

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, December 5, 2013

Call to Order

Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History): Let me welcome you all to the December meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council. I appreciate your being here this afternoon as I recognize not only do we have a scheduling conflict with the academic council, but we also have this shortened period after a very late Thanksgiving and I realize your plate is full. So, thank you for making the effort to come today.

Approval of Minutes

First off on our agenda, as usual, is a review of the minutes from our last meeting in November. They are up on the website if you have had a chance to review them. Do I hear any corrections or amendments to those minutes? Do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

Linda George (Sociology): So moved

Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology): Seconded

Thomas Robisheaux (History): All those in favor? Thank you very much; the motion carries unanimously, so the November minutes are now in the archives.

Announcements and Updates

I have couple announcements today. Today's council meeting spotlights a couple of issues for discussion. You may have noticed in looking over the agenda that the executive committee has deliberately cleared the agenda for us to talk about, stand back, and take stock of two really important issues of faculty business. Before we do that I want to make a couple of announcements, and we do have one substantive proposal to introduce to the council today. First off, I think you are unaware of this, but our committees have been very active and busy. Our course committee is now enlarged, and had, if I understand this correctly, completed reviewing of all new course proposals by the middle of October or so, and we feel pretty good about that.

The curriculum committee has taken on a number of really important issues, and you will be hearing about one or two of them in our discussion today. I anticipate for next month, if the executive committee approves, [that there will be] a proposal coming to the floor of the Arts and Sciences Council proposing the number of Duke courses necessary for graduation; that is, how many courses overall, and how many Duke-originated courses are necessary for that. That was one of the pieces in last year's discussion of a Duke education and online courses in particular. That had not been worked out as a policy matter, and the curriculum committee has made that a first priority this fall. The global education for undergraduates committee has already reviewed it, and I understand from talking to Suzanne Shanahan that they have just approved it, so I anticipate that coming to the council very shortly.

There will be some other issues coming next semester, so just a heads up for you. I have been talking with the people who run Bass Connections, and I want them and also faculty members from departments that are actively involved in it to discuss how BASS connections is actually working as an innovation in the curriculum. In February or March I will have a report from the faculty research committee. As you know, that committee was reconstituted last year under the leadership of professor Valeria Finucci. Valeria has breathed life into the committee: it has a full complement, they have been thinking about their mission, and I have asked her to come before council and explain some of the mysteries of applying for research and conference support from the research committee. That has not been done for a couple of years and we wanted to make that as transparent as we possibly can.

You are going through the online course evaluation process right now. I know yesterday in my class I got out my laptop with my students and it went flawlessly. We were done in ten or fifteen minutes, it was very easy, and there were no

glitches. I hope you are having a similar experience, but I also want to call your attention to the fact that we will be asking early next year for a report on how this first experience with the online course evaluations went. We will throw it open for your questions, comments, and views to get a sense of how it has gone for faculty because that is an important priority.

Brazilian and Portuguese Studies Proposal

Let me turn to our first item of business, which is a proposal for a new undergraduate major. I will report very briefly on behalf of the executive committee. They have met and discussed the proposal that originated in the romance studies department for a new undergraduate major in Brazilian and Portuguese Studies. I want to report that we are very satisfied with the whole process, since our primary job on the executive committee is to make sure the due diligence is paid to the proposal before it comes to the floor of the council. It does not mean that we do not identify things that may generate some discussion, but it was carefully prepared, as you can tell from the proposal you have read by Richard Rosa in Romance Studies.

The curriculum committee met and discussed it several times this fall. It came to the executive committee in November, and we wanted to put it on the agenda after having approved it. One of the things I just want to say by way of complimenting Professor Rosa about this major is that it is a humanities major that reaches out and includes in a systematic way all kinds of components that cross the schools. I think this is really innovative for a humanities major, because one of the things we talked about on the executive committee, with the emphasis on Brazil in particular, is the collaboration with the public policy school and with the Nicholas School for the Environment. We thought this was a fascinating and exemplary way for a humanities major to incorporate in an organic and integral way sciences, policies, and social sciences right into the core of this major.

Without any further ado, let me introduce our colleague Professor Richard Rosa, who is the chair of the romance studies department. He has brought a couple of colleagues from the department who will be at the center of this new major in teaching and managing it, and then we will have our first discussion. I do not anticipate any vote on this proposal, as the council seems to have become fond of the recently invented tradition of having a proposal come before the council in one month, waiting for a month to digest, reflect, and discuss, and then come and vote if called for in the next meeting.

Professor Richard Rosa (Romance Studies): First of all, I want to thank the former chair of the romance studies department, Roberto Dainotto, and Deborah Jenson who was the DUS when this whole process started last year, and also our new Brazilian studies colleagues who, when they arrived at Duke, immediately started working on this.

This is something that is very appealing to us, and we are very enthusiastic about the possibility of having this new major. The romance studies department is committed to a global education that is focused on the study of language and culture. To this day we have majors in French and francophone studies, Italian studies, Spanish, Latin American, and Latino studies, and in romance studies. This new major in Brazilian and Portuguese studies will not only complete the romance studies department, but it will also complement a whole area of the work that is represented by this language. For us, this is more than adding a new major; it is completing the whole project as a department.

The rush for doing this at this moment is due to several more global reasons. One of them has to do with the growing importance of Brazil as a country that has become one of the most important economic locales in the world, and we are aware that the study of Portuguese and Brazilian language and culture will become more important in next few years. Brazilians have joke where they say, "Brazil is the country of the future, and it will always be." This time, the future is now. The importance of Brazil is not only in terms of the Brazilian economy, but also in many different areas such as science, technology, energy, and the environment. Brazil has become a place that is interesting for scholars to research and explore further, and for students who are also interested in those areas, this will be a very appealing major. The second reason is that there is an interest in Brazilian studies coming from different disciplines and professions, and there are more substantial reasons for doing this now. One of them is the world cup, which will take place in Brazil, but also other events that will focus on Brazil that will provide an opportunity to start off strongly in this major.

