of that were changes to the recommendations that his subcommittee was considering. [These] changes have made their way into the proposal that is before you right now.

In other words, faculty and DUSs who wanted more time to think, who[se views] needed to be included more, or who wanted more autonomy for their departments to decide, had their voices heard and their suggestions [were] folded right into the recommendations as we went along in thinking about this as pilot project. When David [Bell]'s committee passed it on to the Courses Committee—those are our colleagues who have expertise in reviewing courses and coding them—there were additional recommendations that were made based upon their experience as faculty members who review [hundreds] of course proposals in the course of a couple of years or so. And the same attention, especially to the process, was paid by members of the Executive Committee when the proposal came to us. We reviewed the whole process from start to finish making sure that all of the necessary input, advice, accommodations, compromises, suggestions, and good ideas had been taken into account.

This process continues and if this motion were to carry today, I promise you, it will continue. Even if the motion today does not pass, the process of engagement with this issue, and trying to find ways forward for Duke faculty who are interested in online education, will continue. This is just one more step in a long process about offering Duke undergraduates another way to gain course credit.

Let me call your attention to two new developments. The Executive Committee went on retreat all day yesterday, and we amended and modified the language based upon a number of meetings with department officers, DUSs, faculty members, and [other] individual conversations. We amended the language of the motion before you to read in the following way. Let me call your attention to the sentence at the end that makes it [the modification] very plain: "Each department will decide whether and when to opt in to the pilot project." I have also made handouts available, and I can come back to this if there are questions about how that crucial language of opting in to the pilot project is to be understood. For those departments that opt in, faculty may teach 2U consortium courses, they can select 2U consortium courses to be accepted for credit, elective or otherwise, and these may be offered under that department's subject code for a general education credit in any given semester, provided they do not overlap with any course that is being offered at Duke in that academic year. For departments or programs that choose not to opt in, wait to opt in, or never opt in, I will highlight a couple of the operational statements for you. Faculty will not teach any 2U consortium courses from those departments and no 2U consortium course will be accepted for credit, elective or otherwise, towards the fulfillment of any major, minor, or certificate requirements. Finally, no 2U consortium course offered under the subject code of that department will be available to Duke students for credit of any kind, unless other departments or programs that have opted in chooses to accept that course for credit. That [modification] is one [additional] part of the dynamic process we have been involved in.

I have had the privilege this year to work closely with our dean. [Dean Laurie Patton]. She does not feel new [to Duke] anymore, but this spring I have seen an aspect of her talents that I have come to admire, and that is how unbelievably hard and creatively she works on behalf of every single department and faculty member who comes to her with a concern, question, or something [else] to help support them with a particular curriculum issue. In this case, it has been no less. She has been magnificent in adapting [to the circumstances]. I have learned to use her language [about the process]: that we are proceeding "as the way opens."

In that spirit, there have been some new features that have been added to the online pilot project that Dean Patton has negotiated on our behalf from the provider. The provider will work with Duke professors to develop a platform for "real time" small enrollment classes and seminars that could be connected to other consortium classes. Just imagine your own seminar, but multiplied across the consortium [universities]. Duke online courses [can also be] offered simultaneously on campus in person and in real time, so if you have a course right now, that course could just add online sections to it. Finally, this is the one I like, because I want to press them for help there: the [teaching] platform would be made available to Duke faculty [members] to create platforms to help their faculty research. That is to say, if you are collaborating with researchers at other institutions they [2U] would help you set up a platform using their technology to do so. If you have a study group it could be used, adapted or designed to meet those needs. If you are on the board of a journal and you have to sit and review papers, you can find this as perhaps a very useful collaborative tool.

We are going to have a discussion period in just a minute, but before I do so, there have been a lot of questions of fact, and I want to make sure that all of those have been addressed. There was a supplemental set of questions extracted from the last time at the April 11 meeting. By the way, the [questions] were the words [of] council members and visitors. They [the questions] were just extracted from the minutes. I and a whole team of faculty members involved in this [project], deans, provosts, and [other] officials all worked together to answer them. These have been distributed and even updated as late as a couple of days ago.

I want to make sure everyone understands the kind of technological platform that is being discussed. For that, I have asked Lynne O'Brien to come and present to us for ten minutes regarding the technology platform. Lynne, as you know, is the Director of Academic Technology and Instructional Services. She knows better than anyone how this kind of technology works and why it is different from others that might be available.

2U Technology and Online Course Development

Dr. Lynne O'Brien (Directory of Academic Technology): Thank you for the opportunity to talk with you. I know many of you in this room, and I have had the privilege of working with many of you and seeing the kinds of interesting teaching technology innovation and curricular planning that you like to do. In this whirlwind tour of the 2U technology platform, I am going to try to relate it to things I have heard you telling me that you would like to be able to do, and show you what things this platform can enable for those classes.

Before showing you the actual platform, I wanted to make sure you understood that the development process involves working with both a content planner and an instructional technology designer person. The goal in the initial consultation, and throughout the process, is to understand how you like to teach, both in terms of the content, and the strategies that you use. Then to figure out which of those things translate into an online version through the 2U platform, and whether there are some things that you are currently not doing that could be enabled by that platform that you would like to try. The goal is to meet your educational goals and to fit with your teaching style.

The course home page has the kinds of things that you might see on a number of technologies that you and your students use. There are profiles of individuals where students can create both a photograph and descriptive information about themselves. They also can upload a short video where they introduce themselves, and many faculty [members] who teach on this platform ask students to do that. One of the other things it has that I know many people here at Duke have talked about that is up at the top is the ability to form a lot of different kinds of groups. A faculty member can create groups for students to work together on a project or a team project. Students can create their own groups. Those can be social groups, such as other people in the area that they might want to meet and study with, or they can be academic study groups. They can be a project development group; they can be whatever kind of configuration they want. I think the ability for both students and faculty to [create] different kinds of groups is something that I have heard people say would be very useful.

There are places for people to post comments, and the instructor's comments are highlighted so they stand out. The calendar can include not only things like assignment dates, but also online office hours or events that are coming up in the area that are related to the class. The event calendar can sync to the individual's phone or their personal calendar so that their assignments and other things can be all part of one calendar.

There are places to post assignments, readings, and things to do. These are the materials that students are supposed to work with and the activities they are supposed to do before the live section of the course meets. You can post a variety of things there. As students work their way through the materials, they are checked off so they can keep track of their progress. Then there are both recorded videos and live sessions that involve video, and I wanted to distinguish between them and stress that it is not correct that it is just a talking head video, people recording lectures, and you just sit there and watch the lectures. That is really not the case. There are opportunities to create video that do have the faculty member talking and different kinds of graphic images, notes, or whatever [else] on the other side. That is something that many of you are familiar with. The print view lets people print out the slides or outlines ahead of time in case they want to take notes while they are watching. The thing where it says "jump to" lets you go to a very specific place, so if someone wants to go back to review a single concept, they can go directly to that.

There are other types of video that are in produced in the studio. Again, it is up to the individual faculty member; I thought this quote was highly appropriate. You can insert images, multi-media, exercises, and any number things. I believe this is from an economics class. Then there is produced video where it is not a lecture at all. In fact, even with the lecture part it does not need to be the faculty member lecturing. You could record a guest expert or an interview with somebody. Then there are also opportunities to develop narratives that would illustrate something. In this case, they wanted to capture what certain types of interviewing techniques were. The faculty member worked with a content person to develop the script, and then they recorded a sample of that type of interviewing. You could have students create video and upload for other people to look at. You could have a small panel discussion, so it does not have to be a lecture at all.

Then there are ways of making things interactive for the students. You could have a short segment of video followed by something for students to do. The things that you see up at the top or the places where video pauses [is where] students are asked to do something, so here the instructor is asking the student to respond. The students can take a quiz, write a paper, or they could also be asked to upload a video response. You can require students to upload that and require other students to comment on it and react to it before they can go on to the next part of the activity.

