

**Arts & Sciences Address**  
**September 11, 2014**  
**Laurie L. Patton,**  
**Durden Professor of Religion**  
**Dean, Arts & Sciences**

I am delighted to be starting the fourth year of our journey together and the first year of our work with new provost Sally Kornbluth. With Tom, with ECASC, with Arts & Sciences Council and its committees, A&S will begin its own strategic planning this year. It is great to have the fresh perspective that Sally brings to our academic priorities. In the first three years I have used the terms **integration**, **adaptation**, and **innovation** to define how we think about 21st century undergraduate education. And we have redefined those terms three times.

Integration was finding a meaningful place for our knowledge in the world (year one), and doing so without over legislation (year two). In year three, I focused on our integration of curricular initiatives such as the global health major and certificate 2.0.

Adaptation was “turning on a dime” in terms of intellectual and life and career choices and to move across spheres of activity with equal parts rigor and joy (year one), and do to so without overreacting (year two). In year three, I defined adaptation specifically in terms of financial sustainability, and we have come a long way toward that goal.

I defined innovation as finding new laws of information in addition to those of nature and society (year one) and doing so with a keen eye to tradition (year two). In year three, I defined innovation in a curricular way—both making a faculty-owned environment

around online courses, and developing a new kind of course—the signature course—which we are launching this year. In our fourth year together, the integration, adaptation, and innovation will focus on the Trinity College curriculum, about which I will say more in a moment. I also start each address with a historical figure from Duke. As we move toward building a new architecture for the curriculum, I thought it only appropriate that we have as our historical guide the figure of Julian Abele. Julian Abele was the architect of three major buildings on the Duke campus, in fact probably many more. He was a fascinating, cosmopolitan character—one of the first known African American architects to work on major buildings in the United States. His partnership with Horace Trumbauer, for whose firm he also worked, was also an extraordinary example of collaboration. In addition to building in stone, he also worked with many different kinds of materials— watercolor, lithography, etching, pencil; in wood, iron, gold and silver. He designed and constructed all his own furniture, even doing the petit-point himself. And as this multi-purpose designer, Julian Abele can inspire us with a kind of aesthetic vision for guiding us through the curriculum. The curriculum is also a kind of working in multiple media, from scientific study to artistic performance. And Julian Abele could not be easily categorized. He was always immaculately dressed, and he would wear a suit even for a walk on the beach. He was a patron of the Philadelphia orchestra as well as the University of Pennsylvania football team. Our Trinity College curriculum, too, defies easy definitions. And its complexity is part of its beauty as well as its challenge for us in 2014.

## FINANCIALS

And speaking of collective, or collaborative, genius—I begin, as I always do, with our financial situation in which our collaborative spirit has been an exemplar for other

schools at Duke as well as more broadly. I will be briefer this time because you all received my financial update letter a few days ago, and I want to spend more time talking about our collective work together on the curriculum.

As you may recall, we began fiscal year 2013/2014 with a budgeted deficit of \$2.8M, which we then worked to address by increasing revenue and closely watching expenses. I am pleased to report that we ended the 2013/2014 fiscal year with a surplus of \$92K, thanks to better than anticipated returns from the Annual Fund, Global Education and Summer Sessions. This is no small accomplishment and I want to thank everyone for contributing to our success.

I particularly want to thank our Annual Fund team, led by Office of University Development Assistant Vice President Jennifer Cameron. Here for Jen are development officers Randy Garcia and Betsy Gentry-Bumm. Using several new outreach strategies, her team raised an extraordinary \$1M more than their original budget goal. Global Education, led by Executive Director & Vice Provost Amanda Kelso, had higher than projected enrollments and we benefited from \$557K in budget deficit relief. Susan Pratt is here from the Global Education Office. And finally, the Summer Sessions program, led by Associate Dean and Director of Duke Continuing Studies Paula Gilbert, ended the year with additional net revenue of \$376K. Please join me in thanking them now. They are the key to attaining financial sustainability while maintaining extraordinary Duke standard programs.

I also want to note the successful launch of three new masters programs (MS in Statistical Science, MA in Historical & Cultural Visualization, and MS in Economics and Computation). Please join me in thanking the faculty and staff who made this

possible. While faculty have developed these programs to enrich our graduate offerings, the new net revenue from these programs contributes appreciably to our financial sustainability overall.