There are also more local reasons at Duke, which have to do with the presence of a significant and enthusiastic group of scholars who are interested in Brazil all across campus and who are working in different disciplines in different schools. The second local reason for doing this now is that there has been a continual increase in the number of students enrolling in language classes in Portuguese. It has been consistent for the last few years, and I think this is the moment in which we need to go to the next step. Also at Duke there is the recent creation of a Brazilian initiative, which is an initiative that my colleagues would want to talk about, that will also work along with the department of romance studies to see how we can complement each other.

The fourth reason at Duke is the recent hiring of new tenure-track faculty in the department of romance studies, which is something that has started this process, and it will provide us with the resources for developing and sustaining this major. I want to introduce our two new colleagues. One of them is Gustavo Furtado who is coming from Cornell University; he works on Brazilian and contemporary cinema. The other is Professor Lamonte Aidoo, who is coming from Brown University, and he works on 19th and 20th century Brazilian culture and literature. They will talk more about how this major was conceived.

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): There is not too much to add to that introduction, just that the Brazilian initiative is going to be bringing speakers from Brazil and it is going to be creating connections with Brazil and Duke through the university systems by sending students to Brazil, bringing students back here, and bringing scholars as well. We should expect in the next year or two to see much more exchange between Brazil and Duke than we have ever seen before.

The major can help and capitalize on the initiative that is going to be happening. Beyond that, I think the thing that is important to underscore is that we envision a major that is appealing to a broad range of students, not just the students who are interested in Brazilian culture, be it cinema, literature, or whatever, but students who might be in the Nicholas School, or who might be envisioning a career in law or in business but who want to get a strong grounding, not just in the language, but in an informed cultural and historical understanding of Brazil. We designed a major so that almost half of the courses can potentially be taken outside of the department, as long as they focus on Brazil. [It is] using the resources that are already at Duke like Professor John French and Paul Baker, who are in different fields, and [it is] using what we already have in the department: the language program that is established, the study abroad program that is already established, and Lamonte, me and Professor Gabara as well to provide the basis for a culturally informed understanding of Brazil.

Lamonte Aidoo (Romance Studies): Just to add to what Gustavo said, many of the students that are already enrolled in the language courses are students in science and law. What we want to do with this program is to cultivate the already existing interest in Brazil and to further enhance collaboration that is essential to the Duke culture here. Ideally, by working with these exchanges with Brazilian universities and working on bringing Brazilian scholars here, we want to continue to provide opportunities for students to study not only Brazil but also the other half of the major, which are Global Portuguese studies. We also want to bring in scholars from lusophone Africa and open up other Portuguese-speaking communities to students and faculty around campus.

Discussion

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Why don't we turn now to those council representatives who are present and who may have questions, comments, or observations?

Margaret Humphreys (History): This all sounds very fascinating, and I am hearing more in the application about why faculty want it, but back when we were considering a South Asian institute and major we heard student demands. They were speaking in front of the academic council and they were demanding these things. Can you give us student demand for this major? Are there program II students like there were in Global Health who pushed that major?

Richard Rosa (Romance Studies): I want to introduce Luciana Fellin who is our DUS in the romance studies department, and she might answer that question.

Luciana Fellin (Romance Studies): We have seen steadily growing numbers in enrollment, and specifically in the spring we have an accelerated course, which is predictive of interest and grounding in a language, it is at 20+ on the waitlist and [there is] another elementary course at sixteen. We have not had that in the past, and looking to the future [we can see that] student demand is there.

Karin Shapiro (AAAS): How many faculty [members] are involved in Global Portuguese Studies through the university? What is the mission of the Brazilian initiative, and what will the link be to the romance studies program?

Richard Rosa (Romance Studies): In terms of the faculty in the romance studies department there is a core faculty with Professor Magda Silva, who is in charge of the language courses, and Professors Gustavo and Lamonte Aidoo who will deal with the main parts of the major. Also Professor Esther Gabara, who is in Mexican and Brazilian studies, and she was also involved in the process of doing this major. There was an enthusiastic response that we had from faculty across the university that was incredible, which goes from professors in anthropology and in history, like John French, who will also be very involved in the major, and also the ones who worked on the Brazilian initiative, like Paul Baker. There are other professors as well.

Lamonte Aidoo (Romance Studies): To comment on the student interest, I should say that currently we have ten students who are freshman who are interested in majoring, and this is the result of the vibrant language program that Magda Silva has already created. We want to capitalize on this interest, and there is interest not only by freshman but also by students who have already studied abroad in Brazil and who would like to major in Portuguese. We have a couple of students who are wanting to do that now, so we do have quite a few students in the initial stages who are interested in the major. As for lusophone Africa, I work on that, and I should mention that we are also working with our colleagues in the Thompson writing program, particularly Brenda Baletti, who works on Cape Verde. She is also going to be essential in helping us build up the Global Portuguese part of the program. I also offer a course on Brazil and Lusophone Africa, so what we want to do is not solely focus the major on Brazil, but also look at Brazil in relation to the rest of the global Portuguese community.

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): The global aspect is very important in the way we envision the major, as for the Brazil initiative, you should speak to John French directly about what the vision is, because I was not the director of that. I can say that their goal is to increase the exchange between Brazil and Duke, and to make Duke more visible in Brazil than it is now. How that is going to affect us in the major is that it has brought together all of the folks at Duke who are interested in working with Brazil. We now have a lot of leg-work already accomplished and know the faculty who, in some cases, had not even met who were working on similar topics that were related to Brazil. We are going to be contributing to what they are doing, and vice versa, and they have been very enthusiastic about the major.

Dean Lee Baker: I want to answer Margaret's earlier question about student demand. There is no real correlation between student lobbying and subsequent demand, since the demand for that fell off completely, but there does seem to be a correlation between study abroad programs that students can take for their ten away [credits] and continuing to do second or first major. This has a robust study abroad program, so I am confident that you will yield some of those folks who have gone through Portuguese and have done study abroad, because they are halfway there. My question is for Professor Rosa,

romance studies is distinctive in terms of having classes with high demand for the language requirement and less demand for classes in the major. In terms of simply managing a brand new major, do you have any mitigation strategies? Can you think through creatively how this will not reproduce some of the challenges that other language programs have in your department?