There are live class discussions. Again it does not have to be just the instructor talking to individual students, quizzing them, and so forth. I talked about the groups. You can ask the students during the live session to go into breakout

rooms, so you might divide your class into groups of three, have them take a position on some issue, and have them come back and present to the class. They can present to each other in addition to the faculty member. Both the faculty member and students can give presentations while others are watching and listening in. They can ask questions, you can pause and ask for comments along the way. You can use a tablet to sketch out, draw something, make an outline, or illustrate something.

There are a variety of things you can do during the live session that involve more than simply having a large group session. I was asked to be short, so I am going to stop there, but I have looked at this and I have looked at sample classes. I feel confident that not only can this do the kinds of things that I have heard faculty saying they would like to be able to do, but could actually add some other capabilities. I will close by mentioning that any materials that are developed for this can also be used in your class back here at Duke. Let's say that you asked to have recorded interviews, panel discussions, or the thing where they acted out interviewing techniques, those materials could then be used back in your Duke class as well.

Faculty Perspectives on the Online Courses Proposal

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you very much, Lynne. There may be some questions for you, so thank you for sticking around. I now want to turn to two faculty perspectives, and then we will open up the floor for discussion and deliberation. I contacted a couple of colleagues to ask them to spend a little bit more time—five minutes or so—talking about their own passion for teaching and their own views on this particular pedagogy and pilot project. The first colleague I would like to recognize is Professor Rebecca Stein in cultural anthropology, also the Director of Undergraduate Studies in her department.

Professor Rebecca Stein (Cultural Anthropology): I am going to be brief, because I know many people want to speak. I am not going to be talking about my passion for teaching, but about the proposal that is before us. Obviously, as we know, there are many opinions in this room about this matter, but what is surely clear to all of us regardless of where we stand on the 2U proposal is the magnitude of concern about the future of online education at Duke. There is concern expressed across the Arts and Sciences faculty and all the three divisions. There seems to be a perception that it is only the humanists who are opposed to this proposal, but in fact, serious concerns have also been raised by colleagues in the social sciences, where I am situated, in the natural sciences, as well as the Pratt School of Engineering.

I am not going to articulate the full range of concerns here, as they are numerous and varied. Some of them have been summarized in a handout that I believe is available at the front of the room, which I recommend to you. In my opinion, and that of many of my colleagues, is that there is one chief issue before us today: namely the process by which this proposal has moved to the council, and what many of us feel is the inadequate time that we as a faculty have had to consider it together in a serious and thorough manner. I understand that numerous committees have considered this proposal all year, but for many of us faculty members, open and inclusive discussion of 2U only began a few weeks ago.

Let me be clear about the nature of the opposition to this proposal. We are not, as I think we have been characterized, ideologically opposed to online education. In fact, some of us approached this with considerable enthusiasm. We are not afraid of technology, or the future of education in a digital age. I, for one, am writing two books about the politics of digital media. This is something many of us are deeply invested in.

We simply seek due diligence on the part of the *entire* faculty, as this proposal has the potential to affect every department on campus. If you are in favor of online education at Duke, as many of us are in one way or another, the only way to make this work is to ensure that we have a more thorough and open discussion. If we force the proposal through now, despite the considerable volume of faculty objections and concerns, we will surely harm the future of online education at Duke. Many of us simply cannot come on board now before a more thorough discussion is had.

Therefore, I would propose that we postpone the vote, and consider this proposal again next fall, perhaps as early as the first Arts and Sciences meeting in September, thereby leaving substantial time for serious research and discussion. If you are in favor of online education at Duke, you can surely wait at least one semester for these concerns to be aired in order to consider possible modifications and alternatives. If this is passed now, I believe it will substantively undermine Duke's future online profile, and I think it will also harm the future of our faculty community. Surely this alone is worth the brief delay.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you Rebecca. Our second perspective is going to be offered by Professor Emma Rasiel**,** who is a professor of economics, and who will be offering one of the online courses for Semester Online in the spring semester.

Professor Emma Rasiel (Economics): Thanks Tom, I just wanted to make a few comments, since I am one of just two of us in this room who have actually been working directly with 2U to develop an online course. When I first heard about it, I had a lot of the same concerns as other people. Is this just going to be hours of me lecturing on a webcam? That would bore me. I cannot see how it could possibly interest the students. What I have discovered through working with 2U is it is actually incredibly exciting in the range of different ways that we can deliver content to the students.

There is a little bit of video going on, but as you saw from Lynne's presentation, you can have all sorts of other stuff going on the other side of screen while you are talking, so they are not really watching you, they are watching other stuff and listening to you. There are also very high quality graphics that you can bring in where you can have students do surveys that are recorded or do what we call validation tests, where they are essentially testing themselves by answering questions on screen as they move through the material. They cannot progress until they have gotten the question answer right. They are actually being forced to do some work to make sure they get through it. They cannot be sitting there

passively clicking through and not paying attention. Almost every delivery mechanism requires them to be paying active attention. Then, of course, there are the discussion boards, and many other ways of communicating with the students outside of the formal class time.

I have actually taught distance education [before]. I have taught at Fuqua for over ten years [and] I have taught various distance courses there, so I am familiar with the concept of staying in contact with your students throughout the weeks, semesters, and through discussion boards. At a time of day that suits you, you get on the discussion board, you answer the questions, and then these students are asking and answering questions with each other being continually engaged in the educational process.

I have found it incredibly exciting. I have been challenged by the guys at 2U to be very creative in ways that I had not thought of before. I think I am a reasonably experienced teacher, but I am not a creative designer. I am not someone who knows how to think about what you do when you have your head in front of a green screen; this was relatively new terminology to me, and then there is other stuff going on somewhere else. The expertise that I am getting from 2U as I work with them is challenging, creative, and fun. I actually think this is going to be another new fun way that we can educate students using technology that is new and is only just available. Inevitably, I am extremely supportive of the opportunity to extend our educational abilities in this way.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Thank you Emma. I know some of you may have questions for Lynne O'Brien, Emma [Rasiel], or Rebecca [Stern]. What I am going to ask now is that we turn to our discussion part of the meeting. We have two microphones set up to facilitate our discussion instead of having to take time passing out one microphone among us.

I realize this [process] is unfair because you cannot divide people in two, but if you are leaning against this proposal, please form a queue to speak over there. If you are leaning in favor of this proposal, or in some shade of the spectrum that it is okay with you, [please stand] off to the right. I am going to alternate speakers between the two microphones. These were rules that were developed by our executive committee which serves as the unofficial rules committee of the council. In our discussions yesterday we realized we needed to structure this [discussion] so that we have as many faculty who wish to speak be able to [do so], [that they] speak to the point, and that we hear all sides of the issue.

Every faculty member and visitor is welcome to speak. [First,]I want to ask you to speak to the motion that is on the floor. Second of all, if there is a particular comment or question that comes up that needs an immediate answer of some sort, I may ask that a person who knows the answer [to] identify themselves, and they will jump to the head of the queue. Limit your comments to two minutes, please. I got wise advice from former council chairs that have been through similar times where faculties [members] were intensely interested in a motion before the council.

I want to remind everyone in the room that only council representatives and alternates may make motions and second a motion. When and if we have a vote on the main motion on the floor, the voting will be done by secret ballot. If there is a subsidiary motion, the discussion on those will be limited to ten minutes, and then we will vote. If there is a vote on a subsidiary motion, I will just ask for a show of the Carolina blue cards "yes" or "no". I asked David Paletz if he wanted to start [the discussion], because he was cut off in the lively discussion last time. He is welcome to come and begin. We usually start with a speaker who was unable to speak last time. In the meantime, if you have something that you wish to say, would you please come forward and wait your turn in the line. I also want to ask every speaker to identify themselves by name and department.

Professor Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): I have a procedural question that might require some investigation by our parliamentarian that is why I would like to ask it now. If someone wishes to move to table this motion until the next meeting, what are the rules? At one point in this meeting would that be necessary?