### **For Fiscal Year 2014/2015**

You may recall that last summer, the whole school engaged in intensive budget planning aimed at moving us towards financial sustainability. With the support of our departments, programs and academic administration units, we were able to permanently lower our overall projected budget deficit by more than \$4.6M. In addition, we were successful in finding \$700K of one-time funding to further reduce the budgeted deficit to \$1.2M for 2014/2015.

Going forward, we are exploring opportunities to generate new net revenue by increasing sponsored research that provides facilities & administrative (F&A) return to the school, expanding and enhancing continuing studies program offerings, and potentially launching several additional new masters programs. We have also optimistically raised the fundraising target for our Annual Fund to \$18M and will continue to be creative in thinking about summer session, continuing studies, and global education enrollments.

I want to touch base finally on the Trinity campaign. We have raised \$294.2M (~68% to goal), and a reminder that while it takes some time for some of the gifts to kick in, those endowments will help us financially in the future and the programmatic funds are helping us balance our budget now. We have raised \$98.1M for financial aid—a huge portion of our budget—26% as you saw from the pie chart. We have raised \$54.2M in

faculty support (including sponsored research from non-governmental sources,) \$69.1M through the Annual Fund, and \$54.7M in programs such as DukeEngage, Focus, Financial Economics, advising, and the career center. We have also done \$18.1M in other areas, such as capital, bequests, and unrestricted gifts that are not part of the annual fund.

## FACULTY HIRES

We also continue to support A & S departments in developing strategic visions for planning faculty searches. You may recall the faculty salaries are the single largest expense for the school, and that faculty renewal is an ongoing and vital part of sustaining a top tier research institution. I want to turn now to our ongoing focus on those faculty hires. We have hired just over 100 new faculty members over the last three years, and those hires have contributed greatly to the quality of our faculty. I am very pleased with what we have accomplished while balancing opportunity against financial considerations. Our overarching goals are to keep the number of faculty searches less than the projected number of faculty departures, to hire junior faculty in place of senior retirements, and to identify additional resources for faculty searches such as endowments or grants. Here is a list of our new faculty hires, and I am delighted to say that they represent the best in sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.

As we turn to our hires for the future, I want to remind you of our criteria for faculty hiring. We share this with you every year and we will continue to share this with you so that you see what we struggle with as we keep working with departments on their strategic priorities. Our searches are allocated to assure opportunities for renewal across departments. They are strategies that ally with departmental development plans and

opportunities for departmental rankings advancement. We also try to respond to serious teaching needs; we focus on continuations of pending searches; we look at interdisciplinary hires that advance big research questions of departments. And we try to continue the “unfinished business” of diversity; build faculty strength in global arenas, especially Asia. Here is our list of approved searches for this year, based on our assessment of these criteria I just named.

### TRINITY INITIATIVES

Let me turn now to the Initiatives we began with when we started our journey together in 2011. I am pleased to say that all of them—both short term and long term—are thriving. Scholars & Publics is a beehive of activity, with over 30 events last year where Trinity scholars and researchers interacted with and reflected on their publics. We have also made great strides in diversity in the sciences—with key hires of women and minorities in mathematics, statistics, biology, computer science, physics, and most spectacularly, in chemistry. We have hired 7 people overall with a focus on Asia or Asia-related areas, but we need to make more, and are working hard on an exciting staggered cluster hire in the study of China over several years. We are particularly focused on comparative study of Asia, or Global Asia. We feel this is the right way for Duke to grow in the future.

### DIVISIONAL INITIATIVES

I want to begin our discussion of Divisional Initiatives by asking you to join me in thanking in person the extraordinary work of Srinivas Aravamudan who, as you know, has stepped down this past summer as Dean of Humanities. As I mentioned in my letter to you this summer, much of the new signature that Duke has in the Humanities is due to his

leadership and creativity. And while we will miss him as our Dean, he will continue to do three full time jobs instead of four. He will continue to run Humanities Writ Large, the Consortium for Humanities Centers and Institutes, and the new Mellon grant which I will say more about in a moment. Let's pause for a minute to give our extraordinary colleague a round of applause.