Richard Rosa (Romance Studies): That is a good question, and I think one of the advantages of creating a major is that you can improve on what you already have. This major was conceived so that some of these continuities between the language program and the advanced courses would not repeat. That is the reason why in the process of conceptualizing it we took into consideration that these students were going to be doing this major along with a second major, and how they will have the opportunity of going into the more advanced course as a continuation of the language courses. I think that this will provide a different model compared to the other majors, and each major can learn from this depending on what the outcome is for the Brazilian and Portuguese Studies major.

Dean Srinivas Aravamudan: This is a comment along with information rather than a question. I just want to say as Dean of Humanities that I very strongly endorse and hope that the council supports this proposal. We have made a major strategic investment in this area. I just want to point out that we could hire two excellent professors, Furtado and Aidoo, because of bridge funds from the Mellon Humanities Writ Large grant because we identify Brazil as a strategic priority in terms of the future of the humanities. Furthermore, there is a significant interest, and people might recognize this already, in environmental humanities because of the way in which students are thinking about not only the Amazon, but culture, literature and those areas, and we see those synergies working well if the right major is mounted.

Of course people know about the degree to which Brazil is going to have much more attention with both the World Cup and the Olympics, and I think some student demand links with external events of that nature. That is a step; it is not the main reason to do it, but it is good timing. In terms of good timing, let me say very shortly in the next few days there will be another major announcement around this that would be very significant in relation to Humanities Writ Large and the Franklin Humanities Institute that would potentially help bring even more students to connect between the Brazil initiative and the major if the major were to be approved. I just wanted to give a hint that there will be a significant announcement, but I do not want to make it.

Dean Laurie Patton: I have a small comment to everyone. First, I want to note that the dean of humanities has suggested that we be driven by sports in the planning of our curriculum, but more importantly, I want to give some historical context. Even though I was not here, I really love learning the histories of departments at Duke, and the thing that romance studies is to be commended for is realizing that the comparative focus of their four languages is what made them distinctive. When they decided to make that comparative focus their form of distinction it allowed them to flourish, and they are now one of the most highly ranked romance language programs in the country. They already were, but they pushed it up yet another level. I think that was wonderful collective reasoning and intellectual engagement on their part, and it took a lot of bravery because I know other romance language departments and they do not necessarily do this.

I think that this fourth plank for the four languages is something that not only departments should absolutely have the permission from us to do, but it also solidifies that comparative approach, because the way they have designed the major has been so comparative. In your historical trajectory of thinking comparatively amongst these four languages and culture areas, this major is the final step. I wanted to make sure folks knew that, and the only other thing that I would encourage for the future is the emerging economies. I think some engagement with economics on this would be really interesting; [to have] a working group for the South Asian-ists, the Sinologists and the Brazilian-ists around emerging economy questions would be fascinating, particularly as it relates to culture.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): One of the things about a discussion like this is the opportunity for council representatives to learn about what their colleagues are doing in other departments and how they are imagining majors. This is an opportunity for us to recognize just how vibrant Brazilian and Portuguese studies has become within Romance Studies. At this point, we will move on to another item of business unless there is one last question that you would like to have clarified today before we do so.

Chantal Reid (Biology): You mentioned that courses outside of the department could be taken for the major, and there is a list of extra-departmental faculty [members] that contribute. Do you have some idea of the numbers of courses that already exist that would count for the major in other departments?

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): I do not remember it off-hand but we do have it on paper and I can provide that if you like.

Lamonte Aidoo (Romance Studies): I think there is a list...

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I think it is in the proposal.

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): We also envision that changing over time, and we envision it as being something that is not constant. There is always going to be some offerings of Brazilian courses, and what the Brazil initiative and hopefully the Global Brazil Lab will do is help us connect those loose dots that otherwise we would not be aware of. From now on I think we are going to be aware of courses on Brazil that are happening, and [we will] be able to collaborate much more than ever before; that is part of the plan.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): If a colleague finds a course is not on your list, can they send you a note?

Gustavo Furtado (Romance Studies): Absolutely.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Please tell your colleagues to check over the list of courses, because they will want to know that their course is also part of this proposal for a new major in Brazilian and Portuguese studies. Thank you very much.

Online Learning: Where are we Now?

Our next item of business is just a discussion, and I think it is an important one. In its last meeting the executive committee, recognizing that we have had a lot of faculty forums, committee work, and high visibility of some speakers as to the issue of online teaching and learning in general, thought it would be good time to see how council representatives see the discussions that have been going on. What is the state of the discussion now? It is a moment to pause and reflect because next month, and you will be hearing more about this, the executive committee is asking all of you representatives to compile a report of some kind to send onto us, which we will make available. We have two reports already; the history department led the way with the first one and Dick MacPhail just sent me the chemistry department's report. We deliberately did not give you a particular format for this, because we really wanted to see what the interests, goals, and discussions would look like within your own department.

In introducing this, if I can, let me summarize my own sense of a couple of things. When, in the spring of this year, we began discussing the proposal for a consortium of universities that would be part of a semester online program, a number of issues were quickly attached to it that were difficult for many of us to disentangle from each other. In the final resolution of the council on April 25th, which you can see the interim report that we have put together for you in one of the handouts; it is also up on the Sakai site, you will notice that the council heartily endorsed faculty innovation and experimentation in online learning [in order] to figure out what might work best for faculty members in departments as they think about incorporating these technologies into their pedagogies.

In the summer and early fall the Executive Committee put together a four-pronged approach. One involves policy issues, and I have mentioned one that is already going to be coming to the council next month, but there are probably some other policy issues. Dean Inge Walther has been made responsible in the dean's office for thinking through some of the policy issues that might be associated with online courses, and you may be seeing some more proposals come up. We need to disentangle all of the policy issues into the appropriate categories and take them in a deliberate fashion.