Dean Peter Burian: To table a motion, a motion must be made and seconded by members of the council. It can then be discussed, and there can be a time limit on that discussion. It will be voted on before returning to the main motion.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Does it require a two-thirds vote or a majority vote?

Dean Peter Burian: It does not require a two-thirds vote.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I just want to point out one thing about motions to table; it is usually abused. Usually what is meant [by such a motion] is to defer the question to a later meeting.

Dean Peter Burian: This is the technical terminology. To postpone a motion is actually used to kill a motion, it can come back, but there is no promise within the motion that it will come back. A motion to table implies that it will be brought back.

Discussion

Professor David Paletz (Political Science): I was thrilled when Tom said that I would be the first speaker, so I delved in detail into the provisions and everything. Then I received an email, which told me I would have two minutes. What I have done is I have printed up a statement of the questions that I would have asked otherwise, and I hope you all have copies. I will now take thirty seconds for each of four of the many points that I would have asked.

The first one is, it is clear, is it not, that we are only talking about five Duke courses that would be offered? The other 95 courses will be offered by the other colleges and universities, so there will be a total of 100 courses altogether. The second is, how prestigious and research-oriented will the completed consortium of twenty universities be? We know four, and another four are Brandeis, Notre Dame, Boston College and UNC. We do not know, as far as I can tell, anything about the next twelve, except a statement [that says] they will be direct peers or in a couple of cases aspirational peers.

Third, there is a question of class size. In one place it says the determination of class sizes is up to us, but in other places it says there will be a maximum enrollment of 100 per course in the first year, and then it can go up to 300. It is not clear how large these classes can be after that. The corollary there is: who decides on admitting students to these courses? That was not clear in the material. Finally, I speak on behalf of my department, which is somewhat outraged to find 2U announcing, promoting, and soliciting enrollment for a political science, which has never been submitted to or approved by the department.

Professor Tom Metzloff (Duke Law School): Thank you for raising these questions. I am working on [developing] a course [for Semester Online]. From the very beginning when I went to see 2U, I was impressed by the technologies and their platform. The course that I am designing with other members of the Law School is a course that has regularly been taught at Duke for undergraduates, which we were calling "Contemporary Constitutional Law." Erwin Chemerinsky had taught it regularly when he was here, and Guy Charles did it regularly for the last couple of years. It is common in undergraduate [studies] for a course on civil rights, civil liberties, and the constitution to be taught, often using the resources of the Law School.

Let me say a little bit about the course itself, its design, and why I think it is exciting. I have loved the opportunity. I have spent the last month working with the 2U folks on it. I would second what Emma said about how good they are in terms of the production values. One advantage here is the ability to use other members of the Duke Law School. Guy Charles has just written a book on hate speech, and will be doing a lecture that relates to that topic. Neil Siegel, one of the world's experts on the commerce clause, will be dealing with that topic, abortion issues, and other questions. Joseph Blocher, one of the leading experts on the second amendment is involved in that.

All four of us have won teaching awards at Duke, and I think we are doing this because we are committed to education. We think with the four of us working together doing the lectures where we have expertise we can do something valuable. I have brought a couple of copies of our syllabus, and the specific lesson plan. I think you can see that it is not an 80 minute lecture. The part the students watch is interactive. The reason I thought it would work great for an online course is it features some work that I have been doing on documentaries on Supreme Court cases. We have about ten to fifteen minutes each week of ready-made and very high-quality digital material that pulls out the case method that is very common for studying the constitution and the Supreme Court. If anybody is interested in this, I would be delighted to pass it out.

Professor Thomas Pfau (English and Germanic Languages and Literature): In some ways, my remarks will echo the ones that Rebecca [Stein] made earlier in this meeting. Others have spoken cogently to the many unresolved and potentially disastrous ways in which the 2U initiative may impact our curriculum and our undergraduate culture of learning.

I will not reiterate or inflect these concerns now, except to say that I very much share them, and that in my view they deserve a much more thorough hearing and consideration than can be achieved here today. Leaving aside the central topic, [which is] today's vote if indeed there is to be one, is mainly about whether at this time the idea of faculty governance at Duke holds any meaning whatsoever.

The claims of faculty consultation made by the Provost at previous meetings are dubious at best. Cherry-picking faculty for subcommittees does not equal consultation, and such cherry-picking has, in fact, taken place. That much is clear. For how else could we possibly explain the discrepancy between the speed with which this initiative was ran through since the Provost so precipitously signed the consortium agreement last fall and the depth and intensity of faculty misgivings voiced about this initiative now.

Now, in my 22nd year at Duke, I have had ample opportunity to observe a dramatic shift from a culture of timely, inclusive, and unbiased deliberation to a top down management style obsessed with controlling the process with secretiveness and with sheer efficiency. 2U is merely the later symptom of an institution whose administration and faculty no longer see eye to eye on its basic priorities, objectives, and values. Instead what we witness yet again in the context of 2U is, simply put, the displacement of wisdom by power.

The provost tells the Chronicle that he has the right to enter into agreements of such sweeping and potentially troubling curricular implications as 2U, and that he may do so without consultation of the faculty. Perhaps he does, but is it wise? The provost tells us that he has the right to appoint committees as he sees fit, and presumably he does. Is it wise to select members principally on the grounds of their presumed or expressed commitment to a specific outcome? Is it wise habitually to choose the path of least resistance, and to proceed straight towards forging a coalition of the willing, as you would call that phrase from politics, which others then re-translated as a coalition of the bribed and the coerced?

What are faculty to think of an administration that since April 11th has summoned chairs from departments dubious about 2U to sit downs with the dean and the provost? Why try to create converts in back rooms while claiming to favor open consultation of the faculty? Baltasar Gracián advises us that we should always surround ourselves with people from whom we can learn. If our administration followed that most sensible bit of advice, a very different mix of voices would have been found on the committee than the ones that have produced this deeply problematic proposal before us today.

Professor Mark Goodacre (Religion): I am very conflicted on this [proposal.] I simply went to this line because it was near to where I was sitting. My personal views, I am pretty strongly in favor of the proposal. However, I am also council representative and my department has a very slight majority against the proposal. The key things that colleagues remain concerned about are the haste with which the proposal has been put before Council, the issue of faculty governance, and the issue of course approval.

The last one I just want to focus on very quickly. The issue is that some colleagues are concerned that if a course is offered on Semester Online that does not have a religion department tag, it might still be taken by others for general education credit. It is my understanding that we can make representation to the courses committee to say, "We would actually like that not to be taken by Duke students." I am not myself concerned, but I do want to represent fairly my colleagues concerns.

The reason I am personally in favor of it is that, frankly, I would like to teach one of these courses. The other issue is that I have talked to one of our potential partners in the consortium, and she said that her institution had not consulted the faculty at all. They had simply gone into it, so even if we feel that things are a little bit on the hasty side, at least I have not seen consultation quite like this since I have been at Duke in eight years or so. I am reasonably content myself that we are being listened to.

Professor José María Rodríguez García (Romance Studies): Our department has voted overwhelmingly against the proposal. In general, most of my colleagues who expressed their opinion publicly were very concerned, like Rebecca Stein and Thomas Pfau, about the administration's failure to meet the satisfactory horizon of due diligence. I am too, myself, on a personal level.

This year I happened to be serving as the elected member of the department to the Academic Council. I am also the alternate on this council, and I am in the same department as David Bell, the chair of the Advisory Committee on Online Education. Yet, I only found out about this proposal and 2U three weeks before we had our previous meeting. I really think that as an elected member of the faculty, and as a member of the Academic Council I have been kept in the dark.

I just want to say a few things about the issue of the opt-out clause. I want to look at it from the perspective of our department, and the departments of humanities in general, which I think are being treated as simply an exception to the latest curricular reform fostered by a well-meaning administration. I think it is probably not a good idea to dismiss the pedagogical and interpretative specificity of what we scholars who teach in the humanities do. To dismiss it as a minor encumbrance to the new curricular master plan, to look at it as a blemish or an erratum, which may be edited out of the proposal by means of an opt-out is not cognizant. We know that many types of pressures can be put on the faculty and on under-funded projects to conform to the type of technology assisted modes of inquiry that are represented by 2U.