I also ask you to join me in welcoming two new deans—Linda Burton, the James B Duke Professor of Sociology and Rick Powell, the Bassett Professor of Art History. You have already read about their distinguished scholarly careers and intellectual visions that made them perfect candidates for leadership roles at Duke, where the scholar-administrator model is the key emphasis. They have already hit the ground running with new ideas and different energies and all the good things that a change in leadership in an organization can bring. We are delighted to have them here.

I also want to turn to the accomplishments of the individual divisions. In the Natural Sciences, thanks to the work of faculty and key administrators, working together, we have received a substantial Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) grant in science, technology, engineering & mathematics (STEM) education. To increase student success in STEM disciplines, particularly that of Underrepresented Minorities (URMs), highly selective research universities must think in a much more deep and multifaceted manner about STEM education: we must develop a data-driven model for understanding how faculty perceive and experience teaching, how students perceive and experience learning, and what kinds of educational experiences in science gateway courses can be created for the best 'high-impact' engagement of all students, including URMs. To achieve these goals, Duke will launch the **COMPASS (Collaborating on Mentoring, Persistence, Assessment,**

**and Student Success) Project**, an integrated suite of complementary efforts designed to align and realign engagement readiness of STEM educators and students. Our project will focus on students and faculty, spanning multiple departments and creating a community of STEM learners and research practitioners.

We continue to make progress on our partnership with Pratt in our new building, which combines labs and classrooms for engineering and key specialized labs for our table-top physics group. Although we have a long way to go, we have raised \$2M toward this goal—far more than I ever thought possible when it was just a wish and a prayer in 2011. In addition, we intend this building to have classrooms and auditorium for new methods in science learning to support our great strides in inclusivity in STEM teaching and learning.

I am also thrilled to share with you that, under the leadership of scholar and former dean Angela O’Rand, Duke has received a major grant from the National Institute on Aging to expand the core of Center for Population Health and Aging, housed within SSRI. Expansion of our research faculty has permitted substantial intellectual growth in this area. While CPHA’s traditional strength is in biodemography, it has integrated researchers from other related substantive areas—specifically *life course analyses* of physical and mental health and general wellbeing over the life span and *intergenerational studies*, including the transmission of health and longevity. While much research here employs widely used, large scale nationally-representative datasets and will continue to do so in creative ways, CPHA also has an unusually large number of unique ongoing longitudinal data collection efforts that support and integrate these three substantive areas. It has received a \$2M grant to do just that.



We have also launched a new initiative focused on the social, political, economic and cultural dimensions of uneven and inequitable access to resources, opportunity and capabilities. Launched in July, and headed by Sandy Darity, researchers in the Duke Consortium on Social Equity will address the overarching social problem of general inequality and explore disparities and conflict associated with group-based identity such as gender, race, ethnicity or religious affiliation. The team will particularly focus on the construction of group identity and nationalisms at the social and individual levels, and to the cultural products such as visual arts, dance, literature, and music that result from and that critique inequality.

In the Humanities, we have made several significant strides. We have appointed a Humanities Director of Academic Engagement; we have had a conference funding program; we have new humanities open house for interested students, and an undergraduate Focus in the Humanities hosted by PAL, the Center for Philosophy, Arts & Literature, among many other new initiatives. Humanities Writ Large continues to thrive, giving out grants to a wide variety of emerging humanities networks, partnerships with other universities, and helping us with key strategic hires in these areas.

In addition, I want to announce a new grant from Mellon: \$1.3 million, three and a half year grant exploring the futures of the humanities disciplines in light of the interdisciplinary growth and development of recent decades. Here, our grant partners include all of Duke's humanities and interpretive social sciences departments, along with other non-departmental centers and units.

Key programs include monthly public symposia, faculty seminars and working groups, and a collection of online position papers. Our fall 2014 activities include 2 PAL-FHI

Seminars ("Whose Kafka?" and "The Contemporary Novel"). Discussions with departments to configure potential seminars are underway. And a CFP for non-departmental working groups is circulating with a September 15 deadline for submission.