The other thing we recognized that faculty and council members needed and wanted was more information about what is going on at Duke, what is being done right now, the different kinds of platforms that are available, and some breathing space just to talk about whether an online dimension to a course makes sense to a particular faculty member's instruction. We have had a whole string of faculty forums this fall. The last one was on Tuesday afternoon; unfortunately it was not as well attended as I had hoped it might be, though I know this week is a difficult one for everybody. Actually, that was by far the best, the most interesting, and the most diverse and the sharpest points of view came from our students. We will have the video recording of that faculty forum up on our website as soon as we get it, and the November 15 recording, which is also delayed, will be up there as well. I encourage you to take a look at these when you can, because I know that not everyone can come to the forums.

The other thing that we wanted to be clear about is that we would be reporting back to you about all of these activities, so if you have not seen the report of all that has been going on please take one. When a colleague says, "What is going on?" you can say, "This is where we are right now." Right now there are no proposals before the executive committee or the curriculum committee, except for the number of courses that count towards a degree, which you will be seeing soon. The discussion is relatively wide open right now about a whole range of issues involving online pedagogies.

Let me begin the discussion with one thing that I have learned that I just wanted to pass on to you. A year ago I had no idea that I would learn this much. I have to confess that reluctantly, because I had no interest in this subject twelve months ago. I have become progressively more interested in some of the possibilities, but I wanted to share with you one of my minor revelations, and that is that there is no single discussion anymore. There are many discussions that have gone out into departments and programs; it is not one that is just focused at one place in Arts and Sciences council. One of the things that is so characteristic of it is that I have learned to let go of stereotypes. I realized in the spring, for example, that when I thought of online learning I had the stereotype of a MOOC in my head. I have learned that is not just wrong, but it is confusing and misleading for me when I think about it, and I think it is for others when they begin to realize that there are many different approaches that are being used right now in Duke instruction.

I had this very useful way of thinking about courses; when we say an online course, we often do not know what we mean by that. It is just a placeholder for lots of very different pedagogies, so when some people say online, this is the full-blown hard definition of a course for credit that involves eighty percent of the content delivered online. I think that is a useful way to think of it, but most of the courses that are using online pedagogies here at Duke are blended. They are using a wide variety of integrated pedagogies from the flipped classroom to bringing in a seminar group in another country into a discussion. A whole wide range, here [on the slide] there is a distinction made between web-facilitated courses and blended courses and up at the top courses that make little or no use of online technologies. I would just like to pass on that bit of understanding I now have. When someone uses the term "online course" my first instinct is, "What do you mean by that?" I encourage you to think in a very complex way about it, because one size does not fit all. There are many sizes, and it is more, in my view, about pedagogy than it is about the means of instruction, which technology is. I have some general themes for discussion, but I want to start with representatives. You have had this issue in your laps since last spring; how does the state of the discussion look to you right now? What would you like to share with your colleagues?

Discussion

Wahneema Lubiano (Literature): I wrote down my colleagues' comments in the interest of conciseness, but I will say that they are directed towards conversations that we wish were going on and had gone on before last year, and we continue to hold these ideas. For example, looking at the categories that are established...they are already established as things that are in the air, as opposed to a previous kind of conversation; a conversation around residential education itself, a conversation about teaching, especially as so much has been circulated about what this means for a new kind of teaching, relations both between and among departments around curriculum issues, but also labor issues. We are not just thinking about departments on Duke's campus, but departments and disciplines more generally speaking. That is the preamble to what I wrote.

The first is from one colleague who articulated an interest in having the question addressed of the rush to join the new before we have those general discussions around residential education itself, around teaching, and around the structure of disciplines and departments, especially given the pressure right now on departments and faculty to respond to the new initiatives organized across disciplinary lines when departmental budgets are being cut, and the humanities departments are being told to look for quite scarce funding outside of the university. The administration and ECASC have actively produced an air of inevitability, which actually works against the larger issues that we want to see brought up.

A second colleague said, "There are those of us who change our courses every time we teach them, and we are actually disadvantaged by the stereotype of the professor with yellow edged lecture notes that is continually bandied about in this discussion." Moving a lecture online actually makes it more difficult to do real-time, and sometimes minute by minute tweaking, in response to students' questions, comments, or baffled looks on their faces, as is the class to class tweaking that goes on as we respond to every previous class. There is a dynamic interaction that not only gets lost, but is incredibly expensive to replicate once you have made the initial labor and cost investment in online. We have to think about what it means to have not had this kind of conversation before online presence became inevitable.

A third colleague said that she is concerned with the dubious ethics of being a PhD training university while actively joining in the narrowing of the tenure track function and of shortening more than adjunct teaching opportunities nationally, internationally, and here on campus. These are concerns that many of us are talking about with regard to whether we are broadening our understanding of the online environment for teaching, or we are narrowing it down to the participation of Duke in a consortium. We are talking about a momentous breaching of faith with the very graduate students we bring here to train for a future that we are actually going to be participating in narrowing.

Finally, a set of three colleagues, some of whom work in languages other than English and/or with materials from developing regions, sent me an article that ran Wednesday in the Chronicle of Higher Education by Phil Altbach who is the director for the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College because they are, as is he, concerned with the impact of the worldwide presence of the "American Academy", the "Western Academy" generally, and the dominance of English language online. The online presence of courses that move beyond our universities also move with a disparate amount of impact against others' participation in knowledge production. Online courses that move from institutions have the effect, even if it is unintended, of simplifying a diverse ecology of knowledge production and language participation here and elsewhere. As Altbach pointed out, neither knowledge nor pedagogy are neutral, whether here on campus or spreading beyond campus, they reflect traditions, methodological orientations, and teaching philosophies. Duke, as part of a larger conversation that did not happen before we were in the middle of thinking about the online environment, needs to consider its participation in increasing the weight of our collective national and international foot in knowledge production across the world and across disciplines.

Linda George (Sociology): We have not had in our department, though we will in early January, a meeting devoted exclusively to this particular topic, but I have talked to my colleagues at considerable length. One of the big concerns that we came up with is the changing of courses every time we teach them and of changing what you are going to do at the next session because there was something that happened in this session. We think that is an incredibly important part of education, and part of the professor's role is to monitor those things and be able to make mid-course corrections, so we worry about that.