The specific challenges faced by small humanities departments should be factored in as a constitutive dimension of higher education rightly understood. We strongly believe, as a department, that more mindful and cogent attention to the humanities should inform an inclusive discussion on the future of both classroom instruction and online initiatives at Duke.

Professor Charles Becker (Economics): I will try to make this fairly brief. I have three points to make here, the first of which is that delay is strategically unadvisable, because right now we are at a point of maximum bargaining power with 2U to get the kind of program that we like. If we do not go for it now, going for it later we will come back and bargain with them in a weaker position. If we are going to vote it down, we should vote it down now rather than postponing to the Fall when we have inferior options.

My second point is that, in a way, it is like closing the barn door after the horse has bolted. We already accept online courses, because one of our aspirational peer institutions, North Carolina State, which is in the consortium with us offers a lot of online courses, and to my knowledge, we, in principle, accept them. Departments do not have veto power over that.

The third point I would make is that last night I was over at my son's [place] and his girlfriend happens to be a UNC student. I was asking a consumer if she had taken an online course, and her response was "Yes, I have taken one." I think it is probably a 2U course over at UNC, and I asked her how her experience was. Her honest response was that she thought she learned more because [she] could not slide along. She had to be attentive and be a participant, so she said it was not as fun. I think that reflects on her, or at least her evaluation of time. I think pedagogically this is something we, not so much today, but a few years from now, we will find ways of integrating this into our courses and making them better.

Professor Maureen Quilligan (English): I want to make two points. First, just listening to this conversation so far today about the idea of online education, it seems to me that the Duke faculty is clearly very excited about making their own online courses. All of the people who are in favor of it, or many so far, have said, "This is a wonderful opportunity." Lynne's wonderful presentation of what you could do with your classes with all of the bells and whistles made me really want to do an online course. Clearly with the visuals you could get it all. I actually do have a lot of stuff on a PowerPoint that has all of the bells and whistles when I lecture to students, myself, but I see that there are lots of other ways you can go.

I think the major concern here at Duke University is the courses that we, and our students, would have to select from. They would, for the most part, not be like the UNC students who take five years to graduate because they cannot get into classes because they are so full. That is the reason why UNC, quite rightly I think, is serving its student body by offering online courses. That is not a problem with Duke. Our students graduate on time. What we can do is offer them wonderful chances to take online course when there happens to be a lacuna in a course offering for a year when the three people who teach the one class all got fabulous Guggenheims and have to go off.

However, those people are the people who should choose the course, and there are many courses out there. I, for one, would not like to have any Milton course come from anybody that is in the consortium right now, but I do know that John Rogers has a fabulous Milton course that has been publicly available for a very modest amount of money on DVDs. I am the best person, along with Len Tennenhouse, to make the decision about who would [offer] the best Milton course.

Why don't we say we will use the consortium to teach us how to make our own classes, but we will not buy any courses from them without individually selecting what they are? I think it is a bad bargain.

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): I have been elected to this council and to ECASC. I have not been cherry picked. What I want to speak to is the impact that I feel the proposal on the floor is going to have.

Frankly, I feel that the impact is going to be minimal. A Duke student can take one course per semester, with a maximum of four courses over the next two years. The course offerings that are out there at 2U right now will probably not stand up to a Duke review to a large extent. Of the twenty courses you may see, perhaps only ten courses or less will end up on Aces for Duke students to take. The impact the consortium, as it is right now, will have on Duke students is very small. But, it will afford us an opportunity to experiment with the medium, which I think is important to gain experience, data points, and see what works and what does not.

The second point that I wanted to make in favor of this proposal that harkens back to Charlie Becker is that with the proposal on the table as it is right now, we have achieved an unheard of level of autonomy with the position of the departments in how they shape the future of online education at Duke. This is, of course, the result of faculty governance of all of the voices that have been heard here over the last month. This is now a really good opportunity and a really big deal that the faculty of no other university I know of has in terms of the decision power and how to shape online education. I think that we would really be foolish not to take this opportunity.

Professor Wahneema Lubiano (AAAS): I want to start by bringing two comments from colleagues of mine who could not be here. The first is that right now we are talking about opt in and opt out as though these things only affect single departments. Part of Duke's calling card has been that it is interested, supports, and insists on interdisciplinary collaboration. Opt out and opt in works against that, and it will work against departments that are predicated on pulling together small resources from a number of different entities, and whose arc of courses may take two or three years to run through. The second colleague said that it is not as though 2U has invented a magic platform. There are other possibilities for the online future that beckons too many of us. Those are colleagues that I wanted to do justice to.

For myself I wanted to say that we have been unevenly informed and unevenly heard. Some people know a lot, but some people know next to nothing. Some voices have been listened to, some have not. We are also talking about something that has great magnitude to the curriculum, and we are talking about it in the language of negotiating with a commercial entity that will determine, in large part, the shape of our interactions as these things go forward, if they go forward the way that 2U and Duke have currently defined them.

We are clearly good for 2U, but I am not really sure that 2U is good for us. I want us to think about this because locking ourselves in, even for five years, and it will be five years, since three years only gives us the time to say we are pulling out of it, can be devastating to departments in this university. I also want us, while we are thinking about being locked in, to think about the nature of the commercial entity with whom we are locking ourselves in. 2U is the creator of Hooked on Phonics, which itself is a scandal, both in terms of intellectual delivery, and in terms of how it has behaved itself in the commercial arena. The thing that is most important to me is what this means to go into an online future without thinking about its impact on scholars who are in training who will have less clear futures as the consortium grows larger. Delay is only a problem if we think we do not have to think about those things with each other. It is only a problem if we think that 2U's platform is our future.

Professor Clark Bray (Mathematics): It seems clear to me that there is an enormous amount of potential in the idea of online courses. I think there is a very strong argument that it is an inevitability, so with that in mind I would like to make an observation of a point of view that we could take on all of the issues, problems, and complications that we are noting, and instead of viewing them as reasons not to do it, we can consider viewing them as challenges to be overcome, and I think we can.

For example, I have done a lot of technology in my own classroom, and it did create problems. I experimented with a solution that did not work, but then I experimented with a different solution that worked. In this trial and error and keeping an eye on the nature of the problem as it applies to my class, I have improved the offering of my courses dramatically over the last several years. It is not a perfect comparison, of course, but I think there is a point there.

With that spirit in mind, there is one problem that I am concerned about with the online courses, and that is secure testing. If I am giving a math class, and there is a student at Notre Dame who is taking the class, how do I give a timed test with no notes and know that they have followed the rules? That was something that I was very uncomfortable with for quite a while, but I discussed it with a few people, and some pretty interesting ideas came up as possible solutions. There could be testing centers on each campus that wants to participate in this. There could be reciprocal agreements between instructors at the various schools that are willing to trade proctoring duties for the classes that they are offering. That turned from an argument against [this proposal] to not a problem at all, in my mind. I think that all of the problems we are facing, we can deal with.

Professor Jocelyn Olcott (History): There are two things that I really love about Duke. Every time I go away, I am reminded how much I love them. One of them is that it really is a liberal arts college embedded in a research one university, which means that our teaching and our research inform one another. I think our teaching is better and made more dynamic for having the research component, and I think that our research is made more relevant for having to think more about teaching than a lot of our colleagues at more exclusively research one based schools have to.

The other thing I love about Duke is that the ethos of Duke is interdisciplinary, and that shapes the intellectual climate and the teaching. I am concerned that the proposal here will undermine those two aspects of the things I love about

Duke. I appreciate what Mark Goodacre said, but I am concerned that opt in and opt out will set departments against one another. There are plenty of courses that are up there now that could be offered under different departments, and I realize that there is probably friction now over cross listing, but this would make it [have] much more friction.