These are extraordinary stories, typical of our faculty. And I have no doubt I will continue to share similarly good news with you in the future. However, I want to pause here to send a broad message to all faculty that the Dean's Office strongly supports your search for grants and other forms of support for your research. Our F&A's, Facilities and Administrative income, which is overhead from federal and some foundation grants, has been declining. This is partly because of the larger funding climate and sequestration. That changing funding climate is real both in the federal realm and in foundation support. However, we should be submitting a far larger number of grant proposals in relevant fields than we are. Trinity College's submission rate is essentially flat at a time when it should be ascending. So I want to make a strong plea to make use of our wonderful staff members who are here to help in just this area—the first of which is Carmel Lee. As the Director of Research Opportunities in Arts & Sciences, Carmel Lee is here to help particularly with respect to our most fundable fields. She has already held one workshop that was heavily subscribed and will be holding two more in the coming months of the semester. Please contact her office for more information on this. Beth Eastlick in the Office of Foundation Relations is the person who shepherds all our exemplary grants to Foundations in this area, including the several Mellon Grants that we have received. We need to do more in crafting, submitting, and producing fundable proposals—plain and simple.

We realize that funding climates vary widely across the three divisions in Arts & Sciences and our strategies need to honor those different environments. And so we will

support you even more in this collective goal. We are currently looking for strategies to mitigate research shortfalls as well as other incentives and support mechanisms to help faculty with this work. And we have a great new partner in Larry Carin as Vice Provost for Research, who with Dan Kiehart, already has come up with a great set of proposals to help us in this arena. Please stay tuned for an announcement from us about these programs to help faculty on this issue. Funding is always positive. Period. More funding is even more positive.

### CURRICULAR INITIATIVES

For our curricular initiatives this year, I want to mention that we have followed up on a wish from last year, and launched a series of Signature Courses—courses that combine the best of Duke’s virtues. These courses focus on the exploration of compelling challenges or “big questions” of our time. These courses--taught by our most renowned scholar-teachers--highlight Duke's particular strengths in promoting active interchange among faculty and students in the humanities, natural and social sciences, arts, and engineering. Signature courses are designed to integrate curricular and co-curricular engagements, and to foster the skills that prepare students for life-long learning. Drawing explicit connections between the past and present, these courses provide students with an informed analytical context for understanding significant social, cultural, political, or scientific issues, events, or historical moments.

In addition, after a robust faculty led discussion last year about the various forms of online learning last year, we are sponsoring more creative forms of online that serve to increase the liberal arts focus of Trinity College, not decrease it. Those include more work

in the flipped classroom modality than ever before. They also include a suite of courses that join teaching partners at Duke and another university—whether it is a global partner in Asia or Africa or South America, or a research partner with whom we are teaching our latest research project. More faculty are helping further Duke’s public outreach in teaching non-credit MOOCs than ever before, 14 courses ranging from copyright law to sports and society to bioelectricity to composition. But even these courses are being repurposed in the service of the small classes at Duke, deepening the liberal arts focus that will always be Trinity’s signature.

I also want to update you on the work of the faculty committee on advising, led by Steve Asher and offices capably led by Beth Fox. After a great amount of dedicated work last year, the faculty committee has made some great recommendations, and Steve Nowicki, Lee Baker, and Beth Fox are working hard on several components to our already robust and exciting advising program. These include an increase in the number of Directors of Academic Engagement (we are now up to six), deeper training for all advisors, more engagement with faculty advisors, better transitions from pre-major to major advising, and moving to a voluntary four year advising model. In collaboration with Steve Nowicki’s office, we will be keeping you updated throughout the year.

And finally, a reminder that the Global Study Abroad semester has opened at DKU, with 62 undergraduate students, six courses being offered by Duke faculty and a wonderful address about the classical approach to beginnings by Classical Studies Professor William Johnston. Nora Bynum will be joining us in October to give a full report of the semester’s opening, and the progress on the campus to date.

## CURRICULUM

I want to spend the rest of my time on a single topic—the inauguration of what we are calling the big-tweak in our curriculum. Let me begin with some context. When we first started thinking about Curriculum 2000, it was the mid-90's. The Internet was still big news. We made an evaluation in our class assessment form that said, "Do you use the Internet in your classes?" Then, the Internet promised a future that was both different and the same than the Internet future that we have now been living into for the past decade and a half. Under the leadership of Steve Nowicki, we have focused on a tweak in 2004. His work in the mid 2000's, what I like to call the "roaring aughts," reduced the complexity of the original Curriculum 2000 and, in so doing, increased degrees of freedom (or, conversely, made the curriculum less constraining). Previously students were omitting whole areas of knowledge (largely math and foreign languages), and this revision gave a structure and expectation of what engagements students needed to have to prepare for a 21<sup>st</sup> century life.