Beyond that, I think this list of definitions is very useful. I do know the courses we teach in our department, and I would say we teach zero traditional courses. I do not know of anyone or any course in our department that does not use Sakai for something; that is not where our concerns lie. Most of us teach what are called here web-facilitated courses, and we probably also have a few blended/hybrid [courses] but they are nowhere close to [being] seventy-nine percent at the top end of the range. They are more in the thirty percent level at the bottom of the range.

Without question our biggest concern, and at this point we are not even sure that we can endorse such in any form, is a totally online course that takes away face to face interaction between the instructor and the student, and the students with each other. Moving up to that level is so qualitatively different than other ways in which we have been able to incorporate technology into our classes, so we think that particular one deserves very careful scrutiny. We are not saying there might not be courses that could be effectively done that way, but we do not envision any such courses in our department. We think the full ramifications of that qualitative leap have not yet been totally addressed or discussed in any campus forum at this point.

David Malone (Education): I appreciate the issues that have been raised. As Tom said, in the student discussion that I attended, many of these same issues were raised by them. I felt like whatever we are doing at Duke let's keep doing that,

because these students had an incredible conversation about their concerns and hopes for the uses of technology. I want to come back later to Wahneema's comment about residential and general education, but first I wanted to ask Wahneema [something]. As someone who is involved in ECASC and trying to facilitate conversations around these issues...I appreciate your concern that some of these issues could have been attended to much earlier had we had a sense of intentionality about them and our consciousness raised about them a few years ago...How do you see us moving forward with having these more open conversations about the concerns that you raised?

Wahneema Lubiano (Literature): This is probably going to seem radical, but it seems to me that we actually could stop and go back to the first conversations. When I look at the handouts, for example, and I see the detail that is already given to the online environment, none of the categories that I just brought up are represented here, and it seems to me that I am participating in a conversation where I literally cannot be heard because it has already been set up and structured. The radical intervention would be to say, "We actually have to go back and work on this ground before we go on to consider what else can happen." It could take a number of different forms, and I know that friends and colleagues around the campus have suggested things. It could take the form of a series of open meetings that did not go on at one time, so that people could participate over time. It could take the form, and this I found highly ironic, but it was a colleague's suggestion, of a Duke MOOC on online education that actually took up some of the earlier issues. If we want to run forward into this future that we think is inevitable, then could we at least make use of the technology to think about the contours of that inevitable future?

Micaela Janan (Classical Studies): Following what Wahneema said about the MOOC style of conversation, discussion is not simply to channel opinion. It can change opinion, and the wider this conversation is, the more that will happen. Offering asynchronous possibilities, blogging for example, or possibly offering conversations that are geographically distant...I think involving all of the Duke faculty and probably most of the student body would be extremely educational.

Ken Rogerson (Sanford School of Public Policy): We did not have the chance, as a faculty, to talk about this in a meeting, so I created a Qualtrics survey and sent it out to the faculty. I had enough of a response rate that it gave me an idea of that, and what I found is that I remember making my comments at the April meeting that my faculty was split, and that is exactly correct. They are split almost down the middle between people who are very viscerally against this, being the eighty percent category. We need to make a distinction between a fully online course and using computer-generated things in the classroom. I do not think we have a zero at all in Sanford.

I will just raise two things that came up with the faculty. There is a fear of the technology; there is a fear of not understanding it well enough to be able to integrate in a way that they feel comfortable doing by themselves. There is a feeling of a need for either assistance in doing this, if they are willing to, or not going there because they are afraid that they do not know how to use the technology. Number two was, I asked two questions: of the kinds of courses that you see being taught online and with online tools, and I had an introductory paragraph that distinguished between online-only and MOOC things and using technology in the classroom, are there courses that you think should never be taught online? One-hundred percent of people said a seminar should never be taught online. I do not know what that means, but there is the indication that it has to do with this kind of a conversation of what education really means and the bigger pictures of that. I will throw that out there, and I will turn this into a report.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): There is no delay; I have been deliberately vague on when we are looking for it.

Dean Inge Walther: I am really grateful to Wahneema, and if you could email these, I would love to circulate these comments from your faculty. I just wanted to say a few things to both of you. I think in all of the discussions that I have been a part of with ECASC, there has been a general recognition that the conversations that should have happened last year did not happen, so I think we should get away from beating ourselves up about that.

I think there has been a genuine attempt to make this year be the year of information, gathering, and discussion around all of the issues that you mentioned, Wahneema, and I am happy about all of these suggestions and about having fora that are more of a single faculty forum on a single issue. I think it has been unfortunate that more faculty [members] have not been able to attend, because part of the discussion has taken place in ignorance of what online courses are. Part of the idea behind the faculty fora has been getting information out there about what do we mean by online courses? What forms are they taking? What pedagogies are involved what technologies are used? You can have a more meaningful conversation around the issues that you have articulated, Wahneema, when you have more information about these kinds of things.

I think that has been the attempt, and I just wanted to say in response to your comments that we have an unwritten policy right now that we are not offering "purely" online courses. We are not doing that at Duke right now, so I just want to put the word out there, but we are doing it in the summer. We do have a few purely online courses that have taken place in the summer for which students are very grateful because they do not have to pay the extra expense of having to be on the Duke campus to take those. We have approved these courses because they have been special courses that were offered for particular groups of students who were on Duke engage programs, for example, or doing internships.

So we have been flying by the seat of our pants and doing things without having any particular policies in place. The provisional policies that we have now are that we allow purely online courses in the summer, but not during the semester. I just wanted everyone to know that. There are a few experiments going on, as you know, with this blended/hybrid form, and as people have noted, there are various degrees of online and face to face that are going on. I just want you to know that there are no purely online courses going on during the semester right now, because we do not have policies, and we are still having the discussions.