Mark said he would like to teach one of these courses, but he is actually in the minority in his department. It would put faculty at odds with each other within departments. I think the way to avoid this kind of conflict is to have had more deliberation and to have had true discussion within these kinds of faculty forums. We have yet to have an extended discussion in my department. We had one quick conversation tagged on at the end of a department meeting.

I am concerned about that part of it. I realize that we have now negotiated these options for live teaching, but the fact is that the bread and butter for 2U is to have pre-recorded lectures that they can recycle, which is not a very dynamic understanding of knowledge, and it really goes against what we are trying to do. The final thing is simply a question. I thought what we would what get on April 11th and what I thought we would get here is something more like a search committee report where we would hear about different possible vendors, what the possibilities were, how they chose among those vendors, why they ended up with this one, and how this is better than all of the free services like Piazza, Sakai, and all of the different things we might use. We did not get that yet, and I feel like we need more time to discuss this.

Professor Richard MacPhail (Chemistry): I and my chemistry colleagues, at least the ones who had input, support the proposal. We think there is a real opportunity for trying this out. I read the committee reports, and I think they tried to address many of the questions that were reasonable. I think the assessment plan looks good and if you are going to assess something like this, you really need to do it for three or four years. You are not going to find out in one or two years. Secondly, I think we are finding the idea of enriched course offerings compelling. We do not offer Nuclear Chemistry and I know a Nuclear Chemist at Washington University who might offer a course like that. I think it would be great for our students to have that opportunity.

Professor Cary Moskovitz (Thompson Writing Program): I am on this side to balance out Mark who spoke from the other side about mixed feelings about this [proposal]. I did want to raise two points that I feel at this point have been under-discussed. One is that it seems that the whole issue of expanding the diversity of choices for students raises questions as far as what we think a Duke undergraduate experience should be and how many of the courses that Duke students take ought to be taken with Duke faculty on campus. It seems that this is just one more potential kind of experience for students to have. I think it would be useful for us to have that conversation in a broader context, not just for online courses but other kinds of courses as well. Second, it seems to me that virtually all of the possible benefits of online courses could be had in courses in which the faculty members are actually in real time interaction with the students. I think that maybe we want to think more about whether or not the particularities here gain the maximum in terms of benefits and drawbacks from online.

Professor Mohamed Noor (Biology): I actually was not involved in the 2U initiative at all or any previous discussion, so everything I have heard is just the same things you all have heard as well. A lot of my colleagues on that microphone, and in the handouts we got from Professor Paletz have made a lot of really good points. There are a lot of questions to answer, things like who is going to teach the consortium courses, what is the quality going to be like. This is the tip of the iceberg. There are a billion questions that we are going to need to answer, but we are not going to be able to answer them until we know which ones are relevant and we give it a shot.

That is my opinion of it, because I have actually done an online class, and let me tell you, some of the prep that I did ahead of time was useful, but a lot of it really was not until I actually did it and said, "Oh! This is actually what I really need to figure out, and this thing that I thought would be a problem is not remotely a problem. As several people have pointed out on this microphone, there are not tons of these coming online, and if departments are worried, [you can] opt out for a while, see how it goes, continue your discussions, and ease into it as you are comfortable.

This is an opportunity; it is out there right now. The students want this possibility, and personally I think that we should have faith in the fact that we will be able to react, but we are not going to know how to react until we do the experiment. Several people in my department made the comment: "Where is the control?" The control was the last 100 years. Let's do the experimental part now and see what is going to happen; compare it to the results, compare outcomes, and assess it as we are going. As long as we have faith that is going to happen, which I fully have faith will happen, I think it is going to be great.

Professor Kerry Haynie (Political Science): I am speaking in opposition to the proposal on a number of grounds. First and foremost is the lack of faculty consultation. To get this proposal initially about three weeks before the April 11th meeting was set I think is not a good way to do business. I am not opposed to online courses; I have not heard anyone speak in opposition to that in principle. Even the issues that Mohamed just spoke of, [I think] we can work out those kinks. They are not the ones I am worried about. What will this do to education at Duke? To proceed with an opt in and opt out way might lead us down the road, and I think we are headed this way, in some respects, to a multiversity rather than a university where individual departments or a small group of departments will go in one direction while others go in another. We may want to end up there, and that may be a good thing, but we should do that after deliberation, discussion, and with some thought. I am not sure that we have done this in this case. We have not had time to discuss this, and this may be a great idea. I am interested in this myself, but I am also concerned about what it means for education at a place like Duke University. I think we need to slow down and deliberate, but I do not think we have done that. I have been concerned about the lack of faculty governance in this process.

Professor Steve Craig (Chemistry): I am here representing only myself. For me, my very personal view is pretty simple. I feel like I and my colleagues are very time and resource challenged when it comes to undergraduate teaching. We do not

have time in our courses to give all of the great examples and go into the really high value exercises that we want to. We do not have time in our semester to offer as many courses as we would ideally like to offer. I think the technology offers a potential solution to the first [problem]. As we have pointed out, that technology is available in other ways. I think the consortium offers an opportunity to address the second [issue] in that every course that we bring into our quiver from other institutions creates an opportunity for us to offer something that we would not have been able to offer otherwise. For those reasons I am supportive [of this]. I would also say that as far as all of the challenges go, for me personally, I think the greatest challenge is that any time you do something like this, there is a challenge in the expectation that comes from our undergraduate students that what comes out the other side is better than what went in. I think everyone here is mindful of that, and frankly, I find that to be a very exciting thing about the whole opportunity. I think that, as much as anything, it will encourage us all to raise our game to yet another level.

Professor Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): I am my department's representative, and I bear the responsibility of a "no" vote from everyone, except one abstention, in my department. Many wonderful things have been said about online education, and we support that. I think all of us do, and I think that has been said many times. [There are] a couple of the concerns that have been shared with me, and also that just well up as I listen. One of my colleagues wrote "the offshoring and outsourcing of curricula is, by definition, neo-liberal in its outlook and intent, and it fundamentally entails de-humanizing."

The question comes up: what is the value of education on the Duke campus? By outsourcing what can ultimately wind up to be four courses, in addition to, as it was said at the last meeting, up to twelve courses at Duke when you include study abroad, is problematic when it comes to the problem of what are we doing on campus for our students. Not simply in human contact one-on-one, but what this place represents as a campus.

There are a couple of points that have come up that I think need to be re-emphasized. In particular, why do we have to rush? Pushing to rushed decision-making is always problematic, and I do not mean in the sense that we need to delay decision making, this is an important issue that needs to be decided, but the real question that I think we need to ask is why 2U? This is a very problematic commercial business. Why is it that Duke needs to choose this particular platform to engage in all of these wonderful online initiatives that have really been supported so well on both sides of the room?

Professor Linda George (Sociology): For the record, I never want to teach an online course in my life. That does not mean that other people should not be able to. There are a lot of things that other people do that I would never want to do. I am standing here because my department told me they wanted me to say things whether everybody else had said them or not. I guess they wanted this on the record.

I am here on this side because if this motion does come up today in its current form I am going to vote favorably for it. I want to express the fact that just because that is where we feel the vote should best go, it does not mean we do not have concerns. It does not mean we do not have worries about what this will mean. I loved what Mohamed [Noor] said. Our overall view was this is an experiment. We will learn by doing it; we will learn whether it works, what works, what does not, and if this is the right company, etc.

We feel strongly in our department, and it is not just this, but we think there has to be some reasonable limit on how many courses Duke students can take and get credit for that they do not take at this campus. We should set a limit, be it twenty or twenty-five percent. If we are going to offer these [courses], then students are going to have to take a choice. You can do an online course, but then we are not going to count one of your APs or we are not going to count one of your study abroad courses. We do not want a Duke education to be diluted.

We also have some concerns about what this is going to do to the DUS position. We think that if it is done well, it will bring a lot more work to whomever is in that position, and yet we think it is critical that person have the authority to do all that needs to be done. Finally, and this is probably the sociologists in us, we are somewhat concerned about the casualization of labor. We do not think it is at all clear what rewards faculty members are going to get. Are you going to get residuals if they broadcast your course again? We are concerned, and we think that apparently, this has not been totally worked out. Nonetheless, we think that all in all the best way is to go forward and give it a try.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Colleagues, before our next speaker, I would like to ask for your patience and perhaps extend the meeting for ten to fifteen minutes so that all voices can be heard.