But that was ten years ago and in 2004 we did not have Duke Engage, Duke Immerse, Certificate 2.0, Winter Forum, and Bass Connections—five significant curricular changes that have had impacts that we are only just beginning to study. In the meantime, we had fewer students going on study abroad; fewer students who had significant Service Learning Experiences, and fewer students who did two or more things, such as a double major, a major and a minor, following the national trend. We also were not grappling with the effects in the larger educational environment of online learning—whether those are MOOCs, online degree learning at other universities or at the masters' level at Duke.

Last year was the silent phase of our thinking. And that included our asking the A & S Curriculum Committee to think about diagnostics—what was working and what wasn't. That query resulted in a series of informal reports over the last year and a half, which can now help us launch the more formal stage of our investigations. They felt that much of our curriculum was working well, and a major overhaul was not necessary. However, they had clear concerns about how the curriculum might be working in the 2014 pedagogical and scholarly environments. As they wrote to us, some significant simplification and functional enhancement would both lend greater coherence to student pathways and make it easier for students to participate in important new pedagogical initiatives such as Bass Connections, Experiential Certificates, Online Opportunities, University Course, DukeImmerse, etc. So first: less is more. Second, a smaller more focused set of competencies should be prioritized over a more extensive set of limited exposures. Third, majors should be a more not less significant element of a student's portfolio.

I also asked the Course Committee to answer the question: "What is a Course?" They raised essential questions about how we might need to rethink certain key issues in light of our current educational environments which include new forms of global education, new uses of online learning platforms, and new forms of pedagogical practice: how might we therefore rethink contact hours, flexibility of course timings, and the relationship between course duration, student effort, and course credits. The three points I am going to outline below as part of the charge to the committee are based on responses from faculty in these informal conversations during this silent phase. They are the beginning of an iterative process that we hope will take us to an entirely new curricular place.

We also began to think about process, particularly over the summer. The major commitment I want to articulate here is: In consultation with students, faculty own the curriculum. Faculty author the curriculum. Faculty revise the curriculum. This is a fundamental point that we need to proceed and from which we need to end.

In that spirit, Tom Robisheaux and I have been working throughout the summer to put together what we feel are two extraordinary committees. We have appointed an Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee (aka the Big Tweak Committee), with representatives from all the divisions in Arts & Sciences and three administrators ex-officio who are closest to the curriculum on the ground. That committee is chaired by a great leader for all of us: Suzanne Shanahan. A sociologist of immigration and globalization, you also know Suzanne as former head of Arts & Sciences Council, former head of the Curriculum Committee, and innovators of Duke Immerse & DukeEngage programs. We are thrilled that she has accepted this role.

We also have created another key committee, an Advisory Committee who will be consulted every step of the way. These comprise key faculty members who are known for their curricular innovations, for their extraordinary oversight, for their robust sense of the common good, and who are leading faculty members in our partner schools in undergraduate education.

Our charge is simple and comprises the “Three points/Three years” principle. And, as mentioned above, it is based on the informal conversations of last year, between A & S, ECASC, Curriculum Committee and Courses Committee. We want to clarify and, if necessary, simplify the logic of the curriculum. We want to create more opportunities for

exploration and creativity in the curriculum. In light of our interdisciplinary work together, we want to rethink our vision for disciplinarity as embodied by the curriculum.

And in answering these concerns we will take three years. A reminder: it takes 1.5 years to do a certificate—and that is only 10 courses. So we do need to give ourselves some time and engagement as we proceed on this “Big Tweak.” Our proposed time frame will comprise diagnosis in year 1; the development of proposals in year 2; official discussion & voting in year 3.

In addition, our intention is to keep things light, rather than mandate a major reform. If we had mandated a major reform, then we would all be carrying this heavily. But I want there to be a frame in which we work together in a more creative and engaging way, and yet if there is a big idea that emerges from this committee, we move forward with it. I would welcome it and endorse that big idea. So this frame gives faculty the ability to carry things lightly AND have big ideas at the same time.