Ara Wilson (Women's Studies): My methodology is probably a selective and totally unreliable ethnography. One of things that I would say in response to that is that I do not think I saw any beating up at all and a little public self-flagellation probably would not be a bad idea. I was actually surprised to find that what I proposed in the last session was not the starting point. To me after last spring, the starting point would have been "let's hear the critiques" because we did not recognize that they would be there, so let's start with the critiques and let's start by hearing what the conversation should be. The fact that only in the last session I raised it... to me that suggests there actually has not been fully as much reflection as I would have expected given what the conversation was last year.

I think many of what takes place in my department is similar in way to what Wahneema outlined, but one of the first things that I would say is that there is massive confusion about what the discussion is. Is there a hidden, or not hidden but we do not know about it, proposal for yet another for profit MOOC? We do not know that in the department, and maybe I need to do a better job of conveying it, but I do not feel one-hundred percent of a purchase on that.

I have a few points, one is that I actually chafe at the equation of "technology" with "online." There are many instances in which it is irrelevant whether it was a pencil and paper, Gutenberg printing, online, or VHS for the content delivery we are talking about, so in many cases the technology is irrelevant. I think that when we use online in that way, we tend to mean the eighty percent [level] or higher level of the hybrid, particularly as it bears upon the questions of the Duke curriculum, the BA, and the residential questions that Wahneema raised. Technology should not be conflated with online, and I agree we should be specific about what we mean in that sense.

I think one of the conversations that has not fully come up, and Tom I think that is what you are doing by having the departments discuss it, is the pedagogical diversity that we have for all of our legitimate aims, and the institutional diversity of smaller versus large etc. We planned to stage more formal conversations, but my department is reduced by more than fifty percent this year, which leaves us with three [people]. One of the things I would say in general that I have heard is there is not a lot of Luddite anti-technology, but there is a lot of interest in using technology in a variety of different ways, subordinated to pedagogy as this suggests. I can say with some empirical confidence that we would be interested in the use of technology that not only is towards pedagogical ends, but that also ends up valorizing scholarship, informed reflection, slow reflection, and educated critique. We are not interested in the use of technology that de-valorizes the traditional liberal arts contribution to learning and education. That is one of the ways that I would phrase that.

We also would be very interested in the use of technology that enhances graduate students' competitiveness on the market and [in their] career prospects. We are also interested in the use of internet, online, or other technologies that will attract students to research, intellectual, and academic pursuits; not just in applying twitter to a marketing job. We would be particularly persuaded by the use of technology that valorized and reinforced liberal arts values, in-depth learning, slow reflection, and a tool that was deployed towards those ends. We would be highly suspicious, cranky, and resistant to a discourse about the internet, online technology, and the advice to use it in a way that undercut those values. That is the alleged women's studies ethnographic report.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Could I just clarify one thing about the faculty forums that have been organized? There was an intentional decision not to organize forums around positions with online. We were very sensitive, and we do not want to label faculty members as skeptics, enthusiasts, or supporters. We wanted to organize it around themes, as you have seen by the topics, and let the discussion come out of that. In fact, in a number of them people were all over the place, so the skeptical position... I do not even know what that means anymore, because I think everyone has skepticism to some degree. I do think that having continued discussions is really important, and if I could just throw these questions out before we move on to some other comments... when there are questions raised about the value of all of online for credit courses, are colleagues comfortable with the idea of not letting other colleagues experiment with online pedagogies? Let me just point out that right now, the Arts and Sciences Council's courses committee does not police formats for courses. We do not have standards for courses, so we trust that each faculty member, being an expert in their field, will adopt the appropriate pedagogies for teaching. Are questions so serious that we would forbid certain kinds of courses? Do we trust our colleagues to develop courses, as they have across a wide spectrum?

Charlie Becker (Economics): I think our department is one of those that is quite comfortable with online courses, although I also think that probably only ten percent would have any interest in participating themselves. I think it is important for us to recognize that this university, the Arts and Sciences and Sanford, are not homogenous. The stresses that the different departments face vary a great deal, so the need for a value of the range of online options is going to vary a lot.

In our department we have a large number of majors, and we have an objective of increasing undergraduate participation in research. We have been pretty successful at that, but there is still a long ways to go, therefore using tools that would leverage faculty time and would increase research and one to one contact would be attractive to us. Some departments do not have as many majors, so this would not be necessary, and I understand that there are departments that feel threatened by it. It really varies enormously. I think the ability to experiment is the most important thing that we could come out with from this year, and I also think it is really important that whatever happens, because some online ventures will be unsuccessful and I am a huge believer in trial-by-error experimentation, ultimately we want to evaluate student outcomes. Most of us, even if we do not find a position in the academy, most people here and most people with PhDs are going to... this is not a welfare institution for people with PhDs, this is an educational institution. We need to be focusing on student outcomes, and that is going to be tough to measure.

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): It seems pretty clear, as most people have mentioned, that all of us are using technology in the classroom. It seems to me that it would makes sense to try to focus the conversation we are having

here on this really important issue of courses for credit that are taught online. That is something that Inge brought up, and I would love to hear exactly what these courses are that students have taken for credit. I just wanted to add that you mention the money problem, and it would be terrifying to think that students of a lower income who could not afford the in person class time that we have here at Duke might find that online courses would be their default option in the summers or at other times. I think that we are trying to encourage, for example, first generation college students to come to Duke and feel comfortable here.

Chantal Reid (Biology): Several of my points have already been raised. In biology we are just starting the conversation, so I only have a twenty percent sample size. Some of the concerns that were raised already have to do with the student-faculty interaction, which is very critical for the learning process so we need to have that conversation. That being said, the online technology could be used to leave more time for the faculty to have online interaction, so that is a possibility. The other concern was the dilution of the Duke brand, and here I should make a distinction with truly online versus with the various hybrid models. In the department, the truly online is where people are not so comfortable, whereas a majority of the faculty is already doing some kind of hybrid model, and associated with that, we would need to have logistics. More and more faculty are moving into using video or reading online, and use the time for really interacting with the students. To do that, we need to have infrastructure and we need to have rooms that are going to facilitate that, but they are not available, particularly for larger size classes. That is one of the concerns that was expressed, and that is main one that I wanted to raise.