Professor Mark Anthony (AAAS): I am the 2010 Robert B. Cox teaching award winner thanks to Randy Matory. I am someone who has been deeply embedded and committed to alternative pedagogy in digital platforms. These are my concerns, and I want to point out some really interesting ironies. As the university invests in making sure that students in China have face to face contact, we are arguing against that same process for our own students. We have been inundated for the last eighteen months about the power of MOOCs and about "Bass Connections," which I still do not know what it is, yet this proposal comes to us as a thief in the night. Given the neo-liberal realities in which we exist in this moment, I have a hard time not seeing this proposal as part of a deliberate attempt to walk down the size of the Duke faculty.

Dean Peter Burian: I am a humanist, and I share a lot of the questions that people have about online education and the value of online pedagogy in a liberal arts context. Yet I am standing here to urge the members of the council to vote in favor of this proposal. Why? If we ask ourselves what is good and valuable about online education? What are the best practices? What will work in what context? What kinds of courses can profitably be offered online? What sort cannot? What sorts of things might you be able to do online that you cannot do face to face? We do not have the answers. How might Duke answer these questions for Duke? I think this is a kind of Duke moment. One thing we could do is have a limited, carefully monitored, and vigorously assessed pilot project, which would allow a lot of room for experimentation,

and which, over period of a few years, would start to give us the kinds of answers we all want. Guess what? That is, I believe, what is being proposed today.

Professor Michael Gillespie (Political Science): I am really torn about the proposal. I think the idea of online education is a great thing. In fact, eight years ago Mike Munger and I tried to run a course in Second Life, which was an utter disaster. This is obviously a little bit different.

I want to say something about students, because I think we are vastly idealizing our students in taking these courses. My son when he went to visit Brown, as he was thinking about going to school there, did an overnight stay. He came out and he said, "I am never going to school there." I asked why, and he said, "These guys told me that for the first year and a half, I do not even have to go to class because everything is online." He said, "Who would want to go to a school where you do not have to go into class?" I think that is a real question about our students, especially when we give them choices from among the easiest courses they can find at twenty different institutions. I suspect a lot of them, not all, will select out the easiest courses that they can if only to pad their Duke GPA. I think that is a really important question, and it goes to the heart of this.

I think probably I am one of the few people that have ever been in a course of this kind. When I was in high school, I was rated one of the best math students in the area. I was asked to take part in an online televised course. This was the 1960s before the internet. It had all of these built in tests as you go along, and I have to say there was nothing that killed my enthusiasm for math like that [course]. It took me years to get interested in math again. I am sure all of you will be better than that, but just being in that medium makes a big difference in terms of how we are able to teach our students and the kind of enthusiasm we impart.

I think there is a huge difference in the way people teach courses in the sciences, the social sciences and the humanities, and I think that is reflected in the differences here. A lot of people in the sciences do not see that what they are doing now [would be] so different from what they would be doing online. I think for lots of humanists who engage in conversation, and [have] at the center, of course, I think there is a huge difference. I think we should recognize that and try to deal with that.

Professor Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Philosophy): All of the things that I wanted to say as I was standing in line have already been said. There is only one point left to make, which is, I think, about freedom. The chemists want to offer their intro courses in this way, and this can be best for their curriculum and their students. I do not want to stand in the way of that. They know a lot more about teaching chemistry than I do.

I think the same thing applies to me. If I want to teach my courses a certain way, and I am in the humanities, my course fits well into this format. It [the conflict] is not humanities versus sciences, there are people on both sides. I would hope that my colleagues at Duke would respect me and say, "I want Walter to be able to try that out and see if it works." Yet if this proposal is voted down, then we will not have access to this platform that many of our colleagues want access to.

I think the other aspect to freedom of education is for the students. We have a lot of students who want to take these courses. Not every course, nobody wants to spend the first two years without ever going to class. I think very few of our students would want that, and we are not going to let them anyway. The question is whether students who find that they can learn better in these formats should be allowed to do so. They should have access to this for a reasonable number of courses that we can limit. Departments can say, "We are not going to accept that in our department because it does not fit our plans for our department." Departments can do that; they can say "We are not going to let our majors get credit for these courses." It seems to me that a lot of the fear is misplaced here. Duke is not going to fall. Our curriculum is not going to be destroyed by this. It is actually a fairly modest experiment that is going to allow some of our colleagues to teach in the way that they think is best for their subject matter.

Professor Janet Ewald (History): I originally came up here because I wanted to say something in response and opposition to what my highly esteemed colleague, Peter Burian, had said. [He is] one of my favorite faculty members at Duke, and he has been here even longer than I have. But I am going to start with something else, which is, that I want to assure Walter that we do not want to deprive people who want to teach online courses from their platform. We just do not want to do this particular proposal at this particular time. One of the reasons we do not want to do it is because, and this gets back to Peter [Burian], at least I do not feel that this is a good pilot project for evaluating online technology for the wide range of courses we teach at Duke. The original proposal is clearly geared towards large lecture courses where you want to keep track of students absorbing a certain amount of contact information. That is how the presentation by Emma came across. It is good because you could check them to make sure they were getting the content. Many of us across the disciplines do not necessarily teach like that. I have heard, and it was announced, that the CEO of 2U is willing to experiment with a small course. I am sorry, maybe this is my child of both the Wisconsin populace plus the 70s time, but I do not totally trust a CEO who is trying to get a project started. If it is actually in a contract, and I see the contract, which I realize faculty members do not do, I might believe it.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): I do not want to cut off a speaker. I have asked these two colleagues to make their comments very brief. I appreciate your patience colleagues. This is obviously a very important motion.

Professor Chantal Reid (Biology): Last Monday at our meeting, the biology faculty discussed the Semester Online proposal again. Several issues were raised: the assessment of online courses for pedagogy, course overlap, funding support, and the non-Duke course credit for the biology major and for a Duke degree. In principal, the faculty was supportive of the Semester Online, but they required answers to some questions before being able to support this proposal. At the time, the faculty vote was unanimous against the proposal. Since then, the new document with frequently asked questions provided

answers to most of the questions, but not all of them. Some of the answers were not very satisfactory for the faculty. On the assessment and pedagogy issue, the issue of academic integrity was not addressed. That is one that someone else raised here, and that is one that we are concerned about. The trial run, it is a trial, it is not an experiment, and the faculty wanted to see a true experiment being done so we could assess courses online. The faculty was also uncomfortable with the lack of clarity for the long-term funding for the lead faculty instructor. The maximum number of courses for non-Duke credit allowed for a Duke degree still needs to be determined, and the faculty was concerned about that. Overall, the faculty would like more time to consider these issues.

Professor Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): Mark [Goodacre], I am with you. We did not have a chance to talk about this [proposal] in the departmental meeting, but I got the gamut [of opinion]. I had someone e-mailing me saying, if you vote for this I will never be your friend. That was the impression, and I had someone say this is a way to re-define the classroom and we should absolutely be doing this. We had a bell curve that was leaning more towards voting for it, but there were certainly opinions from all sides. Just a couple of things that they were concerned about, was the issue that it is just 2U and that did not have a spectrum of possibilities there. They are not uncomfortable with it being 2U. Another thing is that we actually convened a student group to say, would you take these courses? What would that mean to you? 100 percent of them would like this option. We have been teaching an online course in the summer for the last three years. The general consensus is that very few students want this, but those who do, appreciate having it available. There were only two students in the first year, three students in the second year, and this year we have six. It is not a huge thing, but we have noticed that there is demand for this in the moment. [No further speakers.]

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): I love a meeting where all of the faculty [members'] voices are exhausted. I would like to turn now to Dean Laurie Patton for the dean's report [on the proposal]. Dean Patton has been working endless hours on this project, as you can well imagine. It involves lots of fast-moving intricate pieces of the project, and it is still administratively under discussion. We want to hear what you have to say, Laurie.