Here is our charge to the committee:

The Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Chair of the Arts & Sciences Council of Trinity College charges the Imagining Curriculum Committee to examine the state of the curriculum and make revisions. The committee’s revisions should respond to three key questions: In its present educational context, can the logic of the curriculum be clarified and simplified? Does the curriculum have a capacity to draw out and challenge students’ curiosity and creativity? Does the curriculum have a capacity to reap the full benefits of the disciplinary and interdisciplinary work of a research university?



Here are some of our further questions. Are we taking full advantage of vertical integration, undergraduate research strength, and interdisciplinarity that has now become a Duke signature? Are there ways we could integrate those strengths more into the curriculum itself? And are there ways to reimagine disciplinarity? Are we confident enough in our disciplinary activities that we could, in fact, rename our disciplines? If we could rename each of our departments with a more accurate title of our current work, what would it be? Other schools are known in part for their curricula—a distinctive core curriculum, a particular approach to distribution requirements. With our curriculum engaging these three further strengths of undergraduate research, interdisciplinarity, and vertical integration, we could create a signature that is truly distinctive and well known for its creative, rigorous, student-centered thinking. We could adapt to the complexity that is a particularly 2014 form of complexity; we could integrate levels of learning to deepen the sense of discovery in our individual students; and we could innovate by providing new opportunities for our students to push themselves without focusing on checking the box.

Here is the process, worked out in extensive discussions with ECASC, Suzanne Shanahan as chair of the Curriculum Committee, Tom Robisheaux and other faculty involved in the review process. First, it is a highly iterative one, because that is the administrative style of our offices in A & S, and it is how we work so well with ECASC and Arts & Sciences Council as a whole. The Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee, the core committee, will be meeting once a week. Second, the work of the committee will be data driven, working with our offices of institutional research and some data analytics faculty who have volunteered to collect information on key curricular questions, such as how our students make their way through the curriculum, what course choice and major

choice have to do with each other, changes in patterns in study abroad, and so on. Third, the Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee (IDC) will be listeners in several different ways. They will be coming to departmental meetings to hear what faculty members have to say about the curriculum from their disciplinary perspectives. They will be attending and listening at Director of Undergraduate Studies meetings. And they will be listening at chairs' meetings in each division. Both Arts & Sciences Council and the Dean's office will be sponsoring open faculty forums on these questions. And, as you have heard from Tom, those of you who are Council representatives will be vital to this process: listening to colleagues and bringing faculty views to Council. We will continue to do this throughout all three years.

And finally, the Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee will be working closely with its faculty advisors on the Advisory Committee. They will meet regularly with the Advisory Committee—twice this semester and three to four times in the spring, and then regularly over the course of the next three years. The Imagining the Duke Curriculum Committee will report in on its progress to date and get constructively critical feedback on all of its ideas and proposals.

As you see, our process is highly iterative. That means tolerating ambiguity and anxiety while things are in process. Suzanne, Tom, and I want a Duke undergraduate curriculum that faculty shape, understand and embrace. We want you, the faculty writ large, to be reflected in this curriculum, and the curriculum to reflect what faculty care about. The process will require a robust and capacious sense of the common good, not a narrow interest in defending a particular piece of curriculum but a concern about what is in the best interests of the college and the students. Two thirds of the faculty members that

are currently at Duke have come on to the faculty since our current curriculum was created. We need to think together again, as a community, to create new focus and logic for a curriculum that is working well, but in our new context, could work even better.

In the last three years we have done extraordinary things together. We are on the road to financial sustainability, and we did it collaboratively. We have become a true national leader in creating an inclusive environment in the sciences. We have deepened the university's relationship to its multiple publics. We have begun to focus better and differently on Asia. And we have hired 100 extraordinary faculty. Among so many other things. So let us do something even more challenging. Let us imagine the Duke curriculum together.

For some, Julian Abele in all his complexity was not imaginable during his time. And yet he, and others around him, imagined the possibilities for himself and his talents nonetheless. The first African American graduate at the Department of Architecture at the University of Pennsylvania, and the first to become a chief architect in the firm of Horace Trumbauer. Lithographer. Woodworker. Silver worker. Etching artist. Like Abele, we are architects of our intellectual futures as we imagine a new version of the curriculum. Like him, we use the artistry of multiple media to get it done. Inspired by him, I invite you to join us in this next phase of the collective genius that is Trinity College.