David Malone (Education): I appreciate that comment about how this impacts so many other aspects of our world here on campus, because after the student conversation, Ed Gomes, Shawn Miller, and I had a conversation about how all of this impacts physical space. If you are going to flip a classroom and your intent is to do something different, then the part that is not online might not [have a] space of a 400 person auditorium with bolted-down chairs, you might need other space.

I also wanted to comment on how this impacts, and hopefully Dean Patton will not be upset if I bring this up, our vision of a new curriculum. I know we are going to go with a big tweak for a while, but to me you cannot have this conversation about the impact of technology...and I appreciate what Ara said about what uses of technology work towards the ends of a liberal arts education, because we need to have more of a conversation about what the desired outcomes are of a Duke education. What are the aims and purposes of it? One of the things that was missing from the student conversation was a discussion about outcomes. What are our hopes for how the four years at Duke University make students qualitatively different as people, thinkers, and intellectuals? If we are making a list of all of the things that we need to have a conversation about, let's throw in there, "Learning outcomes of a liberal arts education."

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I just wanted to recall last month's council meeting when you and your colleagues on assessment committee were talking about assessment and I know that some colleagues have not yet recognized that one can turn assessment into a way of improving pedagogy. This is exactly it: we often do not know the outcomes for the classes that we teach right now. We do not necessarily know the right measurement for this. I was talking to my students yesterday that maybe the best time for them to know the outcome of the seminar they are taking with me is three to five years from now, but we usually test at the end of the semester.

Cary Moskowitz (Thompson Writing Program): I want to come back to the points that were made about the nature of the conversations that have taken place. I have to say that when I have seen the emails that have come through, whatever the intentions are, there seems to be the tone of a sales pitch about them, in terms of who is getting the floor and come see the things that people are doing. I am completely supportive of the idea that we need to know what we are talking about and we need to know what these things look like, but I think it is worth thinking about how those are framed in ways that would invite people to come and think about opportunities for these kinds of discussions rather than for the naysayers to come learn about what the people that are doing it have been doing. At least that is the way that it has appeared to me.

Second, it seems to me that there is this continual slippage and a possibility of conflation between the uses of online tools that do not change students' face time with instructors with those that do. My sense is that no one other than Wendell Barry, whom I greatly admire, would have any problem with doing whatever people want as long as they are still having that human contact in the room. Unless we can make that distinction, we will end up circling off into different issues of things related to the support of faculty doing things online, but I do not think that gets back at the issues that people are most concerned about.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): I have already made the decision to postpone the other item on our agenda to January, so you do not have to worry about that. I am going to ask Dean Patton if she can use less time for her [Dean's Corner]

Wahneema Lubiano (Literature): I want to get to the question that you ask explicitly: do we want to stop others from experimenting? Do we trust our colleagues? That is exactly the kind of question that I think is not helpful. First, experiments are not value free, especially in a university that is making decisions about what it will support and what it will not support. The university that decides it will make resources available to those who are already experimenting or willing to experiment online has also made a decision to cut departmental budgets. That means if you are searching for more resources to do something, you are being nudged in the direction of an experiment. Simply raising the question that way, raises it as though there are no other hidden or visible currents, because I take seriously what Cary said about the tone of the emails. We are being addressed as though this is a decision that is going forward: show up and figure out where you fit in it, when our critique has been, we want the bigger discussion that is not constrained by fitting ourselves into this, so we do not have to hear things like, "This is not a welfare university." Where does that come from? Especially since all of us,

regardless of how much we are or are not using technology are thinking about our knowledge projects, our scholarship, and our students' connection to that knowledge.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Are there any other comments? Let me ask one thing: what would representatives suggest is the next step? We are going to be collecting reports over the course of the winter and there is already a mountain of information that has been collected. You represent your units, so what do you think is the right thing for you to suggest for us to do?

Linda George (Sociology): [We should have] discussions about the big underlying issues, not how many courses are going to fit what, but can these modes fit into the kind of liberal arts education that we want to provide.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Linda, would you and your colleagues come [to such a forum discussion]?

Linda George (Sociology): I would come, and I would bring at least some of my colleagues

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Should we have that here in the council meeting itself? Attendance at the forums has been...

Ara Wilson: Wait Tom, you are missing the point of what we are suggesting. It is not a time constraint or place constraint discussion, but one on whether technology should be universal.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): So we should have further discussions in council that are completely open ended?

Linda George (Sociology): Or blogging, some way to let people in from all over. (1-27-45)

Carol Apollonio (Slavic and Eurasian Studies): We used to have a center for teaching excellence. I do not know who remembers that, and it disappeared. I do not know what happened to it, and it was replaced by the CIT. Am I right about that? I would be curious to see if this conversation could be framed a little more closely with a bigger conversation about teaching. It has not been that way, so a teaching center or something along those lines might make a lot of sense.

Chantal Reid (Biology): I need a quick clarification, as to the faculty forum, for people who could not attend they are going to be on the council [website], but there was also a discussion that they were going to be put online on the Duke site, and I was trying to find that for some faculty [members]. Is that going to happen?

Thomas Robisheaux (History): Shawn, the online Duke site...is that CIT?

Shawn ?: We are a part of that

Thomas Robisheaux (History): We have an incredibly modest website that we cannot keep up to date, so that is not Arts and Sciences, but we should have a cross link to that so folks can have better access.

Chantal Reid (Biology): I think that would make it available to everyone who could not attend.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): That is a good suggestion

David Malone (Education): I do not think it has to be an either/or where we have this conversation either in person at a designated time, or somehow use technology. I think we can do both, because I have gained a lot from today's conversation and I would like to have these in person conversations, as well as figure out a way we can do this using technology. If we do have some type of blog...there are a lot of issues here that seem conflated. We need to figure out some ways to have strands of conversations, because some of the policy questions are a little bit different from some of the, "What is a liberal arts education?" A lot of times, I think we think about this in the context of teaching, but I am trying to advocate that we also think of it in the context of learning, what the results of our teaching are, and what we want the results of our teaching to be. [We should] have that conversation as well.