Dean's Corner

Dean Laurie Patton: When I was first thinking about coming to Duke, someone whispered in my ear that the Arts and Sciences Council was not a relevant body of deliberation. I think today we have proven rather differently. To set the stage for my comments today, I first want to define what I believe to be my role as the Dean of the faculty of Arts and Sciences. It is my charge and responsibility to interpret and make a case for Arts and Sciences in a larger context in the university. In that vein, I have spent much of the last weeks in conversations with faculty, administrators, and online executives working to generate options and common ground as we move forward. As the provost well knows, my job is also to create a clear voice for Arts and Sciences distinct from the provostial perspective, at times in alliance and at times in contrast to it.

We are attempting to build a common ground in something rather less than terra firma. It is always shifting beneath our feet. We share this with every other institution of higher education in the United States. The online for-credit conversation is happening across academia. Beyond Duke the larger landscape is fast-moving, complex, and constantly changing. On this particular issue, for example, we have compelling unfolding events. We have Washington University voting positively last week in their faculty forum like ours to join the consortium. We have Amherst against being a portal for edX contrary to one report from the Amherst provost saying they are still in touch with 2U. We have 2U winning an educational innovation award at ASU for outstanding content and university partnerships. We have people who feel that online awards are not terribly valuable. We have people cheering, booing, and watching on the sidelines.

Where are we with online learning? Studies have shown that hybrid model combining face-to-face time with some online delivery mechanism is one of the most effective ways to learn. Hybrid courses, whether they are flipped classrooms, online quizzes, or full-blown degrees have the powerful potential to supplement our traditional teaching models; and they have downfalls if they are adopted uncritically. Here at Duke we view them as supplemental only.

One study says some employ the online platform as a repository of traditional didactic material, while others believe e-learning represents a major tool to which they can involve students. Some hold doubts about its potential effectiveness. The collective data show that blended learning provides the most encouraging results from every point of view with regard to education and communicative skill. More specifically, the best results have been achieved through the co-existence of the following factors: blended learning, a large and diversified number of learning opportunities, widespread and active use of online communication tools, and the support of at least one didactic or technical tour. I think this study is a good one and as a dean I will commit to making sure all of these elements are present if we decide to move ahead. We are seeing emerging communities, learners, and teachers across the social sciences, the sciences, and the humanities and each of them have their own particular pedagogical challenges. I think this framework gives us the opportunity to address each challenge in an appropriately critical manner.

Secondly, my job as dean is to ensure that departments who want to participate can do so in a way that advances their curricular goals; and equally important, I want to ensure that departments who do not want to participate at that moment can advance their curricular and pedagogical goals and those of their faculty members by deliberating on a variety of options. The opt-in possibility we have heard about is practically and symbolically important. I also have some experience in mediating between departments. I guarantee you that will be one of my major roles if the opt in proposition has that effect.

Departments who choose not to participate in the Semester Online will not be disadvantaged in any way. Those departments are free and encouraged along with all of the departments to develop online learning approaches through other

platforms. I will encourage and support that to the fullest extent possible. Departments who participate will not be unduly advantaged. That is the point of our multiple engagements, and I want to stress that we already have multiple engagements online; this is simply one among many.

Third, a dean's job is also to ensure that every educational platform is driven by the goals of a liberal arts education. Liberal arts must drive technology, not the other way around. That was one of the topics of our first faculty forum and we are moving forward on any number of fronts in pursuit of this goal. Through new teaching awards and other forums of recognition, through support for innovation, and in my recent conversations about opportunities and collaborative possibilities, I have pursued this liberal arts goal.

I want to make sure that we have an opportunity as an elite liberal arts institution to lead and design the next steps in using online technologies in support of a liberal arts education. Whether we move forward or not, I will meet with any department at any time, or with any individual to continue critical reflection, to revise and re-submit, which is a key part of this particular pilot, to do research, and to encourage any form of critical engagement so that our online possibilities are the best they can be at Duke.

I want to point out and address some of the public debates about this issue. I welcome this debate and have found it useful as I have listened to faculty concerns. I also think that the fact that we are here today is a testimony to the vitality of faculty engagement and governance, imperfect as it sometimes can be. Thank you for being a part of the Duke public sphere.

I did want to address some key things. The first is about profit and non-profit. The Semester Online consortium is a nonprofit entity of nonprofit institutions interested in engaging a for-profit company to provide an internet service. 2U is a for-profit platform provider similar to Cisco and Blackboard. Second, 2U has no ownership over course content. The faculty member owns and controls the content. The consortium of universities retains control over course offerings, course content, and course admissions. We are talking about joining a consortium.

Third the university consortium controls membership in the consortium itself. 2U is not a member of this consortium. The schools who are members of the consortium control the curriculum, coordinating within the consortium, consulting about the curriculum, and advocating for their own interests and faculty concerns. 2U's platform is simply the delivery mechanism like Cisco or Blackboard. Fourth, there is no connection between our budgetary challenges, the question of faculty size, and our discussion about participating in Semester Online. As I mentioned in our open faculty forum two weeks ago financial sustainability has been an issue since I arrived at Duke before Semester Online became a possibility.

Beyond those key points, there are important concerns that faculty have raised that I share. I share the concern about the potential for casualization of labor. As an elite university, Duke has been more successful than public universities in broadly stemming this trend. I think Semester Online could create an opportunity for us to give graduate students a major priority as course section leaders, providing them with training in a key pedagogy that is certainly going to be a part of the future of academia. We can choose to go for our graduate students. This helps make our students more marketable for their skill set, and the graduate school is willing to train and prepare our students in this area. Here I am simply stating an opportunity, nothing more. We have no more conversations about this, but I think we can work together to create a unique environment that goes against the casualization of labor in this way.

I also think it is worthwhile to put the scope of the Semester Online endeavor into perspective. We teach roughly 2000 course every semester. At current operating capacity, the Semester Online consortium of universities might offer between fifty and 100 courses. Through Semester Online Duke could provide at most four or five courses each semester. The ratio of online to campus-based courses is very small. Further, putting numbers aside, as we work with faculty over the last weeks departments retain absolute and irrevocable control over what courses our students can take for credit and whether they can count towards student majors. We can do now exactly what Maureen Quilligan said earlier by not taking any courses and still using 2U to create new platforms. We could do exactly that if that is what we wanted to do.

I am also deeply committed to limiting the number of classes that students can take from outside Duke. The current policy is no more than ten classes, and we will address this issue immediately if we decide to move forward. My hope is that a consultation with the key committees in Arts and Sciences council would keep that limit and include the Semester Online courses within that limit.

In my conversations with 2U in trying to represent all of the key faculty concerns that I have heard, I have advocated specifically for options that can help us lead in creating and critiquing new forms of technology deployment. I hear your suspicions about the CEO of 2U. I do have the e-mails, and as the Provost can tell you, I hold people accountable.

2U is not willing to aid us in developing a single class. 2U is willing to aid us in developing many small platform, synchronous, limited enrollment seminars with Duke Professors in the lead if we wanted to do so. One faculty member suggested this as the way we could move forward alternatively. 2U is providing that alternative. As in the pilot that I have been delighted to be a part of in Arts and Sciences for lesser taught languages, which faculty have engaged and students have supported, 2U is willing to work with tele-presence, real time small enrollment classes, and to help connect via tele-presence to other classes at partner universities. The key thing here is that we do this almost every day with the Beaufort lab. Now we get to do it as part of the provisions.

Third, 2U will work with any faculty member on the creation of new platforms for both curricular and extra-curricular innovation. Whatever we want to do, however we want to do it, inside or outside of the classroom, 2U will

support that. Finally, as we have heard in a number of conversations, there could be real advantages in creating consortia agreements between members within the 2U consortium and how we might rotate large introductory classes in any number of disciplines so that we can gain a larger arena for our topics, whatever they might be. 2U is willing to help us facilitate that as well as facilitate the online delivery of how that might work best. We can plan our curriculum accordingly so that we know when we are teaching our courses and when others might be teaching them.

As the Dean, I am also willing, in the case where there are students from Duke who are taking a course from another university that has been approved, to connect those students with the relevant department, if they so wish, to make sure they know what other offerings are also available from that department.

I have heard from Duke faculty, and share the view, that class size is deeply ingrained in Duke's educational values. Today 80 percent of our classes have fewer than 30 students and 67 percent have fewer than 20. Using online technology does not have to mean fewer face to face classes, and in some ways, it can mean the opposite, as Steve Craig and others have spoken with the flipped classroom. While I am dean, I will work to increase the number of small classes to greater than 80 percent simply because it is the right thing to do. In other words, whatever happens in future years, we will continue online face to face learning.

I also wanted to say something important about assessment, which is another key concern that I have heard from faculty. The Arts and Sciences council has developed an assessment plan. The Semester Online courses will be comprised of both new pedagogies and new formats with traditional pedagogies, and as a result an extra layer of assessment is necessary. Courses will be assessed with the same instrument with which regular Duke courses are assessed. The members of the consortium are now engaged in a conversation about a shared assessment instrument, and Duke will comply with that consortia recommendation.

In addition, we are going to make an extra layer. Semester Online courses will have pre and post-assessments to measure the change in learning, expectations, and motivations for Semester Online students. This will be conducted by the Arts and Sciences committee that will be appointed for this purpose. Duke will conduct focus groups of Duke's Semester Online students to discuss and assess the experience. It will follow up with the students after one semester and one year. It will not only monitor Duke student's experiences but also gather evaluations from other students taking Duke classes using Duke, Semester Online, and independent instruments. Duke will evaluate instructor experiences also in pre and post assessments.

I think part of what we are continuing to develop is precisely those issues around academic integrity; we have assessment instruments for those online classes and we will able to address them quite effectively. I also think it is important for us to engage an outside perspective in evaluation as well as Duke's perspective.

Finally, 2U is working with several universities who are considering membership in the consortium who are our full peers in the top ten ranking working on a controlled experiment comparing Semester Online classes with in-person and hybrid classes to find the best form of learning for students. I know this is important for us to look at, and it is a key way to drive the process.

I want to end by referring to conversations I have had with faculty over the past three months. From an economics professor, I have heard that Semester Online would facilitate building an urban planning, economics, and design concentration at Duke by coordinating courses with other programs. In biology one professor spoke about the ways in which students could appreciate having the primary content delivered asynchronously online in video format; personal and approachable, and yet adjustable and flexible. Then the class period synchronous is for actual discussion so they have the opportunity to ask detailed questions and have concepts reinforced with activities directly. A humanities professor has spoken about the potential of developing new iterative learning in historical visualizations online that would be explored with multiple pedagogical perspectives that may contribute to new knowledge production that cuts across multiple fields and disciplines.

The critics of Semester Online have had very legitimate concerns that we need to pay attention to. We need to pay attention to pedagogy. We need to make sure that departments have control and enrollments are not affected. We need to embed this within faculty governance. I think this can be about faculty leadership.

As I have been listening to you, and as I have been in conversation with 2U and the provost, I have tried to create the optimum conditions and opportunities for faculty leadership and faculty critique. Right now we have several courses that will be scrutinized thoroughly. It is a voluntary system of course offerings that will undergo rigorous review from the department to the Arts and Sciences level.

We have an extraordinary amount of control. We can maintain Duke in-person dialogical pedagogy at same rate. In fact, while I am dean I will work to increase it. We can control exactly how we use the Semester Online pedagogy, and how we give credit for any courses, if at all. We can now create new pedagogies online for free with this platform's help. We can take our time thinking about it at our own pace and with our own criteria. We could not participate at all and adopt an entirely new platform.

We have concerned faculty who will be engaged in a committee to monitor these courses on a semester by semester basis with changes being made and implementation along the way depending on what is working and what is not. We will have annual reviews. It is essential that we have constructive critics that are key partners in conversation as we move forward and that they can shape our next steps. Most importantly, we have a proposed system that is enabling for all departments however they want to think about online learning. I will be willing to meet with anyone at any time about these

issues as we move forward. As you see already, I respond rapidly and quickly to any concerns and issues that come up. I think we can proceed as the way opens and try this voluntary and limited pilot. Thank you very much.

Voting

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): I sense that representatives may be ready to vote on the motion before the council. Let me bring the motion back up so we are quite clear of what we are voting on.

Professor Randy Matory (Cultural Anthropology): I move to table it, and I do so with deep ambivalence because I myself have been convinced by many of the arguments in favor and many of the arguments against. I would feel very bad about voting "no" on this proposition because that would suggest a disapproval of the general intent to advance the best online courses that we could. However, it is clear to me that fully half of the people who spoke either feel that they do not have sufficient information, or their information is so discrepant with the information available to those on the other side that it is not time for a vote on such a motion. In a true and non-abusive spirit of a motion to table the outstanding motion, I feel that we need more time in order to deliberate on this vote, and therefore vote on it in good faith and in full knowledge. It is not, therefore, in disapproval of the motion, but rather in pursuit of a general and thorough knowledge of what we are voting on by all parties involved. In that spirit, I would like to move to table this motion until the next faculty meeting.

Professor Anne Allison (Women's Studies): I second

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): The motion is not debatable. It will carry if a majority of representatives vote in favor [of it]. The motion that stands before us is to table [the proposal until] the faculty council resumes in September. All those in favor indicate by raising your blue card please? I would like two representatives from the council to help me count [the votes]. Clark [Bray], you are a mathematician, and Dalene [Stangl], you are from statistics. May I ask for the votes to table the motion? [There are] ten in favor to table it. Those opposed please raise your card. [There are] sixteen against. Abstentions? [There is] one abstaining vote. The motion fails.

I sense that colleagues are ready to have the question called. Let me say what we are voting on. A "yes" vote would be in favor of the motion that is here on the screen. Let me read it for you. A "yes" vote would indicate support for the motion that "The Executive Committee moves to accept the recommendations of the Courses Committee on the policies governing online courses. It is a three year pilot project to be monitored and reviewed by an Arts and Sciences faculty committee in collaboration with the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Each department will decide whether and when to opt in to the pilot project." A vote "no" is a vote against adopting this proposal. We will carry out this [vote] by secret written ballot. I am going to ask Shawna Kaufman if she would distribute ballots to representatives.

There are thirty-two votes to count, and I have asked Clark Bray and Dalene Stangl to count the votes. I will announce the outcome, if you would wait for a moment. Have all of the ballots been gathered? I am going to ask our mathematician and statistician to count the ballots, and when they have a result I will announce it. The ballots have been counted. [There are] fourteen "yes" votes, sixteen "no" votes, and two abstentions. The motion does not carry. The floor recognizes Bill Seaman.

Professor Bill Seaman (Art History): [I make the following motion:] Whereas Duke faculty [members] encourage and embrace online innovation, therefore be it resolved that Duke faculty remain committed to continue their current practice of exploring and adopting a variety of online platforms with which to deliver the highest quality liberal arts education.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Is there a second?

Professor Steffen Bass (Physics): Seconded.

Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Any discussion or debate? A majority of representatives are present to vote. Those representatives, who are in favor of this motion, please indicate by raising your cards. Those who oppose the motion as read? There is one against. *The motion carries.* Before we adjourn I would like our dean to say one final word in our meeting.

Dean Laurie Patton: I want to thank everybody for being a part of this process. The one thing that is very important to me, as you know, and is extremely important for us as we move forward, is our working on a collaborative model of decision making. I do not want this conversation to be about the faculty vs. the administration. I want this to be about us moving forward with creative possibilities for online education, and I know we are all really excited about that. I want to make sure that you know that even though I thought this would be a good thing worth trying, I am totally committed to working with everyone as we move forward on multiple sets of platforms, and I want to thank everyone for their participation.

Meeting Adjourned