Thomas Robisheaux (History): This has been really helpful, and we have members of the executive committee who are here and listening, so we will have the notes soon. We can go back to it, take stock, and see where we are and what the steps early in the year. Let me turn to Dean Laurie Patton for her updates, announcements, and so on. She reassured me there was not a whole lot, but I want to be sure that she has time.

Dean's Corner

Dean Laurie Patton: I think important it would be important for me to respond to some of the conversation that just happened, because I think it is really important. I want to say a few things briefly before I turn to some other updates. The first is, as you probably already know, it is very important to me that this be a faculty led conversation. Turning over faculty forums and supporting that from the dean's office is exactly what we did this autumn, and we would love to continue to do that. That is the number one priority that it not be decanally led in any way, shape, or form, so I am hoping that we can continue to do that. Second, I can only speak for Arts and Sciences, but as people know, I find it confusing when people say the "administration" because I am not sure what that means. I will speak for this administration in Arts and Sciences, which is in terms of an agenda: absolutely none. I am speaking for Arts and Sciences, and I hope I make myself clear.

The third thing is that I think what Ara said is really important. That should be what moves us forward, which is that the number one thing we should be talking about at this stage is pedagogy and how we support pedagogy that is deepening and engaging student-faculty interaction. That is the only thing we should be doing, and as I have said in about ten different forums, the only thing that matters is liberal learning. The point is not to go online, because if you lead with the technology, then we are going to have some of the concerns that have been raised here today. I really appreciate them being raised, because I think they are essential. This was said in a number of different points, which is that the point is to think about how liberal learning can be deepened. That is really the only question, and I think that is absolutely essential to finally say that I endorse the idea of some of these basic conversations.

I think perhaps the next thing that faculty might do is engage on a number of different designs for those conversations. How do you design them? Here is where my frequent thought that I would be more helpful as a faculty member than as I dean...I used to design these conversations as the director in the center for faculty development, which had as its major mandate teaching and learning. Some of you already know that I have been a major advocate at Duke for trying to create a center for teaching and learning that would be university wide. I highly support that and I have lots of experience in running one. It needs to be about pedagogy, not about technology. I really want to endorse both the basics of a conversation that Wahneema was encouraging us to do, as well as the ways in which we think about the uses of technology to deepen faculty-student interaction.

Just to give you heads up, we have heard from students and we will be sharing some of those results. Lee Baker wanted to communicate as an Arts and Sciences administrator how important this is to us. We wanted to communicate that we will be sharing those students' results, and students feel the same way. We will be doing more with all of those results later, because it is all about the Duke experience, which is faculty-student in person interaction. Let's think about what those pedagogies look like for the 21st century. I just wanted to give you a bit of response to the conversation and I very much appreciate it. I think it is a really good one that is probably hard sometimes, and I am very glad we are having it.

I have a couple of other little things in relationship to where we are headed and what we are doing. I wanted to report about advising and the advising task force. We are continuing to work on several principles that the advising task force will give to us in the Arts and Sciences administration about where they think advising should move. They are going to be voting on the last few principles in the next couple of days and then they are going to be coming up with some suggestions around structure. We have been really pleased with the conversation so far; it has been very robust, and that is where we are with that.

Second is to report on the liberal arts in china committee. I think I mentioned in my last update that we are working very hard, Mary bullock will be with us next time; we are very pleased about her visit here and we are going to be working on three different committees and the charging of those committees. One is on liberal arts in China more broadly, the other is on faculty governance, and the third is on student experience. We have also been talking a lot with the Academic Council and the China Faculty Council about a broad, open conversation on the procedures that we have in place for academic freedom. We will keep you posted on that, and we are going to be working very much in sync with the Academic Council on those conversations. Also, I wanted to let you know that the university course, which is hosted by Arts and Sciences, is moving forward. We have 100 students again this year, so we are really excited. As you know, the theme is shelter and that has folks from across the university registered, as well as professors, so please stop in. We have had several professors come in when they wanted to.

The final two things that I wanted to let you know about are certainly open to any questions, concerns, or thoughts. The first is that in our fundraising in July we were at 222 million toward our \$450 million goal and we are now at 241 million. That includes 19 million in new commitments, which has been really wonderful. In the annual fund, which is really where we get our bread-and-butter and are able to be discretionary in our movement and leadership, we are 29 percent ahead of our goal and where we were last year. That is also really exciting, so people are continuing to really want to give to Duke in all sorts of wonderful ways.

The final thing I want to say is the most important, which is that, as you know, we are required to balance the budget. Our decision to cut was not a decision that we wanted to make, but what we wanted to do, as you remember, is to create an environment where departments were not across the board at all but were meeting with us with more data than they had ever had before. We had a set of iterative conversational meetings, and what was wonderful about those meetings is that they came up with both solutions for revenue generation as well as some solutions for reducing expenses. You have heard from Sandy Connolly about the proposals that each department chair submitted to us, and just remind you, this was not an across-the-board cut. We wanted to work with each department differently, because some departments have lots of resources while others do not and each department looks different in terms of what they have.

We were incredibly impressed with the care and thoughtfulness with which each department worked with us and came up with a solution, which we are required to have. We now have more data shared between Arts and Sciences and departments than ever before, and that is really great for everybody. It looks like as a result of those discussions we are going to save 4.7 million, which is wonderful. That reduces our previously predicted \$6 million deficit considerably. It is really wonderful for us on so many different levels. We have not completely resolved the deficit issue, but we are making major progress, and I really wanted to end by thanking everybody for their extraordinary contribution in helping us with this challenge, and to say again that we are absolutely moving in the right direction thanks to your creativity.

I will not be at the Arts and Sciences Council in January; I will be traveling in Asia trying to raise funds in that arena, but I know that the conversation will be great. I am particularly looking forward to sharing some of the results from our student surveys and beginning those big picture conversations about pedagogy.

Meeting Adjourned